

Zion's Advocate

"And blessed are they who shall seek to bring forth my Zion at that day for they shall have the gift and power of the Holy Ghost." 1st Nephi 3:124

VOLUME 2.

INDEPENDENCE, MISSOURI, DECEMBER 15, 1925

NUMBER 11

WHICH IS SCRIPTURAL?

President Elbert Smith declares that the First Presidency is part of the "organic structure of the Church." That being true, we shall expect something from the organic law of the Church to sustain his contention.

The brother parades the "forward march" of the Church under the First Presidency. Probably it would have been as well to soft pedal that assertion in view of our historic past while under the marching orders of the First Presidency.

Who was it that led the Church into the changing of her name in 1834 to that of "The Church of the Latter Day Saints," removing the name of Christ entirely? Who was it that marshalled, equipped, and led the Missouri army in their fanatical attempt to recover their lands, only to experience a disastrous defeat? a defeat from which the Church never recovered.

Who was it that led in the sacrilegious work of changing and altering the revelations as published in the *Star* and the Book of Commandments? Who was it that foisted that so called Book of Abraham burlesque on the world with its miserable doctrine of many Gods, furnishing Utah with a foundation for its faith? Who was it that encouraged the taking of the "Covenant of Avenge" and that played a prominent part in the Daughters of Zion, otherwise known as the Danites? Let the First Presidency make answer.

The march from Independence to Missouri was anything but a "forward march," ending as it did in the expulsion of the Church from Missouri and Nauvoo. For the sake of charity we owe to our common dead, we shall forbear mentioning the dastardly deeds, and apostate teachings developed in the period extending from 1838 to 1844. And all this was encouraged under the eye of the "forward march" of the Presidency. We have no defense to make of that defenseless past that ruined the Church, scattering her sons to the four winds, and all resultant of the blighting doctrines introduced under the regime of a First Presidency. There is no other argument needed to silence forever any plea for a First Presidency with its assumed superiority of supreme directional control. There are some who would like to efface the errors of the First Presidency inerascably engraven on every milestone from 1834 to 1844. That sentimental stuff that would fanfare a triumphal reception to that scriptureless order of a First Presidency, on the presumed ignorance of the people, will not be appreciated by the student of history.

Our brother states that bishops and deacons are only "vaguely indicated in the New Testament." Well, even at that, they find an honorable place in that Book of books, a distinction the First Presidency has never been able to secure. It is well understood that the office of a deacon is the least of all the offices in the Church of Christ, and surely if a seat in the New Tes-

tament is reserved for such an office, how much more easy should it be to find a pew for a First Presidency, if such an office ever had any official existence. Judged by its present distinction, we ought to find several richly upholstered box reservations. But go where we will, whether to the "gods," or the orchestral "pit," there is nothing vacant for a First Presidency.

In the estimation of the Reorganization the quorum of the First Presidency is such a monstrous affair that nothing of importance can transpire in the Church that the quorum is not advised of, and actively interested in. The press is full of it, and the sermons are saturated with it. Yet when we come to the Book of Mormon and the Bible, those divinely approved records containing "the fullness of the Gospel" in an honest effort to locate a supreme directional controlling First Presidency, we are hopelessly repulsed with an ominous silence. And that silence covers a period of 4,100 years.

In his efforts to dig up a First Presidency our brother goes back to the administration of the Law of Moses. He tells us that Alma was a "High priest over the Church," and that he "did baptize his brethren," and that he "ordained priests and elders to preside and watch over the Church." Alma 3:3, 4; 4:1. In all this our visionary brother sees a First Presidency endowed of course with those extraordinary powers of S. D. C. so tenaciously contended for by the Presidency of the Reorganization.

Unfortunately however the above says nothing about a First Presidency. The work done by Alma was such as could have been done by any ordinary elder holding presiding authority in branch, field, or district.

Later on, there was placed upon Alma the office of Chief Judge. This was an office of state. It was conferred by the people in an election, and must not be confounded with that of his office of high priest previously placed upon him. Mosiah 13:54-65. Concerning this dual position, that of an officer of state, and a high priest in the Church, our brother tells us that "this is strikingly in accord with modern revelation to the First Presidency." Again he says, "We find Alma as President of the church doing about what the President of the Church is told to do in the revelations through Joseph Smith." What, would he have us believe that Pres. Smith should also be an officer of state, the chief judge, the president of the nation? Is this a veiled revival of that delusion that inspired his grandfather to accept nomination for the Presidency of the United States, and for which the twelve apostles were sent out to electioneer? These facts are so patent to the student of history that questioning will not be made.

The Book of Mormon student will not fail to observe that the references pointed out by our brother are taken from that part of the Book of Mormon where the law of Moses was operative. "And they were strict

in observing the ordinances of God, according to the law of Moses; for they were taught to keep the law of Moses until it should be fulfilled." Alma 16: 4.

Under the Mosaic administration one may find many things that were later discarded when the apostolic administration came into operation. Slavery, burnt offerings, circumcision, feast days and Sabbath days were rigidly enforced until "the times of the reformation," when an apostolic administration took charge of affairs. With the passing of the old law there was necessarily a passing of a portion of the official administration. "For the *priesthood being changed* there is made of necessity a change also of the law." Heb. 7: 12.

If our brother had gone to the New Testament part of the Book of Mormon, he would have found something applicable to the christian dispensation. The ministry called into general charge of the Church was apostolic in character, and nowhere did it ever provide for a First Presidency. The following from the Book of Mormon is pertinent to the question:

"And it came to pass that when Jesus had said these words, he perceived that there were some among them who marveled and wondered what he would concerning the law of Moses; for they understood not the saying, that old things had passed away, and that all things had become new. And he said unto them, Marvel not that I said unto you, that old things had passed away, and that all things had become new. Behold I say unto you, that the law is fulfilled that was given unto Moses. . . . therefore, it hath an end." 3 Nephi 7: 3-6.

Following the appearance of the Lord amongst his disciples, the administration of the Church was committed to the "Twelve" whom Jesus had chosen.—"And now it came to pass that when Jesus had spoken these words, he looked upon the twelve whom he had chosen, and said unto them, Remember the words which I have spoken. For behold, ye are they whom I have chosen to minister unto this people." 3 Nephi 6: 1-2. See also pages 633, 635, 650, 651, 652.

We are told that the Mosaic economy was a "shadow of good things to come." Just so! And who did Moses himself foreshadow? A president??? Let the scriptures answer:

"For Moses truly said unto the fathers, A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you. . . . Unto you first God, having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities." Acts 3: 22, 26.

Jesus Christ was the substance foreshadowed by Moses; he, *only*. And be it remembered that Jesus was no president; he was "The Lord of life and glory."

It is true that Jesus was part of that trinity that rules the universe, known *not* as a presidency, but as the Godhead. Of this, a leading elder said to me a short while ago that in order to preserve this divine fitness it was necessary to have a first presidency of three who might occupy as God in the Church. What blasphemy! How ignorant that elder of the prophecy indicating that just such a condition that would arise in the Church. Note the following unerring prophecy:

"Let no man deceive you by any means; for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that MAN OF SIN be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth HIMSELF above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as

GOD sitteth in the temple of God, showing HIMSELF that HE is god." 2 Thes. 2: 3, 4.

This prophecy was first demonstrated in the elevation of the Papacy to the exalted position of Supreme Head of the Church—S. D. C. and is again fulfilled in the elevation of the latter day First Presidency to the position of supreme director and controller—S. D. C. And now that the elders of the Reorganized Church are coming out boldly acclaiming the necessity of having a three on earth the same as the three in Heaven, there is no longer any questioning as to who the latter day "Man of Sin" is.

If a fitness of the heavenly is necessary, we have it clearly stated as to who the trinity in Heaven represent:

"For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness on earth, the Spirit, and the Water, and the blood; and these three agree in one." 1 John 5: 7, 8.

Here then, is the presidency on earth, if we may be excused in using so profane a word to express it. It was the SPIRIT, the WATER and the BLOOD.

The Spirit was sent to take the place of Christ, of which he often spake: "It is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away the comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you. And when HE is come, he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment: . . . Howbeit when he, the spirit of truth, is come, HE will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak; and he will show you things to come."

Ah yes, the Church of Christ is precious, and its sacred treasury must not be exposed to the pilfering of a Godless generation. Christ Jesus the Lord, is still Head of the Church and is present with the Body through the power and operation of the Holy Spirit, and it ill becomes any man to assume the prerogatives of Him who spoke as never man spake: "And he is the head of the body of the church; who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead; that in all things He might have the preeminence." Col. 1: 18.

Our brother quotes the circumstance of Peter, James and John going up into a mountain with the Lord as a sure proof that they were a first presidency. Yes, and a leading advocate in contending for the claims of Mary Eddy to church leadership, set forth the circumstance of Jesus talking with the woman at the well, as proof positive that woman leadership was thereby designed. It is remarkable what some people will see in a little prayer meeting on the mountain side. But what about Moses and Elias who were also in that mountain gathering? Were they also a part of that Presidency? There is no limit to the number they are liable to set over us as Heads. In the early days of the church they had SEVEN HEADS. Note the following:

"President Joseph Smith then introduced Oliver Cowdery, Joseph Smith, Sen., Hyrum Smith and John Smith for assistant Counselors, these last four, together with the first three, are to be considered the HEADS OF THE CHURCH." Sept. 3, 1837. Millennial Star 16: 56. Rather a Smithy head!

There is considerable said in the prophecies about a certain nondescript animal having seven heads, but it would be sacrilegious to suggest that this is what prompted the latter day inspiration that would put seven heads over us. But then it only shows how fickle

this presidency of THREE is. The Reorganization has been under the dominion of only two men, up to a short while ago.

Again our brother tells us that three of the disciples were taken into the garden to watch whilst Jesus prayed. Yes, and they all went sound asleep. Probably in this respect a very fitting representation of the First Presidency.

Our brother next urges the conference at Jerusalem as affording evidence of a First Presidency. He failed to quote the scripture however which states in no less than five places that it was a conference of the "apostles and elders." See Acts 15: 2, 4, 6, 22, 26. When that conference delivered judgment that brought peace with the whole church." See vs. 22, 23. Now if there was a First Presidency there, with its supreme directorial power the text should have stated that judgment emanated from the "First Presidency, together with the Twelve and the Elders," or possibly there would have been no mention of the elders or the apostles. Rather from the First Presidency as a "WORD OF INSPIRATION."

Yes it is true that Paul alludes to James, Cephas, and John, "who seemed to be pillars." And of course the ancient way of spelling P-R-E-S-I-D-E-N-C-Y was P-I-L-L-A-R-S. Wonderful!!! But how was it that if those three men were occupying the distinguished position of the First Presidency that Paul was not more certain about it? To him they only "seemed to be pillars."

It will be interesting to recall that the same Paul in alluding to the quorum of the Twelve places them in a more responsible position. He saw them as the very foundation of the church. "And ye are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone." Eph. 2: 20.

If the First Presidency are to have place in the Church compatible with their supreme controlling dignity, they should be located somewhere beneath the foundation, as the very bedrock. But somehow or other the apostle overlooked noting that matter.

Our brother assails those who would doubt the revelations in the Doctrine and Covenants, declaring it will lead to rejecting the Bible and the Book of Mormon. If that is his estimate of the impregnable strength buttressing the Record of the Nephites and the Record of the Jews, that his faith in those two witnesses of the Ages could be shattered because of some discrepancy existing in certain of the latter-day revelations, then we would advise him to dig deeper, and he will no longer view them as being located "in the misty past."

If his reverence for the Doctrine and Covenants is so great, it will be interesting to have him explain why it was that a few years ago Walter W. Smith waited upon the Quorum of Twelve with a proposal to drop some eleven sections from that book. It was then recognized that the said Walter was serving as the henchman of the Presidency, or at least of the President. This information comes to me from one of the numerous axed-apostles belonging to the Reorganized Church, who will doubtless commit to writing his observations in the near future.

Our brother finally locates a First Presidency in Doc. and Cov. 7: 2. — "I will make thee (Peter) to minister for him (John) and for thy brother James; and upon you three I will give this power and the keys of this ministry until I come."

If the brother had been anxious to give us the whole truth about the matter he would have informed us that the above paragraph did not appear in the revelation as first given. Any one may determine this by turning to the Book of Commandments Chap. 6. The Book of Commandments was first given to the world in 1833, whereas the Book of Doctrine and Covenants did not make its appearance until five years after the Church was organized, in 1835.

Perhaps the brother will now be willing to explain why that revelation was changed. Was it God who changed His own word, or was it the work of man? If it was God who changed it, we shall be glad to be informed as to when it was that the Almighty repealed that statute of the ages, "I am the Lord, I change not." Or if it was mere man who altered the revelation, then pray tell us what value does an altered, amended revelation carry in the eyes of intelligent people?

Is this the best the Presidency can do to sustain their scriptural calling, quote from an altered, mutilated revelation??

The strongest proof presented by our brother for the First Presidency is reserved for the "last wild charge!" D. C. 104: 11, 42. It would have been disastrously illuminative if he had told us that this revelation was not given until after March 28, 1835.

The first Presidency had already been set up, and how it got there is the mystery. Joseph Smith had been previously ordained to that office Jan. 25, 1832, at a Conference at Amherst, Ohio, which does not give any evidence in itself of being a general conference. There was no previous revelation calling him to that position that we have any knowledge of, nor is there any information as to whether the conference at Amherst ever acted on a resolution purporting to be a revelation sanctioning the call of Joseph Smith. Probably that was why Joseph, perceiving the impropriety of the transaction, met with a "Council" three months later, and was by them acknowledged in the office to which he had been previously ordained. This was done at Independence.

The revelation, however, that gave birth to the First Presidency, was not given until three years and two months after the ordination of Joseph Smith at Amherst, Ohio.

If the First Presidency is the head of the Church, then we have the gruesome spectacle of the Church being born without a head. Certainly the history covering the introduction of the First Presidency into the Church is a very entangling affair. We wish that John Whitmer, the God appointed historian, had said something about that important event in his very interesting record, a copy of which lies before us. Was it too small for him to notice, or did the event really take place? We wonder!

In conclusion, let me say that the Church of Christ stands for the revelations in their original form inasmuch as they agree with the Bible and the Book of Mormon in principle and in truth.

Daniel Macgregor.

"WHY a First Presidency in the Church?"

Under the above caption, in *The Saints' Herald* for November 25, one of the Editors endeavors to enlighten doubting minds in reference to this question. The writer, while not taking a positive stand against a First Presidency, has lately developed some doubts due to investigation not hitherto made. Like many others,

Zion's Advocate

issued on the 15th of each month in the interests of the

Church of Christ

at Independence, Missouri

Address all communications to

Zion's Advocate

TEMPLE LOT

INDEPENDENCE, MISSOURI

Published under the direction of the Board of Publication,
Offices on Temple Lot, at Independence, Missouri

EDITORS

Daniel Macgregor Independence, Mo.
Thomas J. Sheldon 1416 W. Walnut, Independence, Mo.
Clarence L. Wheaton 1225 S. Delaware, Independence, Mo.

BUSINESS MANAGER

Alma O. Frisby, Route 1, Box 218, Independence, Missouri

foreign countries

Subscription is \$1.00 per year in United States and \$1.25 in

in accepting the gospel he accepted the church that brought it to him, with all that pertained to it. But some questions were asked in *Zion's Advocate*, Vol. 2, No. 6, page 4, relative to the silence of the New Testament and Book of Mormon on the subject, which he could not answer, and which the above mentioned editorial also fails to answer. The writer is still open to the reception of light. The fact that some of the first revelations to the church were changed from the way they were first published, so as to make provision for a first presidency, presents an obstacle that is hard for some to get over. This logically places such revelations at a discredit, as also all later revelations supporting the changes made. Under these conditions the Bible and Book of Mormon must be our standards of appeal.

Reference is made to the Doctrine and Covenants to support the necessity for a First Presidency, and taking the book as a whole, with those changed revelations, there is no trouble proving the contention. But there are *those changes* facing us all the time, making it all the more necessary to rely on that which is written in the two standard books of the church. Hence we are especially interested in the citations to the Bible and Book of Mormon.

We are referred to Num. 11: 16, 17, and to Exodus 24: 14, 15, to prove there was a presidency in the Mosaic economy. And while these particular passages seem to indicate that two men were closely associated with Moses upon two occasions, they do not prove that the three composed a First Presidency. That is mere inference. If there was a First Presidency at that time, what became of it at Moses' death? If it is answered that with the taking of Moses God also took the high priesthood away (and hence the presidency of the high priesthood)—be careful—for the *Herald* Editor contends that there was a First Presidency in the church among the Nephites after the death of Moses, and prior to the coming of Christ. How could there be a First Presidency if the high priesthood did not exist on earth? And if it was among the Nephites, how did they get it, seeing their ancestors were with Israel when God took Moses and the "holy priesthood out of their midst"? See D. C. 83: 4. So to be consistent the Editor should be able to show a First Presidency all along the line down to Christ among the Israelites, as well as among the Nephites which he assumes. We

should not lose sight of the fact that Moses was a military as well as a spiritual leader. He was raised up expressly to lead Israel out of bondage into the land which God had given their fathers. Moses did not live to see the task finished. But after they were settled in the land, conditions of government and leadership were greatly changed. We find no more such leaders or rulers as was Moses, but government by a system of Judges; that was God's plan.

A sentimental appeal is made to the work of the late President Joseph Smith as evidence of God's approval of a First Presidency. All will agree that he was a great and a good man, and that God blessed him. But God blessed David and Solomon. Does that prove that God approved of a monarchical form of government? The logic would be just as applicable in one instance as the other. The fact is the people rejected God from reigning over them, and wanted a king. God told Samuel to warn them of the results of their choosing, but they insisted in having their own way, and God permitted it. Read 1 Sam. 18: 7, 10-22. After that, God gave them revelations appointing and removing kings, although it was not according to his original design of government. He blest them to the extent that he could, considering the remote distance from him to which they had removed themselves. It is thus in every dispensation. But it does not show that God approves of all that they may have entered into. But it does, on the other hand, prove the wonderful love and mercy of God toward his wayward children. He met them on the ground of their choosing, but not to bless them as he would have done had they adhered to the plan he gave them. They were farther away from God by reason of the choice they had made; but that was not God's fault. And now some of us (doubters) are wondering if it is possible that in this last dispensation history has repeated itself. This from the standpoint of an inquirer.

In his attempt to prove a First Presidency by the New Testament, the Editor makes the mistake that is usually made by elders of the Reorganization. Referring to the account of the transfiguration (Matt. 17: 1-4), and of Christ's agony in the garden (Matt. 26: 36-38), where in each instance Peter, James, and John are mentioned as being especially chosen to be with the Lord, he adds:

"After Christ's departure these three appeared as in charge to speak for the church."

Then he quotes the following:

"And when James, Cephas and John, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given unto me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship: that we should go unto the heathen, and they unto the circumcision." Gal. 2: 9.

Again he says:

"At a time of grave crises one of these men, James, gave a decision in council exactly as one member of the presidency might speak for the entire quorum:"

"Wherefore my sentence is that we trouble not them which from among the Gentiles are turned unto God." Acts 15: 19.

Now the James referred to in these two citations could not have been the same James who with Peter and John were so often referred to as being especially close to their Lord, for this reason: Acts 12: 1, 2, says:

"Now about that time Herod the king stretched forth his hands to vex certain of the church. And he killed James the brother of John with the sword."

This was in A. D. 44., which was eight years before the council at Jerusalem in which one James expressed his sentence. This was A. D. 52. And it was fourteen years after the death of James, the brother of John (the son of Zebedee, and who was with Jesus), when a "James, Cephas and John" gave Paul and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship, which was in A. D. 58, according to our Bible chronology. The James mentioned in Acts 15: 19, and in Gal. 2: 9, no doubt, was James, the Lord's brother. See Gal. 1: 19. Too bad to spoil a pleasing theory, but theories should not be accepted when contrary to proven facts.

James was not the only one to express an opinion in that Jerusalem council, for Peter, Paul and Barnabas are also mentioned as expressing themselves. James joined in with them. And further, there is nothing to indicate that this was a council of the First Presidency, or a joint council of the presidency and twelve, but rather a council of the "apostles and elders." Acts 15: 2, 4. It was these who were appealed to, and these were those who sat on the council. However, we should note that in this same chapter there is mention made of "prophets," but these were "Judas and Silas," not Peter and James, and did not belong to a First Presidency. See Verse 32.

And so far as "James, Cephas and John" being a first presidency, we had just as well assume that they were a "committee" on church government. One assumption is as good as the other. We fail to see where there is any foundation in fact for either.

It is hard for us to give up this long cherished belief, but if there is anything outside the Doctrine and Covenants to support, by positive evidence, the belief in a first presidency, it is yet to be produced. We are still open to the reception of light, and still inquiring "Why?"

H. E. Moler.

Church at Council Bluffs

A church consisting of twenty-five members has been organized at Council Bluffs, Iowa, where Bro. Macgregor has been laboring recently. Elder Chas. Putnam is pastor, Elder M. A. Smith being associated with him. William T. Faye is secretary, and Sr. Charlotte Dryden is treasurer.

The Sunday school is in charge of Louisa Thomas as superintendent, Melvina Richieson, secretary, and Sr. M. A. Smith, treasurer.

May we be co-laborers together with God.

Ingathering in the East

Bro. J. D. Suttell sends in seven names from one point, and among the number is an elder, a priest, and a teacher. We hope to hear that these good people organize themselves and hold regular services to encourage one another, and offer a church home for others who might become cold and indifferent without the help that association and service affords.

Mission in St. Louis

Brn. C. L. Wheaton and E. K. Patterson have been laboring in St. Louis. Three baptisms to date, with prospects of others in the near future. The people attending manifest their interest by the questions asked, and the invitations to the missionaries to visit and talk with them.

THE TEMPLE LOT, WHERE?

The Temple Lot is a portion of a tract of land consisting of 63 acres that was purchased by the church in 1832. The Temple Lot comprises something like two and one half or about three acres, and is the highest part of the tract. It is referred to in section 57: 1, of Doctrine and Covenants, as follows:

"And the spot for the temple is lying westward upon a lot which is not far from the courthouse."

We are in receipt of this question:

"Is there any sworn testimony to the effect that the property owned by the Church of Christ is the location that was dedicated for the temple site?"

We answer that there is. When the Reorganization was suing for the Temple Lot a number of witnesses were brought into court to identify the property. We give extracts from the testimony.

Robert Weston testified:

"I came to Independence in 1827 or '28. I knew this piece of property out here in Independence, Missouri, called the Temple property.—Yes, sir, it is true that whenever this property was spoken of by anybody from 1830 or '31 down to the present time it has been spoken of as the Temple property, or the Temple Lot; that is, from the time they first got it; that is the way they designated it. Everybody who lived here at that time knew where it was, and it was known as the Temple Lot. The piece of ground that was called the Temple Lot in 1830, '31, '32, '33 and up to '34, was the piece of ground that is called the Temple Lot now."

Ember Mason testified:

"I know exactly where the piece of ground that is fenced and called the Temple Lot is:—This ground has always been known as the Temple Lot, ever since I came to this country.—When I first came here in 1833, the Temple Lot was mostly timbered land."

Wm. R. Wilson testified that he came to Independence in 1839, when a child of three. At the time of his testimony he was fifty-six years of age. He remembered hearing about the saints being driven out, and he said:

"I heard about the Temple Lot at that time; knew where it was located at that time; have known where it was located ever since I was big enough to know anything. It has always been called the Temple Lot ever since I have been here. If anybody had come to me during any of the time that I have lived here and asked me to point out the Temple Lot I could have done so."

John Taylor joined the church in 1832. He came to Independence in 1833. He testified:

"Edward Partridge took me to the corner stone or the stone that marked the Temple, he and Mr. Morley together, and said that was the place where the Temple was to be built.—I know the property that is in litigation in this suit. I stood on the ground, and Bishop Partridge showed me where it was."

The above evidence will be found in the Record Temple Lot Suit, pages 172, 252, 248, 249, 253, 413, 414, 446-448, 188; also see testimony of Hiram Rathbun, Sr., page 230. It corroborates the foregoing, but introduces nothing new, hence we do not give it, as our space is limited.

Geo. D. Cole was a member of the Church of Christ from 1870. He became an officer in the church, and was a most estimable man. He played on the Temple Lot when a child. He says:

"I remember talking with Dr. McLellan several years before his death in Independence regarding the ground. Like every other believer in the prophecy concerning the building of a house on the Temple Lot, I was anxious to know the spot to an inch where the corner stone was laid. The Doctor told me that the corner for the Temple was marked when the spot was dedicated, but there was no trace of the stone when I talked with him. While he was unable to locate to the inch the exact spot of the corner, yet he pointed out the ground now within the enclosure of the Temple Lot fence as being the place dedicated for the building of the Temple."

Geo. P. Frisbey, another member of the Church of Christ said: "I came from Bloomington, Ill., to Independence, in the spring of 1867, because of a revelation Granville Hedrick received in 1864, stating that the way would be opened up in 1867 so the saints could begin to gather again on the land of Zion. I have lived in Jackson County ever since and am well acquainted with the ground commonly known as the Temple Lots—I mean the ground lying on the west side of the street now known as River Boulevard and between Walnut and West Electric streets containing about three acres, and now in the possession of the Church of Christ, of which I am a member and officer. The Temple Lots were well known as such by the residents of Independence whom I met on my arrival in 1867. Soon after our arrival, under the counsel of Elder Granville Hedrick, our people began to buy up the Temple Lots. We did not make any effort to buy the entire 63 acres originally purchased by the church, but sought that portion dedicated for the site of the Temple. There was no difficulty in identifying the spot as the spot had become famous because of its peculiar history. Among other men I met in Independence at an early day was Dr. Wm. E. McLellan, a member and officer of the old church in Independence before the expulsion in 1833. I have talked with him about the spot dedicated for the site of the Temple, and he assured me that the piece of ground now known and recognized as the Temple Lot embraced the spot dedicated in 1831 for the spot of the Temple. During all my forty-one years' residence in Independence it has been generally understood and stated that the spot dedicated for the Temple is contained in the present enclosure of ground possessed by the Church of Christ. I have talked with dozens of persons familiar with the circumstances of the early church's experience in Jackson County, and have been told many times by different men who lived here in 1832 and knew the facts, that we had the place commonly known as the spot for the Temple."

The statements of George D. Cole and George P. Frisbey, as well as the testimony of the witnesses introduced in the Temple Lot suit were printed in the *Evening and Morning Star* for May, 1909, page 3, a paper that was formerly published by the Church of Christ.

Copy of Deeds.

In Remembrance

As we go to press word reaches us of the death of "Captain" George Potts, father-in-law of Bishop McGuire. Brother Potts helped the *Advocate* in a substantial manner, because he believed in "proving all things." We feel that truth has lost a friend, and we extend our sympathy to the bereaved relatives.

SOCIAL MEETINGS

It is a joy to look through the pages of fine old publications and there is the thrill of discovery when we come across gold nuggets of thought and expression. We experienced that sensation when we read an article in the *Evening and Morning Star* for January, 1909, Vol. 9, No. 9, on "Social Meetings." Space will not permit giving the entire article, but some of the thoughts are as follows:

"Habitual practice of participating in these meetings helps to form a liking for them in the minds of those who take part. This liking tends to grow into a habit until by and by the habitual attendant finds himself eagerly looking forward to a recurrence of social meetings, and 'lost' if he should miss a session. The mere habit, then, of attending social meetings, while perhaps the least valuable of the results to flow from it, is nevertheless of worth. The man or woman who develops a habit of attending social religious meetings is not apt to be found frequenting the pleasure resorts or to be found in questionable company on the Lord's day.

"We never know the hearts and minds of others, and oft times behind the mask of a smiling face, sorrow sits enthroned."

"Discouragement is constantly at work seeking to break down the man 'who tries.' Oft times but a word or two uttered in the hearing of the tried and tempted proves a veritable benefaction. A sentiment spoken from the heart often is more weighty than a long and lengthy discourse without real sympathy back of it. The man who feels he has a big load to bear goes to social meeting. Pretty soon he finds himself listening to the trials and difficulties of others whose burdens, when contrasted with his own, he finds are much larger, or perhaps he hears some one whom he knows is bearing a grievous burden, speak with hope and courage. As he sees the cheerfulness of others he becomes ashamed of his own complaining and with a little reflection soon finds that he, too, can find a bit of cheer to add to the occasion.

"Oft times in social meetings experiences are related which are valuable to those who hear them. Some one struggling to overcome an evil habit, hears another tell of his struggle and triumph over, perhaps, the self same sin he is doing battle with, and the recital of the experience of the victorious one serves to cheer the man who is struggling but has not yet overcome.

"No one can measure the good likely to come from experiences gathered in social meetings. The writer, after many years, still retains a vivid recollection of prayers offered in his behalf in social meetings. These prayers were effectual, too, in obtaining the results sought and desired. Some of the greatest benefits reaped by the Church of Christ have followed united efforts of prayer offered in social meetings. Many a convert has risen from his seat and professed Christ as a result of the overpowering influence attending a social meeting. We do not know what soul is waiting to get at a social meeting its first impetus in the pathway of peace. Malachi tells of a great blessing to be given those who meet together to speak on His name. How beautiful and encouraging are the sentiments contained in his third chapter, verses 16 and 17.

"Then they that feared the Lord spake often one to another; and the Lord hearkened and heard it, and a book of remembrance was written before him for them that feared the Lord, and that thought upon his name.

deem it wise that our space be more devoted to teaching the gospel and setting forth the positions of the church in an affirmative manner, without making attacks upon other factions whom we consider as our brethren, though they differ from us. There are profitable fields of literary expression that we can engage in which will not only be enlightening as to our position upon the various differences, but be beneficial in a constructive, spiritual way as well. The Church of Christ has always maintained that the Restoration was brought about for the purpose of correcting the spiritual, economic and social evils existing in the world to-day, and it is our duty to let our light shine forth undimmed by bitterness or strife. Let us remember that the whole field of opportunity as revealed in the angel's message is before us. The field is white for harvest and the laborers are few. Zion has not been redeemed; the gathering has not been effected; the temple has not been built; equality has not been established, and the endowment has not been given. There are millions of people in the world that have not heard the fulness of the gospel as taught by the Church of Christ in these last days, yet we are given to understand that all these things must be and will be realized before the winding up scenes of the last days shall take place. Let us do our part in relieving the needs of those who are suffering from the famine of the last days, not of bread only, but of hearing the word of God.

It is written that every plant which the heavenly Father has not planted shall be rooted up. It is one of the rules of life that that which does not have the germ of life within it, will destroy itself. History records the downfall of individuals, principalities, churches and nations that have gone contrary to this law. Let us therefore be patient, long-suffering and full of love. Let us be temperate in all things, and be builders in Christ, and by the use of the pen, the spoken word and our hands, work for the glory of God and the salvation of his people.

C. L. Wheaton
T. J. Sheldon
A. O. Frisbey
(Board of Publication.)

NEWS AT HOME

Good prayer meetings.

Our pastor, Bro. F. B. Shirk, gave us a good talk on the need of prayer, admonishing us to be careful that we did not neglect this important factor in our spiritual life.

Two better sermons are not commonly heard in our church than were delivered by Elders Madden and Mann, two brethren nearing eighty. All enjoyed the testimonies and strong words of assurance borne by these two aged gospel veterans.

Other speakers of the month were T. J. Sheldon, R. V. Roberts, and Andrew Himes.

Our congregation is enjoying new song books, Hymnals, a present for most part, from the Sunday school.

NOTICE

Those of the priesthood applying for membership upon their original baptism, please send the following information along with your application, date city and state where ordained, and names of all men officiating, if possible. This information will make unnecessary further correspondence and expedite the forwarding of your license.

WHY I AM THANKFUL

Just a small portion of the "generation" remains, as some of us believe, since the angel's message came forth in 1830. Nearly a century has passed, and Zion is not yet redeemed; Israel is still scattered. Those who long for righteousness yet wonder where the people of God really are. The Gentile church is divided, cruelly divided. "By their fruits ye shall know them." What fruits have we produced?

Only those who are willing to abide the celestial plan can bring about Zion. If the celestial plan were in operation Zion would be a reality instead of a long-looked-forward-to dream. This higher plan was revealed to the latter day prophet, but the human entered in. Early in the thirties they raised their voices proclaiming that Christ's coming was near, even at the door. Why hasn't he come yet? Why has not the hope of Mormonism been more fully realized? Alas! idols have existed, and do exist in the hearts of the people, even among those who seem zealous in prayer.

Reviewing the failure and the wreckage the thought will come, What have we to be thankful for to-day? The question finds an answer in some of the splendid prayer services on the Temple Lot—"We are thankful for the *desire* to seek God and live in righteousness." The workers may be few, as the parable of Zenos says they will be (Jacob 3:136, Book of Mormon), but so were the number of faithful men who lapped water, and were instrumental in delivering the Midianites into the hands of Israel. (See Judges 7.)

But what can a *few* do? some may ask. They can have open minds and contrite hearts. They can be wholly consecrated to the cause of truth and righteousness, and they can strive for faith, for implicit confidence in God, like the brother of Jared had. Who of us would present two stones to God for him to give them illuminating quality? One sister to whom I made this remark said, "Oh, we have modern means of lighting now." True, but suppose we were placed under circumstances where we had *need* of light we could not supply, would we have faith to look to the Lord in our extremity?

I thank Israel's God to-day for the gospel; for the privilege of living in this last dispensation when all shall be gathered into one, and for the fellowship of those who are desirous of being set in order. I am thankful for association with those who are looking for Christ to lead his people, and who are endeavoring to build on the foundation of 1829 and 1830.

I thank our Father who is watching and is ready to assist us for peace and rest of mind, and for freedom of thought in this Church of Christ. We have golden opportunities, and never before has the church been forced to its knees as now. For what shall we pray? What shall be the ideal towards which we shall strive? What else, indeed, but humility, love, peace, and great faith that will qualify us, and enable us to assist the "remnant" in Zion's redemption.

Cora M. Reynolds, R. R. 3, Independence, Mo.

NOTICE

By virtue of action of the late semi annual conference, I hereby appoint Elder Wm. F. Shaub and Sister Cora M. Reynolds to complete the committee on selections and arrangements for a Hymn book.

H. E. Moler.

Holden, Mo., 400 E. 4th St., Dec. 2, 1925.