

1

(CHAPTER 3) MULTIHUSBAND-MULTIWIFE

Multiple spousal systems are about loving more than one person. In other words, human beings *are capable* of loving more than one person (poly+gamy) with all the heart and cleaving only to them. In fact, our Father in heaven prefers it to be that way because that is the society that exists among the perfected men and women in heaven. While the scriptures clearly justify a marriage relationship that is defined as the union of one man and one woman — there is nothing that limits people to only having one such marriage union at a time.

The current narrative is that God somehow has made humans to only be able to love one person (mono+gamy) with all the heart — and therefore adding another person would thereby take away from the love/cleaving to the first.

This is not true.

However, if a person adds another spouse into his/her family *at the expense* of the first, then they are not initiating a tribal relationship. Essentially, they are still monogamous (only loving one person at a time) but are just married to multiple people. If you've promised to love more than one person, then love more than one person — otherwise you are not keeping the covenant.

1) To the extent that it offends a person that another is loving their spouse and fulfilling his/her needs — this is selfish. If the second spouse will *add to* the fulfillment and love the spouse feels, then why would that person be against it?

2) To the extent that adding another spouse to better satisfy a person *takes away* from the original spouse — this is selfish. Before adding another spouse, a person must ensure that they are indeed capable of fulfilling another person's emotional and physical needs.

Monogamy vs. polygamy is really about the number of people that a person *loves* — not the number of people they are married to. If you take a look at marriage from an agency standpoint, then monogamy is the devil's tool of choice because it limits the agency of both parties with respect to other people. Polygyny/polyandry would come in second because it limits the agency of only one of the genders with respect to other people, while freeing-up the agency of the other. Multihusband-multiwife marriages would be the last thing the devil would want because no one's agency is limited. No one becomes the exclusive property of anyone else.

Things are not as black and white as to say that monogamy is holy matrimony and every other type of marriage is inspired of the devil. There are many extrinsic factors that are more likely to determine a level of "badness" in a human relationship than just relying on counting spouses. One can find abusive monogamists as easily as finding abusive polygynists.

Having a love-based marriage relationship is about striving to meet the needs of the *other* person — not yourself. A need-based relationship focuses on what my spouse does to fulfill/affect *me*.

Marriage is a covenant designed to make permanent the love that is manifested when the sexual natures of the two genders come together. Marriage is about staying unified beyond an initial sexual unification [consummation]. As such, there can be no prohibition on loving multiple spouses [whether it's polygyny or polyandry]. Saying marriage can *only* be monogamous [or *only* be polygynous, or whatever] — limits the free expression of the human choice to love. It's akin to limiting the number of children a family will have.

Why would we limit love? Because of the fear that some of *my* resources would go to a child I didn't biologically foster? So what? Because I fear that a woman I love will be emotionally or sexually satisfied by someone else? Get over it. If a couple wants to *choose* monogamy, then they are free to go for it — D&C 132 allows for vows of exclusivity. But no one should impose their own emotional needs for exclusive relationships of love onto others — especially by using the scriptures in an attempt to justify such an exclusionary position.

PLURAL MARRIAGE IN HEAVEN

Jesus said, "He that receiveth me receiveth my Father; and he that receiveth my Father receiveth my Father's kingdom; therefore all that my Father hath shall be given unto him" (D&C 84:37-38.)

Simple logic deduces that the Father has more of everything than any one of his children, or than all of them combined. (The Lord explained this principle in Abraham 3:19, using intelligence as an example.) So, if Brigham Young had 56 wives, the Father has more. If Solomon had 300 wives, the Father has more.

We are taught that there never was a time when there was no God; that God the Father had a Father and so did he, and so on throughout eternity. We ask, then, can any of this infinite number of male gods have more than our heavenly Father? Of course, not. "It is not given that one man should possess that which is above another" (D&C 49:20) is a heavenly principle. So, if a male god has x-amount of wives, so do all male gods have x-amount of wives. It is likewise a principle of the heavens that they have "all things common." (See Acts 4:32; 3 Ne. 26:19; 4 Ne. 1:3.)

Godhood can be defined as receiving all there is to receive. So, how many wives does God have? He has as many wives as there are female gods in the heavens. How many is that? An infinite number that continues to grow as more women become exalted.

Now let's talk about husbands. If there is at least one female god in heaven that has more than one husband, all the female gods must have more than one husband. No female god can have more or less than any other female god. They must all be "equal in the bonds of heavenly things" (D&C 78:5), including the marital bonds. The scriptures explain that polyandry (one wife with multiple husbands) is part of the law of the Lord. (See D&C 132:41.)

So, it becomes apparent that the heavens are made up of male and female gods *who are all married to each other*. (They have "all things common.") This is why we read that early General Authorities, during the time of Brigham Young, etc., referred to the practice of plural marriage as being a requirement of exaltation. It most certainly is. We may not be required to live it now, but we will be required to live it then.

So, to answer the question, "How many wives will a man receive when he enters his exaltation?", we answer: he will receive all the wives there are and all that there will be in the heavens, without limit. And how many husbands will a woman receive when she enters into her exaltation? She will receive all the husbands there are and all that there will be in the heavens, without limit. Each man or woman must be willing to share what they have with all the others and to share in all that the others have. They must enter into the state of having all things common.

This is our understanding of the doctrine of the Lord, as revealed in the scriptures.

PLURAL MARRIAGE IN THE SCRIPTURES

The Bible starts out with the first five books of Moses, who himself had two wives: Zipporah (see Ex. 2:15-16,21;18:1-6) and an Ethiopian woman (see Num. 12:1-15.) Moses wrote in the first of these books that Adam and Eve were married, saying:

“Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh. And they were both naked, the man and his wife, and were not ashamed” (Gen. 2:24-25.)

A monogamist would point to these verses as proof-positive that monogamy is the only approved marriage order and that polygamy (in any of its forms) is an abomination and those that practice it are wicked, but they fail to take into account that Moses, the author of the text, was himself a polygynist, a holy prophet and was “very meek, above all the men which were upon the face of the earth” (Num. 12:3.)

After writing of our first parent’s marriage, Moses wrote that polygyny was in practice among the people who lived prior to the existence of the house of Israel and the law of Moses. He mentioned that Lamech had two wives (see Gen. 4:19), that Abraham had three wives (see Gen. 16:1,3;25:1) and that Jacob, who would later have his name changed to Israel, had four wives (see Gen. 29:23,28;30:4,9.) Isaac, son of Abraham and father of Jacob, only had one wife. This shows that people practiced both monogamy and polygyny during those times.

When the law of Moses was received, it came with provisions for polygyny. For example:

If a man have two wives, one beloved, and another hated, and they have born him children, both the beloved and the hated; and if the firstborn son be hers that was hated: then it shall be, when he maketh his sons to inherit that which he hath, that he may not make the son of the beloved firstborn before the son of the hated, which is indeed the firstborn. (Deut. 21: 15-16)

In fact, under certain circumstances the law of Moses even *commanded* the practice of polygyny. When a married man died, the dead man’s brother was commanded to take the widow as his wife (see Deut. 25:4-10.) If the brother was already married, he would have had to take his brother’s widow as a second wife. The law of Moses does not view this as a sin.

Throughout the Old Testament, various men were mentioned who practiced polygyny. Here is a brief list: Abijah, Abraham, Ahab, Ahasuerus, Ashur, Belshazzar, Benhadad, Caleb, David, Eliphaz, Elkanah, Esau, Ezra, Gideon, Jacob, Jehoiachin, Jehoram, Jerahmeel, Joash, Lamech, Machir, Manasseh, Mered, Moses, Nahor, Rehoboam, Saul, Shazaraim, Simeon, Solomon and Zedekiah. Some of these men were spoken of as wicked, others as righteous, but the practice of polygyny was never condemned.

At one point in the history of Israel, king David, who had at that time seven wives, committed adultery with Bathsheba and arranged for her husband Uriah to be killed so that he could marry her. The prophet Nathan chastised him and called him to repentance, telling him that God had given him his wives (plural) and that if he had wanted more wives, God would have given them to him, also. (See 2 Sam. 12:8.) This shows that not only was polygyny a justified practice, but it was one in which God Himself took interest and participated in, by giving wives to men on Earth.

In some of the Old Testament writings, God spoke of Himself as a polygynist husband. In Ezekiel chapter 23, Aholah/Samaria and Aholibah/Jerusalem were called His wives, while Jeremiah chapter 3 mentioned Israel and Judah as wives. Jesus Christ may have also done the same by referring to Himself as a polygynist husband in the parable of the ten virgins according to some interpretations (see Matt. 25.) Finally, in Eph. 5:22-25 Paul equated a husband’s relationship to his wife with Christ’s relationship to the church (which are plural members, He being the church’s bridegroom and we being His plural brides.)

Polygyny continued as an acceptable practice among ancient Israel up to and including the time of Christ and was not officially rejected by some of the Jews until the end of the 1st Millennium AD. However, this rejection only applied to one branch of Judaism. The other branch never agreed to it and to this day still accepts the practice of taking more than one wife.

During New Testament times, the Jews lived among the Romans, who were monogamists. Nevertheless, there is a mention of a possible polygynist among them in the text. 1 Cor. 5:1 speaks of a son sinning with his “father’s wife.”

This does not refer to his biological mother, but to another wife that was married to his father. These distinctions are made in Lev. 18:7-8 and Deut. 27:16,20. For the most part, though, the New Testament is silent about marriage, whether one should practice monogamy or polygamy.

There are a couple of passages that talk about bishops and deacons needing to be the husband of one wife (see Titus 1:6 and 1 Timothy 3:2,12), but the word “one” in the text can mean either numerical “one” or the indefinite article “a” and almost all scholars are of the opinion that these passages are likely not talking of a prohibition of polygamy, because the people at that time were by and large monogamous. And in more recent Biblical translations, the passage is rendered as “never divorced” or as just “being married.” Polygamy was essentially not an issue for Christians living in that time because hardly anyone was practicing it. So all that matters is that these passages are likely not speaking of a prohibition of polygamy.

In 1 Timothy 4:1-3 there is also a curious prophecy of a time in which wicked people would be “forbidding to marry.” This may have particular application to our day, because of our laws which prohibit people from taking more than one spouse.

Before we leave the New Testament text, there is one more set of scriptures that talk of the polyandrous aspect of polygamy. The Sadducees asked Jesus about the above listed law of Moses commandment of a man taking his deceased brother’s widow as a wife and they presented to him a hypothetical situation in which a woman ended up marrying seven brothers because each brother she married ended up dying and then the woman died also. The Sadducees then asked Jesus which man would have her as his wife in the resurrection. Interestingly enough, Jesus did not answer their question. (See the Adult, Consensual Polyandry Is Never Condemned in the Scriptures section of this chapter for analysis of these scriptures.)

Turning our attention to the Book of Mormon, we find the Lehites living the law of Moses, but in Jacob 2:22-35 we learn that Lehi had received new commandments from the Lord which modified the law and took away all of its plural marriage provisions, causing monogamy with no concubinage to be the approved marriage doctrine *for the Nephites*. Because of this, from Lehi onward plural marriage became a *whoredom* (illicit sexual commerce.)

The Nephite men in Jacob’s time thought to commence plural marriage anyway, as that was a part of the original law of Moses, and were using the same old prophet vs. new prophet tactic that many people use nowadays—the old prophet held up as good and righteous and his doctrine as pure, meaning undiluted or unmodified, whereas the new prophet was represented as having modified, meaning apostate or corrupt, doctrine. Specifically, they were pointing to David and Solomon and the righteous deeds these polygynous men had done.

*And now I make an end of speaking unto you concerning this pride. And were it not that I must speak unto you concerning a grosser crime, my heart would rejoice exceedingly because of you. But the word of God burdens me because of your grosser crimes. For behold, thus saith the Lord: This people begin to wax in iniquity; they understand not the scriptures, for **they seek to excuse themselves in committing whoredoms** [illicit sexual commerce], **because of the things which were written concerning David, and Solomon his son.** (Jacob 2:22-23)*

To counteract this, the Lord brought up the *unrighteous deeds* of David and Solomon.

Behold, David and Solomon truly had many wives and concubines, which thing was abominable before me, saith the Lord. (Jacob 2:24)

In this passage, the Lord didn’t condemn polygyny, but only the abominations David and Solomon committed in the name of it, meaning that they “had many wives and concubines” instead of “receiving many wives and concubines” from the Lord. In other words, they took wives which were forbidden them to take. In the case of David, this was the Uriah affair, and in the case of Solomon, it was that he took wives of a forbidden people.

Again, the Lord in the above saying was pointing to the *whoredoms* of David and Solomon. And what is a whoredom? A whoredom is any illicit sexual commerce, in other words, whatever the Lord has said, “No,” to, is a whoredom. *That is the key to understanding these sayings.* With that in mind, let’s take a look at the next couple of verses:

Wherefore, thus saith the Lord, I have led this people forth out of the land of Jerusalem, by the power of mine arm, that I might raise up unto me **a righteous branch** from the fruit of the loins of Joseph. Wherefore, I the Lord God will not suffer that this people shall **do like unto them of old**. (Jacob 2:25-26)

A righteous branch is a branch that *obeys the Lord*. The Lord was not referring to polygyny here and equating righteousness with monogamy and unrighteousness with polygyny. Had the Jews of the Old World obeyed the Lord's commands, they would have been a *righteous branch* even while practicing polygyny.

When the Lord said that He didn't want the Nephites to do like them of old, He was not referring to the Old World practice of polygamy, but to the Old World practice of *disobedience*. So, the Lord was simply saying that this Nephite branch was to hearken to His words (obedience) or they would be cursed. He would not allow them to prosper in disobedience.

Wherefore, my brethren, hear me, and hearken to the word of the Lord: For there shall not any man among you have save it be one wife; and concubines he shall have none; for I, the Lord God, delight in the chastity [approved sexual commerce] of women. And **whoredoms** [illicit sexual commerce] are an abomination before me; thus saith the Lord of Hosts. (Jacob 2:27-28)

These are the commandments given to Lehi, repeated here by Jacob. The word "whoredom" does not refer to polygyny but to all sexual commerce prohibited by the Lord. In the case of the Nephites, as they had received a law of monogamy (a modification of the law of Moses), polygyny in their case was a whoredom, whereas in the case of the Old World Jews, polygyny was not a whoredom, as it was permitted.

Wherefore, this people shall **keep my commandments**, saith the Lord of Hosts, or cursed be the land for their sakes. (Jacob 2:29)

The emphasis was on keeping the *current* commandments of the Lord. It is the current prophet's words that are the most important, not the words of dead prophets. The Lord was not so much concerned with polygyny, as He was concerned with *obedience*.

For if I will, saith the Lord of Hosts, raise up seed unto me, I will command my people; otherwise they shall hearken unto these things. (Jacob 2:30)

"Raise up seed unto me" refers to plural marriage. "I will command my people" means that plural marriage was illicit sexual commerce (a whoredom) *to the Nephites* unless the Lord commanded its practice. "These things" refers to the *new* commandments received by Lehi, which modified the law of Moses *for the Nephites*.

For behold, I, the Lord, have seen the sorrow, and heard the mourning of the daughters of my people in the land of Jerusalem, yea, and in all the lands of my people, because of the wickedness and abominations of their husbands. (Jacob 2:31)

The abominations and wickedness that the Lord spoke of in this verse did not apply to the law-of-Moses-approved practice of plural marriage found among the Old World Jews (and those of other lands), but to their disobedience to His commandments. Again, the Lord was talking of *disobedience* to His commandments and not specifically of the general practice of polygyny.

And I will not suffer, saith the Lord of Hosts, that the cries of the fair daughters of this people, which I have led out of the land of Jerusalem, shall come up unto me against the men of my people, saith the Lord of Hosts. For they shall not lead away captive the daughters of my people because of their tenderness, save I shall visit them with a sore curse, even unto destruction; for they shall not commit whoredoms, like unto them of old, saith the Lord of Hosts. (Jacob 2:32-33)

Remember, the Lord is still talking about whoredoms (illicit sexual commerce) and other disobedience, *not about polygyny in general*. Polygyny in the Old World was not whoredom, but in the New World it was.

And now behold, my brethren, ye know that **these commandments were given to our father, Lehi**; wherefore, ye have known them before; and ye have come unto great condemnation; for ye have done these things which ye ought not to have done. Behold, ye have done greater iniquities than the Lamanites, our brethren. Ye have broken the hearts of your tender wives, and lost the confidence of your children, because of your bad examples before them; and the sobbings of their hearts ascend up to

God against you. And because of the strictness of the word of God, which cometh down against you, many hearts died, pierced with deep wounds. (Jacob 2:34-35)

In summary, they did wrong not because polygyny was intrinsically wrong, but because the Lord made it wrong through Lehi for the Nephite people, until the Lord should make it right again (which He did later on in 4 Nephi.)

The Nephite branch became righteous when the Lord visited them and they “graduated” from the law of Moses to the law of Christ. Everybody still alive (after the destruction caused by His death) converted to Christ. Upon becoming a “righteous branch,” the record states the following:

*And now, behold, it came to pass that the people of Nephi did wax strong, **and did multiply exceedingly fast**, and became an exceedingly fair and delightsome people. **And they were married, and given in marriage**, and were blessed **according to the multitude of the promises which the Lord had made unto them.*** (4 Ne. 1: 10-11)

These passages were referring to the doctrine of plural marriage and the promises made to those who enter therein. When the full Nephite record comes forth, *it will show this.*

The Nephites were *temporarily* prohibited from entering into this practice while they lived the law of Moses, for reasons known only to the Lord, while the Jews in the Old World and the 10 Tribes of Israel in the Northern Countries were allowed by the Lord to practice plural marriage under the same law of Moses. In other words, there were three groups of contemporary people living different laws of the Lord. This doesn’t mean that one group’s laws were unjustified before the Lord. The Lord “commands and revokes” as He pleases. It is His privilege and as long as each group of people kept the commandments He gave to that particular group, they were justified.

Also, it should be kept in mind that the plural marriage under the law of Moses was not the plural marriage under the law of Christ. Plural marriage under the law of Christ is *a doctrine of exaltation*. Plural marriage under the law of Moses was not a doctrine of exaltation, however, it did prepare a people for the doctrine that came under the law of Christ. And that was what the law of Moses was for, to point people to Christ and to prepare them for Him and His doctrines.

Therefore, the Nephites lived the doctrine of plural marriages under the law of Christ, from the visit of Christ to them onward, a period of 300+ years. *Most people miss this* and it could be that this is by the design of the Lord. When the Book of Mormon went forth at first, it was the intention of the Lord that it be the public doctrine, the milk, while the meat was to be revealed privately and over time revealed publicly as the public became more ready for it. Had the Book of Mormon been exceedingly plain on this point of plural marriage, upon it being published everyone would have rejected it, as the world was not ready for a doctrine of plural marriage.

As it is, the wording in the Book of Mormon was sufficiently obscure (on purpose) that people (even Joseph Smith!) mistook the Lord’s words in Jacob 2 as being a condemnation of polygyny. Most people completely missed the meaning of “For if I will, saith the Lord, raise up seed unto me, I will command my people; otherwise they shall hearken unto these things,” the meaning being that only the unauthorized practice of polygyny was condemned. Now, after the doctrine of plural marriage has been publicly taught, the chapter heading expounds the principle plainly, but when first published, the meaning of Jacob 2 was “hidden in plain sight.”

The verses in 4 Nephi were also (and still are) obscure to many people and most did not understand that they spoke of authorized plural marriage being practiced among the Nephites *according to the more excellent law of Christ.*

Besides all of that, Jacob 2 served another purpose: that of getting Joseph Smith, Jun. to inquire about plural marriage, which ended up revealing some meat, so we see in this that the purposes of the Lord are fulfilled and none of this has anything to do with perversion or whoring spirits, but with how the Lord works among the children of men, meaning *according to their conditions.*

Let us now turn our attention to the time of Joseph Smith, Jun. In 1816, four years before Joseph had his first vision, a man named Jacob Cochran began a new denomination in Saco, Maine, and introduced polygamy among them. This was not strict polygyny, but a multihusband-multiwife marriage system in which they renounced their “legal marriage bonds” and adopted a spiritual husband and wife model, in which wives would be exchanged with other husbands. This doctrine was called by them “spiritual wives.”

Mormon missionaries eventually made their way to Cochranite communities in 1832 and communicated the restored gospel, baptizing many, which converts then joined the body of the saints in Kirtland and Nauvoo. Many of these converts brought their polygamous beliefs with them. Although both missionaries and the body of saints were monogamous, contact with the Cochranites had its effect on everyone, bringing the question of polygamy to the forefront.

Polygamy was a topic commonly spoken of in both America and England at the time. After Mormon missionaries arrived in England in 1837, there was a book entitled, *The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, the Sons of Jacob*, which was circulated among them about on this topic. Brigham Young later said that he received some revelations on polygamy while he was in England. Lorenzo Snow also converted to this principle while in England. In America, during the 1830's, there were more than a hundred different religious and other groups practicing some form of polygamy. It was, indeed, a hot topic.

This revival of interest in polygamy occurred simultaneously but independently in three different countries: Germany, England and America. Many who believed (and still believe) that polygamy was an abomination called it the work of a whoring spirit sent from the devil. However, the Lord often sends forth His Holy Spirit among the people to prepare them for what is about to be revealed and as far as the issue of polygamy in the 1830's is concerned, it appears that such was, indeed, the case.

Thrust into this tumult of opinions and practices concerning polygamy, Joseph did what he always did: he inquired of the Lord. Now, some have wondered why it was that Joseph asked God about David and Solomon if he already knew per Jacob chapter 2 that they were unjustified. Such a thought, though, is but a misunderstanding of the text of Joseph's revelation, for Joseph never inquired about David and Solomon. Here is what really transpired:

After translating Jacob chapter 2, Joseph did not understand it. He interpreted it, as many do today, as meaning that David and Solomon were not justified in practicing polygyny and that polygyny, therefore, was a sin. But he wondered about Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, because the Bible didn't say anything bad about those patriarchs, although they lived in polygynous families.

Accordingly, Joseph approached the Lord specifically about Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and not about Moses, David and Solomon. In his answer to Joseph (recorded in D&C 132), the Lord threw in a surprise, for He also included three more justified servants in His answer, two of which Joseph was thinking (because of Jacob's words in the Book of Mormon) were not justified. In fact, when the angel appeared to Joseph with the answer to his question, Joseph quoted Jacob chapter 2 scriptures to him. One of Joseph's wives said the following:

*An angel came to him and the last time he came with a drawn sword in his hand and told Joseph if he did not go into that principle [plural marriage], he would slay him. Joseph said he talked to him soberly about it, and told him it was an abomination and **quoted scripture to him**. He said in the Book of Mormon it was an abomination in the eyes of the Lord, and they were to adhere to these things except the Lord speak. (Mary Lightner 1905 Address, typescript, BYU, Pg.1 – Pg.2)*

Joseph knew it was a true angel from God, as he had already received the keys to discern true and false angels and had applied them. Again:

*I [Mary Lightner] asked him [Joseph Smith] if Emma knew about me, and he said, "Emma thinks the world of you." I was not sealed to him until I had a witness. I had been dreaming for a number of years I was his wife. I thought I was a great sinner. I prayed to God to take it from me for I felt it was a sin; but when Joseph sent for me he told me all of these things. "Well," said I, "don't you think it was an angel of the devil that told you these things?" Said he, "**No, it was an angel of God. God Almighty showed me the difference between an angel of light and Satan's angels.** The angel came to me three times between the years of 1834 and 1842 and said I was to obey that principle or he would slay me. But," said he, "they called me a false and fallen prophet but I am more in favor with my God this day than I ever was in all my life before." (Mary Lightner 1905 Address, typescript, BYU, Pg.1 – Pg.2)*

So, the Lord's response was not only to explain Abraham, Isaac and Jacob's justification, but also to expound a bit on the meaning of His words to Jacob, which Joseph, at the time, did not fully comprehend. This is why the first verse of D&C 132 reads like this:

Verily, thus saith the Lord unto you my servant Joseph, that inasmuch as you have inquired of my hand to know and understand wherein I, the Lord, justified my servants Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob,

[at this point there is a break of "as also" because the Lord is giving more than Joseph asked for, to teach him that David and Solomon were also justified, except in those things which they did not receive from the Lord, in other words, the Lord's intention was to more fully explain Jacob's words in the Book of Mormon]

as also Moses, David and Solomon, my servants, as touching the principle and doctrine of their having many wives and concubines—

Had Joseph made inquiry of all six men, it would have read, "*as you have inquired of my hand to know and understand wherein I, the Lord, justified my servants Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, David and Solomon, as touching the principle and doctrine of their having many wives and concubines—*" But it is not stated that way. Instead, Joseph only inquired about the first three men. This is why the Lord phrased it "as also," which means "and also," to indicate to Joseph that not only were the first three justified, but also the last three.

Joseph's question was doctrinally sound and consistent with what we know of those times. He applied the keys to determine a real angel from a false angel, and testified that a real angel from God appeared to him and delivered a real doctrine (D&C 132) in answer to his honest inquiry. *The answer made him recoil and resist, but he eventually was able to wrap his mind around it and embrace it.*

D&C 132 puts forth a multihusband-multiwife marriage system in which no one needs any permission from a government to enter into a covenant of marriage. Overlaid upon this multispouse system is the power of the priesthood, which seals everything for all eternity.

The only other revelation that speaks of marriage is found in D&C 42:

Thou shalt love thy wife with all thy heart, and shalt cleave unto her and none else. (D&C 42:22)

The above marriage doctrine is completely compatible with the plural marriage system of D&C 132. It is not a doctrine of *monogamy*, but a doctrine of *fidelity*. In essence it is the law of chastity stated differently.

D&C 42:22 is a command to "cleave unto [thy wife]," wife being a title, designation or office of a person. If you have 50 wives, each time you cleave unto one of them, you are cleaving unto your wife and none else but your wife. It is not a specific person you are commanded to cleave unto, but a specific *title*. This is why the early saints that practiced plural marriage had no problem at all with D&C 42: 22. It is compatible and not contradictory.

The phrase "none else," when combined with just "wife" does not indicate monogamy. It only indicates fidelity. This is why the Article on Marriage was inserted into the Doctrine and Covenants. That Article on Marriage put forth a doctrine of monogamy and was necessary because the revelation in D&C 42 was merely a doctrine of marital fidelity. If D&C 42 put forth a doctrine of monogamy the Article on Marriage would have been an unnecessary redundancy.

Interpreting D&C 42 as a doctrine of monogamy wrests the scripture. If a man marries a wife and then she dies, does D&C 42 prohibit him from taking another wife? If section 42 indicates that he is to cleave only to one wife, then he could only be married once and he could only cleave to her and to none else, *even if she dies*. He is to remain single and widowed forevermore, for if he takes another wife he would be cleaving unto someone other than his (first) wife.

Of course this is not the meaning of the scripture. It is a doctrine of marital fidelity, not monogamy, meaning that he is only to cleave to his wife, whether he has one wife or ten wives. Each woman married to him, whether in succession (after their deaths) or with all of them still living (in polygyny), is to have him cleave to her and to no one else *who is not his wife*.

Thus we see that there are no scriptural, plural marriage restrictions placed upon anyone living in this day and age. The Old Testament approves of plural marriage and so does the New Testament. The Book of Mormon temporarily prohibited the Nephites from practicing polygyny (not polyandry) until Christ came among them and then they were

allowed to practice it. And the Doctrine and Covenants gives a multihusband-multiwife marriage system to the world, along with a doctrine of marital fidelity. Tribes can safely build using multipouse covenants because this principle is firmly grounded in the scriptures.

ADULT, CONSENSUAL POLYANDRY IS NEVER CONDEMNED IN THE SCRIPTURES

There are three verses in the Bible which prohibit polyandry: Leviticus 20:10; Deuteronomy 22:22; and Romans 7:3. These scriptures are only applicable in cases in which there is no consent, or permission, given by the first husband. They deal with the sin of adultery, or the breaking of wedlock by a wife, meaning that the marriage covenant or agreement was broken by the wife. They do not apply to situations in which a husband gives consent to his wife to take another husband. In consensual cases, a woman who marries another man with the permission of her first husband does not commit adultery, for a marriage agreement that allows her to take another husband cannot be broken by the taking of another husband, and she does not break the law of chastity, for she is married to the second man.

Here are those scriptures:

And the man that committeth adultery with another man's wife, even he that committeth adultery with his neighbour's wife, the adulterer and the adulteress shall surely be put to death. (Lev. 20:10)

If a man be found lying with a woman married to an husband, then they shall both of them die, both the man that lay with the woman, and the woman: so shalt thou put away evil from Israel. (Deut. 22:22)

So then if, while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress: but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man. (Rom. 7:3)

There are also three Biblical scriptures that teach a doctrine of polyandry: Matt. 22:24-30; Mark 12:20-25; and Luke 20:28-36. In these verses we learn that the Sadducees once approached Jesus with a scenario in which a woman marries a man, who then dies, and so she marries his brother, who then dies, and so on until seven brothers are dead and then she dies. This is all according to law of Moses protocol. So, then the Sadducees ask Jesus who her husband will be in the resurrection. His answer to them was that "in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage."

The meaning of these scriptures is the following: Jesus had previously taught the Pharisees about divorce (in Matt. 19:6 and in Mark 10:8-9) saying, "Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." Whatever God does, He does forever. Jesus' answer to the Pharisees regarding Moses' allowance of divorce was that "from the beginning it was not so" (Matt. 19:8.) The Mosaic idea of dissolving a marriage is a made-for-man law of expediency because they could not live the best law of no divorce. Ideally, man would never allow divorce and never should have said in their ceremonies "until death do you part" because that is a dissolving of holy matrimony that God never said nor ever intended. So the answer to the Sadducees question of which husband would be hers was: *all* of them. It is the obvious answer which they didn't even need to ask, but their hearts were so hardened that they could not even think of it.

Charity is the overwhelming desire and willingness to give all that you have to everyone else. Without charity, everything remains as separate stewardships, even as mine is mine, and thine is thine and never the twain shall mix. Jesus introduced the principle of reciprocal charity in his great intercessory prayer to the Father in which He said, "And all mine are thine, and thine are mine; and I am glorified in them" (John 17:10.) This is the principle of joint or shared stewardships. This scriptural pattern shows that two men who are stewards, may join their stewardships together, becoming joint stewards and combining the concerns of their stewardships (their wives, children and properties), according to the principle of charity. As long as there is consent among all the adults involved, this can be done in righteousness.

This does not take away from the doctrine of "heads" or "headship" in which it is stated that God is the head of Christ and Christ is the head of every man and the head of the woman is the man. (See 1 Cor. 11:3.) This is simply the doctrine of stewardships. The same could be said about women and children, that the head of the child is the woman. These are all various levels or degrees of stewardships, which can be kept separate, or, following the pattern of Christ,

can be joined or shared, so that all become “joint-heirs” (Rom. 8:17) of what Christ inherits and also joint stewards, everyone seeking the interest of his neighbor.

Jesus once said that “no man can serve two masters,” referring to serving either God or mammon (riches). This saying does not apply to marriage relationships. Neither is the man without the woman, nor the woman without the man, in the Lord. There is no master-servant relationship in a matrimony. God is our master and we are His servants, but it is a Parent to child or Creator to created relationship, which does not exist between a man and a woman. Therefore, this saying does not prohibit polyandry. It does not mean to say that a woman can’t have two male leaders, or heads or masters (husbands.) It means no such thing.

Even if this were to be applied to the marriage relationship, it does not say “no *woman* can serve two masters,” but only refers to men. Or, it might be said that the man, as the steward, is to *serve* the woman, just as Christ, as the Steward, *serves* all mankind by saving us. If we apply this directly to marriage (even though it has no application to marriage whatsoever), we’d have to say that no man could have two or more wives, because as the steward, he’d be serving more than one. In other words, the saying could only apply to polygyny and not to polyandry.

The Nephite scriptures mention a prohibition on polygyny in Jacob chapter 2. Said the Lord, “For there shall not any man among you have save it be one wife” (Jacob 2:27.) Curiously, the Lord never at any time says to the women that they can only have one husband.

The Lord does the same thing in D&C 42:22. When He says, “Thou shalt love thy wife with all thy heart, and shalt cleave unto her and none else” He only directs the word to the men.

Finally, D&C 132 completely opens up polyandry. Adultery is defined in verses 43 and 44 as being under a marital vow and then breaking it. In the Bible, this is called breaking wedlock, the etymology of which means a pledge or betrothal. Under biblical marriage, all women were put under wedlock to their husbands, whereas the men were not under wedlock to their wives. Therefore, the men were free to take additional wives without permission from their wives, because they took no marital vows of exclusivity. They could not “break wedlock” because they were not under wedlock. The women, however, were under wedlock and so if they were with another man while their husband was still living, they broke wedlock and committed adultery. The men they were with also committed adultery, since they assisted the married women in breaking their wedlock. Biblical adultery, then, was defined as a “woman that breaks wedlock” and always involved a married woman.

In modern times, not everyone marries as they did during the times of the Bible, namely, with only the women under wedlock. Both men and women nowadays often put themselves under wedlock (vows of exclusivity.) So, the D&C 132 definition of adultery expands it to include *anyone* that breaks wedlock. When speaking of a married man that commits adultery, the Lord says, if he “be with another woman, and he was under a vow, he hath broken his vow and hath committed adultery” (D&C 132:43.) For an innocent married woman, He says, “she hath not committed adultery, but is innocent and hath not broken her vow” (D&C 132:44.)

In essence, this means that any man and woman may marry without marital vows of exclusivity, so that neither party is under wedlock, and they can give consent or authorization to the other party to take additional spouses in this same manner. Additionally, already married persons who have placed one or the other or both of themselves under wedlock by their marital vows, may release themselves from their vows of exclusivity, through their common consent, so that each party may now be free to take additional spouses. No adultery can be committed in either of these cases because there is no (longer any) wedlock to break.

Thus we see that there is nothing in the scriptures that condemns adult, consensual polyandry.

PLURAL MARRIAGE IN THE CHURCH: CURRENT SEALING POLICY

If you look in *Handbook 1: Stake Presidents and Bishops* of the two-volume Church Handbook of Instructions, under subsection 3.6.1, which is entitled, Sealing of a Husband and Wife, on pages 20-21, under the heading, Sealing of Deceased Members, you will find:

- * that when a man is deceased, all the women that he was married to during his life may be sealed to him if these women are also deceased, or if they are still living, but are not sealed to any other man;
- * that when a woman is deceased, she may be sealed to all the men that she was married to during her life if these men are also deceased. But, if she was already sealed during her lifetime to a husband, the church must wait until all of her husbands are deceased before she can be sealed to all the husbands she was not sealed to in mortality;
- * and that all deceased couples who were divorced in mortality may be sealed.

In addition to the above policy, the current practice of the church allows a living man to have multiple wives sealed to him, just not while they are all alive and married to him. For example, if his first wife who was sealed to him dies and he marries again, his second wife may also be sealed to him, and so on and so forth, for as many times as he marries. Or, if he marries a wife who is sealed to him, then divorces her, he may marry a second wife and have her also sealed to him without the first sealing being canceled. For living women, the church allows them to be sealed to only one husband during mortality, regardless of how many husbands they end up having. However, per the above instructions, once they and their husbands are dead, they may be vicariously sealed to all of their husbands.

The sealing policy of the church must operate in this fashion (sealing a woman to all her spouses) because of what the Lord has said about a woman who has been received as a wife in the new and everlasting covenant, namely, that if she be with another man, “she hath committed adultery and shall be destroyed” (D&C 132:41.) So, if a woman’s husband dies and she was sealed to him, and she takes another husband, she is guilty of adultery and must be destroyed. The only way around this is by sealing her to the second husband also, for time and all eternity (“appointing unto her by the holy anointing”), giving her two eternal husband companions. The Lord does this so that none of His daughters are destroyed. Polyandrous sealings, then, are acts of mercy on the Lord’s part.

Thus, every husband and wife will eventually be sealed to every spouse they ever had, regardless of how they were married, for all marriages that are entered into “until death do they part” will be sealed when they are deceased and turned into eternal marriages, for any marriage sealing that is performed for a worthy man and woman *will* continue throughout eternity. The church, then, *already* practices both polygyny and polyandry, just not with all spouses living. And since the current practice is to vicariously seal polygynous and polyandrous marriage couples — it can be inferred that such marriages are *not* against the law of the kingdom of God.

This means that there is no such thing as “for time only” sealings (which are really “for time only while the woman lives” sealings), or “death do you part” marriages, or even divorce, because everybody is sealed to all their spouses (even their divorced spouses!) when they are all dead. All marriages become celestial marriages. They either start out that way with a sealing for time and all eternity in the temple, or they will be made that way in the Millennium.

All ordinances for every person must be performed, because the final judgment cannot occur until the entire kingdom has been prepared for judgment by the performance of every ordinance, for if Christ does not present a perfected kingdom for judgment, then He and His atonement are not perfect. This includes all endowments, sealings, second anointings, adoptions, etc.

And so we see that the tribal model is not as radical as some may make it out to be. It merely takes what we are already vicariously doing in our sealing ceremonies for dead people (the multihusband-multiwife marriage system) and applies it to living people. Nothing more, nothing less. What’s so radical about that?

We baptize for the dead, but we also baptize for the living. The ordinances are equally valid and the covenants equally binding. One is not more valid than the other. What can be done for the dead can be done for the living and vice versa.

So, if we marry men to multiple wives and marry women to multiple husbands (while some or all of them are dead), the same principle can and does apply to the living. In fact, there was a time in our church history when men and women in our church have had multiple spouses while all spouses were still alive. The tribal model, therefore, holds up

both scripturally and in light of current and past church practices, because it is part of the gospel, for the gospel is and always has been and always will be tribal in nature.

THE PURPOSE OF PLURAL MARRIAGE: ESTABLISHING THE TRIBES OF ISRAEL

The tribal aspects of the restored gospel of Jesus Christ are in a suspended state among the current membership of the Gentile church. Although our patriarchal blessings indicate which tribe we pertain to, the church does not function tribally. We are only tribes in word, not in deed.

The saying, “form must follow function,” is an eternal principle. To *function* as a tribe, a group of people must first take on the *form* of a tribe. With Joseph Smith’s D&C 132 revelation, the Lord began the process of forming a real tribe among the members of His church, so that the tribal functions could be activated.

The Wikipedia defines a tribe as:

*A social group of humans connected by a shared system of values and organized for mutual care, defense, and survival beyond that which could be attained by a lone individual or family. A ‘tribe’ is defined in anthropology. When viewed historically or developmentally, a tribe is a mutual care system which, unlike a kingdom or state or other schema, **is oriented around kinship** and shared beliefs. Tribes can well exist simultaneously with other schema such as states or other systems. They might consist of a social group existing before the development of, or outside of, states. Tribes are the most enduring and successful social survival system that has ever existed on earth. Tribes can exist within or without a state or kingdom and may or may not depend on the state or kingdom to endure.*

*Many anthropologists use the term to refer to societies organized largely **on the basis of kinship**, especially corporate descent groups (see clan and lineage.)*

It is largely kinship that makes a tribe. Keep this in mind, as it is the key to understanding the revelation that is D&C 132 and Joseph Smith’s interesting plural marriages. Shared belief alone does not a tribe make. There must be shared belief *and kinship*. Richard Bushman, author of *Rough Stone Rolling*, wrote the following:

*The personal anguish caused by plural marriage did not stop Joseph Smith from marrying more women. He married three in 1841, eleven in 1842, and seventeen in 1843. Historians debate these numbers, but the total figure is most likely between twenty-eight and thirty-three. Larger numbers have been proposed based on the sealing records in the Nauvoo temple. Eight additional women were sealed to Joseph in the temple after his death, possibly implying a marriage while he was still alive. Whatever the exact number, the marriages are numerous enough to indicate an impersonal bond. Joseph did not marry women to form a warm, human companionship, **but to create a network of related wives, children, and kinsmen** that would endure into the eternities... He did not lust for women so much as **he lusted for kin**. (*Rough Stone Rolling*, page 440. Bold emphasis added.)*

The implication is that the Lord’s revelation to Joseph was designed to make the Gentile converts, who were now called Ephraimites, *an actual tribe*. To become truly tight-knot, everyone in the tribe needed to be related to everyone else by either blood, adoption or marriage.

A Community of Christ member once noted the following:

*Our denomination’s crisis with polygamy came in about 1970. We began baptizing in an Indian-subculture in which the **tribesmen** were already living in polygamous marriages. After struggling so hard for a century to disassociate ourselves from this particular LDS belief, what were we to do?*

The revelation brought to the church and confirmed by the general conference established for us the principle that “monogamy is the basic principle on which Christian married life is built” and authorized the First Presidency and the Quorum of 12 (Apostles) in their field jurisdictions to interpret that principle as directed by the Spirit.

The implementation ultimately meant that newly baptized polygamous people were allowed to remain in those marriages for the rest of their lives, but were not allowed to take additional marital partners into the marriage. The latter act would be treated as adultery or fornication under church law (I forget which).

This ruling became a schismatic issue for a number of people.

Notice that the problem only came when the non-tribal Community of Christ church (which back then was called the RLDS church) came in contact with *an actual tribe*. Keep this in mind. We will revisit this dilemma later on in this chapter.

Peggy Fletcher Stack of the Salt Lake Tribune wrote:

Polygamy may be abhorrent to most Americans, but in the global community it is common, normal and accepted.

Although the percentage of men in the world who have more than one wife is relatively small, as many as a third of the world's population belongs to a community that allows it, says Israeli anthropologist Joseph Ginat.

There are many plural marriages in Africa, the Middle East and in Asia, said Ginat, professor of social and culture anthropology at the University of Haifa.

*Many American Indian **tribes allow polygamy**; several experimental Christian groups practice it. And, of course, there are those famous offshoots of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.*

...

*American Indians: Polygamy was fairly widespread among American Indian **tribes**, said Patricia Albers, chairman of American Indian studies at the University of Minneapolis. There were plural marriages among the Dakota of Southern Minnesota, Ojibway of northern Wisconsin, Mesquakia of Iowa, and the Ho-chunk (formerly Winnebago). In the Intermountain West, plural marriage was common among the Shoshone and Paiute tribes; it was also practiced by the Utes and Navajos. **"I don't know any tribal nation in this general region that didn't have it or disallowed it,"** Albers said. At the beginning of the 19th century, the Blackfoot Indians of the Dakotas, Wyoming and Montana were increasingly involved in buffalo-hide trade, and "families were more successful when they had more women engaged in processing of buffalo hides," she said.*

*In many American Indian **tribes**, polygamy "was not a sign of subordinate position," Albers said. "It occurred where women stood on fairly equal footing with the men in their communities." Many tribes expected women to have responsibility, not only for her own children, but for those of her sisters as well. That could be one reason why the most common type of polygamy practiced by American Indians was sororal polygamy, or two sisters married to the same man. If a woman's husband died, it was not uncommon for her to then marry her sister's husband, Albers said. **It was a way of "melding family units."***

(Excerpts from Globally, Polygamy Is Commonplace, by Peggy Fletcher Stack, The Salt Lake Tribune, Sunday, September 20, 1998. Bold emphasis added.)

Thus we see that tribes and polygamy often go hand in hand. Those living in tribes are often permitted to, and sometimes do, practice polygamy and those that practice polygamy often take the form of, and sometimes function as, tribes. The two principles are linked among the tribes of the earth. But let's talk about the heavenly model.

The polygamy of D&C 132 is not strictly Biblical. There are aspects of it, but it adds the additional dimension of polyandry. In fact, Joseph Smith began practicing plural marriage by marrying another man's wife, instantly creating a simultaneous polygynous and polyandrous arrangement. This makes the polygamy practiced by Joseph more egalitarian than that practiced by most of his successors. In fact, it resembles the unity of the heavens, in which *all have all things common*. This makes sense because Joseph's mission in the Dispensation of the Fulness of Times is to gather together all things in one, in Christ, both things in heaven and on Earth. (See Ephesians 1:10 and D&C 27:13.) So, going beyond the confines of the Bible is definitely a sign of the times we are living in.

Had Joseph succeeded in promoting D&C 132's full doctrine among the people, the Gentile church would have been converted into a bona fide tribe, yet stronger and unlike any other tribe on Earth, as all would have been related to all through marriage covenants. It would have resembled the tribal family of the heavens.

Over time Joseph Smith's successors began to practice a diluted or limited form of the doctrine he revealed, turning it into strict polygyny, without the polyandrous aspects. Although polygyny did still create a tribal form, it was not the heavenly ideal around which Joseph had striven to gather the saints. Eventually, the saints gave up polygamy altogether, adopting monogamy as the standard. This effectively removed all tribal form, making tribal function an impossibility.

Although it is true that we call the people at church brother and sister so-and-so, and even though their patriarchal blessings may state that they are of our own tribe, we still view them differently than our real kin. They are members of

our tribe in name only. They are our brothers and sisters in name only. Our real brothers and sisters, those of blood, take precedence over our church brother and sisters. We distinguish between our blood family and our church family. This is natural and normal in society and true for just about everyone.

Be that as it may, we must always remember that the gospel of Jesus Christ is designed to be lived by genuine tribes composed of kin. This means that there will be a tribal movement among the saints at some time in the future, which will activate the tribal functions. This also means that D&C 132, which is a tribal key, will likely at some point be lived again *in its fulness*.

The return, gathering and establishment of the twelve tribes of Israel is going to be a major event of the last days. Currently they are in a scattered state, but in the coming restoration and gathering they will have vitally important roles and an equal division of leadership, each tribe directing itself under Christ. In the interim, the Gentile converts have the gospel and the Lord has assigned them principally to the tribe of Ephraim and secondarily to the tribe of Manasseh. As a result, we have received a volume of scripture written by and intended for the tribe of Manasseh (the Book of Mormon) and a body of revelations specifically tailored to Ephraim-assigned Gentiles (the Doctrine and Covenants.)

Because the Gentiles alone have the gospel, there is a tendency among the Gentile converts to believe that the (Gentile) tribe of Ephraim is the main tribe of the restoration, meaning the leadership tribe, or the tribe in which all or most of the church leadership will come from during the time preceding the Second Coming. Nothing could be further from the truth. The scriptures state emphatically that at some point the Gentiles will reject the gospel and it will be taken from them and given to the tribes of Israel, restoring them. The few Gentile convert remnants who won't commit spiritual suicide like the majority of their brethren will do in the day that they reject the gospel, will then be numbered with a real tribe of Israel and assimilated with them, under the protection of the people of the Lord, to be spared His wrath upon the rest of the Gentiles.

In that day all twelve tribes of Israel will be restored and each tribe will have its own prophets, seers, and revelators, its own tribally-tailored body of revelations, visions and prophecies, its own set of scriptures and its own group of leaders. (See, for example, 2 Nephi 29:13.) Were this not so, there would be no point in having twelve tribes. One single tribe would suffice. And there would be no point in saying that the people of God even belong to a 'tribe' if they were never to function as a tribe (composed of actual kin), but as just a group of unrelated people who believe in Christ (a church.)

The whole purpose of the gospel which has been given to the Gentiles is to get them to the point where they can be numbered with the real tribes of Israel and be saved, both temporally and spiritually. Once the tribal aspect of the gospel is understood, then the revelations which have been given in this dispensation can be seen through "tribal filters," showing that the Gentile converts have only been given revelations, prophecies and scriptures that are tailored and pertain to them. Additionally, there is much more that will be revealed that will come from and pertain to the real tribes of Israel, including the real tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh, through their own prophets.

Polygamy ties into this because it activates the tribal functions of all the tribes of Israel. Also, as we know that the other tribes will be coming, and by this we mean literal tribes, composed of people related to each other, it is very possible that the other tribes are living polygamy already. If the Gentile church continues to reject polygamy and the real tribes of Israel suddenly show up on the scene and they are found to be living polygamy, this will create quite a problem, for the Gentile church may end up spurning the literal seed of Abraham, inciting the anger of the Lord against the Gentiles.

To avoid such a scenario, the Lord in His mercy revealed the principles of plural marriage in D&C 132 to prepare and allow the Gentile converts to form themselves into a fully functioning tribe of Christ patterned after the real tribes of Israel, so that they might more readily and easily assimilate when the time arrived for them to be numbered with His "people who are of the house of Israel" (3 Ne. 30:2.)

NEW SCIENCE: HUMAN SEXUALITY IS BASED UPON A MULTIMALE-MULTIFEMALE MATING SYSTEM

Sex at Dawn, a book by psychologist Christopher Ryan and psychiatrist Cacilda Jetha, was written to challenge the long-held assumptions most have about sex. It's not hard to observe that humans have historically had a tough time following a doctrine of God-ordained monogamy. What *Sex at Dawn* presents is some interesting evidence for *why* we are such a hypersexual species with marked physical adaptations for promiscuity among both males and females. Ryan and Jetha discard our current model based on cultural assumptions such as:

- * human society being organized around marriage
- * fathers providing exclusively for their *own* children
- * sex being associated primarily with paternity
- * children being raised in separate nuclear families

This current model starts by looking around and describing our present practices and then projects those assumptions back into how we understand the past. *Sex at Dawn* instead looks at the evidence of our sexual history *as it is*—taking nothing for granted.

It is often assumed that monogamy comes naturally to us. Mainstream science—as well as religious and cultural institutions—have maintained that men and women evolved in family-units in which a man's possessions and protection were exchanged for a woman's fertility and fidelity.

Marriage between man and woman is essential to [God's] eternal plan. Children are entitled to birth within the bonds of matrimony, and to be reared by a father and a mother who honor marital vows with complete fidelity. ... By divine design, fathers are to preside over their families...and are responsible to provide the necessities of life and protection for their families. Mothers are primarily responsible for the nurture of their children. (The Family: A Proclamation to the World, 1995.)

We are taught that the ideal for human relationships is that you will have relations with only one person and he or she will only have relations with you—total chastity of men and women before marriage and total fidelity within that one marriage. Thus, promiscuity and any associated temptations are of the devil—and one, true monogamous love is ordained of God. However, it doesn't take a genius to see that humans have had a historically tough time fitting this mold, which in turn (in the minds of creedal Christians) only strengthens the claim that God ordained it that way—the “natural man” being an enemy to God, etc.

The basic narrative accepted as the history of ancient humans is that women sought a stable man to stick around to help raise the kids and bring home food—yet wanted to sleep with the sexy rebel because of his genes. While men sought to impregnate as many women as possible while keeping their women monogamous so they wouldn't have to spend resources to raise someone else's kids. And thus, we are taught that we are the products of these horribly conflicted ancestors. However, this narrative presupposes that every ancient culture centered itself around assigning men and women to each other through marriage, granting exclusive rights of property to individuals, associating sex with paternity, and having men provide only for *their* offspring.

However, when hunter/gatherer communities are studied, it is found that they share all duties (like providing food and raising children) communally, as a tribe or family. Ideas of, “*I'm not raising that other man's kid,*” developed later as a function of the agrarian concept of converting labor into personal property. Marriage may have existed as a social arrangement among many hunter/gatherer communities, but it was one in which sexuality was less well-defined.

Human society developed in egalitarian tribes that shared food, childcare, and often—sexual partners. In these small, intimate family groups, the most mature individuals would have had several ongoing sexual relationships at any given time. Here the extended family, which was often the entire community, was where children were raised. We are the descendants of these multimale-multifemale tribal groups and, even though we've constructed a radically different

society from them, the behavioral and psychological traits from the past still manifest themselves today. This is why we see:

- * Sexual passion that tends to fade even as love deepens
- * Many middle-aged men risking everything for affairs with younger women
- * Homosexuality persisting in the face of evolutionary logic and scriptural condemnation
- * Predominate sexual fantasy among men of cuckolding and/or multiple males with one female

Monogamous animals, by definition, don't have to compete for reproduction and, as a result, are characterized by a *low-level* of sexual activity. However, humans sit atop a very short list of animals that engage in sex for pleasure. No animal spends *more* of its allotted time on Earth focused on sexual matters than we do. In fact, the animal world is filled with species that confine their sexual behavior to just a few periods of the year, when conception is the most probable. Also, considering that males have a very large genitalia-to-body size ratio, that females can experience multiple orgasms, etc., indicates that we are in fact designed to engage in concurrent sexual relationships within a group/tribal setting.

If, as the current narrative says, men are inclined to be promiscuous and women are not, then our behavior would match that of gorillas – which fight over the exclusive rights to have sex with all the women in the group. However, biologically, it seems that humans are designed to instead use a woman's body as the battleground. In other words, unlike gorillas, who have developed to *physically* compete for mates, human sperm is made to race against sperm from other men, and the human vagina is the formidable racetrack able to sort out the hardiest genes. Further, polyandrous wives would have had an easier time ensuring reproductive success and passing on greater genetic variation in her offspring as well as encouraging parental care while discouraging infanticide [as would take place among polygynist animals].

The leaders of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints used to recognize the dangers that monogamous, family-unit systems represents:

Monogamy... is no part of the economy of Heaven among men. Such a system was commenced by the founders of the Roman empire. ... Rome became the mistress of the world, and introduced this order of monogamy wherever her sway was acknowledged. Thus this monogamic order of marriage, so esteemed by modern Christians as a holy sacrament and divine institution, is nothing but a system established by a set of robbers. ... Why do we believe in and practise polygamy? Because the Lord introduced it to his servants in a revelation given to Joseph Smith, and the Lord's servants have always practiced it. "And is that religion popular in heaven?" It is the only popular religion there... (Brigham Young, Journal of Discourses 9:322.)

Monogamy has been used as a means of controlling women in societies since the dawn of agriculture and sedentary societies have greatly influenced the structure of human mating. Sadly, one of the legacies of agriculture and industrialization has been STD's, lower testosterone and sperm counts, and sexual repression. In fact, it was the high-grain, vegetarian diet pushers like Kellogg and Graham (whose diet-plan itself lowers libido) who were also advocates for strict sexual repression and genital mutilation.

The paradox of monogamous marriage is that we *do* enjoy intense pair-bondings with other people – bonds that intensify with time. But, *at the same time*, the spark of new relationships is deeply satisfying as well, and new partners have been the tried and true method to boost lowering testosterone levels in middle-aged men for thousands of years.

The difficult fact to face is we *do* have hunter/gatherer sexual desires but live in a world where children are not raised in a tribe, where sexually-expressive women are looked down upon, STD's present a serious risk, and monogamy is considered culturally and spiritually superior. Our current model is bad. We cannot continue on with: A man eating food laced with chemicals and hormones, taking medicines that lower testosterone and deform sperm while being hooked to watching internet porn and professional sports all day—and a woman with a frustratingly repressed libido struggling to

juggle a career and children—trying to form an isolated family-unit. It has driven our society to a point where more than half of all marriages end in divorce and serial monogamy (rather than actual monogamy) is the order of things.

When Jesus says that:

For in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage,

He is indicating that our current model of assigning men and women to relationships of ownership and exclusivity will have an end with this world. In the celestial state, *all things* are held in common and all of the Gods are equal in the bonds of all things, which include the bonds of matrimony. If our Father kept His wives locked away in some celestial harem, then He would be exercising unrighteous dominion—restricting the agency of both His wives and His other children from expressing their love one for another.

We can continue as we have been, using religion to judge others and reject our God-given sexuality—creating discord, misery, and shame where none should be. Or we could reject the laws of God and throw ourselves into sexual abandon, in temporary sexual connections (swinging/swapping/etc.), which just creates a different kind of discord and misery. We, the authors of this work, suggest a third option: using the tribal model to harmonize the two sets of laws by basing tribes on multihusband-multiwife marriage. A tribe should place its marriage practices in harmony with the natural sexual order of humans as well as with the word of God, including Joseph Smith's D&C 132 revelation—rather than pitting one against the other.

PLURAL MARRIAGE IS NOT ADULTERY

There are different meanings of the word adultery, depending upon the authoritative source to which one is appealing. Some of the sources people look to include the scriptures, the edicts of their churches, the laws of their country or State, and even the popular opinions and customs of the day. We are only concerned with what the written word of God says about it.

In the Bible, the Hebrew word for adultery is *na'aph* and refers to a “woman that breaks wedlock.” (See Strong's #5003.) In other words, it is an unlawful breach of a marriage covenant.

Under the patriarchal societies that existed in biblical times, the marriage covenant between a man and a woman allowed a husband to take additional wives with, or without, his wife's consent, while disallowing a wife from having another living husband. Only when her husband was dead or if she were divorced from him could she marry another man.

Anciently, wedlock often consisted of three parts: the betrothal (Hebrew: *erusin*), which was a promise to take as a future spouse or a contract for a future marriage initiated by payment to the father of the bride of a bride price, called in Hebrew the *mohar*; the marriage covenant proper (Hebrew: *nissu'in*) in which the two received each other as husband and wife; and finally there was the “handshake,” in which the two individuals involved in the covenant or contract “shook” on the agreement with their entire bodies, in the sex act, or what we today call consummation.

A man could commit adultery by having sexual relations with a woman who was married or betrothed to someone else, thereby breaking her wedlock. If he had sexual relations with an unmarried woman, wedlock would not be broken and therefore no adultery would be committed, nevertheless he was expected to take her afterwards as his wife.

For a betrothed or married woman to commit adultery, she had to sleep with any man who was not her actual or betrothed husband and this would unlawfully breach her marriage covenant. If she were a single woman sleeping with a man of any status (single, betrothed or married), she would not be guilty of adultery for no one's wedlock would be broken.

Some scriptures that pertain to this definition of adultery are:

And the man that committeth adultery with another man's wife, even he that committeth adultery with his neighbour's wife, the adulterer and the adulteress shall surely be put to death. (Lev. 20:10)

If a man be found lying with a woman married to an husband, then they shall both of them die, both the man that lay with the woman, and the woman: so shalt thou put away evil from Israel. If a damsel that is a virgin be betrothed unto an husband,

and a man find her in the city, and lie with her; then ye shall bring them both out unto the gate of that city, and ye shall stone them with stones that they die; the damsel, because she cried not, being in the city; and the man, because he hath humbled his neighbour's wife: so thou shalt put away evil from among you. (Deut. 22:22-24)

(See also Proverbs 6:20-35 and 7:1-27.)

The ancient marriage covenants of the Bible allowed for the practice of polygyny, which is one man having multiple wives, and not the other way around. This is because in all biblical marriage contracts the woman was joined or bound to the man and not vice versa.

The wife was the husband's possession (of a special sort), and adultery constituted a violation of the husband's exclusive right to her; the wife, as the husband's possession, had no such right to him. (Jeffrey H. Tigay, "Adultery," Encyclopaedia Judaica, Vol. II, col. 313)

The truth of the matter, of course, is that no one owns another person, therefore a wife was not literally the property or possession of her husband. What the ancient biblical marriage contract established was a transfer of the concerns of one steward (her father) to another steward (her husband.) Thus, the woman *was given to the man* and the man *received the woman*. He was never given to the woman. The married woman *belonged to the man* only in the sense that she became his concerns and he became her steward through the marriage covenant. He was free to enlarge his stewardship by taking other wives, but she was not free to go beyond the bounds of his stewardship by being with another man (steward) without her real steward's (her husband's) say so. If she were to do this, she would break the marriage covenant, committing adultery. This is why the biblical definition of adultery always deals with what occurs between a *married woman* and someone other than her husband.

The Bible's definition of adultery didn't change from the Old to the New Testament, nor with the Book of Mormon. During the Savior's mortal sojourn, He added a new dimension to it, called adultery of the heart or spiritual adultery, but the definition of the physical act of adultery remained the same.

During the time of Joseph Smith, monogamy was the accepted practice among the people and churches and the laws of the Gentiles reflected the monogamous practice in its definition of adultery. The dictionary in use was Noah Webster's first edition, published in 1828. Under the entry of "adultery" that dictionary gave the following definition:

ADUL'TERY, n. [L. *adulterium*. See *Adulterate*.]

1. Violation of the marriage bed; a crime, or a civil injury, which introduces, or may introduce, into a family, a spurious offspring.

By the laws of Connecticut, the sexual intercourse of any man, with a married woman, is the crime of adultery in both: such intercourse of a married man, with an unmarried woman, is fornication in both, and adultery of the man, within the meaning of the law respecting divorce; but not a felonious adultery in either, or the crime of adultery at common law, or by statute. This latter offense is, in England, proceeded with only in the ecclesiastical courts.

In common usage, adultery means the unfaithfulness of any married person to the marriage bed. In England, Parliament grant absolute divorces for infidelity to the marriage bed in either party; and the spiritual courts divorce a mensa et thoro.

When Joseph Smith inquired about the ancients having many wives and concubines, he received the revelation found in D&C 132, which also explained to him the relationship of plural marriage to the sin of adultery. This is what he learned concerning it:

And as ye have asked concerning adultery, verily, verily, I say unto you, if a man receiveth a wife in the new and everlasting covenant, and if she be with another man, and I have not appointed unto her by the holy anointing, she hath committed adultery and shall be destroyed. If she be not in the new and everlasting covenant, and she be with another man, she has committed adultery. And if her husband be with another woman, and he was under a vow, he hath broken his vow and hath committed adultery. And if she hath not committed adultery, but is innocent and hath not broken her vow, and she knoweth it, and I reveal it unto you, my servant Joseph, then shall you have power, by the power of my Holy Priesthood, to take her and give her unto him that hath not committed adultery but hath been faithful; for he shall be made ruler over many. (D&C 132:41-44)

And again, as pertaining to the law of the priesthood—if any man espouse a virgin, and desire to espouse another, and the first give her consent, and if he espouse the second, and they are virgins, and have vowed to no other man, then is he justified; he cannot commit adultery for they are given unto him; for he cannot commit adultery with that that belongeth unto him and to no one else. And if he have ten virgins given unto him by this law, he cannot commit adultery, for they belong to him, and they are given unto him; therefore is he justified. But if one or either of the ten virgins, after she is espoused, shall be with another man, she has committed adultery, and shall be destroyed; for they are given unto him to multiply and replenish the earth, according to my commandment, and to fulfil the promise which was given by my Father before the foundation of the world, and for their exaltation in the eternal worlds, that they may bear the souls of men; for herein is the work of my Father continued, that he may be glorified. (D&C 132:61-63)

These scriptures present five scenarios in which adultery may or may not apply. Let's review each one in depth.

And as ye have asked concerning adultery, verily, verily, I say unto you, if a man receiveth a wife in the new and everlasting covenant, and if she be with another man, and I have not appointed unto her by the holy anointing, she hath committed adultery and shall be destroyed. (D&C 132:41)

In the first scenario, Husband-1 is sealed for all eternity to Wife-1. This means that Husband-1 forever has an exclusive right to Wife-1, but not vice versa. If Wife-1 sleeps with Man-2 while Husband-1 is still alive, Wife-1 commits adultery, for she breaks her wedlock to him. Even if Husband-1 dies, leaving Wife-1 a widow and she subsequently marries Man-2, Wife-1 still commits adultery, because she is still sealed (eternally married) to Husband-1, meaning that her wedlock to him is still in force. The remedy for this is the holy anointing, whereby she is sealed (eternally married) by proxy to all the husbands she has had in mortality, after her and her husbands are all dead, causing her to be wedlocked to all of them simultaneously.

If she be not in the new and everlasting covenant, and she be with another man, she has committed adultery. (D&C 132:42)

In the second scenario, Husband-2 is married (not sealed) to Wife-2. If Wife-2 sleeps with Man-3 while Husband-2 is still alive, Wife-2 commits adultery. This is because she has unlawfully breached the marriage covenant she made with Husband-2. Also, because all marriages are sealed by proxy for all eternity, each woman who marries two or more times in mortality must have both husbands sealed to her because the instant one of those marriages becomes an eternal marriage, its wedlock will be in force and the other unsealed marriages will be considered adultery, therefore, both marriages must be sealed, wedlocking her to each of her husbands simultaneously. All of this so that the daughters of God are not destroyed by the sin of adultery.

And if her husband be with another woman, and he was under a vow, he hath broken his vow and hath committed adultery. (D&C 132:43)

In the third scenario, Husband-3 is married (or sealed) to Wife-3, but Husband-3 has taken a vow of exclusiveness, meaning that he has promised not to take another wife. If Husband-3 sleeps with Woman-4, or even if he marries (or is sealed to) her, making her Wife-4, Husband-3 commits adultery because he has broken his vow of exclusiveness to Wife-3.

And if she hath not committed adultery, but is innocent and hath not broken her vow, and she knoweth it, and I reveal it unto you, my servant Joseph, then shall you have power, by the power of my Holy Priesthood, to take her and give her unto him that hath not committed adultery but hath been faithful; for he shall be made ruler over many. (D&C 132:44)

In the fourth scenario, if Wife-4, who has been deceived by Husband-3 and has married him (or was sealed to him) thinking that he was not under any vow of exclusiveness, is innocent and has been faithful to Husband-3 and not broken her wedlock to him, she may be taken (unsealed to Husband-3, if she was sealed to him) and may be given (sealed) to Husband-4, who has not committed adultery.

And again, as pertaining to the law of the priesthood—if any man espouse a virgin, and desire to espouse another, and the first give her consent, and if he espouse the second, and they are virgins, and have vowed to no other man, then is he justified; he cannot commit adultery for they are given unto him; for he cannot commit adultery with that that belongeth unto him and to

no one else. And if he have ten virgins given unto him by this law, he cannot commit adultery, for they belong to him, and they are given unto him; therefore is he justified. But if one or either of the ten virgins, after she is espoused, shall be with another man, she has committed adultery, and shall be destroyed; for they are given unto him to multiply and replenish the earth, according to my commandment, and to fulfil the promise which was given by my Father before the foundation of the world, and for their exaltation in the eternal worlds, that they may bear the souls of men; for herein is the work of my Father continued, that he may be glorified. (D&C 132:61-63)

In the fifth scenario, Husband-5 desires to have more wives and his first wife, Wife-5, consents to give them to him, and so he marries nine more wives. In none of these marriages is there an unlawful breach of their marriage covenant for the marriage covenant they entered into (a temple sealing) allows him to take additional wives and he is under no vow of exclusiveness. Also, as his first wife, Wife-5, has consented to give him the other nine wives, even if there was a vow of exclusiveness between him and Wife-5, she has now freed him from it so that he is now at liberty to take wives as he wishes. Finally, none of these new wives were ever betrothed, married or had sexual relations with anyone else, for they are virgins and “belong to no one else.” So, after he marries them they “belong to him.” He cannot commit adultery with them because he is not unlawfully breaching any of the marriage covenants he entered into with any of them, nor are they breaking wedlock to any other man (because there is no wedlock to any other man.) They are “given to him” by the first wife “giving her consent,” which protocol is known as the law of Sarah.

In each of these scenarios, the same biblical ideas of a husband having an exclusive right to his wife, of a husband “ruling over” his wives, of a husband “receiving” his wife, of a wife being “given” to her husband and of a wife “belonging to” her husband is repeated, all of which are descriptions of a stewardship. Even the temple sealing ceremony for eternal marriage contains stewardship language:

SEALER: Brother _____, do you take Sister _____ by the right hand **and receive her unto yourself** to be your lawfully wedded wife, for time and all eternity, with a covenant and promise that you will observe and keep all the laws, rites, and ordinances pertaining to this holy order of matrimony in the new and everlasting covenant; and this you do in the presence of God, angels, and these witnesses of your own free will and choice?

GROOM: Yes.

SEALER: Sister _____, do you take Brother _____ by the right hand **and give yourself to him** to be his lawfully wedded wife, **and receive him** to be your lawfully wedded husband, for time and all eternity, with a covenant and promise that you will observe and keep all the laws, rites, and ordinances pertaining to this holy order of matrimony in the new and everlasting covenant; and this you do in the presence of God, angels, and these witnesses of your own free will and choice?

BRIDE: Yes.

[Note that while the bride gives herself to the groom (in addition to receiving him as her husband), the groom does not give himself to the bride. Presumably, this leaves him free to receive plural wives, having not given himself to one wife exclusively.]

All of this shows that the Lord’s sayings in D&C 132 on adultery coincide with the Bible, with the addition of three points, namely: that a man who is under a vow can commit adultery with an unmarried woman; that polyandrous priesthood sealings (a wife sealed to multiple husbands) is a sanctioned practice; and that a marriage covenant can be modified by consent of the parties involved so that one may be released from a vow of exclusiveness.

To make a determination as to whether the sin of adultery has taken place, one must ask two questions. First, did sexual intercourse occur between the two parties who are accused of committing adultery? And second, did one or the other party break his or her marriage covenant or vows of exclusiveness by the act? Only if the answer to both questions is “yes” will adultery have been committed. With that in mind, let’s bring up the multihusband-multiwife, tribal anarchy model.

The multihusband-multiwife marriage system is based upon the principle of consent. The first wife of a man consents to give him additional wives. A woman is married to a new husband with the consent of the husbands she already has. Because the parties consent to the new marriages, no violation of the various marriage covenants occurs. Are they all having sexual relations with each other? Yes. Is wedlock being broken? No. Therefore, a tribe that is based upon

such a consensual multispouse system passes the two-question test and does not and in fact *cannot* commit adultery with their spouses.

Consensual, Extra-Marital Courting Does Not Commit Adultery in the Heart

But I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart. (Matt. 5:28)

But I say unto you, that whosoever looketh on a woman, to lust after her, hath committed adultery already in his heart. (3 Ne. 12:28)

And verily I say unto you, as I have said before, he that looketh on a woman to lust after her, or if any shall commit adultery in their hearts, they shall not have the Spirit, but shall deny the faith and shall fear. (D&C 63:16)

The multispouse tribal model will necessarily have men looking upon multiple women who are not their wives, desiring to marry and thus bed them. Some of these women will be single and some will already be married. As the previous chapter addressed, in none of the relationships in which men and women are married to multiple spouses with consent by the parties is physical adultery committed. The other half of that coin, though, is adultery in the heart.

Most people who read the above scriptures focus on the word “lust.” The 1913 Webster’s New International Dictionary of the English Language defines “to lust” as “to have an eager, passionate, and especially an inordinate or sinful desire, as for the gratification of the sexual appetite or of covetousness;—often used with *after*.” As an example of this definition, the dictionary quotes Matthew 5:28 and James 4:5.

Just as important, though, as the word “lust” is to a correct interpretation of these sayings, so is the word “adultery.” The Hebrew text found in Exodus 20:14, which is one of the Ten Commandments, is almost always translated into English as some form of “thou shalt not commit adultery,” but a new way* of translating Hebrew into English renders it “do not break authority vows.” This latter rendering exactly matches the definition of adultery which Joseph Smith received in D&C 132 back in the 1830’s and shows that Smith restored the original meaning of the Hebrew to the world.

Because adultery is a breaking of vows, where there is no (marital) vow that can be broken, the sin of adultery cannot be committed. This means that either the man that is looking is a married man who is under a vow of exclusiveness, or the woman that he is looking at is a married woman who is under a vow of exclusiveness, or both.

When a man looks on a woman who is not his wife with this sinful desire—which is a desire to break either his, hers or both of their vows of exclusiveness by having sex with her, which is what makes this desire sinful—he commits the sin of adultery in the heart. This sin, then, only applies to one or two married people who are not married to each other. A single man looking upon a single woman cannot commit adultery in the heart because neither individual is under any marital vows.

To court is “to endeavor to gain the affections of; to seek in marriage; to woo.” When a single man courts a single woman, the desire to bed the woman is always present. This desire, though, is not sinful because it is not a desire to break any marital vows.

In a polygynous situation, in which a man already has a wife and is courting a new wife who is not vowed to any other man, he also has the desire to bed the new woman, but again, this desire is not sinful because he doesn’t break his marital vows and the new woman is not under any vow which she could break. Only if the man has entered into a vow of exclusiveness with his wife could he possibly commit adultery in his heart by courting the new woman.

The tribal model works with consent going in both directions. A man takes a new wife by his first wife consenting to give the new wife to him and a woman takes a new husband with her current husbands’ consent. Like the polygynous man, the tribal man is not bound by any vow of exclusiveness, therefore he is free to court a single woman and does not commit adultery in the heart while pursuing the new woman. However, unlike the polygynous man, the tribal man may likewise court any married woman whose husband has, or whose husbands have, given her consent to be married to

additional spouses. Because of the consent given both by his first wife and the husband(s) of the married woman he is pursuing, there is no vow of exclusiveness that can be broken, so he is incapable of committing adultery in the heart.

The idea of a married man courting a married woman is only considered adultery in the heart if one or the other are not free to marry additional spouses. The tribal model, then, being based entirely on consensual freedom, does not commit adultery in the heart during the courting rituals of the spouses.

*See www.thechronicleproject.org

Dealing with Adultery and Fornication Among Tribal Members and Prospects

The Lord has given His church laws on how to deal with sexual transgression found among them and also what to do with investigators who are found transgressing sexual laws. It may be wise for each tribe of Christ to take these church laws into consideration when deciding how to treat sexual transgressors within the tribe itself and also among tribal prospects. These scriptural patterns can be just as easily applied to a tribe, as to a church.

For sexual transgression within a tribe, the following scripture can be used as a guide:

Behold, verily I say unto you, that whatever persons among you, having put away their companions for the cause of fornication, or in other words, if they shall testify before you in all lowliness of heart that this is the case, ye shall not cast them out from among you; but if ye shall find that any persons have left their companions for the sake of adultery, and they themselves are the offenders, and their companions are living, they shall be cast out from among you. (D&C 42:74-75)

Normally the act of separating from a spouse (“putting away one’s companion”) is a great sin, a sin that the Lord says He hates. However, there is an exception to this rule, and that is when a spouse has committed some sexual sin and is unrepentant. When that happens it is okay to separate from the spouse. The act of separation is not a punishment, but merely a means to help them confess and repent. When confession and repentance has occurred, the spouses ought to be reconciled and reunited again.

Therefore, if a tribal member is found to have separated from a spouse, but humbly testifies that the separation is because of the spouse’s unconfessed, unrepented sexual sin, the one who has separated should not be cast out of the tribe.

On the other hand, if a tribal member separates from a spouse so that he or she can commit adultery with someone else, this should carry a penalty of expulsion from the tribe, because leaving unrepentant adulterers within the tribe will bring condemnation upon the entire tribe and make it unjustified in the eyes of the Lord. In all cases, though, if there is sincere confession and repentance on the part of the transgressor, tribal forgiveness and reconciliation should follow.

For sexual transgression among tribal prospects, the following scripture can be used as a pattern:

And again, I say unto you, that ye shall be watchful and careful, with all inquiry, that ye receive none such among you if they are married; and if they are not married, they shall repent of all their sins or ye shall not receive them. (D&C 42:76-77)

People who are known to be committing adultery should not be allowed to join a tribe of Christ, nor anyone who is committing fornication, until they have repented of all their sins. Otherwise, if they are received, it will bring the entire tribe under condemnation. (See D&C 63:14-19.)

PLURAL MARRIAGE DOES NOT VIOLATE THE TEMPLE’S LAW OF CHASTITY

There have been two definitions given of the law of chastity in the temple of God in recent times. The one given prior to April 1990 was worded:

*We are instructed to give unto you the law of chastity. This I will explain. To the sisters, it is that no one of you will have **sexual intercourse** except with your husband to whom you are legally and lawfully wedded. To the brethren it is that no one of you will have **sexual intercourse** except with your wife to whom you are legally and lawfully wedded*.*

After April 1990, this was changed to the following wording:

*We are instructed to give unto you the law of chastity, which is that each of you shall have no **sexual relations** except with your husband or wife to whom you are legally and lawfully wedded*.*

Although the wording of these two passages is different, the meaning is the same, for the law of chastity is eternal and does not change. So, while the pre-April 1990 wording used the term “sexual intercourse” and the post-April 1990 wording uses the term “sexual relations,” both terms must mean the same thing and are interchangeable.

The Oxford English Dictionary defines “sexual intercourse” as:

1 : *sexual union between the sexes, copulation, coition*; (now esp.) intimate sexual contact between two individuals involving penetration and typically leading to orgasm, which serves (between a male and a female of various species) as the means of sexual reproduction, and (in humans) typically expresses feelings of love or desire.

2 : also in later use more generally, any form of sexual contact **of this kind** between members of the same sex.

The very same dictionary defines “sexual relations” as:

1 : sexual contact or activity, esp. **sexual intercourse**.

From the above we see that the terms “sexual intercourse” and “sexual relations” are *synonymous*, both referring to the same thing. Sexual relations means sexual intercourse, therefore the two temple definitions (pre- and post-April 1990) are identical in meaning.

The historical and original meaning of the term “sexual intercourse” is “sexual union between the sexes, copulation, coition” and it is this definition which exactly conforms to the biblical sexual laws. The temple’s use of sexual intercourse or sexual relations, then, refers to the sexual union of two people in which penile-vaginal penetration occurs (genital union, meaning the union of the genitals of the man with the genitals of the woman) and the two become “one flesh.”

So, restating the temple definition above using these definitions of terms:

The law of chastity is that no woman will become “one flesh” (meaning that she is vaginally penetrated by the penis of a man) except with her husband to whom she is legally and lawfully wedded, and that no man will become “one flesh” (meaning that he vaginally penetrates a woman with his penis) except with his wife to whom he is legally and lawfully wedded*.*

Penile-vaginal penetration is the law of chastity standard because it is based upon the biblical event of “becoming one flesh.” They are one and the same thing. This law merely regulates who may become “one flesh” and who may not according to the existence, or lack thereof, of marriage covenants. It regulates nothing more than this.

To illustrate using church judgments as an example, if an unmarried man and an unmarried woman have engaged in sexual activity with each other, but no penile-vaginal penetration has occurred, the leadership of the church will not view the act as fornication, nor will they view it as adultery if the man and the woman are married to other people, but not to each other. As long as no genital union has occurred, sexual intercourse or sexual relations (coition) has not occurred.

Genital union is the private standard used by church leaders when judging whether fornication or adultery has occurred, as well as the standard given in the temple of God. The sins of fornication and adultery *require* penile-vaginal penetration. But, don’t take our word on this. Go ask your bishop or stake president.

The temple definition of the law of chastity is a re-affirmation of biblical laws regulating procreation. Sexual intercourse or sexual relations refers to genital union. Without genital union, there can be no procreation, so it is genital union that is regulated. The Lord gives an easy way to make a judgment call as to whether this law has been broken or kept. There is no wiggle room for different interpretations. Either the genitals did, or did not, unite. There is no in-between.

It was never the intention of the temple’s law of chastity to create something new or extra-biblical, but merely to bind people down to obeying biblically revealed laws. The law of chastity is not taught as something new and unique to this dispensation, but as something that has existed in all dispensations. Had the purpose been to go beyond what the Bible says, it would have been worded something similar to: “There shall be no sexual intercourse, *nor anything like unto it*, except between a man and his wife.”

There are other biblical passages that regulate activities other than strict genital to genital union, so defining the law of chastity as penile-vaginal penetration does not, necessarily, give license to someone to engage in other sexual activities. Nevertheless, the church leadership have chosen to publicly preach a broader view of the law of chastity, going

beyond the specific limitations established by the temple's use of the term sexual intercourse to include many other sexual and non-sexual activities. As an example, in the book *Gospel Principles* (chapter 39, The Law of Chastity), under the section called What Is the Law of Chastity?, the following is written:

*We have been taught that **the law of chastity encompasses more than sexual intercourse.** Elder Spencer W. Kimball warned young people of other sexual sins:*

*“Among the most common sexual sins our young people commit are **necking and petting.** Not only do these improper relations often lead to fornication, [unwed] pregnancy, and abortions—all ugly sins—but in and of themselves they are pernicious evils, and it is often difficult for youth to distinguish where one ends and another begins. They awaken lust and stir evil thoughts and sex desires. **They are but parts of the whole family of related sins and indiscretions**” (*The Miracle of Forgiveness*, p. 65). (Emphasis added.)*

This tendency to go beyond the temple definition and lump together anything and everything that can lead to breaking the law of chastity is fairly common. These “related sins and indiscretions” are often categorically labeled with the broad-brush term, “immorality.”

This is the same tendency which lead Adam, who was told by God prior to Eve's creation:

“Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat: But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.”

to tell his wife that:

*“of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, **neither shall ye touch it,** lest ye die.”*

The fear of the “related indiscretion” of touching the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil lead Adam to add to the commandment from God—telling Eve that even *touching* it would surely bring death. Imagine Eve's reaction (given what she had been taught by Adam), when the serpent was able to touch the fruit without dying. Perhaps that was enough to plant a seed of doubt sufficient to get Eve to scrap the whole commandment—choosing to partake of the fruit at Satan's direction.

In the same manner, knowing exactly what the law of chastity is and what it isn't can help a person from being deceived. For instance, some activities that are not encompassed by the temple's law of chastity include masturbation, kissing, necking, petting, viewing pornography, committing adultery in the heart and immodesty. None of these activities can be defined as sexual intercourse. A person is still free to avoid them as he or she sees fit, but none of them come under the jurisdiction of the temple definition of the law of chastity, though other laws of the gospel may still apply prohibitions, restrictions or regulations to them. That said, a tribe may choose to define boundaries beyond the scriptural/temple definition, like the church does. For the purposes of this work, we choose not to go beyond the standard given in the word of God.

Regardless of how you define “sexual intercourse” or “sexual relations,” as long as the two parties are married to each other, they cannot break this law by having “sexual intercourse” or “sexual relations” with each other. With that in mind, we find that the tribal model, with its multihusband-multiwife arrangements, only has men having sexual intercourse or sexual relations with women (and women with men) to whom they are married, therefore, it fully complies with and is justified by the temple's law of chastity—however one might want to define the word. Even for those tribes that choose to allow concubinage, since the concubines are married to their husbands, they do not, and in fact cannot, break this law by becoming “one flesh” with them.

*The phrase “legally and lawfully wedded” means that the marriage must be in a manner consistent with the word of God as found in both the law of Moses and the law of Christ. The words *legally* and *lawfully* are used only in their theological sense, for the temple is a theological institution, dealing with the laws of God and not those of man. When we look up the words *legally* and *lawfully* in the dictionary, we find that each term has specific theological shades of meaning, in addition to other shades that apply to the laws of man. It is only to these theological shades of meaning that

the temple definition applies, because the temple only deals with the things of God and leaves worldly, mundane matters alone.

The word *legally* is the adverb form of the adjective *legal*, which has six shades of meaning. Only the sixth one is theological in application:

legal, a. **6**. Theol. **a** *According to the old or Mosaic dispensation; in accordance with the law of Moses.*

The next word, *lawfully*, is the adverb form of the adjective *lawful*, which itself is derived from the noun *law*, which has ten shades of meanings. This word has two theological shades of meaning, the third and fourth shades:

law, n. **3**. *The Jewish or Mosaic law, contained in the Hexateuch (Pentateuch and Joshua) and in Ezekiel xl.-xlviii.; also, this part of the Scriptures;—often distinguished from the **prophets** and **gospel**. Hence, the Old Testament. One school of Biblical critics finds in the Jewish law three main systems, shaped at different periods and successively combined, namely: The Covenant Code (included in **JE**), the primitive Hebrew law representing the customary law, as notably in Exodus xx.-xxiii, so called as being based on the covenant with God; the Deuteronomic Code (designated **D**), marking a transition between the Covenant Code and the Priestly Code; the Priestly Code (designated **P**), including the Law of Holiness, characterized by ceremonialism, statistical details, and a formal style, esp. in Leviticus and Numbers, and by being suited to the period of Babylonian exile or later.*

law, n. **4**. *A divine commandment or a revelation of the will of God; collectively, the whole body of God's commandments or revelations; the will of God, whether expressed in Scripture, implanted in instinct, or deduced by reason; specif., **Obs.**, a religion or religious faith or dispensation.*

Therefore, the temple language of “legally wedded” means that one must be married in accordance with the law of Moses, and “lawfully wedded” means that one must be married in accordance with the whole body of God’s commandments or revelations (the scriptures), which includes the law of Moses.

Furthermore, even if it could be granted that “legally” in the temple’s definition of the law of chastity refers to the secular use of the term meaning, “that which is not forbidden by legal statute,” a multiple spouse arrangement is *not* illegal. What is *not* legal [speaking according to the law of man] is for one person to obtain more than one marriage license from the State. So long as plural marriage couples do not seek to obtain a second marriage license when they marry, their union is considered, by the law of man, to be legal.

Abrahamic Concubinage as an Inter-Tribal Function

The Encyclopædia Britannica, Eleventh Edition, says the following in its entry on concubinage:

CONCUBINAGE (Lat. **concubina**, a concubine; from **con-**, with, and **cubare**, to lie), the state of a man and woman cohabiting as married persons without the full sanctions of legal marriage. In early historical times, when marriage laws had scarcely advanced beyond the purely customary stage, the concubine was definitely recognized as a sort of inferior wife, differing from those of the first rank mainly by the absence of permanent guarantees. The history of Abraham’s family shows us clearly that the concubine might be dismissed at any time, and her children were liable to be cast off equally summarily with gifts, in order to leave the inheritance free for the wife’s sons (Genesis xxi 9 ff., xxv. 5 ff.).

The above write-up adequately shows the differences between a wife and a concubine. On the one hand there was the wife, who had permanent guarantees. The marriage contract or covenant she entered into bound her exclusively and permanently to her husband, the only way out being through death or divorce. The wife received an inheritance and held rights to the husband’s rank or titles, as did the children she bore him. So, for example, if he was a king, she became a queen and the children she bore him became princes and princesses who also held rights to an inheritance.

On the other hand, the concubine’s marriage covenant had no permanent guarantees. She was bound to her husband exclusively and *temporarily* and held *no* rights to an inheritance *nor* to any of his titles, *nor* did any of the children she bore him. Her marriage contract, being of a temporary nature, could have a stipulated duration of time after which it would end or a stipulated manner by which it could end, such as at the discretion of her husband or herself, and when it ended she was sent away with her children.

It is impossible to comprehend Abrahamic concubinage without an understanding of the context of the ancient world, which was tribalism, meaning that the ancients lived in tribes. Moses wrote:

Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh. (Gen. 2:24)

If there was a man who lived in one tribe and a woman who lived in a different one and the man desired to marry her, he was, per this standard, to leave his tribe and take up residence in his wife's. The woman was always to stay with her tribe, under the protection of her tribesmen, her father and her brothers when marrying a man from a different tribe.

Husbands and wives were also to be of the same religious background. Paul wrote, "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers" (2 Cor. 6:14.) Interfaith marriages, then, were prohibited by the Lord because such permanent unions would tend to turn the believing spouse's heart away from Him. This was especially detrimental in the case of a believing husband and a non-believing wife, for the husband would leave his believing tribe and would be immersed in the unbelieving tribe of his wife. The marrying of believing husbands to only believing wives would make gospel tribes somewhat insular, or set apart, from the tribes of the world, for they would end up taking wives and husbands only from other gospel tribes.

Concubinage worked differently than normal, permanent marriage unions. A concubine did *not* remain with her tribe, but left it to live with the tribe of her husband. After her concubinage contract had ended, she was to leave her husband's tribe with her children and return to her own. Also, a concubine could be an unbeliever from one of the tribes of the earth, meaning one of the non-gospel Gentile tribes in the surrounding area. Because her union was only temporary and she came to live among the believer's tribe, it was less likely that she would have influence enough over the husband to turn his heart from the Lord.

The union of Abraham and Hagar is the prime example of this. Hagar was an Egyptian slave possibly acquired as Pharaoh's gift to Sarah when Abraham and Sarah were sojourning in Egypt. She was not, therefore, of their religion and tribe. So Abraham took Hagar to wife *as his concubine*, not as his wife. Some time after she had given birth to a male child (Ishmael), her concubinage contract was ended and she was sent away with her son. Ishmael eventually ended up marrying an Egyptian woman.

A concubine would bring many benefits to the tribe of her husband. Being from a different tribe, she would bring with her different customs and ways of doing things, which would enrich his tribe and give them knowledge concerning her own. She also would learn the customs of her husband's tribe. Specifically, she would learn their language, their arts and academics, their tribal organization and politics, their talents and industry, their religion and all their other customs. And she would be totally immersed in a gospel culture, dwelling among a gospel tribe, so it would be more likely that she would convert to their religion, than that she would convert them to her religion. If she or any of her children *did* end up converting to the Lord while residing within the gospel tribe, after her contract ended she would be sent back to her tribe as the perfect tribal missionary, as one who was already fully aware of all the ways of her non-gospel tribe, having grown up in it.

Concubines would also bring great benefits to their original tribes. Upon her return, a concubine could teach her people all of what she learned while living among her husband's tribe, including the language and religion of her husband. In this way, she becomes an ambassador of peace between the two tribes, having lived in both for an extended period and knowing the customs and ways and languages of both. This would do much for inter-tribal relations, allowing two foreign tribes to more easily interact with each other without any misunderstandings. What is true for her would also be true for her children, who were raised in their father's tribe and would now be living in their mother's. Each would be immensely benefited by the experience and become natural tribal ambassadors, having allegiances in both tribes.

After returning to her tribe, a concubine would be free to contract marriage as a wife to a fellow tribesman or to someone of another people, while remaining among her own kind. As a tribeswoman by birth, she would be entitled to an inheritance in her tribe. If she was sent away with gifts from her husband, these would also benefit her people.

Another benefit, and a main one at that, would be the introduction of genetic diversity among the various tribes practicing concubinage. A woman from a foreign tribe that became a concubine in a gospel tribe, would end up mixing her tribe's genetic code (though her) with the genetic code of her husband's tribe. If she became a concubine of more than one husband of the new tribe, she would introduce even more genetic diversity into her children. Then, when the concubinage contract(s) ended, she would take her children, the product of her and the new tribe, back to her old tribe, where these children could then pass on this genetic diversity through marriage into their mother's tribe.

Without concubinage, gospel tribes become too insular, marrying only among themselves and not generating much genetic diversity. Also, tribal missionary work becomes more difficult, for it is much easier to send tribal missionaries to a foreign tribe that has had concubines who have already lived in the missionaries' tribe, who can put in a good word for the missionaries and open other doors, allowing the gospel to go forth unimpeded.

Tribal missionaries that spent much time in foreign tribes, preaching the gospel, could enter into concubinage contracts with women of that tribe for the duration that the missionaries were there. This would allow the missionaries to marry non-believers without the danger of being unequally yoked in a permanent union. If the concubine ended up converting to the Lord, the missionary could end the concubinage contract and either leave her there as a new ambassador of the gospel or arrange to bring her to his own tribe as a permanent wife. Whatever they decided to do, the children that came from these unions would create greater genetic diversity for whichever tribe they ended up in.

A concubine whose marriage contract does *not* end and who is *not* sent back to her father's tribe defeats the whole purpose of concubinage. The benefits that come from concubinage—benefits for both her, her children, her husband's tribe and her father's tribe—come only when the concubine and her children return to live with the tribe she originated from. Not receiving an inheritance in her husband's tribe is necessary, in order that she return from whence she comes. Otherwise, concubinage is merely a method for the exploitation of women—the husband having the benefits of a wife, without any associated responsibilities.

A concubine is a noble, honorable calling and title, that accomplishes a great deal of good for two whole tribes. Only when viewed in this manner, under tribal filters, does concubinage make any sense.

When Joseph Smith inquired of the Lord concerning how it was that the ancients were justified in having many wives and concubines, he was given the revelation found in D&C 132. This revelation, for the most part, only speaks of wives. The reason is because it was the purpose of the Lord that Joseph and the saints establish themselves into two bona-fide, fully functioning tribes of Israel using the principle of plural marriage. The revelation ends with an enigmatic carrot on a stick:

And now, as pertaining to this law, verily, verily, I say unto you, I will reveal more unto you, hereafter; therefore, let this suffice for the present. (D&C 132:66)

The only thing that the Lord says about concubines in this revelation is that the ancients were justified in receiving them and that it was accounted to them as righteousness and not sin. But there is no indication that Joseph was supposed to start contracting concubines, only that more would be revealed later.

It makes sense that the Lord wouldn't get into all the details of the doctrine and practice of concubines at this point because concubinage serves an inter-tribal function and the saints had not, yet, even formed themselves into *one* gospel tribe. The intention of the Lord was to have the saints form themselves first into two gospel tribes, a tribe of Ephraim and a tribe of Manasseh and then, and only then, were they to start entering into concubine arrangements with the tribes of the earth. This would serve to counteract the insular nature of the two gospel tribes, who would marry among themselves, in believer-only marriages.

Although the Lord did not go into detail concerning concubines, there is enough in the revelation and in the Bible for modern, gospel-based tribes organized according to the model explained in this book to enter into concubinage contracts if they see fit. In fact, the Lord gives a commandment that these things be done in the revelation itself:

*Verily, thus saith the Lord unto you my servant Joseph, that inasmuch as you have inquired of my hand to know and understand whereby I, the Lord, justified my servants... **as touching the principle and doctrine of their having many wives***

and concubines—*behold, and lo, I am the Lord thy God, and will answer thee as touching this matter [of having many wives and concubines]. Therefore, prepare thy heart to receive and obey the instructions which I am about to give unto you; for all those who have this law [concerning having many wives and concubines] revealed unto them must obey the same.* (D&C 132:1-3)

So, once a gospel tribe is established using plural marriage, the Lord expects it to begin entering into concubinage contracts with the tribes of the earth, in order that the purposes, promises and prophecies of the Lord may be fulfilled about the people of the Lord becoming the salt and leaven of the earth. The Savior said:

The kingdom of heaven is like unto leaven, which a woman took, and hid in three measures of meal, till the whole was leavened. (Matthew 13:33)

Through converted concubines, returned back from whence they come, entire tribes will be converted. Concubinage, then, is a true principle of the gospel and one which any gospel-based tribe may justifiably embrace.

All covenants, contracts... that are not... sealed... as well for time and for all eternity... are of no efficacy, virtue, or force in and after the resurrection from the dead; for all contracts that are not made unto this end have an end when men are dead. (D&C 132:7)

This scripture shows that a marriage contract between a husband and a wife and a marriage contract between a husband and a concubine are similarly temporary. The only difference is that one is intended to last a little bit longer than the other. The wife's contract has an end at death, while the concubine's contract has an end sometime during mortality, but neither in reality are permanent contracts.

It is the sealing power that will vicariously seal *all* such impermanent marriage contracts, including concubinage contracts, making them *all* permanent unions in the afterlife. Because of this, it is not correct to speak of a concubine as “a sort of inferior wife.” She is every bit as much a wife as any other and will be sealed to her husband permanently after her death just as every other wife will be, and she will inherit the same reward as a wife will in the eternities.

Multihusband-Multiwife Marriage and the Law of Sarah

The Lord gives plural wives and concubines to men through two means: 1st, through the law of Sarah (administered by the first wife) and 2nd, through priests who hold the sealing power.

God commanded Abraham, and Sarah gave Hagar to Abraham to wife. And why did she do it? Because this was the law [of Sarah]; and from Hagar sprang many people. This, therefore, was fulfilling, among other things, the promises. (D&C 132:34)

Here we find God commanding Abraham. And what was the commandment?

I, the Lord... commanded Abraham to take Hagar to wife. (D&C 132:65)

The commandment was for Abraham to take Hagar to wife (as his concubine) *by the administration of the law of Sarah*, and not by simply taking her, for plural marriage was to be a symbolic representation of the Lord Himself giving the man his wives and concubines and the first wife was to be the Lord's representative in this act. Therefore God gave Hagar, Abraham's concubine, to him using a proxy (Sarah).

Was Abraham, therefore, under condemnation? Verily I say unto you, Nay; for I, the Lord, commanded it. (D&C 132:35)

Abraham received the law of Sarah from the Lord. He then taught it to his wife, and she received it and administered it to him. Both of them were obedient to this commandment and were justified (not condemned) by their actions.

D&C 132:61-66 contains more information about the law of Sarah. Let's review:

*And again, as pertaining to **the law of the priesthood** [which includes the law of Sarah]—if any man espouse a virgin, and desire to espouse another, **and the first give her consent** [*], and if he espouse the second, and they are virgins, and have vowed to no other man, then is he justified; he cannot commit adultery **for they are given unto him** [through the law of Sarah]; for he cannot commit adultery with that that belongeth unto him and to no one else.* (D&C 132:61)

*The first wife gives her consent to administer the law of Sarah by acting as the Lord's proxy in giving the man a new wife or concubine. The word “consent” in this verse does not mean that she gives him permission to marry, *because he*

does not need her permission. It merely means that she consents, or agrees, to administer the law of Sarah and to represent the Lord by giving her husband a new wife or concubine.

And if he have ten virgins given unto him **by this law** [of Sarah], he cannot commit adultery, for they belong to him, **and they are given unto him** [through the law of Sarah]; therefore is he justified. (D&C 132:62)

But if one or either of the ten virgins, after she is espoused, shall be with another man, she has committed adultery, and shall be destroyed; **for they are given unto him** [through the law of Sarah] to multiply and replenish the earth, according to my commandment, and to fulfil the promise which was given by my Father before the foundation of the world, and for their exaltation in the eternal worlds, that they may bear the souls of men; for herein is the work of my Father continued, that he may be glorified. (D&C 132:63)

And again, verily, verily, I say unto you, if any man have **a wife, who holds the keys of this power** [and the first wife of the man is the wife who holds the keys of the power to administer the law of Sarah], **and he teaches unto her the law of my priesthood, as pertaining to these things** [in other words, he teaches her the law of Sarah], then shall she believe and administer unto him [meaning that she shall administer the law of Sarah by representing the Lord in giving him his wife or concubine], or she shall be destroyed, saith the Lord your God; for I will destroy her; **for I will magnify my name upon all those who receive and abide in my law** [in other words, all first wives who receive and abide by the law of the priesthood, which includes the law of Sarah, administering the same, will have the Lord's name magnified upon them, by giving wives and concubines to their husbands *in the name of the Lord, as His proxy*, whereas all first wives who refuse to represent the Lord according to this law will offend God and be destroyed in the flesh until they repent—see D&C 132:26]. (D&C 132:64)

Therefore, it shall be lawful in me, if she receive not **this law** [of Sarah, meaning that she refuses to administer it to her husband], for him to receive all things whatsoever I, the Lord his God, will give unto him, because she did not believe and administer unto him according to **my word** [His word being His law, which in this case is the law of Sarah—see D&C 132:12]; and she then becomes the transgressor; and he is exempt from **the law of Sarah** [which is the name of the law the Lord has been talking about], who administered unto Abraham according to **the law** [of Sarah] when I commanded Abraham to take Hagar to wife. (D&C 132:65)

And now, as pertaining to **this law** [of Sarah], verily, verily, I say unto you, I will reveal more unto you, hereafter; therefore, let this suffice for the present. Behold, I am Alpha and Omega. Amen. (D&C 132:66)

God views all marriage as a stewardship. The husband is the steward and the wife and her children are his concerns. This is why “women have claim upon their husbands for their maintenance, until their husbands are taken” and why “all children have claim upon their parents for their maintenance until they are of age” (D&C 83:2,4.)

In a matrimonial stewardship there are two sets of keys: those possessed by the husband (the steward) and those possessed by the wife or concubine (the concerns). The keys of the wives/concubines activate, authorize and validate the keys of the husband.

Matrimonial stewardship keys are jurisdictional. The marriage covenant binds the woman to the man exclusively, and binds the man to the woman non-exclusively, creating different jurisdictional boundaries for each party. (This is the only pattern that shows up in the scriptures and it is how God views all marriage, even non-religious marriage. The only exception to this is if the man takes a vow of exclusiveness in addition to his matrimonial covenant, as stated in D&C 132:43). The keys of a husband steward encompass, or have jurisdiction over all of his concerns, which consist of all of his wives, concubines and children. The non-exclusive nature of his covenant with each of his wives and concubines allows him to care for all of these concerns. But because a woman's marriage covenant is exclusive in nature, her keys activate, authorize and validate the keys of her husband steward *in relation to only herself and her children*. In other words, the keys of a wife or concubine have jurisdiction only within the sphere of herself and her children.

Without concerns no man is a steward and without a wife or concubine, no man is a husband. It is the wife or concubine that makes him a husband, just as it is the concerns that make him a steward. For a man to become a matrimonial

steward (a steward husband), he must contract marriage with a woman because it is the keys of a wife or concubine that activate his stewardship keys.

Because a wife's keys do not apply to anyone outside of the sphere or jurisdictional boundary of herself and her children, she cannot authorize her husband in taking another wife or concubine. She has no jurisdiction over any another woman. Her husband steward, not being exclusively bound to his wife, is free to contract marriage with another woman, but the authorization to do so does not come from his keys, either, for his steward keys have no validity unless first activated and authorized by the keys of some concerns. From where, then, does this authorization come from to take on additional wives and concubines? *From the new wife or concubine.*

A new woman activates an already married man's keys of stewardship by accepting a new proposal of marriage to him, thereby becoming another set of concerns that he must take care of. Her entrance into a covenant of marriage with him, to be his wife or his concubine, is all the authorization needed to activate his keys in relation to herself and any children that will result from the covenantal relationship they will have.

Nevertheless, to remain right in the Lord's eyes, the man must utilize the law of Sarah to be given the new wife from the Lord, through the administration of his first wife, but if she rejects the law of Sarah, his keys may still be activated by the keys of the new woman, creating a new set of concerns and a new stewardship, under the same husband steward. His first wife's permission is not, nor ever is, needed to allow him to take a second wife or concubine, because her keys do not apply to the second woman. This is why if his wife rejects the law of Sarah, he becomes "exempt from the law of Sarah" (D&C 132:65) and may still go ahead and marry the woman he desires to espouse.

The point of the law of Sarah is not so that a man gets permission from his wife before taking another wife because a man is non-exclusively bound to his wife and has the right and power to marry additional wives and concubines. The action of the first wife in administering the law of Sarah is to bring the Lord into the act, by setting up a proxy (the first wife) who will give the new wife to the husband in the Lord's stead, as Jehovah's representative. It is a privilege that the Lord extends to His daughters alone and is the reason why refusing it incites His anger.

When a man goes to his wife and asks her to administer the law of Sarah to him and to give him a wife or a concubine he desires to espouse, in the name of the Lord, she acting as the Lord's proxy, this creates an opportunity for the wife to voice her opinion on the matter. After hearing her opinion, the man may change his mind about taking the new wife or concubine or may proceed forward anyway. If he decides that he still wants to marry the woman, the wife is to administer the law of Sarah to him.

A man sins, therefore, if he takes another wife or concubine without going to his first wife and asking her to administer the law of Sarah to him. And his wife sins if, after he gives her the opportunity to represent the Lord in this manner and having His name magnified upon her by giving him the new woman in His behalf, she refuses to do so.

The second and third and other wives and concubines do not hold the keys of this power, therefore they do not administer the law of Sarah, for only the first wife does. It is her privilege alone to represent the Lord in giving the man additional wives and concubines. Nevertheless, as the tribal model is based upon multiple husbands as well as multiple wives, if a second wife marries a second husband who is not married to anyone else, she becomes her second husband's first wife, and so obtains the keys to this power in relation to him. In this way, many plural wives may at some point end up becoming someone's first wife and obtain the privilege of acting as the Lord's proxy for the administration of the law of Sarah.

Obviously, it is better to have all wives in agreement before new wives are added, but the jurisdictional relationship of a marriage stewardship in which the steward is not under a vow of exclusiveness allows the husband to take a new wife with or without his wives' agreement or permission, nevertheless, in order to be justified before the Lord, he must first allow the law of Sarah to be administered by the first wife.

The tribal model, of course, operates on universal consent, going both ways, allowing both men and women multiple spouses, but keeping in mind how the law of Sarah works and the jurisdiction of the various keys, as well as the relationship of the steward to his concerns and vice versa, may allow tribes to organize themselves better so that they conform

more closely to the revealed word of God. As long as all the tribesmen make sure that they go to their first wife to have her give them a new wife or concubine in the name of the Lord, they will be in conformity. And as long as the first wives always administer the law of Sarah, they will also be in conformity and no one will be condemned.

David's wives and concubines were given unto him of me, by the hand of Nathan, my servant, and others of the prophets who had the keys of this power; (D&C 132:39)

Here we have the second way whereby the Lord gave wives: through the sealing power, which made the first way (the law of Sarah) last throughout eternity.

Who decided which wife the man could wed? Was it the Lord who chose the bride for the man, the man's first wife or the priesthood servant? It was none of these people. It was the man himself who picked his own brides:

*And again, as pertaining to the law of the priesthood—if any man espouse a virgin, **and desire to espouse another*** (D&C 132:61)

It was his desires for another wife that decided the issue as to whom he would marry. The Lord grants unto the children of men according to the desires of their hearts. The law of Sarah was given and commanded to be administered by the first wife so that there would be a way whereby the Lord could grant this desire to man by proxy, for marriage is seen by God as an honorable act:

Marriage is honourable in all, and the bed undefiled: but whoremongers and adulterers God will judge. (Heb. 4:13)

Marrying a second wife, therefore, is not selfish. A wife brings with her all the responsibilities of a stewardship, whereas whoredom and adultery carry no such permanent relations and responsibilities. A man typically will not take on a second wife unless he can afford to, nor will a second woman marry an already married man unless he is capable of supporting her. Also, if the man mistreats his first wife, it is doubtful that any woman will want to be his second wife. In other words, there are already built-in bulwarks against marrying for selfish reasons. If a man is truly selfish, he will not marry, but will simply take on a mistress or he will divorce his first wife and marry the second, etc.

There are no scriptures that indicate that marriage is selfish, iniquitous or dishonorable. It is true that there are injunctions against marrying outside of the faith because the wives would turn the husbands' heart away from God, but that is not against the institution of marriage itself. Only in Jacob 2 do we find God prohibiting the taking of concubines and more than one wife, but that was a special case. Besides, even when there were those who disobeyed this commandment among the Nephites, they were never told to separate or divorce their plural wives and concubines. Once married, God recognized the union as binding.

A wife that feels that her husband is taking on a second wife due to iniquity on his part would be hard-pressed to show in the scriptures how this is unrighteousness. Only if the new marriage commits adultery (because the man was under a vow of exclusiveness) or fraud (because he told his second wife he had no other wives) or other such sinful behavior can wickedness be claimed. The more likely scenario, for a wife that protests, is that she is the selfish one. She wishes to be the one and only wife, even though the marriage contract does not express such terms. A husband who is under no vow of exclusiveness is not bound by the law of God to have but one wife. A woman who wishes to force a man to remain monogamous, where no vow of exclusiveness on his part exists, is a transgressor.

A husband who has entered into a vow of exclusiveness creates a special situation. The gospel teaches us to keep all our vows that we have entered into, so if he asks her to release him from the vow in order that he may take a second wife or concubine, and she chooses instead to hold him to it, she does not sin. It is entirely at her discretion whether to release him or not from his vow. He made the vow and now he must keep it until she releases him from it. If he takes another wife anyway, before being released, he commits the sin of adultery. Therefore, all men under vows of exclusiveness must first obtain a release from those vows before they can proceed on with the law of Sarah and start to marry additional wives and concubines. There is no exception to this law.

In the case of polyandry, because a wife is exclusively bound to her husband as her steward, she will need express permission to marry, otherwise she will commit adultery if she is with another man. Also, since every husband she has is an exclusive arrangement, when she takes another husband, she will need express permission from each and every one

of her current husbands to marry the new husband. If she has ten husbands and nine of them give her permission but one says no, she cannot marry another man without committing adultery.

When a woman marries a second husband, in reality she adds a second steward into the mix, causing her second and first husbands to become joint-stewards with equal interest in the same concerns. Adding a new husband is always a bigger deal than adding a new wife because plural husbands starts forming a united order between joint-stewards, instead of just adding more concerns to the same, singular stewardship. This is a very good thing, but care must be taken that each new husband is equally yoked in the gospel and tribe as all the other husbands are, and on the same page as to tribal and gospel goals.

For a tribe that lives on their own tribal lands, one of the easiest ways to do it for both men and women is to simply allow all adult members of the tribe to marry any other adult tribal member that they want, for members who are living on tribal lands. So, if there are fifty men in the tribe living on the tribal land, an adult female tribal member would be allowed by her husband(s) to marry any of the other adult men of the tribe, because these men have all been vetted already. In other words, these men are already tribal members, known to understand the tribal model, the gospel of Jesus Christ, they are priesthood holders, etc.

For potential spouses who are not yet members of the tribe, some form of vetting system could and should be put in place before he or she entered the tribe. Once a member of the tribe, though, he or she could be fair marrying game for all the other adult members of the tribe.

Obviously the law of Sarah and the sealing power are intertwined in Joseph's revelation on plural marriage, but the principle and pattern of the law of Sarah can be applied to non-sealed tribal marriages, as well. Utilizing the law of Sarah for men who desire additional wives, and express (ideally, written) permission from all current husbands for women who desire additional husbands, will bring tribes into greater conformity to the scriptural patterns.

Multihusband-Multiwife Marriage and the Sealing Power

*David's wives and concubines were given unto him of me, by the hand of Nathan, my servant, and others of **the prophets who had the keys of this power**; (D&C 132:39)*

*And again, verily, verily, I say unto you, if any man have **a wife, who holds the keys of this power** (D&C 132:64)*

By divine design, there are two parts to the giving of an additional wife or concubine. There is the first wife who gives her husband another wife and then there is the Lord's priesthood servant who gives (or seals) a wife to him. All of this may occur simultaneously in the temple, with the first wife present, giving the new wife to the husband while the sealer performs the sealing, but it does not have to happen at once. Just as we can marry outside of the temple and then enter at a later time and have our marriage sealed, so the law of Sarah may be used first and then later the marriage sealed by a sealer.

The man's first wife and the priesthood sealer have a different set of keys, both of which are necessary. The first wife's set pertains to time (mortality) and the priesthood sealer's set pertains to eternity (the afterlife). The sealing power makes the marriage covenant between a man and a woman eternal, in whatever form that it might take: monogamy, polygyny, polyandry or multihusband-multiwife polygamy. It is not meant to force everyone into one type of marriage, because that would create an unrighteous dominion because righteous dominions flow "without compulsory means."

When church leaders restrict sealings to *only* monogamous unions, and preach that *only* sealed, monogamous marriages are valid and exalting and every other type of unsealed marriage is, at best, second-rate and bargain-basement and, at worst, unlawful, illegal, immoral and unjustified, they use the sealing power as a form of extortion, to force everybody into the one and only leadership-approved form of marriage.

Preaching "monogamous temple marriage only" cuts many people off from the ordinances of the house of the Lord and perverts the revealed doctrines of plural marriage. For example, such extortion prohibits polygamous Gentiles who repent and accept Christ from being baptized into the Lord's church, simply because they have more than one wife. It

also stops the Gentile converts who are already in the church from taking more than one wife as the word of God allows, if they wish to have access to the ordinances of the Lord's house and not be kicked out of the church. All of this extortion makes the word of God that pertains to plural marriage of none effect.

Due to such preaching from the pulpits, some people get the idea that a marriage is not valid unless it is sealed by a priesthood sealer. Such a thought, however, is not scriptural. How many ancient Israelites, living the law of Moses and practicing polygynous marriage, had their marriages sealed during mortality? Probably not very many. Yet they were all valid marriages for time. The same principle of validity equally applies to monogamous and consensual, polyandrous unions. All these forms of marriage are recognized by God as valid while the matrimony is alive. The sealing power does not make any of these marriages more valid for time than when they are unsealed.

The sealing power only affects the afterlife, not the here and now. Children that are "born under the covenant" are not any more your children than children that are not born under the covenant. The automatic sealing of those children pertains to the afterlife, not the here and now. But it doesn't matter whether a child is sealed automatically or sealed by proxy after they are dead—all children eventually will be sealed to their parents.

Upon death of one or both parties, all marriages of every form are no longer valid, but through the vicarious work for the dead all marriages will be validated and made eternal. Because of this, it makes no difference, at all, that a marriage is not sealed now. Obviously, if a couple has the opportunity to be sealed during mortality, then they should take advantage of it, but if they do not have that opportunity, for whatever reason, even because the church refuses to recognize that type of marriage now, it does not matter one bit. Every "for time" marriage turns into an eternal marriage anyway, so if the church does not seal these types of marriages during time, they will still end up doing it later when everyone is dead. In fact, it is entirely appropriate for unsealed tribal marriages to take the form given in D&C 132:18, in which the man makes a covenant with his wife for time and for all eternity because ultimately, that is how long that marriage covenant is going to last once the work for the dead occurs.

As long as a tribe uses whatever keys they possess to conform as best they can to the written word of God, they will not be penalized or lose out on any of the blessings of the gospel. If the works of the tribe match the works found in the scriptures, for example, if the tribe is utilizing the law of Sarah and making sure all the records are kept, with sufficient witnesses, marriage permissions, etc., the Lord must comply with His own word and bless them and give them the promises they have desired and sought for but were denied by the church authorities. There is no need to be overly concerned with the existence of unsealed marriages among any of the tribes of Christ based upon this model.

*Thus came the voice of the Lord unto me, saying: All who have died without a knowledge of this gospel, who would have received it **if they had been permitted** to tarry, shall be heirs of the celestial kingdom of God; also all that shall die henceforth without a knowledge of it, **who would have received it with all their hearts**, shall be heirs of that kingdom; for I, the Lord, will judge all men according to their works, **according to the desire of their hearts.** (D&C 137:7-9)*

The Lord looks upon the desires and intents of one's heart. If the parties of unsealed tribal marriages desire to have their marriages sealed by a church sealer and would receive it with all their hearts, but they are not permitted by the church because the marriages are not monogamous, the Lord will nevertheless judge them by the desire of their hearts and their willingness to receive the sealing ordinances with all their hearts "if they had been permitted" by the church, and He will arrange to have their marriages sealed, either by vicarious ordinances after they are dead, or by causing changes in the church so that church sealers start accepting polygamous marriages, or by sending other authorized sealers to the tribe, sealers who are not authorized by the Gentile church but who come from the Lamanites (when the church transfers to them. It is only the Gentile church that puts hoops to jump through in front of people.) Thus, all such marriages will eventually be turned into eternal unions, according to the desires of their hearts and their prayers of faith.

*Verily, if a man be called of my Father, as was Aaron, **by mine own voice, and by the voice of him that sent me**, and I have endowed him with the keys of the power of this priesthood, if he do anything in my name, and according to my law and by my word, he will not commit sin, and I will justify him. (D&C 132:59)*

At any rate, the Gentile church sealers we have today do not fit the description of a sealer found in the verse shown above. We do not know of any living sealer who has been called by the voice of the Father and the Son. For all we know, the sealings that have been done by “church sealers” who were not called of God after this fashion, will need to be redone at some point in the future by true sealers sent anew from God and who are called of God in this very manner.

Pornography, Cheating, and Serial Monogamy Compared to a Multispouse Tribe

The gospel-based model of a multihusband-multiwife tribe (also verified by secular research such as the *Sex at Dawn* publication), describes a state in which all are free to love and connect with multiple people as being the natural sexual order of human beings. However, humans have constructed a society in which one-spouse-at-a-time is enforced by legal restrictions and religious injunctions. For all our efforts, we’ve seen cheating spouses, serial monogamy, and pornography explode in popularity as an outlet for repressed sexuality. When something is banned (by the State or churches, etc.) without addressing the underlying motivations, the behavior is just pushed underground, becoming darker in the process.

A multispouse tribe could seem (*in appearances*) to be pornographic to some—with multiple spouses engaging in concurrent sexual relationships, etc. However, it would be incorrect to label this model as pornographic or as excusing sexual permissiveness. Sexually permissive, or “swinging,” couples do not come together and make love by way of a covenant to co-habitate and to continue to love each other. As such, they are not about permanence because there is no marriage—and this is sin.

The same with pornography—one does not co-habitate with and continue to love their favorite porn actor/actress. *That* is what makes pornography immoral (that is connection with non-real entities)—not that it is depictions of two people having sexual relations. Humans should be about connecting with other people, not with pixels. Sexual energy should be devoted to the connection between husbands and wives, exclusively. A man hunched over in front of his computer screen is not sexy, and many people have suffered grief and tears over the heart-break of a spouse who turns to the non-real rather than to them. While it’s true that much of what is said about pornography has merit (like the unrealistic looking women, who are unrealistically turned on, who are unrealistically excited about doing any number of sex acts, it being as addictive as certain drugs, ruining relationships, etc.)—much of what is said does not apply to all pornography or to all porn users and fails to address what’s really wrong with it—and thus can be quite unhelpful.

Though (*in appearances*) a monogamous marriage seems to be more virtuous and self-sacrificing and pornography can be seen as being quite destructive—a group of husbands who make love to their wife is not the same thing *nor* has the same effect as a man watching a video of a group of men having sex with a woman (the most common form of multiple-partner pornography.) Although they seem similar (*in appearances*), they are fundamentally different. One model produces one effect, the other model produces something entirely different. Instead of demonizing sexual expression, we should be about re-emphasizing the sexiness of humans connecting with humans.

In fact, pornography-users and serial monogamists are *already* connecting themselves sexually to multiple people. These behaviors are a manifestation of our natural sexual expression, it’s just that it has been directed incorrectly by laws and doctrines barring multiple real-life sexual partners concurrently, as *this model* suggests we ought to do.

This pattern of behavior becomes a problem because (in the case of serial monogamy) one spouse is abandoned (or divorced) in order to have the additional one—or (in the case of cheating), the marital covenant and the law of chastity are being broken—or (in the case of pornography) the multiple partners are virtual people comprised of pixels on a screen, instead of physical human beings to whom the person is married.

In other words, the popularity of pornography and the prevalence of cheating and serial monogamy can be seen as *further evidence* that humans are (by design) inclined to have multiple sexual connections.

* With cheating, people disregard marital vows and the law of chastity just to satisfy a sexual itch.

- * With serial monogamy, people feel that the permanent separation of marriage families is the only way to find happiness in our “one-marriage-fits-all”, “one-true-love” culture.
- * With pornography, people are carrying on with multiple, unnatural pixel-partners with no covenants binding them.

The tribal model takes these connections between unwed persons, between separate monogamous unions, and with pixels and says let’s transfer them to multiple, human sexual-partners that are bound together by covenants of matrimony.

PLURAL MARRIAGE IS MAKING A COMEBACK

[Valerie] *Hudson* [a Brigham Young University political science professor] ... *predicts the United States will, within a decade, allow same-sex marriage, polygamy, polyandry and all kinds of relationships among consenting adults.* (Are Mormons through with Polygamy? by Peggy Fletcher Stack, The Salt Lake Tribune, Friday, August 19, 2011.)

The world appears to be in the midst of a polygamy revival in which the topic keeps popping up in the news. Muslim polygamy, in particular, is pushing the legal envelope and challenging the religious freedom laws of many countries, as more Muslims migrate to different countries. For example, in France, where polygamy is illegal, there are between 16,000 to 20,000 polygamous families, an estimated 200,000 people altogether, of mostly north or central African heritage. Almost all of them are married under Muslim, not French law and this has been the center of recent political debates. Even here in America, despite the fact that there are laws against it on the books, more and more people are becoming polygamists.

Utah and eight other states make polygamy a crime, while 49 states have bigamy statutes that can be used to prosecute plural families. And they’re not a small population: the number of fundamentalist Mormon or Christian polygamists alone has been estimated to be as high as 50,000. When Muslim as well as nonreligious plural families are considered, the real number is likely many times greater. (One Big, Happy Polygamous Family by Jonathan Turley, The Washington Post, July 20, 2011)

Popular opinion regarding polygamy seems to be changing. In 2006, HBO began to air “Big Love,” a fictional drama based upon a real-life polygamous family, Joe Darger and his three wives. That series gained wide popularity, introducing the American polygamous lifestyle to millions of viewers. The show ended in March, 2011, but the real Darger family have now written a book called, *LOVE TIMES THREE: Our True Story of a Polygamous Marriage*, published in September 2011.

Another American television channel, TLC, began to air “Sister Wives” in September, 2010, which was a reality series starring the real-life polygamist Kody Brown and his four wives. It also gained wide popularity among its viewing audience and began its third season in September, 2011. Due to the show’s success, the Browns have even been featured on the popular television talk show, “The Oprah Winfrey Show,” bringing polygamy even more into the spotlight.

Litigation dealing with polygamy also seems to be on the rise. To the north there was a case in January 2009 in which Canadian police arrested two leaders of separate polygamous factions in Bountiful, B.C. and charged them with practicing polygamy, but the charges were dropped later that September. The fear was that the anti-polygamy law (Sec. 293 of the Criminal Code) might be unconstitutional and the government wasn’t willing to allow the accused to raise the argument about its unconstitutionality.

In 2008, an anonymous phone call tip (now believed to have been a hoax) initiated a raid by authorities on a Texas FLDS compound, in which hundreds of children were removed. Many monogamous Americans had mixed reactions, some supporting the raid, others horrified by it. In 2011, the president and prophet of the FLDS, Warren Jeffs was arrested, charged and convicted of child sexual assault, in a highly publicized trial. Although popular opinion was against the man, the focus was not so much on his practice of polygamy, but on his corruption and raping of innocent children.

Other lawsuits regarding polygamy are also making their way through the legal system. For example, the Browns, mentioned above, have now filed their own suit against the State of Utah. And all of the litigation and controversy surrounding gay marriage has many polygamists looking to use similar legal arguments to usher in a new era of legalized polygamy.

Christian polygamy is starting to gain traction with Internet sites such as Mark Henkel's BiblicalPolygamy.com and its sister sites TruthBearer.org, Pro-Polygamy.com, ChristianPolygamy.info, PolygamyDay.com, Pro-Polygamy.net, and LoveNotForce.com, all actively promoting Christian polygamy both in the court room and among the population. Henkel's even gone so far as to promote an Annual Polygamy Day each August 19th. As a result of his or other Christian polygamy movements, more and more Christians are beginning to embrace biblical polygyny.

Secular polygamy also appears to be on the rise. There are now non-religious polygamy resources in the form of new web sites popping up here and there to help people find additional wives or a family to join. Even on the popular social media site Facebook, there are campaigns to get Facebook to allow people to list their relationship status as polygamous.

These trends show that society is moving in a direction in which polygamy will be tolerated, accepted and perhaps eventually made a legal status. Although the old taboos of polygamy are still found among a great many Americans, a growing population across a wide spectrum are beginning to think that consensual, adult polygamy should not be a crime, creating a healthy environment for the emergence of the tribal model.

UNLICENSED MARRIAGES ARE ORDAINED OF GOD

In March/May 1831, Joseph Smith received a revelation which spoke of marriage between a man and a woman—for back then there was no concept of same-sex marriage, only marriage between the sexes—in which the Lord said:

*And again, verily I say unto you, that **whoso forbiddeth to marry is not ordained of God**, for marriage is ordained of God unto man. (D&C 49:15)*

When we read the above scripture and ask the question, "Who forbids to marry?"—we get the following answers:

Parents – In some states minors as young as 14 years old may marry with a valid state marriage license if they obtain written permission from their parents. Not all parents, though, will give it.

The State – The state has a monopoly on marriage authorization and typically will not recognize nor offer marriage privileges to unlicensed marriages. It makes it a crime to marry two or more living spouses with licenses, prohibiting polygamy in all its forms and promoting and recognizing only a strange form of monogamy with itself as a *third* party. It restricts who can get a license by age and health and other qualifications and puts a price tag on marriage, so that everyone must pay for the permission to get married. Additionally, some states have cohabitation laws on their books so that unlicensed matrimonyes can still be prosecuted and thrown into jail, effectively making the state the major perpetrator of forbidding to marry.

The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints – The church is another major perpetrator of forbidding to marry. Although it has no power to stop anyone from getting married, by preaching a valid state marriage license requirement to its congregation, it supports the state's restrictions and monopoly on marriage. Also, by excommunicating those who marry more than one living spouse, it sets up its own restrictions with attendant judgments placed upon those who marry without a license.

These three institutions, then, *are not ordained of God* when they forbid to marry, but there is one more:

A spouse – Any man or woman who forbids a spouse that is free to marry another, due to selfishness, *is also not ordained of God*.

*And verily I say unto you, that **the conditions of this law are these**: All covenants, contracts, bonds, obligations, oaths, vows, performances, connections, associations, or expectations, that are not made and entered into and sealed by the Holy Spirit of promise, of him who is anointed, both as well for time and for all eternity, and that too most holy, by revelation and commandment through the medium of mine anointed, whom I have appointed on the earth to hold this power (and I have*

appointed unto my servant Joseph to hold this power in the last days, and there is never but one on the earth at a time on whom this power and the keys of this priesthood are conferred), are of no efficacy, virtue, or force in and after the resurrection from the dead; for all contracts that are not made unto this end have an end when men are dead.

And everything that is in the world, whether it be ordained of men, by thrones, or principalities, or powers, or things of name, whatsoever they may be, that are not by me or by my word, saith the Lord, shall be thrown down, and shall not remain after men are dead, neither in nor after the resurrection, saith the Lord your God. (D&C 132:7,13)

God recognizes “all covenants, contracts, bonds, obligations, oaths, vows, performances, connections, associations, or expectations” that are made among men “both as well for time and for all eternity,” regardless of who or what entity or entities ordained them, “whether it be ordained of men, by thrones, or principalities, or powers, or things of name, whatsoever they may be,” as perfectly valid and binding only until “men are dead,” at which point such “contracts... have an end.” This applies only to covenants, contracts, oaths, etc., that are not made by the Lord nor by His word. As marriage is a covenant between a man and a woman, it comes under the above listed conditions of the law of the new and everlasting covenant.

There are three types of marriage covenants covered by these conditions. The first is a marriage covenant that is “not by me nor by my word” and that is stated to be for time only (“till death do they part”), which makes it valid in the eyes of the Lord only until either the man or the woman dies:

Therefore, if a man marry him a wife in the world, and he marry her not by me nor by my word, and he covenant with her so long as he is in the world and she with him, their covenant and marriage are not of force when they are dead, and when they are out of the world; therefore, they are not bound by any law when they are out of the world. (D&C 132:15.)

Marriage covenant #2 is “not by me or by my word,” and is stated to be for time and all eternity, therefore it, also, is valid in the eyes of the Lord only until one of them dies:

And again, verily I say unto you, if a man marry a wife, and make a covenant with her for time and for all eternity, if that covenant is not by me or by my word, which is my law, and is not sealed by the Holy Spirit of promise, through him whom I have anointed and appointed unto this power, then it is not valid neither of force when they are out of the world, because they are not joined by me, saith the Lord, neither by my word; when they are out of the world it cannot be received there, because the angels and the gods are appointed there, by whom they cannot pass; they cannot, therefore, inherit my glory; for my house is a house of order, saith the Lord God. (D&C 132:18.)

Finally, marriage covenant #3 is “by my word, which is my law” and is sealed to them “in time, and through all eternity.” Such a marriage is valid in the eyes of the Lord for as long as they abide in it:

And again, verily I say unto you, if a man marry a wife by my word, which is my law, and by the new and everlasting covenant, and it is sealed unto them by the Holy Spirit of promise, by him who is anointed, unto whom I have appointed this power and the keys of this priesthood; and it shall be said unto them—Ye shall come forth in the first resurrection; and if it be after the first resurrection, in the next resurrection; and shall inherit thrones, kingdoms, principalities, and powers, dominions, all heights and depths—then shall it be written in the Lamb’s Book of Life, that he shall commit no murder whereby to shed innocent blood, and if ye abide in my covenant, and commit no murder whereby to shed innocent blood, it shall be done unto them in all things whatsoever my servant hath put upon them, in time, and through all eternity; and shall be of full force when they are out of the world; and they shall pass by the angels, and the gods, which are set there, to their exaltation and glory in all things, as hath been sealed upon their heads, which glory shall be a fulness and a continuation of the seeds forever and ever. (D&C 132:19.)

It is important to understand that all three marriage covenants are ordained of God:

*And again, verily I say unto you, that whoso forbiddeth to marry is not ordained of God, for **marriage is ordained of God unto man.** (D&C 49:15.)*

The first two marriage covenant scenarios, which operate under temporal power and authority, are ordained of God until death. The third marriage covenant scenario, which operates under eternal power and authority, is ordained of God throughout all eternity.

Marriage is ordained of God because it creates permanency, for God is all about creating permanency: even things that remain.

For whatsoever things remain are by me; and whatsoever things are not by me shall be shaken and destroyed. (D&C 132:14.)

The only difference between fornication (unlawful sexual relations) and marriage (lawful sexual relations) is the idea of a permanent union. God wants men and women to come together and have sex (become one flesh), and He wants them to remain together, continuing to have sex. The marriage covenant is a covenant or contract to remain together permanently, as husband and wife, either until death or throughout all eternity. It is the fleeting, temporary nature of fornication that makes it wrong.

When two people come together and make love, the love demonstrated and generated is intended by God to continue on forever. It is supposed to remain. The marriage bonds keep people connected (and gathered) so that they continue to nurture and grow the love generated between them. God is love, so the scriptures say, therefore, He is all-loving and never stops loving. To come together and make love and then leave (separate from one another) is akin to stop loving (stop becoming one). God wants us to continue to manifest our love for one another, through the marital covenants. In this way we learn to become like Him, all-loving and continually loving.

In the scriptures, there is no mention of the need to have a valid state marriage license in order to create such permanency. All that is needed for a marriage to occur is that there be a marriage covenant between a man and a woman. That's it. The marriage covenant can be written or verbal. It doesn't matter. It can be ordained "by thrones, or principalities, or powers," in other words, by the state, but it doesn't have to be. It can simply be "ordained of men," even the two people entering the covenant (the man and the woman), or even by "things of name, whatsoever they may be."

This means that two people who enter into a marriage covenant with each other, without a state marriage license, without a religious or civil ceremony, the man agreeing to be the woman's husband and the woman agreeing to be the man's wife, who then begin living together and making love, presenting themselves publicly as husband and wife, *are not living in sin*. They are not fornicating. They have nothing to repent of for they have satisfied the conditions of the law of the new and everlasting covenant. Their marriage is ordained of God.

The scriptures also do not state that a wedding ceremony is necessary for a marriage to be valid. Typically, wedding ceremonies do occur, according to the customs of the culture of the two people, but they are not necessary for a marriage to be valid in the eyes of God. Only the covenant or contract is the necessary part.

There is also no mention of witnesses. A third person can be present while the two make their marriage vows (the marriage covenant), but that is not required by the law of the new and everlasting covenant. They can enter their covenant in private, just the two of them and it's still valid in the eyes of God.

This brings up a conflict because a married couple that does not get state permission to be married is seen differently by God and the church. In the eyes of God, they are married. In the eyes of the (modern) church, they are not. (It was not always so. There was a time when the church recognized marriages as valid even without a marriage license.) As the church holds the keys of the priesthood, despite a couple being validly married in the eyes of God, they can be prohibited from receiving baptism, confirmation, priesthood and the temple sealing, all required ordinances for their salvation. The modern church, then, in not recognizing a marriage as valid in the same way God does, becomes a stumbling block to their eternal progression.

Since all marriage between a man and a woman is ordained of God, including unlicensed, non-temple marriage, *all marriage is holy matrimony*. This brings people who follow the practices and judgments of the church under condemnation when they call unlicensed marriage, which is good, holy and ordained of God, an evil, and when they judge those who enter such marriages, who have done no sin but have acted in righteousness, as sinners. This double whammy of transgressions—calling good evil and calling the righteous sinful—comes from a misunderstanding of the word of God and also of Satan's desires, for the devil wants no one to be married. He would rather that everyone sleep around without entering into marriage covenants with each other.

So, a tribe of Christ based upon the principle of anarchy can righteously enter into unlicensed marriages without fear of offending God. There will be no repercussions, whatsoever, from the Lord for doing so, though the church may try to put a stop to such practices.

UNLICENSED MARRIAGES AND WHAT THE BRETHREN CAN DO ABOUT THEM

There are serious consequences to consider before attempting to establish a tribe using the multihusband-multiwife marriage system. If it is learned that you are even planning such an activity, you will be disciplined by the church. The two ways of discipline in our religious institution are disfellowship and excommunication, however, because entire Mormon families are typically plugged into Mormonism, there will be further repercussions from one's family and perhaps even friends as they spurn and/or pity you when they learn of your "apostasy."

All of this must be weighed in the balance when considering exiting out of the confines of monogamy. There is also the law of man to consider, which does not allow polygamy. This means that to obey the laws of the state, one must practice polygamy without a state marriage license. If you attempt to marry more than one spouse using a marriage license for each one, that puts you under the jurisdiction of the bigamy laws.

Marriage without a state license is approved of God, so the state's jurisdiction can be entirely by-passed, but the church still poses a problem if they find out what you are doing. The question then is whether the church can be kept out of one's tribal business. To that end, we thought it would be beneficial to review some marriage scenarios to determine how easy or difficult it would be to practice the multiple spouse marriage system without the church finding out.

First, let's talk about a single man and a single woman who desire to marry. If they marry without a marriage license, by covenant between themselves only, and start living together, chances are that word is going to get out one way or another that two "unmarried" people in the church are living together (living in sin). Now, living together does not equate to having sex, but we all know how people think.

If the couple attends church and continues to partake of the sacrament, while living together, chances are that they will be asked to come in to the bishop's office for a chat. The bishop will surely inquire about the circumstances of this highly irregular affair.

Probably the first thing he will ask is if this couple is married. It is a possibility that the couple has gotten married in secret, in a civil ceremony. Perhaps they eloped to Las Vegas or something.

There are two ways that the couple can respond to questions about their marriage. They can say that they are married, which would be the truth as they entered into a covenant of marriage with each other, or they can say that they aren't married, which would be the truth as they aren't married in the eyes of the state because they never got a marriage license.

If they say that they aren't married, there will be inquiries about whether they are still living the law of chastity, about the living arrangements they have made, with pressure to separate, repent, etc.

If they say that they are married, there will be inquiries about the details of their marriage. When and where they got married, wedding pics, the bridal dress, etc. If the couple divulges the details of the marriage, that it was by personal covenant-only, the bishop, the members, their family and also many other people will not consider it a bona fide marriage and the church will consider them living in sin and take action accordingly. If, however, the couple plans to keep the details secret and arranges circumstances so that it appears that they "left town," eloped and returned married, the membership and leadership will more readily accept that, (though they will be chided for not getting a temple marriage.)

For example, a man and a woman can arrange their affairs so that they are both free on a certain date. They can leave their homes early and go off to some faraway place where others they know would not look for them and then they can enter into their marriage covenant. They can stay away for a sufficiently long time to allow for an apparent elopement to Vegas and back. When they return, the man and the woman can sport wedding rings, move in together and live their lives from that moment on as husband and wife.

When asked about their wedding, they can say they eloped. When asked when they were married, they can say the date that they entered into their marriage covenant. When asked where they were married or if they can show pictures or, for the really nosy ones, a marriage certificate, they can say, “We wish to keep the details of our elopement private, which is why we eloped in the first place.” For proof of their marriage, they can show their wedding rings. As long as they project to the public that they are married, the public will consider them married, including all church officers.

The drawback to this will be a denial of a temple wedding sealing. The Brethren will not allow them to be sealed without a valid state marriage license or certificate, so they will have to wait until the work for the dead is done for them for their time marriage to be turned into an eternity marriage.

In the case of a married couple that wishes to add another spouse to its marriage arrangement, by covenant-only without a state marriage license, which is the only non-illegal way it can be done anyway, the man or woman who is to be married to the second spouse can have a private meeting with the second spouse, in which they enter into a marriage covenant. Living arrangements can either remain as is, with the new spouse living alone in his or her own dwelling, or the family can be combined under one roof.

If the two husbands or two wives have separate dwellings, nothing out of the ordinary would be noticed. If the two husbands or two wives live under the same roof, church members may notice and begin inquiring or report what they see to their bishop, who may end up calling these three members into his office.

During a bishop’s inquiry, a couple may simply say that they, the couple, invited so-and-so to come live with them. This would be the truth. If asked why the invitation, they could say, for a stay-at-home second wife, “So-and-so is helping around the house.” For a working second husband, “So-and-so is helping us out financially.” All of this would be the truth.

If there are suspicions that more than that is going on and that there is an extra-marital affair happening, any one of them can instruct the bishop to ask them the temple question. The temple question concerning relationships is, “Are you living the law of chastity?” To which can be answered, yes. As long as the question remains on the law of chastity, and whether any of them is living it, answer the question honestly with yes. If the bishop tries to slip a, “Are you having sex with this man/woman?” answer, “I am *not* breaking the law of chastity.” Bring everything back to the law of chastity.

Without witnesses of wrongdoing, a bishop cannot pursue the matter further. As long as neither one of the three married individuals divulges information about the non-licensed marriage, the bishop cannot build a case against them. He either needs witnesses or a confession to act.

Like the situation with the two single individuals, the only penalty the Brethren can use towards these people is to stop them from getting the marriage sealed in the temple. They will have to wait until the work for the dead is done for them to be sealed eternally.

If two married couples wish to marry each other, making an interconnected marriage arrangement with two wives and two husbands, by covenant-only without a marriage license, this can be easily done by private meeting among all involved, whereby they covenant with each other to be married. They can then live their lives in their separate dwellings, but visit each other as they please as husbands and wives. In this case, it is doubtful that church members would notice what is going on unless they are around one of the newly married men and his new wife and saw them carrying on romantically. Were that to happen, word would surely get to the bishop, who would call the suspects into his office.

Again, the way to handle this would be to answer all questions in terms of breaking the law of chastity, and that’s it. Is the law of chastity being broken? Nope. That’s all the bishop needs to know.

As with the other scenarios, only the temple marriage sealing can be denied to the newly weds, that is until the work for the dead is done for them.

The children of one or more of the spouses can cause trouble for the non-licensed married couple if the adults are presenting to the world that they are not married (using the state’s definition). For couples that do tell people they are married, such as two single individuals coming together, children pose no problem. But for marriages involving three or more people, in which no one but the spouses themselves know they are married, children might need to be kept in the

dark, at least initially, so that they don't go blabbing to church members or officials about the non-church sanctioned marriage.

If those entering marriage in this manner plan it right and understand how they are going to present it, or not present it, to the public, the church and their children, *the Brethren can't do a thing about it*. They can't stop the marriage from happening, they can't discipline the newlyweds without evidence, witnesses and/or confessions, and they can't keep the parties unsealed (because eventually all these marriages will be temple sealed.) Therefore, the Lord has opened the way for any of His sons and daughters to establish themselves tribally, without repercussions from the state or from the church.

