

Nauvoo Expositor, significance of, 1985 paper, LeGrand Baker

October 23, 1985

SIGNIFICANCE AND PRETENDED SIGNIFICANCE OF

THE *NAUVOO EXPOSITOR*

by

LeGrand Baker

The first issue of the *Nauvoo Expositor* appeared on Friday, June 7, 1844, and a second was printed almost immediately thereafter. The following Monday evening, the Expositor press was destroyed and every copy of the second issue was burned. On June 27, less than three weeks later, Joseph Smith was killed. The proximity of these events made it easy for many of the Prophet's¹ contemporaries to assert that the destruction of the Expositor was a major cause of his death.² Since then, many historians have accepted that assertion, calling the destruction of the Expositor press "the most serious blunder committed by the Mormons,"³ adding that the members of the mob which killed him were angry because of the violence the Mormons had done against freedom of the press.⁴ Some have also asserted that the unconstitutionality of the attack on the Expositor focussed national attention on Nauvoo and brought the Mormons into general disrepute.⁵

This paper refutes those assertions, showing that the Expositor was no more the cause of national feeling against the Mormons than it was the cause of Joseph Smith's murder; and that the nationwide anger supposedly generated by the Mormons' violation of the freedom of the press is an insertion of modern attitudes into history, rather than historical reality. By chronicling the changes in reporting in the American press, this study also demonstrates that most American editors accepted anti-Mormon versions of events in Nauvoo and mocked or ignored Mormon

attempts to explain or justify what they had done, until the Warsaw Signal began to boast of the successfulness of the anti-Mormon conspiracy to kill the Prophet. At that time, rather than discover any justification for the fears the Mormons had expressed in their defense of the Expositor's destruction, American editors began to ignore the anti-Mormon statements also, devising instead, their own justification for Joseph Smith's death by tying it to his action against the Expositor and telling their readers little of the success about which the Signal's editor boasted so openly.

This study is a careful examination of the reaction of the nation's newspaper editors to the Nauvoo Expositor and its destruction. It is not a sampling, but an in-depth survey of nearly every extant (more than 430) newspapers printed in the United States, its territories, and the Republic of Texas in 1844.

Mid-nineteenth century American newspapers were small local businesses whose editors published the things that were interesting to themselves and to their neighbors. There were no designated editorial pages, but the opinions of the editors were infused into the stories printed throughout their newspapers. So every story was, to some degree, colored by the editor's bias, or even distorted in order to make his point.

One of their contemporaries, Henry David Thoreau, lamented:

I do not chance to know an editor in the country who will deliberately print anything which he knows will ultimately and permanently reduce the number of his subscribers. They do not believe it would be expedient. How then can they print the truth?⁶

Newspapers of that day were so notorious for printing half truths that historians cannot depend upon them to provide information which can be used to accurately reconstruct an event.

Nonetheless, the newspapers do have one value which cannot be challenged. They are the

perfect source if an historian wishes to discover the opinions of their editors.

At that time, there were no great newspaper chains with centralized editorial policies, and no news agencies, like Associated Press, which provided articles to be republished all over the nation. However, it was a common practice for editors to exchange their newspapers, and each felt free to republish anything he liked from the others. Mormons had been sending copies of their newspapers to other editors for years. There was nothing new, unusual, or innovative about their trying to effect public opinion in this way, hoping that their messages would be copied into other newspapers and passed on to more readers. Anti-Mormons had been doing the same thing. Both were acutely aware of the powers of public opinion, and their attempts to sway it were a central part of the Mormon war in Illinois.

American editors were interested in Nauvoo. They had access to both Mormon and anti-Mormon versions of what was happening there and kept their readers apprised of developments as they occurred. The source upon which they relied most heavily was the anti-Mormon Warsaw Signal. A typical example of the Signal's influence is the May, 1844, announcement that William Law was leaving the Mormon Church and organizing one of his own. Thomas Sharp, the Signal's editor, reported the chism and described Law and his followers as a "respectable number of the most intelligent members of that body."⁷

That phrase is a useful gauge by which to measure the geographic scope of Sharp's influence. It was repeated verbatim by newspapers from Maine to Georgia.⁸ That fact alone is evidence that there was already a nationwide interest in Nauvoo's internal affairs, but it is also a clear indicator that Sharp was well established as a national source of information about the Mormons, and that his writings were having a significant impact on American public opinion.

Long before the Expositor appeared, the newspaper war between the Mormons and anti-

Mormons was going full throttle. The proprietors of the Expositor were fully aware of this and structured their newspaper so it would be an effective weapon in the national anti-Mormon campaign.

We do not have the Expositor's mailing list, but there are sufficient references in the newspapers cited below to their editors having received a copy, so there can be no question about its nationwide circulation. There is no proof, of course, but it is likely that the Expositor used the same mailing list as Sharp's Warsaw Signal which was clearly sent to all the non-Mormon editors in Illinois and to most, if not all, of the major editors throughout the United States.

When anti-Mormon editors in Illinois received the Expositor, they recommended it highly. In Alton, the editor gloated, "the new Nauvoo Journal --the Expositor--made its appearance last week; and according to promise, began its career by divulging the 'secrets of the Prison house.'"⁹ Sharp wrote in the Signal,

We have received the first number of this long-looked-for paper. In both its editorial and mechanical departments, it is highly credible, and we hail it as an efficient auxiliary in the good cause of prostrating Joe's influence and exposing his villainy.¹⁰

Sharp inserted portions of the Expositor into his own newspaper. These insertions were clearly intended to be a party of his national anti-Mormon campaign. One of the most interesting is the following advertisement:

"One Cent Reward"

Whereas my husband, the Rt. Rev. W. H. Harrison Saegers, Esq., has left my bed and board without cause or provocation, this is to notify the public not to harbor him or trust him on my account as I will pay no debts of his contracting. More anon.

Lucinda Saegers.¹¹

The accused Right Reverend Saegers was a quasi-fictitious character. His title "Right Reverend"

is certainly an invention, for it is as foreign to Mormon usage as "Cardinal" is to Methodist. There was a William Henry Harrison Sagers (note the spelling is different) who got into trouble for preaching spiritual wifery and neglecting his family in Nauvoo, but his wife's name was Harriet, not Lucinda.¹² The real Sagers was never important in the Mormon Church, and the non-Mormons around Nauvoo would have known that. (The Mormon leaders were so well-known in the communities around Nauvoo that Sharp often referred to them by only their given names.) Since most of the Expositor's local readers knew the Mormons had no such leader as the "Right Reverend Saegers," they probably thought the "One Cent Reward" advertisement was supposed to be funny. Phoney though the ad was, it was not a joke, but was unquestionably intended for the consumption of the Expositor's nationwide non-Mormon readers for whom the term "Right Reverend" would have automatically identified Saegers as a Mormon leader. While the ad was apparently intended to lend credence to the paper's other charges against the Mormon leadership, it may also have been put there for the Signal's use.

Sharp latched on to the pretended advertisement with such dexterity that one is left wondering if he had some hand in its being there in the first place. He singled it out and republished it as a separate article, prefacing it with a statement which he and his local readers knew was a lie.

It will be recalled that the Right Reverend spoken of is one of Joe's bosom companions and confidential counselors--no less a personage than he, who was some time since detected in passing counterfeit money in the Holy City, after having brightened it with an application of saleratus.¹³

This time Sharp's influence waned for no other newspaper echoed this well-placed innuendo that the Prophet was involved in a counterfeiting ring. The advertisement was republished in only three other newspapers, and they copied from each other and, perhaps, directly from the Expositor rather than from Sharp. They accepted the false identity of Saegers, commenting: "the following advertisement copied from the Nauvoo Expositor shows that defection has reached the highest functionaries of the Church," but if they saw it, they ignored Sharp's statement about counterfeiting and instead added the quip: "The ladies of Nauvoo seem to come in for a full share of trouble." ¹⁴

Even though Sharp's statement was not republished nationally, it is significant as a commentary on his and the Expositor's first concern. They were more interested in effecting the reputation of the Mormons than they were in telling the truth.

Few newspapers outside Illinois commented on the merits or demerits of the Expositor because their attention was turned to its destruction.¹⁵ Some who did, made these assessments:

"...quite the most intelligent and respectable printed affair that had emanated from the holy city."¹⁶

"The infamous conduct of Joe and his followers was freely and fearlessly laid before the public."¹⁷

"...statements and affidavits very disreputable to Smith's leading Mormons."¹⁸

"...very unpalatable to the prophet."¹⁹

"...[showing] that the prophet was guilty of all the most heinous crimes in the calendar."²¹

If those extracts seem to show a bias, that bias was real. Only two newspapers--one in Vermont and one in Pennsylvania--questioned the Expositor's credibility:

These people are, or have been in trouble again. A paper called the Expositor has started in Nauvoo by some of the sect disaffected with Joseph Smith, which pretended to expose him as a bad man.²²

We have before us the first and only number of the paper, the Nauvoo Expositor, which contains the offensive matter that drew down upon the establishment the wrath of the city authorities. A considerable portion of the gross immoralities prevalent in Nauvoo and the shameful conduct of Joe, and his eleven elders. We do not know when we have read such offensive details, but we notice that the Expositor's editors had been turned out of the Church.²³

Although these statements are probably the only two in the nation which questioned the Expositor' veracity, that does not mean, as one might be lead to think, that the Expositor was effective in its short-lived anti-Mormon campaign. On the contrary, notwithstanding its wide circulation and almost universal acceptance, the destruction of its press worked retroactively, rendering even the issue already printed impotent and ineffectual as far as spreading its message to the general American public was concerned.

If it were possible to prove that Joseph Smith and his followers destroyed the Expositor to silence not only future issues, but the one already printed as well, then we would be compelled to admit that their action showed extraordinary foresight. For as soon as the nation's editors learned of the paper's demise, they turned their attention from what it said about the Mormons to what they did. Few eastern papers repeated any of the Expositor's charges against the Mormon leaders. So, for the most part, the American people never read the things the Expositor printed.²⁴

There was little about the Expositor which did not anger the Mormons. But, as the Nauvoo Neighbor repeatedly emphasized in the next weeks, there was one idea in the Expositor which rendered it an intolerable threat to the entire community. The Expositor urged the use of mob violence to eradicate Joseph Smith and the Mormons:

Shall we...lie still and suffer Joseph Smith to light up the lamp of tyranny and oppression in our midst?...Let us arise in the majesty of our strength and sweep the influence of tyrants and miscreants from the face of the land...if it is necessary to make show of force, to execute legal process, it will create no sympathy in that case [for the Mormons] to cry out, we are mobbed.²⁵

Its invitations for the gathering of the mob generated such horror in Nauvoo that the city fathers felt compelled to act.²⁶

It was in accordance with instructions from the city council that Mayor Joseph Smith sent a formal directive to the city marshall, John P. Green, to destroy the press.²⁷ As Lieutenant-General, the Prophet also sent orders to the Nauvoo Legion, which included most of Nauvoo's able-bodied male inhabitants, to provide the marshall assistance should that be necessary. So almost everyone in town knew what was happening, and came out to watch. One of those witnesses described the scene in a letter to the Prophet, the Mormon owned New York newspaper. This extraordinary account reveals the unabashed piety and unmitigated fear which prevailed in Nauvoo that night. Neither this version of the event nor its sentiment was republished in any non-Mormon newspaper anywhere in the United States.

The order of the council was compiled with in a very orderly and becoming manner; the building was literally gutted of its contents which were thrown into the street and burned. While the blaze sent up its lurid light into the darkening atmosphere making visible the calm, reconciled countenance of 400 or 500 people, many of whom had been left homeless by Missouri incendiaries [a reference to the Mormon homes which had been burned by mobs in Missouri], we involuntarily exclaims, this is but retributive justice.²⁸

Almost as soon as the decision was made to destroy the Expositor, the Mormons turned

to their own newspaper to soften its impact on public opinion. In hope of stifling violent retaliation locally, and curbing criticism nationally, the Nauvoo Neighbor issue of June 12 explained why the Expositor was such a threat, and justified the city's action against it. They made no apologies and insisted that the paper was not destroyed in the heat of anger. The Neighbor carefully reported the city council meeting proceedings to show how desperately intolerable their situation was, and to demonstrate the legitimacy--even correctness--of their action by providing documentation that every step taken to silence the Expositor "was sanctioned by legal proceedings founded upon testimony."²⁹ Predictably, their strategy failed.

John Taylor, editor of the Neighbor, sent copies of his paper to other editors all over the United States, hoping they would be moved by its rationale and relay its message to their own readers. He hoped in vain. Some ignored the legal arguments and called the Mormons a mob anyway; others were appalled by the cold, calculating Mormon behavior--³⁰

A Louisiana newspaper used the information it obtained from the Neighbor, but did not carry its message. Instead it called the Expositor's destruction a "lawless act."³¹

In Galena, Illinois, the editor wrote:

There is something serious in this matter, otherwise it would be laughable. Were it not lamentable to see that a band of men in this state can thus deliberately commit crime in mock accordance with the law, it would be amusing. It is evident that this state of things cannot long progress. There must be a limit and an end to all this, but where will it stop, and what will the end be?³²

The reaction of the Sangamo Journal was typical; it reported the story, but reflected none of the attitude the Mormon newspaper hoped to convey. Its editor, admitting his bias, wrote: "Most of the statements we have copied on this matter came from anti-Mormon authority,"³³ and made little attempt to give balance to what he printed.

The portion of the June 12 issue of the Neighbor which was most frequently republished

in other newspapers was an impassioned plea for understanding entitled "Retributive Justice."

The way newspaper editors responded to it sheds much light on their general attitude toward the Mormons. Only about a fourth of "Retributive Justice" is quoted here. One must read at least that much to know what the editors read, and thereby understand the significance of their response:

RETRIBUTIVE JUSTICE

The Church, as a body and individually, has suffered to forbearances which cease to be a virtue. The cries and pleadings of men, women and children, when the Expositor was published, to the authorities were, 'Will you suffer the surville, murderous paper to go on and nullify and slander the innocent inhabitants of this city, and raise another mob to drive and plunder us again as they did in Missouri?'...In the name of free men and in the name of God, we beseech all men, who have the spirit of honor in them to cease from persecuting us collectively or individually. Let us enjoy our religion, right, and peace, like the rest of mankind; why start pressing to destroy right and privileges, and bring upon us mobs to plunder and murder? We ask no more than what belongs to us--the rights of Americans.³⁴

"Retributive Justice" was reprinted in at least twenty-two newspapers in eleven states and Washington, D. C.³⁵ A few editors published it without comment, but usually it was inserted as evidence of the hypocrisy in the Mormon action. No American editors responded positively to this plea for understanding. The following is typical:

We subjoin the following infamous article [Retributive Justice] from The Nauvoo Neighbor, a Joe Smith organ. It appears that the city corporation have formally resolved themselves into a mob, and have destroyed the press and materials of the Nauvoo Expositor--it is thus that Joe Smith, in the exercise of his tyrannical priestcraft, destroys the liberty of speech and of press. If the perpetrators of this outrage be not sent to the penitentiary then there is no use for such an institution in Illinois.³⁶

On the same day--June 12--that "Retributive Justice" appeared in the Nauvoo Neighbor, it was reprinted in the Warsaw Signal. In 1844, type was set by hand and newspapers were printed slowly, one side of the page at a time. The fact that "Retributive Justice" was printed in

both papers on the same day implies that Sharp got his copy of the Nauvoo Neighbor very early that morning indeed, or that he received the text of "Retributive Justice" before it was actually published.

The Signal prefaced "Retributive Justice" with a letter from Charles Foster³⁷ which described the destruction of the press, and then added Sharp's own personal call to arms:

We have only to state, that this is sufficient: War and extermination is inevitable. Concern ARISE, ONE and ALL! Can you stand by and suffer such INFERNAL DEVILS to con men of their property and Rights without avenging them? We have no time for comment, every man will make his own. Let it be made with POWDER and BALL!

We take the following from the Extra of the Nauvoo Neighbor. It shows the Devils in their proper light. ["Retributive Justice." follows immediately thereafter.]³⁸

Sharp made a slip which reveals he had a collaborator in the Nauvoo Neighbor office who was supplying him with copy before it was printed. The slip was his use of the word "Extra." "Retributive Justice" was not published in an Extra, but one was being prepared. It appears that the decision to publish a Nauvoo Neighbor Extra to explain why the Mormons cashiered the Expositor was made early in the chain of events, and that "Retributive Justice" was originally intended to go in it. After it was written, but before the decision was made to include it instead in the regular issue of the Neighbor, Sharp's source delivered the text of "Retributive Justice" to him. So when Sharp printed it, he claimed to be quoting from the Extra which was, in fact, not published until June 17, five days after Sharp wrote that he was quoting from it.

Sharp was probably not too concerned about his slip. He used his information to good advantage, countering Mormon moves with his own propaganda, by anticipating what the Mormons would print, upstaging their emotional appeal, and trying to refute their legal arguments, almost before they presented them.

When it was printed, the Nauvoo Neighbor Extra was probably intended to settle all

questions about the Expositor. It contained the minutes of the city council meetings which decided the press was a public nuisance, detailed accounts of the arguments presented at those meetings, and copies of official documents. It gave evidence to prove that the Expositor's backers were grossly immoral and, more important, that they had intrigued with other anti-Mormons whose purpose was to destroy the city of Nauvoo itself, as Far West and other Mormon communities in Missouri had been destroyed. The objective of the Extra was to demonstrate that the Expositor was a threat to the public safety, and that the eradication of the newspaper had been judiciously considered, completely warranted, and entirely within the law.³⁹ To underscore that point, the Neighbor published a proclamation by Mayor Joseph Smith in which he justified the Expositor's destruction. The proclamation attracted much national interest. It was reprinted in almost twenty newspapers in ten states.⁴⁰

Sharp's erroneously claiming to have quoted from the Extra is more relevant to this study than that it reveals a traitor in the Mormon's major public relations organization. It also complicates our analysis of eastern editorial comments. Some editors who referred to "Retributive Justice" cited the Extra of the Nauvoo Neighbor as their source. That really means, of course, that they read it in the Signal. Others made disparaging remarks about the content of the Extra's justification of the Expositor's destruction, but in terms too general for us to know whether they were writing about the city council minutes in the real Extra, or "Retributive Justice" as quoted by Sharp. The fact that Sharp's slip creates this problem is significant in itself, for it underscores the impact he was having on American public opinion.

The opening statement in the Extra read:

TO THE PUBLIC

As a soft breeze in a hot day mellows the air, so does the simple truth calm the feelings of the irritated and so we proceed to give the proceedings fo the city council relating to the removal of the Nauvoo Expositor as a nuisance. We have been robbed, mobbed and plundered with impunity some two or three times, and as every heart is more apt to know its own sorrows, the people of Nauvoo had ample reason, when such characters as the proprietors and abettors of the Nauvoo Expositor proved to be before the city council, to be alarmed for their safety...when the paper came; the course and the plan to destroy the city was marked out. The destruction of the city charter and the ruin of the saints was the all commanding topic. Our lives, our city, our charter and our characters are just as sacred...as other peoples.⁴¹

The Mormons also reprinted the above statement in the June 19 regular issue of the Nauvoo Neighbor, but to no avail. This plea for understanding went entirely unheard. No known American newspaper republished it, but there is no question that they had access to it. Their response to the Extra is typified by the following:

A very extensive broadside entitled 'The Nauvoo Neighbor Extra' reached the city this morning...and a precious piece of municipal literature it is, to be sure. About one-half of the Extra is occupied with an expose of the character of the editor and the publishers of the Expositor; and whatever the character of the accused, that some of the affidavits is too abominable ever to have permitted them to be put in type, true or false, Is there no statue in Illinois to send the perpetrators of such obscene and revolting publications [as the Extra] to the penitentiary?⁴²

We strongly suspect that the Mormons concerned in getting up and publishing the Expositor, in character and honesty, are about on a par with the Mormons opposed to them.⁴³

It is an outrage of more than common enormity. There is no pretense that it was committed in hot blood, it was not deplored as an abuse, it is actually justified upon principle, and made to assume the aspect of a legal process.⁴⁴

Not one non-Mormon editor in the whole nation wrote that he accepted the arguments or fears expressed in the Extra at face value. As it turned out, the Mormon fears about mob violence were well founded, even prophetic, for in only two more years Nauvoo would be decimated. But in the summer of 1844, the legitimacy of those fears made no impression on the American press. None repeated or expressed credence in the Mormon claim that they believed

they must either destroy the Expositor or stand aside while it encouraged the mobs to once again violate their homes. Consequently, this, the most compelling reason for the Mormon action against the Expositor, went unreported to the American public.

The only non-Mormon newspaper which spoke at all positively of the Extra's contents was the New York Herald. It accepted only part of the Mormon argument, deplored the destruction of the Expositor, and ignored entirely the Mormons' fear that they were in mortal danger:

The intelligence we give today is highly interesting. Whatever may be the truth of the charges preferred against Joe and his associates, of which we have never yet seen satisfactory proof, it is certain that Joe establishes the fact that his opponents are anything but moral and virtuous men. The most revolting outrage of which we have heard was the destruction of the press and printing office. We expect to hear some very serious news from Nauvoo in a day or two. The Mormons are well armed, and we should not be surprised to hear of a very bloody encounter.⁴⁵

That statement can hardly be called pro-Mormon, but it is the best review the Extra received in the entire nation.

The Mormon accounts of the end of the Expositor insist there was nothing in the event which resembled the actions of a mob. The sheriff and his deputies forced the lock, entered the building, removed its contents, scattered the type and broke the press, and piled the papers in the street and burned them. But they were careful not to exceed their charge from the city government by doing damage to the building itself. All this, the Mormons claimed, was done with the appropriate soberness of an efficient law enforcement agency, with dignity, and concern for orderliness.

The proprietors of the Expositor left Nauvoo and fled to Carthage. That evening they or their friends set fire to their own building, apparently with the intent of claiming that the Mormons had burned it also. That story was told in the Prophet.

On the night of the same day on which they took their illustrious exit, the house in which the Expositor was printed was set on fire by some of their own gag who still tarry with us, doubtless for the purpose of laying it on the Mormons. A fire was blazing in the middle of the floor when discovered by some of the police; the windows were all fastened down, the door locked, and the key in the possession of a Mr. Norton, the person who the deserters had left in charge of the building. Now judge whether it was not premeditated.⁴⁶

Neither this article nor the story it told was reprinted by any other newspaper, nor--and this is more important--nor was the orderliness of their proceedings against the Expositor, as the Mormons sought to portray it in their own publications, reflected in any of the nations newspaper accounts of the Expositor's destruction. But, on the contrary, the anti-Mormon accounts of the Expositor's end were as widely accepted and as imaginatively amplified by the American press, and the Mormon version was universally ignored.

Mormons who were away from Nauvoo at the time remembered their frustration as they tried to discover from newspaper accounts what was happening at home. The following makes their frustration understandable. It is a composite of the story of the destruction of the Expositor as told by newspapers published all over the nation. Much of what was printed was contradictory, much was untrue--and it was all fragmented. Individual Americans got only bits and pieces of the story. But if they had been able to assemble all they were told by the nonparticipatory and therefore, at least in theory, unbiased American press, and put it into one account, this is what they would have had:

"Joe Smith and his myrmidons have been playing the very mischief at Nauvoo."⁴⁷

"A serious riot came off a few days since in the city of the prophet between the old and new school Mormonites which results in the destruction of the printing establishment of the Nauvoo Expositor, besides other revenges. It seems that a portion of the Mormons became satisfied of the bad character of their prophet, Joe Smith, abandoned him and established a new church calling themselves the Reformed Mormon Church. Between this and the old organization, a most bitter and unfriendly spirit soon arose which resulted in the establishment of a new

press as the organ of the new party.⁴⁸

"The disclosures made through it completely enraged Joe and his supporters."⁴⁹

"It so exasperated the Prophet Joe, that he immediately drew on heaven for another revelation, which directed him to proclaim the Expositor a nuisance, and to destroy the press and pi the type. The revelation was obeyed to the letter."⁵⁰

"The prophet took summary measures for suspension of the sheet so dangerous to himself. He dubbed a few of his tools a grand jury;"⁵¹ [or["commanded the authorities of the city to declare the establishment a nuisance, and then to burn it up."⁵² (One version says the council declared the opposing party to be a nuisance and then destroyed that party's press.)⁵³

Smith personally "approved and probably incited a Mormon mob to destroy"⁵⁴ the Expositor.

The members of this "armed posse"⁵⁵ were usually identified with Joseph Smith, personally rather than with the city government. They were described as "the prophet's men",⁵⁶ "a band of the prophet's dupes",⁵⁷ "followers of the prophet",⁵⁸ or "the Smith party".⁵⁹ They were reported to be "a company consisting of some two hundred men",⁶⁰ or "three or four hundred of his creatures",⁶¹ depending on which newspaper one read.

They were "armed and equipped with muskets, swords, pistols, bowie knives, sledgehammers, etc. Assisted by a crowd of several hundred minions, who volunteered their services on the occasion, marched to the building, and breaking open the doors with a sledgehammer, commenced the work of destruction and desolation."⁶²

"They tumbled the press and materials into the streets, and set fire to them, destroying the machinery with a sledgehammer, and injuring the building very materially."⁶³ They "destroyed a printing establishment",⁶⁴ or totally "demolished",⁶⁵ the building, or otherwise left it "leveled to the ground."⁶⁶

"The seceders [the new church group which seceded from the Mormons and operated the Expositor] did not give it up, however, without strong resistance, and after a slight skirmish, they were compelled to yield to the superior numbers of the prophet's men"⁶⁷

"We do not remember anything quite so cruel since Amos Kendall officially approved of breaking open and burning the mails on pretext of abolition."⁶⁸

"All this was done under the sanction of the monstrous city charter granted to the Mormons by the Locofoco authorities of Illinois."⁶⁹

"The whole thing is an absurdity, the pretense is monstrous--and if there is anything in the charter of Nauvoo which gives the least color to it, those who voted for the charter in the state legislature, ought to receive the reprobation of every free man, and the ridicule of every man of sense in Illinois."⁷⁰

"How long will such things be tolerated in the very heart of the state of Illinois? Just as long as the Locofoco's retain the political power of the state and deem the Mormon vote important to them."⁷¹

"This is a high handed act on the part of the prophet, and will serve to open the eyes of many to his outrageous conduct."⁷²

"This Mormon purgatory is now the scene of the most unparalleled corruption and vice, and the increasing disunion and quarrels among the Mormons, must inevitably break them up."⁷³

"From the violence of the prophet's people in burning the materials of a printing office that had been established to oppose and expose his doctrines in crime...we may look for still greater offences in time. There is intolerance on both sides, but we doubt if Mormonism is not the greatest curse the Western people ever suffered."⁷⁴

"The spirit of Mormonism seems near akin to that of Whiggery--it resorts to violence when other means fail."⁷⁵ [Newspapers tended to associate the Mormons with whichever political party their editor disliked most.]

"This outrage has kindled a dreadful fire of indignation among the citizens of Illinois."⁷⁶

"The people of Illinois and the subjects of Joe Smith, in Nauvoo, will have some hard fighting."⁷⁷

No one could claim the above comments show a pro-Mormon bias but neither can they be used to show that it was only the Expositor incident which created the negative feeling they express.

There was no shift in connotation or innuendo in the stories about the MOrmons published in American newspapers before and after the Expositor. Its destruction seems to have reinforced--but not created--a generally negative opinion. No editor in the United States said the incident changed his mind about the Mormons, nor is the evidence of such a change of attitude apparent through their publicans. Not one indicated that he had supported the Mormons before the Expositor was destroyed, but now did not. The only possible exception to that was a New York editor who wrote:

Having heard very rational scripture doctrine preached by Mormons in our section of the country, we have not joined in the ridicule which a portion of the press have attempted to cast upon them; but from all that we can learn of the proceedings of the prophet in Nauvoo, we are inclined to think that something less sacred than divine authority bears the sway in that city, and we sincerely caution some who have a design to make Nauvoo their residence from taking that step until they get further light.⁷⁸

That statement is the nearest one can get to evidence of a shift of attitude on the part of any American editor, and it is not very good evidence at that.

Nor is there evidence that they tried to understand the Mormon point of view.⁷⁹ The one possible exception may be the editor of the New York Herald who published unusually long excerpts from both Mormon and non-Mormon sources. But he believed "Mormons make an enigma in society,"⁸⁰ and seems to have been more curious than sympathetic.

In the communities near Nauvoo, reaction to the Expositor affair was immediate, violent and very well-orchestrated. The Expositor's destruction gave a cue for those who were wanting to do violence against the Mormons, but clearly it did not set the stage; at least Sharp did not think so. As early as May he had written in the Warsaw Signal,

"We have seen and heard enough to convince us that Joe Smith is not safe out of Nauvoo, and we would not be surprised to hear of his death by violent means in a short time. He has deadly enemies--men whose wrongs have maddened them. ...The feeling of this country is now lashed to its utmost pitch, and will break forth in fury upon the slightest provocation."⁸¹

If this and later comments in the Signal can be taken at face value, we must conclude that to Sharp and his associates, the most significant aspect of the destruction of the Expositor was that it gave the Prophet's enemies a legal pretense to get Joseph Smith--to go to Nauvoo, arrest him and bring him to Carthage away from the protection of his friends. To achieve that purpose, a posse would be sent to Nauvoo. But, Sharp predicted, the Prophet would find some legal way to elude the posse and remain beyond their grasp still.

We have one chance left. Joe will undoubtedly have the power to [use Nauvoo city courts to avoid being brought to trial outside Nauvoo], but if he attempts to exercise it, we will throw ourselves on our reserved rights. Justice we will have. If the law is cheated out of its efficacy and can no longer protect our persons and property, we have the consolation to know that steel and gun powder can."⁸²

And, Sharp urged in the same issue of the Signal, Joseph Smith's death must be accomplished as quickly as possible--it must not be delayed until "after the August election."

Not one American editor republished that last statement or even alluded to the fact that the timing of such threats was being tied to the election. As Sharp guessed, the Prophet secured a writ of habeas corpus in Nauvoo and thereby evaded the posse's attempt to take him to Carthage.

One can still feel the anger in Sharp's report of how the posse which set out to apprehend the Prophet was legally out-manuevered and left to return to Carthage without its prisoner.⁸³

At the same time that the posse was trying to arrest Joseph Smith in Nauvoo, a "mass meeting" convened in Carthage to await its return. Even cloaked in the legitimacy of Sharp's description, this public meeting had all the characteristics of a lynch mob. While its members waited, they passed several resolves aimed at the Prophet personally. Two, especially, seem designed to provide justification for their intended course of action when he arrived.

We hold ourselves at all times in rediness to cooperation with our fellow citizens in this state, Missouri and Iowa, to exterminate-utterly exterminate, the wicked and abominable Mormon leaders, the authors of our troubles...a war of extermination should be waged, to their entire destruction, if necessary, for our protection from its adherence.⁸⁴

After the posse returned to Carthage without anyone to "utterly exterminate," the disappointed "mass meeting" resolved to send a deputation to the governor to seek his assistance, asserting that this "action would not retard our operations--but that we would each one arm and equip ourselves forthwith."⁸⁵

The day after the Carthage meeting, a similar one was held in Warsaw. Sharp, himself, was one of its orators. The meeting adopted, without change, the resolutions passed in Carthage, including the call for the extermination of the Mormons and their leaders.⁸⁶ Sharp reported both meetings in detail. The Resolves received nationwide attention and were copied, at least in part from the Signal by more than fifty newspapers in sixteen states.⁸⁷

A strange feature of the resolves is that they contain no expressions of sympathy or concern for the people who owned or operated the Expositor. It is as though the leaders of the "mass meetings" either did not care about them or had considered the Expositor expendable from its beginning.

The purpose, or at least the pretense, of these meetings was to respond to the Expositor incident. This being the case, it would not be appropriate to describe any of their resolves as unrelated to the Expositor even though the relevance of some is not immediately apparent. Strangely enough that might even be said about the resolve which mentions freedom of the press. It seems much more interested in defending the Signal than the Expositor. The resolve and its immediate context, read as follows:

And whereas, Hyrum Smith did, in presence, of the City Council and the citizens of Nauvoo, offer a reward for the destruction of the printing press and materials of the Warsaw Signal--a newspaper also opposed to his interests;
 and whereas, the liberty of the press is one of the cardinal principles of our government, firmly guaranteed by the several constitutions of the States, as well as the united States;
 and whereas, Hyrum Smith has within the last week publicly threatened the life of one of our valued citizens--Thos. C. Sharp--the editor of the Signal;⁸⁸

There is, among students of history, an ever-lingering inclination to read present perspective into past thinking. For an historian, it is often more difficult to convey an historical attitude than it is to describe an historical event. This is especially true of an event like the destruction of a newspaper which twentieth-century Americans intuitively expect would evoke the strongest possible censure on the constitutional grounds of violation of freedom of the press. It is difficult for our contemporaries to consider the destruction of the Expositor as anything except a violation of that constitutional principle. This is unfortunate, for that predisposition distorts the contextual picture for us, imposing inaccurate conclusions, and making it difficult for us to understand the real insignificance of the Expositor.

Freedom of the press was not the overriding issue here. It was not considered to be so in Illinois be either the Mormons or the anti-Mormons. It was not looked upon as such by the

nation's newspapers and, therefore, was probably not considered to be all that relevant by anything like a majority of the American people. There is almost no evidence to support the proposition that anger over the issue of freedom of the press substantially contributed to American newspapers' lack of sympathy for the Mormons.

If the innuendo in their stories and their almost total silence on the constitutional question can be taken as evidence of their attitude, one is compelled to conclude that most American editors (and this is especially true of eastern editors) viewed the Expositor incident as something akin to a shouting match between two Mormon factions--something their own readers would be interested in, but not something which would merit the dignity of being discussed on the level of constitutional principle. Consequently, eastern newspapers rarely mentioned the First Amendment in conjunction with their reporting the story of the ending of the Expositor.⁸⁹

Neither was freedom of the press an important issue in the eyes of the Mormons' enemies near Nauvoo. It was mentioned in an article quoted above, and used by the anti-Mormon Quincy Whig in an attack on the Nauvoo City charter and justification of mob violence against the city's inhabitants, but few other local papers even refer to it.⁹⁰

The constitutional question was not specifically addressed by the Mormon press either. The Nauvoo Neighbor reported that the city council read the U. S. Constitution as a part of its deliberations, but revealed no discussion about whether they were violating the First Amendment. The arguments against the Expositor seemed to preclude that possibility. The were: first, the Expositor had been established to incite riot and mob violence; therefore, it was a threat to the public safety and, presumably, not subject to the constitutional guarantees of a newspaper whose intent was simply to publish divergent opinion. Second, only a few years before, the Mormons' own press had been destroyed by a mob in Missouri. The MOrrmons had

been unable to obtain any redress. They now claimed to have evidence that the Expositor was in cahoots with those same Missouri enemies, and, again presumably, turnabout is fair play.⁹¹

Furthermore, and this may be the overriding consideration, the First Amendment did not apply to the Nauvoo City government. In 1844 the First Amendment was a restraint on the powers of the federal government, but not on the powers of state or local governments. The amendment read, "Congress shall make no law...abridging the freedom of speech or of the press." It was not until 1925⁹² that the Fourteenth Amendment was used to apply the entire Bill of Rights to state and local governments. Consequently, in 1844, the U. S. Constitution did not prohibit a local government from deciding what could be printed or sold within its boundaries. So, in point of fact the Nauvoo City government had not violated the American Constitution.

On this one unlikely issue, the Mormons and anti-Mormons seem to have found some agreement. Joseph Smith clearly did not believe the constitutional right of freedom of the press was a license to disrupt one's own community and anti-Mormon leaders apparently concurred. Neither the Warsaw Signal nor the Carthage and Warsaw resolves used the First Amendment to condone the Expositor's internal attack on the Mormon community. However, as has been pointed out, they did invoke it in defense of the Signal's right to attack the city from without. The anti-Mormons' defacto recognition of this interesting distinction is also a tacit admittance on their part that the Expositor really was intended to be a public nuisance; that it was deliberately used to push the Mormons beyond the breaking point; that, as Sharp would later boast, the Expositor was intended to create a situation where "All was at stake--the press must be destroyed or he [Joseph Smith] must fall."⁹³

But the constitutional principle was evoked to defend the Signal. The story behind that is

as follows: Sharp claimed, and reported in his newspaper, that a secret source had informed him that Hyrum Smith, in a Nauvoo city council meeting, had blustered,

'We had better send a message to Long Nose Sharp, that if he does not look out, he might be visited with a pinch of snuff, that will make him sneeze!' At this burst of oratory, the council were convulsed with laughter. In relation to our press [Signal] he [Hyrum Smith] said, 'If any person would go to Warsaw, boldly in daylight and rig the press of the Signal office, with a sledgehammer, he would bear him out of it, if it cost him his arm'.⁹⁴

Sharp followed this story with his own retort:

And now, Hyrum, in relation to your threats, we wish no better sport than you should send your minions here to destroy our press. Let them come. WE are anxious!!! As regard your threats of our person, we scorn them. We defy you and your hosts! Recollect that our death will be avenged!!⁹⁵

The story provides another evidence of the wide circulation of the Warsaw Signal, and whether true or not, it sheds a great deal of light on the attitude of the American press. The report that the Mormons had threatened the Warsaw Signal and that "the life of its editor was to pay a forfeit for publishing anything further concerning the Mormons or Joe Smith" was almost as widely circulated as the account of the destruction of the Expositor itself. It was reported by at least thirty newspapers from Maine to New Orleans⁹⁶ and the story was expanded to be "threats of the destruction of several presses in the neighboring towns."⁹⁷

The Mormons denied that the story had any foundation of truth. Sixteen members of the Nauvoo city council signed a manifesto swearing that "Hyrum Smith did not make any threats, nor offer any reward against the Warsaw Signal or its editors."⁹⁸ Their statement was published in the Nauvoo Neighbor, distributed nationwide, and almost completely ignored by the American press. That there had even been a denial was reported in only three newspapers in the entire nation, and some of those followed with: "Well, we suppose all this is tragedy; but it looks amazingly like broad farce."⁹⁹

In Warsaw, Sharp became exuberant as his fight against the Mormons gained momentum. When he published the Carthage and Warsaw resolutions in the Signal, he prefaced them with a speech of his own which he claimed had been "unanimously adopted" by the Warsaw meeting. In it he asserted,

...the only recourse left us is to take up arms---/to the communities that surround us we appeal! Will you come to the rescue" Will you aid us to rid the Earth of a pest such as has never before polluted its surface since it was redeemed from Chaos?¹⁰⁰

Near the end of that issue of the Signal, Sharp challenged,

"Go it Joe, and we will go it too!"¹⁰¹

The anti-Mormons appealed to Governor Ford¹⁰² as they said they would in the Carthage and Warsaw resolves, and successfully used the Expositor incident to help convince him to enter the controversy and summon the Prophet to Carthage. The Prophet, who understood his enemies' intent and believed, as did Sharp, that he would be killed if he left the protection of Nauvoo and went to Carthage, successfully resisted until he was sent for by the governor. On the third day after his arrival, he and his brother, Hyrum, were murdered by a mob which stormed the jail where the brothers were being held in protective custody.

According to Sharp, the anti-Mormons had pre-determined that Joseph Smith should die. He wrote, "[that the killing] would sooner or later have to be done, no one acquainted with the facts of the case could deny. It was inevitable, and the only question was the proper time."¹⁰³ That question--when would be the 'proper time'--was answered as soon as Sharp and his cohorts found a way to get the Mormon leaders away from the protection of their friends. Once Joseph Smith left Nauvoo and went to Carthage, his death was a foregone conclusion. Sharp spelled that out clearly. "as to the time and manner, it had to be done then and thus, or not at all."¹⁰⁴ He

argued that he and his associates had expended so much energy to get the Smiths away from Nauvoo, it would be a shame to let this opportunity be wasted. Furthermore, if they let this chance pass, another would not come soon. Sharp justified the killings on those arguments. He said almost nothing about avenging a newspaper.

In the final analysis, Sharp's appraisal of the Expositor's importance as a factor in Joseph Smith's death is probably the correct one. His July 10 issue of the Signal was larger than usual and almost totally devoted to the justification of the killing of the Smith brothers. In his review of the events which led to their deaths, he mentions the Expositor incident as evidence that the Mormon leaders used the Nauvoo courts to evade Carthage justice, but he pays little attention to the demise of the paper itself. Sharp does not dismiss the Expositor as unimportant, but gives it much more credit as a factor in the timing of the Prophet's murder than as a cause of his death.

Notwithstanding the fact that Sharp made his observations as available to his contemporary editors as they are to us, those editors never republished his views. Even though they were fascinated by the accounts of the antiMormon rallies, resolutions, and subsequent mobbings around Nauvoo,¹⁰⁵ most seemed oblivious to the real issues--and they seemed determined to stay oblivious.¹⁰⁶

Up until about the time of the Carthage and Warsaw resolutions, the nation's newspapers had accepted, almost as a matter of course, the anti-Mormon editor's explanation of events around Nauvoo. Then there was a subtle but clearly perceptible change. When Sharp stopped charging the Mormon leaders with corruption and began showing the success of his own appeals for violence, eastern newspapers stopped relying on the Signal as a source of information. They ignored his challenges to Joseph Smith, and reported almost no aggression on the part of the anti-Mormon press. Even the Prophet's death did not pull the threats of his enemies into national

focus. When Sharp boasted that Joseph Smith's imprisonment and death were the result of their well-calculated setup, the nation's newspapers could have written that the anti-Mormons had now accomplished what Sharp had said all along that they were going to do. Instead, they simply ignored what Sharp said, sought another reason for the killings, and printed that.

The newspapers first distorted their readers' perspective of the events which led up to the murders in Carthage by failing to call attention to the fact that, for a long time, Joseph Smith's enemies had been trying to find a way to get him away from Nauvoo so they could kill him. Then the editors oversimplified the situation by assigning to the Expositor a kind of martyr's role, implying that the violence around Nauvoo was the specific consequence of the newspaper's destruction.

They continued to exaggerate the Expositor's role after the Prophet's death by either saying outright or by linking him so closely with the Expositor as to create the impression that his destroying the newspaper was the major reason he was killed.¹⁰⁷ To a remarkable degree, some historians have perpetuated a garnished version of that same misrepresentation. Sharp had not given that kind of credit to the Expositor, but Sharp was not being listened to by his contemporary editors as much any more, just as historians have found the idea of a cause and effect relationship between the Expositor's ending and the Prophet's death to be too titillating to let Sharp's words get in the way of its retelling.

It is true that American editors distorted the news in favor of the anti-Mormons, but it would be a mistake for a present-day historian to think he had discovered in this an organized maleficence on the part of those editors against the Mormons. Such a suggestion can be rejected on the simple grounds that the editors were not organized at all, so could not have had a coordinated anti-Mormon policy. But there is more to it than that.

When one considers the great number of newspapers which republished both "Retributive Justice" and Joseph Smith's June 16 proclamation defending the city's action against the Expositor, one cannot deduce that there was anything like a general attempt to keep the Mormon's side of the story from being told. Yet it was not told, and the editors did show a predisposition to downplay, disregard or even ridicule the Mormon side of the story. One cannot avoid asking why.

The reasons are tucked away in the same newspaper articles in which the editors tell about "the Mormon war." They are: First, communications were not good, and "firsthand information" was neither confirmable nor universally reliable. The editor of Stuebenville, Ohio's The American Union tried to explain that to his readers.

There appears to be a great excitement at Nauvoo, the seat of the Mormon Sect, which is commanded by Joe Smith, but the precise nature of the difficulties is not easy to learn in the prejudiced and blundering one-sided accounts of the western newspapers.¹⁰⁸

In his view, both the Mormon and the anti-Mormon papers were "prejudiced," "Blundering," and "one-sided" and could not be trusted if one wished to know what was really happening.

Second, Joseph Smith had a credibility problem. The editors were not sure he was being truthful about his motives. Many believed he was being deceptive when he claimed to receive revelations from God and they anticipated the same kind of deception in his accounts of other things as well.

Third, because these editors were generally honorable men, usually leaders in their communities, they did not feel the unbounded hatred toward the Mormons which Sharp felt and expressed. They tended to disregard Sharp's threats and diatribes against the Prophet as rhetorical, and sought to discover and publish what might be the story behind his rhetoric.

It was their inability to comprehend that hatred, coupled with their need to discover an underlying event, which caused them to believe the destruction of the Expositor brought about the Prophet's death. Thus, their invention of the Expositor's overriding significance is not only understandable, but entirely consistent with their attitudes toward the Mormons and with their desires and inabilities to discover what was really happening in Nauvoo. So they published what they supposed to be the truth.

The significance of the Expositor as reported by the nation's editors was their invention. It was the product of attitudes they already had--of their preconceived expectations--so there can be no credence given to the proposition that the Expositor incident substantially altered their opinions about the Mormons.

The quick action of the Mormons against the Expositor effectively silenced it--even the issue already published and circulated--as a national carrier of anti-Mormon propaganda. Even though it is not within the scope of this study to discover to what extent individuals in and around Nauvoo read or believed its stories, we are now equipped to address that question on a national scale: so few Americans had access to those stories, the Expositor's content could not have been a significant force in restructuring a national attitude towards the Mormons.

The Nauvoo Expositor and the Mormon reaction to it have been seen by some as a kind of Waterloo of Joseph Smith's career. It was not that, and we should not let its flamboyance upstage its contextual reality. When one sees the Expositor in its historical context, it is apparent that its importance was very limited. It was not the major reason of Joseph Smith's death; anger over its destruction was not what caused the mobs to gather around Nauvoo; Joseph Smith's action against it was not a violation of the First Amendment and his contemporaries understood that, so the nation was not upset about what historians have since called his violation of the

freedom of the press; and the destruction of the Expositor did not bring the Mormons into national disrepute. The closer one looks, the more one is compelled to conclude, that, except as it was used to arrange the timing of Joseph Smith's murder, the Nauvoo Expositor was simply not all that important.

FOOTNOTES

¹American newspapers referred to Joseph Smith as "the Prophet" so frequently and sometimes in articles which did not otherwise mention his name, that it is clear that he was called by that title by Americans generally and not just by members of his church.

²That assumption was successfully put to rest by : Dallin H. Oaks and Marvin S. Hill, Carthage Conspiracy: the Trial of the Accused Assassins of Joseph Smith (Urbana, University of Illinois Press, 1975).

³George R. Gayler, "the Expositor Affair, Prelude to the Downfall of Joseph Smith," The Northwest Missouri State College Studies, 25 (Feb. 1961):3-15.

Inez Smith Davis, Story of the Church (Independence, Herald Publishing House, 1948), p. 335.

⁴Such as: "The cry that the 'freedom of the press' was being violated, united the factions seeking the overthrow of the Saints as perhaps nothing else would have done," in William E. Berrett, The Restored Church (Salt Lake City, Department of Education of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1949), p. 255.

Also: "That he was opposed to freedom of the press was the moral justification for legal action against him and his brother." in Kenneth W. Godfrey, "The Road to Carthage Led West," BYU Studies, 8 (winter 1968):213.

⁵Thomas F. O'Dea, The Mormons (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1957), pp. 66-67.

⁶"A plea for Captain John Brown," Read to citizens of Concord, Mass., October 30, 1859. Reprinted in Reform Papers p. 122 ed. Wendell Olick (Princeton: Princeton University Press) 1973.

⁷Signal, 8 May, p. 2.

⁸The Warsaw Signal story was reprinted in the following newspapers:

Saturday Courier, Philadelphia, Pa., 8 June, p. 2

Daily Ohio State Journal, Columbus, Ohio, 6 June, p. 1.

New Jersey Journal, Elizabeth, N.J., 11 June, p. 1.

Weekly Ohio State Journal, Columbus, Ohio, 12 June, p. 4.

The Pittsfield Sun, Pittsfield, Mass., 20 June, p. 1.

Poughkeepsie Journal & Eagle, Poughkeepsie, N.Y., Saturday, 22 June, Vol. 1, No. 25, p. 2.

Pittsburgh Morning Post, Pittsburgh, Pa., 1 June, p. 2.

Kentucky Gazeteer, Lexington, Ky., 1 June, p. 2.

Alexandria Gazette, Alexandria, Va., 3 June, p. 3.

⁸(continued)

The Daily Mercury, New Bedford, Mass., 3 June, p. 2.

American and Commercial Daily Advertiser, Baltimore, Md., 3 June, p. 2.

Daily Argus, Portland, Maine, 3 June, p. 2.

Bicknell's Reporter, Counterfeit Detector, and General Prices Current, Philadelphia, Pa., 4 June, p. 1.

Rochester Daily Advertiser, Rochester, N.Y., 4 June, p. 2.

The Columbus Enquirer, Columbus, Ga., 5 June, p. 2.

Daily Herald, Newburyport, Mass., 5 June, p. 2.

Buffalo Daily Courier & Economist, Buffalo, N.Y., 5 June, p. 3.

Richmond Palladium, Richmond, Ind., 7 June, p. 3.

Adams Sentinel, Gettysburg, Pa., 10 June, p. 1.

Springfield Republican, Springfield, Mass., 15 June, p. 1.

The Knoxville Register, Knoxville, Tenn., 19 June, p. 1.

Lee County Democrat, Fort Madison, Iowa, 11 May, p. 2.

Cincinnati Weekly Herald, Cincinnati, Ohio, 12 June p. 1.

New York Herald, New York, N.Y., 12 June, p. 1.

The nations interest in Law continued after the prophets death.

When he moved to an area near Rock Island, Illinois, many newspapers reported that fact.

The Upper Mississippian, Rock Island, Ill., 7 Sept., p. 1.

The Newport Mercury, Newport, R.I., 17 Aug., p. 2

Public Ledger, Philadelphia, Pa., 8 Aug., p. 2.

The North American, Philadelphia, Pa., 9 Aug., p. 2.

Milwaukee Sentinel, Milwaukee, Wis., 17 Aug., p. 1.

Ohio Observer, Hudson, Ohio, 21 Aug., p. 3.

The Sun, Baltimore, Md., 9 Aug., p. 4.

The Working Man's Advocate, New York, N.Y., p. 3.

Ohio State Journal, Columbus, Ohio, 14 Aug., p. 3.

The Warsaw Signal, Warsaw, Ill., 18 Sept., p. 2.

The Western Star, Lebanon, Ohio, 16 Aug., p. 1.

Richmond Palladium, Richmond, Ind., 6 Sept., p. 2.

Daily Evening Transcript, Boston, Mass., 9 Aug., p.2.

Vincennes Gazette, Vincennes, Ind., 8 Aug., p. 3.

The Rochester Daily Democrat, Rochester, N.Y., 12 Aug., p. 2.

See also for story of Mrs. Law, The Rochester Daily Democrat, Rochester, N.Y., 22 July, p. 2.

Clarksville Jefferson, Clarksville, Tenn., 24 Aug., p. 2. American & Commercial Daily Advertiser, Baltimore, Md., 8 Aug., p. 2.

The Knoxville Register, Knoxville, Tenn., 21 Aug., p. 4. The Daily Picayune, New Orleans, La., 25 Sept., p. 2. Adams Sentinel,

Gettysburg, Pa., 12 Aug., p. 3.

The Davenport Gazette, Davenport, Iowa, 8 Aug., p. e.

The later report that Charles Foster was trying to be reinstated into the Church "Foster has property in Nauvoo, which he is prevented from using while out of the fold," was not widely circulated.

Public Ledger, Philadelphia, Pa., 7 Aug., p. 2

N.Y. Daily Tribune, New York, N.Y., 9 Aug., p. 2.

⁸(continued)

The Sun, Baltimore, Md., 8 Aug., p. 2.

Pittsburgh Morning Post, Pittsburgh, Pa., 12 Aug., p. 2.

⁹Alton Telegraph, Alton, Ill., 13 June, p. 3.

See also:

Adams Sentinel, Gettysburg, Pa., 1 July, p. 3.

¹⁰Signal, 12 June, p. 2.

¹¹Ibid and Expositor.

¹²Joseph Smith, History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Deseret News, Salt Lake City, 1912, Vol. 6, pp. 81, 333.

¹³Signal, 12 June, p. 2.

¹⁴Public Ledger and Daily Transcript, Philadelphia, Pa., 10 July, p. 2.

Saturday Courier, Philadelphia, Pa., 13 July, p. 2.

Daily Picayune, New Orleans, La., 20 July, p. 4.

This also appeared in the New York Herald among other extracts from the Expositor. New York Herald, New York, N.Y., 1 July, p. 2.

¹⁵The Buffalo Daily Courier and Economist, Buffalo, N.Y., 4 July, p. 3.

The Nashville Whig, Nashville, Tenn., 22 June, p. 2.

The Hampshire Gazette, North Hampton, Mass., 2 July, p. 3.

See also:

Quincy Whig, Quincy, Ill., 19 June, p. 2.

Bloomington Herald, Bloomington, Iowa, 15 June, p. 2.

Charleston Courier, Charleston, S.C., 1 July, p. 2.

Pensacola Gazette, Pensacola, Fla., 13 July, p. 1.

Louisville Daily Journal, Louisville, Ky., 15 June, p. 3.

Buffalo Daily Courier and Daily Economist, Buffalo, N.Y., 1 July,

p. 2.

Jeffersonian Republican, Jefferson City, Mo., 6 July, p. 1.

¹⁶The Buffalo Daily Courier and Economist, Buffalo, N.Y., 4 July, p. 3.

See also:

Hampshire Gazette, North Hampton, Mass., 2 July, p. 4.

Springfield Republican, Springfield, Mass., 29 June, p. 3.

The Pennsylvania Argus, Greensburg, Pa., 28 June, p. 3.

Indiana American, Brookville, Ind., 28 June, p. 1.

Weekly Ohio State Journal, Columbus, Ohio, 26 June, p. 4.

Bicknell's Reporter, Counterfeit Detector, and General Prices

Current, Philadelphia, Pa., 25 June, p. 2.

The Western Star, Lebanon, Ohio, 21 June, p. 3.

Saturday Courier, Philadelphia, Pa., 29 June, p. 2.

Richmond Palladium, Richmond, Ind., 21 June, p. 2.

Daily Ohio State Journal, Columbus, Ohio, 20 June, p. 2.

Daily Cincinnati Gazette, Cincinnati, Ohio, 18 June, p. 2.

¹⁶ (continued)

Tioga Eagle, Wellsborough, Pa., 3 July, p. 2.

The Nashville Whig, Nashville, Tenn., 22 June, p. 2.

¹⁷Richmond Compiler, Richmond, La., 12 July, p. 2.

¹⁸The Sangamo Journal, Springfield, Ill., 29 July, p. 2.

¹⁹Dayton Journal and Advertiser, Dayton, Ohio, 2 July, p. 1.

²⁰The Kanawha Republican, Charleston, Va., 9 July, p. 2.

²¹Adams Sentinel, Gettysburg, Pa., 1 July, p. 1.

Buffalo Daily Courier and Economist, Buffalo, N.Y., 25 June, p. 3.

The Sun, Baltimore, Md., 21 June, p. 2.

Milder observations were The Northern Democrat, Montrose, Pa., 4 July, p. 3, which describes the Expositor "as being opposed to Joe Smith's measures."

The Hampshire Gazette, North Hampton, Mass., 2 July, p. 2, simply reported that the Expositor has been "established by a number of Mormons who opposed Joe Smith's course."

²²Caledonian, St. Johnsbury, Vt., 15 July, p. 2.

²³The United States Gazette, Philadelphia, Pa., 4 July, p. 2.

Lewiston Gazette, Lewiston, Pa., 20 July, p. 1.

²⁴New York Herald, New York, N.Y., 1 July, p. 2.

The Charleston Courier, Charleston, S.C., 4 July, p. 2.

Buffalo Daily Courier & Economist, Buffalo, N.Y., 1 July, p. 2.

Saturday Courier, Philadelphia, Pa., 6 July, p. 2.

Pensacola Gazette, Pensacola, Fla., 13 July, p. 1.

²⁵This quote is a composite of two separate statements in the Expositor.

²⁶See their official statements of the Nauvoo Neighbor Extra of 17 June, 1844, and in the Neighbor of 19 June, p. 3-4. The minutes of the city council are also published in Joseph Smith, History of the Church, 6 Vol., Salt Lake City (Deseret News), 1912, Vol. 6, pp. 432-452.

²⁷Nauvoo Neighbor, 12 and 17 June.

²⁸The Prophet, New York, N.Y., 13 July, p. 2.

²⁹Nauvoo Neighbor, Nauvoo, Ill., 12 June, p. 2.

³⁰The following papers indicate that they have either received the Extra or they quote from it, or describe its contents (other papers which quote specific parts of the Extra are cited elsewhere.)
Weekly Ohio State Journal, Columbus, Ohio, 3 July, p. 2.

³⁰ (continued)

Daily Cincinnati Gazette, Cincinnati, Ohio, 27 June, p. 2.

Daily Ohio State Journal, Columbus, Ohio, 29 June, p. 3.

Daily Cincinnati Gazette, Cincinnati, Ohio, 25 June, p. 2.

Indiana American, Brookville, Ind., 28 June, p. 2.

Public Ledger, Philadelphia, Pa., 1 July, p. 1.

Sangamo Journal, Springfield, Ill., 20 June, p. 2.

The Daily Picayune, New Orleans, La., 27 June, p. 2.

American & Commercial Daily Advertiser, Baltimore, Md., 26 June, p. 2.

Hawk-Eye, Burlington, Iowa, 20 June, p. 2.

Banner of Peace and Cumberland Presbyterian Advocate, Lebanon, Tenn., p. 1

³¹Richmond Compiler, Richmond, La., 12 July, p. 2.

³²The Northwestern Gazette and Galena Advertiser, Galena, Ill., 18 June, p. 4. It cited the Warsaw Signal as its source of information.

³³The Sangamo Journal, Springfield, Ill., 27 June, p. 3, and 20 June, p. 2.

See also:

The New York Herald, New York, N.Y., 30 June, p. 2.

³⁴Neighbor, 12 June, p. 2.

³⁵Sangamo Journal, Springfield, Ill., 27 June, p. 3.

Vincennes Gazette, Vincennes, Ind., 20 June, p. 2.

Morning Courier, Louisville, Ky., 17 June, p. 2.

New Hampshire Sentinel, Keene, N.H., 3 July, p. 2.

Indiana State Sentinel, Indianapolis, Ind., 27 June, p. 3.
The Evening Post, New York, N.Y., 25 June, p. 2.
The Republican Compiler, Gettysburg, Pa., 1 July, p. 2.
The Evansville Journal, Evansville, Ind., 20 June, p. 3.
Daily National Intelligencer, Washington, D.C., 25 June, p. 3.
Albany Evening Journal, Albany, N.Y., 26 June, p. 2.
The Daily Globe, Washington, D.C., 28 June, p. 3.
The Alexandria Gazette, Alexandria, Va., 24 June, p. 3.
New York Daily Tribune, New York, N.Y., 25 June, p. 1.
American & Commercial Daily Advertiser, Baltimore, Md., 25 June, p. 2.
U.S. Gazette Daily, Philadelphia, Pa., 25 June, p. 1.
The Southern Patriot, Charleston, S.C., 27 June, p. 4.
New York Daily Tribune, New York, N.Y., 25 June, p. 1.
Public Ledger and Daily Transcript, Philadelphia, Pa., 24 June, p. 4.
Western Sun and General Advertiser, Vincennes, Ind., 6 July, p. 2.
The Weekly American Eagle, Memphis, Tenn., 21 June, p. 4.
The Charleston Mercury, Charleston, S.C., 28 June, p. 2.
The American Union, Steubenville, Ohio, 4 July, p. 3.

³⁶The Morning Courier, Louisville, Ky., 17 June, p. 2.
The Alexandria Gazette, Alexandria, Va., 24 June, p. 3.
The Evansville Journal, Evansville, Ind., 20 June, p. 3.

³⁷Annette P. Hampshire, "Thomas Sharp and the Anti-Mormon Sentiment in Illinois, 1842-1845," Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society, 72 (May 1979):91-92.

Steven G. Barnett, "Wilson Law: A Sidelight on the Expositor Incident," BYU Studies, 19 (Winter 1979):244-246.

³⁸Signal, 12 June, p. 2.
Public Ledger and Daily Transcript, Philadelphia, Pa., 25 June, p. 1.
The Evening Post, New York, N.Y., 25 June, p. 2.
The Davenport Gazette, Davenport, Iowa, 27 June, p. 2.
The Daily Globe, Washington, D.C., 28 June, p. 3.
Hawk-Eye, Burlington, Iowa, 20 June, p. 2.
Saturday Courier, Philadelphia, Pa., 29 June, p. 2.
Plainfield Union, Plainfield, N.J., 1 July, p. 3.
The Charleston Mercury, Charleston, S.C., 29 June, p. 3.
Delaware Gazette, Wilmington, Del., 28 June, p. 3.
Arkansas Intelligencer, Van Buren, Ark., 29 June, p. 2.
Livingston Republican, Geneseo, N.Y., 2 July, p. 3.
The Knoxville Register, Knoxville, Tenn., 3 July, p. 2.

³⁹Dallin H. Oaks, "The Suppression of the Nauvoo Expositor," Utah Law Review, 9 (Winter 1965):862-903.

- ⁴⁰Nauvoo Neighbor, Nauvoo, Ill., 19 June, p. 3.
Daily Cincinnati Gazette, Cincinnati, Ohio, 25 June, p. 2.
The United States Gazette, Philadelphia, Pa., 1 July, p. 1.
The Evening Post, New York, N.Y., 2 July, p. 2.
Bicknell's Reporter, Counterfeit Detector, and General Prices Current, Philadelphia, Pa., 2 July, p. 3.
The Rochester Daily Democrat, Rochester, N.Y., 4 July, p. 3.
Buffalo Daily Courier & Economist, Buffalo, N.Y., 4 July, p. 3.
The U.S. Daily Gazette, Philadelphia, Pa., 1 July, p. 1.
Hillsborough Recorder, Hillsborough, N.C., 4 July, p. 3.
Vincennes Gazette, Vincennes, Ind., 27 June, p. 2.
Public Ledger, Philadelphia, Pa., 1 July, p. 1.
The New Orleans Bee, New Orleans, La., 27 June, p. 1.
The Daily Picayune, New Orleans, La., 27 June, p. 2.
New York Herald, New York, N.Y., 30 June, p. 1.
The Liberator, Boston, Mass., 5 July, p. 2.
The Sun, Baltimore, Md., 1 July, p. 1.
Morning Courier, Louisville, Ky., 17 June, p. 2.
Rhode Island Country Journal and Independent Inquirer, Providence, R.I., 4 July, p. 3.
The Boston Pilot, Boston, Mass., 6 July, p. 2.
- ⁴¹Nauvoo Neighbor Extra, 17 June.
- ⁴²The Daily Cincinnati Gazette, Cincinnati, Ohio, 25 June, p. 2.
The Indiana American, Brookville, Ind., 28 June, p. 2.
- ⁴³The Buffalo Daily Courier and Economist, Buffalo, N.Y., 4 July, p. 3.
- ⁴⁴The St. Louis Democrat, St. Louis, Mo., 14 June.
- ⁴⁵New York Herald, New York, N.Y., 27 June, p. 2
- ⁴⁶The Prophet, New York, N.Y., 13 July, p. 3.
- ⁴⁷The Appeal, Memphis, Tenn., 21 June, p. 3.
- ⁴⁸Bangor Daily Whig and Courier, Bangor, Maine, 28 June, p.4.
- ⁴⁹Hampshire Gazette, North Hampton, Mass., 2 July, p. 4.
Springfield Republican, Springfield, Mass., 29 June, p. 3.
The Pennsylvania Argus, Greensburg, Pa., 28 June, p. 3.
Indiana American, Brookville, Ind., 28 June, p. 1.
Weekly Ohio State Journal, Columbus, Ohio, 26 June, p. 4.
Bicknell's Reporter, Counterfeit Detector, and General Prices Current, Philadelphia, Pa., 25 June, p. 2.

The Western Star, Lebanon, Ohio, 21 June, p. 3.
Richmond Palladium, Richmond, Ind., 21 June, p. 2.
Daily Ohio State Journal, Columbus, Ohio, 20 June, p. 2.
Daily Cincinnati Gazette, Cincinnati, Ohio, 18 June, p. 2.
Tioga Eagle, Wellsborough, Pa., 3 July, p. s.

See also:

New Hampshire Sentinel, Keene, N.H., 3 July, p. 2.
Indiana State Sentinel, Indianapolis, Ind., 27 June, p. 3.
The Evening Post, New York, N.Y., 25 June, p. 2.
The Republican Compiler, Gettysburg, Pa., 1 July, p. 2.

⁵⁰New York Herald, New York, N.Y., 1 July, p. 2.

⁵¹The Long Island Democrat, Jamaica, N.Y., 2 July, p. 2.

⁵²Northern Democrat, Montrose, Pa., 4 July, p. 3.

⁵³The Charleston Courier, Charleston, S.C., 28 June, p. 2.

⁵⁴The Kenebec Journal, Augusta, Maine, 19 July, p. 3.

Similar statements placing the blame directly on Joseph Smith may be found in the:

Saturday Courier, Philadelphia, Pa., 6 July, p. 2.

Hampshire Gazette, North Hampton, Mass., 2 July, p. 3.

and a lengthy satirical piece in Plattsburgh Republican, Plattsburgh, N.Y., 6 July, p. 2.
Northern Standard, Clarksville, Tx., 10 July, p. 2-3.

⁵⁵Hampshire Gazette, North Hampton, Mass., 2 July, p. 3.

⁵⁶Northwestern Gazette, and Galena Advertiser, Galena, Ill., 14 June.

- ⁵⁷Hampshire Gazette, North Hampton, Mass., 2 July, p. 4.
Indiana American, Brookville, Ind., 28 June, p. 1.
Tioga Eagle, Wellsborough, Pa., 3 July, p. 2.
Michigan State Journal, Ann Arbor, Mich., 10 July, p. 2.
Springfield Republican, Springfield, Mass., 29 June, p. 3.
The Pennsylvania Argus, Greensburg, Pa., 28 June, p. 3.
- ⁵⁸Morning Register, New Bedford, Mass., 25 June, p. 2.
- ⁵⁹The Rochester Daily Democrat, Rochester, N.Y., 26 June, p. 3.
- ⁶⁰Hawk-Eye, Burlington, Iowa, 20 June, p. 2.
Republican Compiler, Gettysburg, Pa., p. 2.
The Evening Post, New York, N.Y., 25 June, p. 2.
The Warsaw Signal, 12 June, p. 2.
The Quincy Whig, Quincy, Ill., 19 June, p. 2.
- ⁶¹Northern Standard, Claesville, Tx., 10 July, p. 2-3.
Caledonian, St. Johnsborough, Vt., 15 July, p. 2.
Richmond Palladium, Richmond, Ind., 28 June, p. 2.
Kanawha Republican, Charleston, Va., 9 July, p. 2.
- ⁶²Signal, 12 June, p. 2.
 See also:
Hawk-Eye, Burlington, Iowa, 20 June, p. 2.
Republican Compiler, Gettysburg, Pa., 1 July, p. 2.
The Evening Post, New York, N.Y., 25 June, p. 2.
Sangamo Journal, Springfield, Ill., 27 June, p. 3.
Public Ledger, Philadelphia, Pa., 25 June, p. 1.
Indiana State Sentinel, Indianapolis, Ind., 27 June, p. 3.
- ⁶³Ibid.
- ⁶⁴The Appeal, Memphis, Tenn., 21 June, p. 3.
 See also:
Long Island Democrat, Jamaica, N.Y., 2 July, p. 2.
- ⁶⁵Hawk-Eye, Burlington, Iowa, 13 June, p. 2.
The Republican Compiler, Gettysburg, Pa., 1 July, p. 2.
The Evening Post, New York, N.Y., 25 June, p. 2.
- ⁶⁶The Scioto Gazette, Chilicothe, Ohio, 4 July, p. 4.
The Ohio Observer, Hudson, Ohio, 27 June, p. 2.
- ⁶⁷Northwestern Gazette and Galena Advertiser, Galena, Ill., 14 June, p. 2.

- ⁶⁸Albany Evening Journal, Albany, N.Y., 26 June, p. 2.
New Hampshire Sentinel, Keene, N.H., 3 July, p. 2.
- ⁶⁹The Louisville Journal, Louisville, Ky., 17 June, p. 2.
- ⁷⁰St. Louis Democrat, St. Louis, Mo., 14 June.
- ⁷¹The Louisville Journal, Louisville, Ky., 17 June, p. 2.
The Davenport Gazette, Davenport, Iowa, 20 June, p. 2.
- ⁷²The Kentucky Gazette, Lexington, Ky., 22 June, p. 2.
- ⁷³North Hampton Courier, North Hampton, Mass., 2 July, p. 3.
- ⁷⁴Daily Inquirer and Messenger, Cincinnati, Ohio, 19 June, p. 2.
- ⁷⁵The Kentucky Gazette, Lexington, Ky., 22 June, p. 2. (Italics in original)
- ⁷⁶Northern Democrat, Montrose, Pa., 4 July, p. 3.
- ⁷⁷Hampshire Gazette, North Hampton, Mass., 2 July, p. 3.
- ⁷⁸Working Man's Advocate, New York, N.Y., 29 June, p. 1.
- ⁷⁹Dayton Journal and Advertiser, Dayton, Ohio, 2 July, p. 1.
The Clay Bugle, Harrisburg, Pa., 4 July, p. 1.
Nashville Whig, Nashville, Tenn., 22 June, p. 2.
Bloomington Herald, Bloomington, Iowa, 15 June, p. 2.
The Knoxville Register, Knoxville, Tenn., 3 July, p. 2.
Pittsburgh Morning Post, Pittsburgh, Pa., 22 June, p. 3.

The same short article was reprinted in three newspapers:

- Adam's Sentinel, Gettysburg, Pa., 1 July, p. 1.
Buffalo Daily Courier and Economist, Buffalo, N.Y., 25 June, p. 3.
The Sun, Baltimore, Md., 21 June, p. 2.

Wisconsin Territory newspapers were willing to give the destruction of the press only a single sentence each:

- Milwaukee Sentinel, Milwaukee, Wis., 29 June, p. 3.
Racine Advocate, Racine, Wis., 2 July, p. 1.

Another short article attributed to the Cincinnati Commercial was published in:

- Daily Times, Hartford, Conn., 24 June, p. 2.
Democratic Free Press, Detroit, Mich., 26 June, p. 2.

Another short article, only a paragraph long, which apparently originated in the Cincinnati Gazette was published many times:

Hampshire Gazette, North Hampton, Mass., 2 July, p. 4.

Springfield Republican, Springfield, Mass., 29 June, p. 3.

The Pennsylvania Argus, Greensburg, Pa., 28 June, p. 3.

Indiana American, Brookville, Ind., 28 June, p. 1.

Weekly Ohio State Journal, Columbus, Ohio, 26 June, p. 4.

Bicknell's Reporter, Counterfeit Detector, and General Prices

Current, Philadelphia, Pa., 25 June, p. 2.

The Western Star, Lebanon, Ohio, 21 June, p. 3.

Richmond Palladium, Richmond, Ind., 21 June, p. 2.

Daily Ohio State Journal, Columbus, Ohio, 20 June, p. 2.

⁷⁹ (continued)

Daily Cincinnati Gazette, Cincinnati, Ohio, 18 June, p. 2.

Tioga Eagle, Wellsborough, Pa., 3 July, p. 2.

⁸⁰New York Herald, New York, N.Y., 27 June, p. 2.

⁸¹Signal, 29 May, p. 2.

Public Ledger and Daily Transcript, Philadelphia, Pa., 18 June, p. 4.

⁸²Signal, 12 June, p. 2.

⁸³Signal, Extra of 14 and 19 June, p. 1.

Stanley B. Kimball, "Thomas L. Barnes: Coroner of Carthage," BYU Studies 11 (Winter 1971):141-147.

⁸⁴Signal, 14 and 19 June, p. 1.

⁸⁵Ibid. See also: Brigham H. Roberts, The Rise and Fall of Nauvoo (Salt Lake City, Deseret News Press, 1900), pp. 284-289.

⁸⁶Ibid.

⁸⁷Sangamo Journal, Springfield, Ill., 27 June, p. 3.

Vincennes Gazette, Vincennes, Ind., 27 June, p. 12.

The New Orleans Bee, New Orleans, La., 27 June, p. 1.

Ohio Repository, Canton, Ohio, 4 July, p. 2.

The Scioto Gazette, Chillicothe, Ohio, 4 July, p. 4.

Pittsburgh Christian Advocate, Pittsburgh, Pa., 3 July, p. 4.

The Christian Freeman, Hartford, Conn., 4 July, p. 3.

The Washington Examiner, Washington, Pa., 6 July, p. 2.

The Niagara Courier, Lockport, N.Y., 10 July, p. 1.

Hillsborough Recorder, Hillsborough, N.C., 11 July, p. 3.

Daily Picayune, New Orleans, La., 23 June, p. 1.

The Illinois Gazette, Lacon, Ill., 22 June, p. 2.

Working Man's Advocate, New York, N.Y., 29 June, p. 3.

Livingston Republican, Geneseo, N.Y., 2 July, p. 3.

Hawk-Eye, Burlington, Iowa, 20 June, p. 2.

The Christian Freeman, Hartford, Conn., 4 July, p. 3.

Daily Times, Hartford, Conn., 26 June, p. 3.

Louisville Daily Journal, Louisville, Ky., 20 June, p. 3.

Daily Eastern Argus, Portland, Maine, 29 June, p. 2.

The Morning Register, New Bedford, Mass., 29 June, p. 2.

The Hartford Times, Hartford, Conn., 29 June, p. 3.

Saturday Courier, Philadelphia, Pa., 29 June, p. 2.

American and Commercial Daily Advertiser, Baltimore, Md., 25 June, p. 2. and 26 June,

p. 2.

Daily National Intelligencer, Washington, D.C., 25 June, p. 3.

The Evening Post, New York, N.Y., 25 June, p. 2.

New York Daily Tribune, New York, N.Y., 25 June, p. 1, and 27 June, p. 2.

Indiana American, Brookville, Ind., 28 June, p. 2 and 3.

Buffalo Daily Courier & Economist, Buffalo, N.Y., 29 June, p. 3.

⁸⁷ (continued)

Rochester Daily Advertiser, Rochester, N.Y., 29 June, p. 2 and 3.

The Norwich Courier, Norwich, Conn., 3 July, p. 1.

Bicknell's Reporter, Counterfeit Detector, and General Prices Current, Philadelphia, Pa.,

2 July, p. 1-3; and 11 July, p. 3.

Cleveland Plain Dealer, Cleveland, Ohio, 3 July, p. 2.

Dayton Journal & Advertiser, Dayton, Ohio, 2 July, p. 1.

Adams Sentinel, Gettysburg, Pa., 1 July, p. 1.

The Daily Globe, Washington, D.C., 1 July, p. 3.

Charleston Courier, Charleston, S.C., 25 June, p. 2 and 29 June, p. 2. The United States

Gazette, Philadelphia, Pa., 27 June, p. 2.

The Ottawa Free Trader, Ottawa, Ill., 28 June, p. 2.

The Louisville Daily Journal, Louisville, Ky., 21 June, p. 2.

Public Ledger and Daily Transcript, Philadelphia, Pa., 26 June, p. 3.

Weekly Ohio State Journal, Columbus, Ohio, 26 June, p. 3.

Cincinnati Weekly Herald, Cincinnati, Ohio, 26 June, p. 2.

New Hampshire Sentinel, Keene, N.H., 3 July, p. 2.

The Western Star, Lebanon, Ohio, 28 June, p. 1.

Springfield Republican, Springfield, Mass., 6 July, p. 4.

The Southern Patriot, Charleston, S.C., 28 June, p. 4.

Richmond Palladium, Richmond, Ind., 28 June, p. 1.

Rhode Island Country Journal and Independent Inquirer, Providence, R. I., 28 June, p. 2.

Alton Telegraph and Democratic Review, Alton, Ill., 22 June, p. 2.

The Liberator, Boston, Mass., 5 July, p. 4.

The Belleville Advocate, Belleville, Ill., 20 June, p. 3.

North Western Gazette & Galena Advertiser, Galena, Ill., 28 May, p. 4. and 21 June, p. 2.

⁸⁸Signal, 14 and 19 June, p. 1.

⁸⁹Two Eastern newspapers (Vincennes Gazette, Vincennes, Ind., 27 June, p. 2., and Delaware Gazette, Wilmington, Del., 28 June, p. 3.) printed an article which contained the sentence "This is the most daring attack on the liberty of the press that has ever been made in this country," but that observation was not echoed by others.

⁹⁰Alton Telegraph & Democratic Review, Alton, Ill., 22 June, p. 2.

Hawk-Eye, Burlington, Iowa, 13 June, p. 2.

Quincy Whig, Quincy, Ill., 19 June, p. 2.

⁹¹Dallin H. Oaks, "The Suppression of the Nauvoo Expositor," Utah Law Review 9 (Winter 1965):890-91 shows that while there was "considerable basis in the law of their day for their action in characterizing the published issues of the Nauvoo Expositor as a nuisance...there was no legal justification in 1844 for the destruction of the Expositor press."

The year after the Expositor incident, the Mormons mentioned freedom of the press in a context that showed it had also been used by their enemies, Nauvoo Neighbor, 19 February 1845.

⁹²Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, *The Constitution of The United States of America, Analysis and Interpretation, annotations of cases decided by the Supreme Court of the United States*, June 22, 1964; Washington, D. C., (U.S. Government Printing Office), 1964, p. 845.

⁹³Signal, 10 July, p. 2.

⁹⁴Signal, 12 June, p. 2.

⁹⁵Ibid.

⁹⁶New Hampshire Sentinel, Keene, N.H., 3 July, p. 2.

Quincy Whig, 19 June, p. 2.

Vincennes Gazette, Vincennes, Ind., 27 June, p. 2.

Richmond Palladium, Richmond, Ind., 28 June, p. 1.

The Working Man's Advocate, New York, N.Y., 27 June, p. 3.

The New York Herald, New York, N.Y., 27 June, p. 1.

The Fredonia Censor, Fredonia, N.Y., 10 July, p. 3.

The New Orleans Bee, New Orleans, La., 24 June, p. 2.

Saturday Courier, Philadelphia, Pa., 27 June, p. 2.

American and Commercial Daily Advertiser, Baltimore, Md., 25 June, p. 2.

Daily Herald, Newburyport, Mass., 29 June, p. 2.

The Ohio Repository, Canton, Ohio, 4 July, p. 2.

The Weekly Ohio State Journal, Columbus, Ohio, 26 June, p. 3.

Daily Ohio State Journal, Columbus, Ohio, 25 June, p. 2.

Adams Sentinel, Gettysburg, Pa., 1 July, p. 3.

The Sun, Baltimore, Md., 25 June, p. 2.

Long Island Democrat, Jamaica, N.Y., 2 July, p. 2.

The Clay Bugle, Harrisburg, Pa., 4 July, p. 1.

The Public Ledger and Daily Transcript, Philadelphia, Pa., 26 June, p. 3.

The Sangamo Journal, Springfield, Ill., 27 June, p. 3.

Daily Picayune, New Orleans, La.

Signal, 14 June, p. 1.

Livingston Republican, Geneseo, N.Y., 2 July, p. 3.

Hawk-Eye, Burlington, Iowa, 20 June, p. 2.

The Christian Freeman, Hartford, Conn., 4 July, p. 3.

Daily Times, Hartford, Conn., 26 June, p. 3.

Louisville Daily Journal, Louisville, Ky., 20 June, p. 3.

Daily Eastern Argus, Portland, Maine, 29 June, p. 2.

New Hampshire Sentinel, Keene, N.H., 3 July, p. 2.

Quincy Whig, 19 June, p. 2.

Vincennes Gazette, Vincennes, Ind., 27 June, p. 2.

Richmond Palladium, Richmond, Ind., 28 June, p. 1.

The Working Man's Advocate, New York, N.Y., 27 June, p. 3, and 29 June, p. 3.

The New York Herald, New York, N.Y., 27 June, p. 1.

Alton Telegraph and Democratic Review, Alton, Ill., 22 June, p. 2.

The Charleston Mercury, Charleston, S.C., p. 2.

Arkansas Intelligencer, Van Buren, Ark., 29 June, p. 2.

⁹⁶ (continued)

The Norwich Courier, Norwich, Conn., 3 July, p. 1.

The Fredonia Censor, Fredonia, N.Y., 10 July, p. 3.

The New Orleans Bee, New Orleans, La., 24 June, p. 2.

Saturday Courier, Philadelphia, Pa., 27 June, p. 2, and 29 June, p. 2.

American and Commercial Daily Advertiser, Baltimore, Md., 25 June, p. 2.

Daily Herald, Newburyport, Mass., 29 June, p. 2.

The Ohio Repository, Canton, Ohio, 4 July, p. 2.

Adams Sentinel, Gettysburg, Pa., 1 July, p. 3.

The Weekly Ohio State Journal, Columbus, Ohio, 26 June, p. 3.

Daily Ohio State Journal, Columbus, Ohio, 25 June, p. 2

The Sun, Baltimore, Md., 25 June, p. 2.

Long Island Democrat, Jamaica, N.Y., 2 July, p. 2.

The Clay Bugle, Harrisburg, Pa., 4 July, p. 1.

The Public Ledger and Daily Transcript, Philadelphia, Pa., 25 June, p. 1, and 26 June, p. 3.

The Sangamo Journal, Springfield, Ill., 27 June, p. 3.

Daily Picayune, New Orleans, La.

Signal, 14 June, p. 1.

Livingston Republican, Geneseo, N.Y., 2 July, p. 3.

Hawk-Eye, Burlington, Iowa, 20 June, p. w.

The Christian Freeman, Hartford, Conn., 4 July, p. 3.

Daily Times, Hartford, Conn., 26 June, p. 3.

Louisville Daily Journal, Louisville, Ky., 20 June, p. 3.

Daily Eastern Argus, Portland, Maine, 29 June, p. 2.

⁹⁷The Clay Bugle, Harrisburg, Pa., 4 July, p. 1.

⁹⁸Neighbor, 19 June, p. 2.

⁹⁹New York Herald, New York, N.Y., 30 June, p. 1.

The Public Ledger and Daily Transcript, Philadelphia, Pa., 1 July, p. 1.

Daily Cincinnati Gazette, Cincinnati, Ohio, 25 June, p. 2.

New York Herald, New York, N.Y., 30 June, p. 1.

The Public Ledger and Daily Transcript, Philadelphia, Pa., 1 July, p. 1.

Daily Cincinnati Gazette, Cincinnati, Ohio, 25 June, p. 2.

Indiana American, Brookville, Ind., 28 June, p. 2, cites the St. Louis Evening Gazette as its source for the "broad farce" statement.

¹⁰⁰Signal, 14 and 19 June, p. 1.

¹⁰¹Signal, 19 June, p. 1.

¹⁰²George R. Gayler, "Governor Ford and the Death of Joseph and Hyrum Smith," Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society, 1 (Winter 1957):391-411.

¹⁰³Signal, 10 July, p. 4.

¹⁰⁴Ibid., p. 2.

¹⁰⁵Paul Ellsworth, "Mobocracy and the Rule of Law: American Press Reaction to the Murder of Joseph Smith." BYU Studies, 20 (Fall 1979):71-82.

¹⁰⁶There were a few exceptions such as:

Alton Telegraph and Democratic Review, Alton, Ill., 22 June, p. 2.

Public Ledger & Daily Transcript, Philadelphia, Pa., 18 June, p. 4.

¹⁰⁷Kanawha Republican, Charleston, Va., 9 July, p. 2.

Richmond Inquirer, Richmond, Va., 9 July, p. 3.

Plattsburgh Republican, Plattsburgh, N.Y., 6 July, p. 2.

Grant County Herald, Lancaster, Wis., 6 July, p. 2.

Richmond Whig and Public Advertiser, Richmond, Va., 9 July, p. 3.

The Daily Mercury, New Bedford, Mass., 12 July, p. 2.

Boston Post, Boston, Mass., 19 July, p. 2.

Pittsburgh Morning Post, Pittsburgh, Pa., 6 July, p. 3.

The Sun, Baltimore, Md., 6 July, p. 1.

Michigan State Journal, Ann Arbor, Mich., 10 July, p. 2.

Bloomington Herald, Blooming, Iowa, 28 June, p. 2.

The Louisville Daily Journal, Louisville, Ky., 1 July, p. 2.

Alton Telegraph & Democratic Review, Alton, Ill., 13 July, p. 2.

The Daily Mercury, New Bedford, Mass., 15 July, p. 1.

Richmond Compiler, Richmond, La., 12 July, p. 2.

Daily National Intelligencer, Washington, D.C., 8 July, p. 3.

The Rochester Daily Democrat, Rochester, N.Y., 22 July, p. 2.

New York Daily Tribune, New York, N.Y., 15 July, p. 2.

Huron Reflector, Norwalk, Ohio, 9 July, p. 2.

Morning Courier, Louisville, Ky., 4 July, p. 2.

The Carolina Watchman, Salisbury, N.C., 13 July, p. 2.

The Liberator, Boston, Mass., 12 July, p. 3.

The Ottawa Free Trader, Ottawa, Ill., 12 July, p. 2.

Peoria Democratic Press, Peoria, Ill., 3 July, p. 2.

Troy Times, Troy, Ohio, 27 July, p. 1.

Racine Advocate, Racine, Wis., 30 July, p. 1.

Richmond Palladium, Richmond, Ind., 12 July, p. 2.

The Evansville Journal, Evansville, Ind., 5 July, p. 2.

Knoxville Register, Knoxville, Tenn., 10 July, p. 2.

New-Hampshire Sentinel, Keene, N.H., 31 July, p. 1.

Northern Democrat, Montrose, Pa., 1 Aug., p. 2.

The Atlas, New York, N.Y., 30 June, p. 2.

Southern Recorder, Milledgeville, Ga., 16 July, p. 3.

¹⁰⁸The American Union, Steubenville, Ohio, 4 July, p. 3.