

# 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."—1 Nephi 3:187.

Published Monthly by the Church of Christ

"Entered as Second-Class Matter May 14, 1929, at the Post Office at Independence, Mo. under the Act of March 3, 1879"

VOLUME 6

INDEPENDENCE, MISSOURI, SEPTEMBER, 1929

NUMBER 9

## KICKING AGAINST THE PRICKS

From across the Pacific, a contributor to the Saints' Herald for July 17, whose mental vision appears to be badly obscured by the "confusion of tongues" of which he writes, draws some erroneous conclusions concerning The Church of Christ and the building of the Temple, which, of course, is based on certain revelations that did not come to us in the way it is thought they ought to have come. He observes:

"What a spectacle is now presented to our view. Men are on record that the church went into apostasy in April, 1925, because it adopted a revelation which was false! Who said it was false? Those who went out. Why did they judge it false? Clearly because it did not suit their views of conducting the affairs of the kingdom. Were they correct? To an onlooker across the Pacific it appears that they merely suffered from the recurrence of the spiritual confusion of tongues and the accompanying dispersion."—P. 862.

Our brother should be the last man in the world to raise such an issue. Does he not know that the "spectacle" he views from across the Pacific is but a repetition of the "recurrence of the spiritual confusion of tongues and the accompanying dispersion" at Nauvoo? And does not he know, too, that the church he represents today occupies a relative position with the dominant faction of 1846? If he will carefully read the third volume of his own church history he will see the deadly parallel that spells "apostasy" for both institutions. The trouble with our brother is this: he is so far away that he gets but a faint view of what really happened, and is still happening. His observation is based on ex parte information which has been highly colored to suit the occasion. The background to the picture is lost to his view because of the glare of the footlights which have been turned in his face. Truly, he sees through a glass darkly.

Of the situation at Nauvoo our misinformed brother says truthfully:

"Traitors to the truth fomented trouble at Nauvoo and caused turmoil there just prior to the Martyr's assassination. Then, with their deaths, the spirit that had been in evidence in heaven when the third part of the angels rebelled at the instigation

of Lucifer, flamed forth, and there were many aspirants for leadership. Again, there was a confusion of tongues—and a consequent dispersion. Many factions arose, the leader of each allegedly called of God. The spiritual content of the message was altered in all of the factions, both by subtraction and addition. Some of the additions were so hideous as to unmistakably brand the work as that of Satan."—P. 861.

Now, against the "hideous" additions the brother mentions, there were a few bold and daring individuals who protested. Yes, they were "Protestors" in the true sense of the term—and THEY WITHDREW FROM THE CHURCH! In turn, they were promptly branded as "rebels," silenced and excommunicated.

Elder James J. Strang was one of the numerous "aspirants" who arose immediately after the death of the Martyrs. He produced a document—which I have been told by those who saw it—was in the handwriting of Joseph Smith, whereby Mr. Strang was appointed by the Seer to be his successor. Jason W. Briggs, one of the leading protestors, declared that he saw in vision Joseph Smith writing the document. In the winter of 1846 Jason W. Briggs, Zenas H. Gurley, Wm. Marks, Emma Smith, et al., withdrew from the church and united with James J. Strang. Mark it well—THEY WITHDREW FROM THE CHURCH because of the "hideous additions." On April 8, 1846, Mr. Strang ordained Jason W. Briggs an high priest. And on the same date Wm. Marks was ordained a Bishop by Mr. Strang. Again on August 26, 1849, Bishop Marks was ordained an Apostle by Mr. Strang, and he was also ordained and set apart to administer baptism for the dead. Be it also remembered that at the Voree conference of April 6, 1846, James J. Strang was acknowledged and upheld as President, Prophet, Seer, Revelator and Translator to the church. Wm. Marks made the motion.

Some time in 1850 Jason W. Briggs withdrew from Strang's organization and joined William B. Smith's faction. Two years later Wm. Marks and Zenas H. Gurley left Strang and joined Charles B. Thompson's faction. In 1855 Wm. Marks left Thompson and joined a movement with John E.

## ZION'S ADVOCATE

Official Publication of the Church of Christ.  
Headquarters on the Temple Lot at Independence, Missouri.

### BOARD OF PUBLICATION

A. W. Bogue, W. P. Buckley, W. R. Dexter, A. O. Frisby  
and M. T. Jamison.

Editor: Elmer E. Long, 424 E. Walnut St.,  
Independence, Mo.

Address all matter for publication to the Editor.  
Business Manager—W. R. Dexter, Box 242  
Independence, Mo.

Address all orders and send all monies to the  
Business Manager.

Subscription Rates: One year, \$1.00; Six Months, 50 cents.  
In bundles of twelve or more for missionary purpose,  
\$1.00 per dozen.

Canadian Rates: Same as above.

## EDITORIAL

### THE ENEMY SHOWS HIS HAND

At last, the enemy who has been beating about the bush and hurling missiles at the workmen on the walls of Zion sallies forth to launch an open attack on the Church of Christ. We have waited patiently for this onslaught, content to bide the time when the man in the dark would expose his position in a way that he could not deny what he said. That time has come with the publication of "The Temple of the Lord, "Who Shall Build It," by J. F. Curtis, the man who "bluffs" his way through when he finds himself in a tight place.

But neither bluff, subterfuge, nor sophistry will avail him anything in this case. He is up against a proposition unlike anything he has met heretofore. The tables have been turned, and Apostle Curtis finds himself in a relative position with many of ignoble memory who opposed the Angel Message at the first.

*By the same old method, in the same old way,  
He fain would drive some people away.*

A casual reading of this latest charge from over the way, reminds one of the Book of Mormon plates and the Spaulding Romance story; or later still, the Kinderhook plates and the Fugate affidavits. The spirit of those early anti's still lives and flares forth to "shut up the kingdom of heaven against men," as it was in the days of old.

The one peculiar aspect of this latest uprising is the change of front of those who are engaged in it. In their mad endeavor to intercept the work of the Church of Christ, they themselves are casting an aspersion that bespatters the sacred mantle of Joseph Smith, and challenges the divinity of his prophetic utterances.

Apostle Curtis has written a sixty-four page booklet, and space in the Advocate is too limited for a comprehensive reply. But let Mr. Curtis and his fellows know that a reply is forthcoming. We will meet him with his chosen method of expression, and lay bare his glaring misrepresentations. We, too, have some affidavits of an interesting nature concerning the stone. Nor is that all—we have the stone, and WE HAVE THE TEMPLE LOT.

## KICKING AGAINST THE PRICKS

Temple was to be reared, and where the Lord said the redemption of Zion would begin, securing a warranty deed to the Temple Lot property which is now on record in the Court House at Independence, Missouri, subject to the inspection of any interested person. Moreover, the Church of Christ has an abstract down to date showing a clear title.

All this was done openly and above board, and no man said aught thereof. They settled in peace and they lived in peace with all men. They begun the redemption after "the way of law and order," which the Lord said was by purchase "beginning at the Temple Lot." They began at the right place, in the right way, to do the thing *the law said must be done*.

Some years later members of the Reorganization moved quietly into the regions roundabout, and when prejudice was allayed and the time seemed opportune, they sought to gain possession of the Temple Lot by "adroit efforts," but in each instance they failed to accomplish their purpose. "Ishmael shall not Isaac fetter, nor my temple David build." No, Ishmael, true to type, may oppose, misrepresent, harass, and by foul means seek to hinder the work commanded of God, but he will not be allowed to deprive the true seed and lawful heir of his birthright.

Now we would like to impress on the mind of our brother another important fact, namely; the Reorganization early assumed the position—which they still hold—that the Temple could not be lawfully built without a command from God. No such command has ever been received by them, and the time limit set by the Lord for the erection of his house has all but expired. The Church of Christ still holds the title to the Temple Lot which was obtained at the time of purchase, and which was made doubly secure by decision of the United States Supreme Court—where the Church of Christ, by divine appointment, exercises *supreme directional control*. And as long as the Church of Christ remains true to the trust imposed, as they have done for sixty-five years, the frenzied efforts of the "blind shepherds" to hinder the work now in progress will only add to their confusion and shame.

E. E. L.

### LEAVE IT TO FORD

Brother James E. Yates writes that he had just organized a church at Hamilton, Missouri, with twenty members, seventeen of whom were transfers made during the week's meetings.

Elder John T. Ford has lately bought a church building in Hamilton, on North Main Street, and opened it with a free pulpit, in harmony with the Church of Christ policy.

## THE VINEYARD

### THE FRUITS OF DARKNESS

The carping critic strokes his pen  
And writes some silly screed, and then  
He puts it in an envelope.  
Now, if he knew just what we think  
Of one who thus would "raise a stink,"  
He'd never send his poison dope.

He'd change his course and seek the fruits  
That come to those of clean pursuits—  
His every act bespeaks his hate.  
His reckless course of sin and shame  
Forbids that he should sign his name  
Lest he reveal his low estate.

But like the silly nincompoop,  
He thinks perchance we fain would stoop  
To dignify his wicked game.  
When we must fight from out the dark  
'Twill be when there is not a spark  
Of manhood left within our frame.

Our course is open, fair and square;  
And when we speak men know who's there—  
The truth ne'er hides itself in fear.  
And when we stand before the bar  
Of Him who says His sons we are,  
Where then will those who lie appear?  
E. E. LONG.



### WORK ON THE TEMPLE MOVING

Since the authorization of the start of the building of the Temple by the General Conference last April, the work of excavation has made considerable progress. An allowance of six feet was made outside of the dimensions given by the revelation of September 1, 1928, and down to the rock in accordance with the directions of the Messenger. Those who desire to contribute their services towards this work, should communicate with W. P. Buckley, Secretary of the Building Committee.

An interesting testimony has come forth in connection with the work of laying out the trenches, one of the many evidences that God has recognized all three of the members of the committee on plans for the Temple, and continues to do so. Numerous complaints have been offered by our critics because all three have not seen the Messenger, entirely overlooking the fact the revelations may be received from the Lord in many ways. At least four distinct methods occur to the writer, namely, dreams, visions,

prophetic revelations and angelic ministrations.

The responsibility of laying out the trenches fell upon Brother Nerren and myself. After fasting and prayer, we were able to understand clearly that which was required of us and to draw up a plan. Tuesday afternoon, July 16th, we secured a surveyor's transit and proceeded to accurately establish the line; a wonderful degree of the spirit was upon us as we did the work. On the evening of the following day, we wrote Brother Fetting and enclosed a draft of the plan we had followed. Before this reached him, the Messenger came to him and stated the plans were on the way, and *that they were correct.*

Let those scoff who may, but this work of the Lord will continue to move steadily onward, bringing forth testimony and evidence that it is Divine. The false rumors and derogatory statements being circulated by Mr. Frank Cutis and others, serve only as an index to the desperation and fear that is gripping officialdom across the way. The result of their efforts so far has been a steadily growing tide of transfers to the Church of Christ.

Our application for a permit to build was not denied by the Independence city council; an injunction against our work has not been served by the Reorganization; the Messenger has not instructed Brother Fetting to call a halt to the work on the Temple; the two marker stores found bear distinctly the date 1831, despite certain affidavits and the efforts of a prominent opposition official to mar the stone and make a 5 out of 3.

A galvanized wire fence now encloses the Temple grounds, admittance being freely granted to visitors by permit from the office. The intent of the fence is to prevent personal injury to spectators who might by chance fall into the excavation, as well as to prevent intrusion by irresponsible persons.

The first load of material was delivered this week by the May Lumber Company, some heavy lumber to brace the sides of the trenches where necessary.

WALTER L. GATES.

### GO THOU AND DO LIKEWISE

Pasadena, California,  
July 5, 1829.

There are only seven members of the church in this city so far. Early in the year, through sister Huddelson's gospel zeal, she began gathering in some children, some of them outsiders, into her home and started a Sunday School class, mostly because they were too poor to get to the regular places of meeting in and around Los Angeles. She kept praying for the Lord to influence the writer to come and join in and hold regular services.

We knew nothing of these meetings, nor of her desires, until one Sunday in February my wife urged me to go out and visit these people; so we drove out the next Sunday in our old Ford truck and found them holding forth in a nice little S. S. class. They invited me to preach, and to our greatest surprise and pleasure, they gathered in a nice house full of outsiders. (And by the way, I, too, had been praying for the Lord to give me some work to do so I could tell this gospel to outsiders.) Two months later we organized a church to be known as the "Church of Christ at Pasadena." We hold regular meetings, and some of these outsiders attend all the services, and are becoming very much interested in the church. We have had some good spiritual meetings, and we look for a harvest.

But as it is always the case, when Satan sees away or you are apt to be deceived." This has been a work being done, he gets busy whispering to "keep his tactics in this case, visiting among our hearers and bewildering those honest souls by telling them to "Beware of false prophets," and that "Satan comes as an angel of light." Satan's cunning tricks are always to quote scripture and misapply it. When he succeeds in this he has won his case. Notwithstanding this opposition, we have one family who think for themselves, and if they come in, will be well trained to meet all comers, so far as a knowledge of the truth goes.

This family is genuine, belong to the Disciple church, and they are free from prejudice. At present they are much interested in reading those messages from "John," about the building of the temple and the coming of the Son of God.

I am offering my time and talent, (with the pick and shovel or otherwise) for two months on the Temple next spring. My wife and I are planning to be there. Carrie can hardly wait till the 1930 Conference to take in this grand overture, and overture it will be to all who have their lamps trimmed and burhing."

That was a treat to read brother Long's little article in the Advocate on the "Midnight Cry." Such articles and short sermons boiled down are what will make the Advocate a success. I would like to see the Advocate made as good a real missionary paper as Zion's Ensign was some thirty years ago. What one says in words is often soon forgotten, but what we write lives on long after we are dead, and as we grow older we feel the need of being more careful what we write, especially for publication in defense of God's work. Let me relate one experience I had in writing an article recently:

I had just finished an article for publication, and on retiring to bed I had asked the Lord to let me know in his own way if the article pleased or displeased Him, to let me know before I sent it in. Just as I was getting up in the morning, the voice of the Spirit said to me: "It is satire." Those words kept

ringing in my ears and bothered me. I did not know the meaning of the word, "Satire," nor did I know there was such a word in the English language. I fully believed every word I had written was true, but lest there might be something wrong with the article, I went and got a dictionary to see if there was such a word in it, and to my surprise, I found the word and also the meaning of it. When I read the meaning of the word, I was so disappointed and humbled, I never will forget the meaning of that word, nor the lesson the Lord taught me in His own nice way. The word Satire means a "censorious discourse." So I tore up the article and thanked God for wisdom.

We cannot be too careful what we write in trying to build up the kingdom of God, for often in our blind zeal we think we are writing or saying the right thing, and while what we say may be true from one angle, it may displease God, injure our brother or sister and lower ourselves in the estimation of both God and all men, and may tend to tear down rather than build up the work of God we all believe to be genuine. Never again do we want to speak or write "Satire."

"The Blacksmith."

---

## A NOBLE WORKER PASSES ON

24 Vale Street,  
Pawtucket, R. I.,  
July 4, 1929.

Dear Editor:

There has been practically nothing to report of Providence church activities for the past two months due to the diminished attendance.

Brother Robert Otis MacKinnon, clerk and priest of the local church, and son of James T. MacKinnon, the pastor, passed away Wednesday, July 3rd, after an illness of six weeks. His passing was sudden and quiet, leaving all who knew him stunned and sorrowing.

A studious young man who toiled unceasingly during the past two years in church work; manager of "Branch Gleanings"—a local church publication; he visited the sick and has carried members to and fro from distant points in the last six months in all kinds of weather.

He was an active worker in the young peoples class in the past and by his efforts brought much cheer to many individuals. A loyal member, a true friend, he has gone ahead in to another sphere in the glory of young manhood, untarnished by the contacts of life. His memory will be cherished by many in the church of Christ, for through his duties as clerk he gained many correspondence friends throughout the country.

Yours sincerely,  
(Miss) Ruth W. Heywood

---

## STILL IN THE FAITH

It has not been my intention to wait so long before letting the saints know something about the little branch in DeKalb.

We are still in the faith, though a few of our younger members are not quite as active, some on account of severe trials we have had to pass through, and other cuses which cannot be avoided. Others have moved away.

We are hoping and praying—and hope the saints will remember us—that there may be a change for the better soon, and the work may move forward. We have had occasional visits from the ministry which has been a help to strengthen and encourage us, and we hope we may have more such visits whenever opportunity affords.

July 7-14 we had the pleasure of having apostle Flint, wife and daughter, Edna, with us, also Brother Daer, our pastor, brother and sister Knudston from near Ottawa, and Brother Vowels and family from Belvedere on July 7.

Mrs. Grace Lusha.

## SUBMISSION

By A. M. HARVEY

One step at a time  
It is better so,  
The way may be hard  
That I have to go.

But if Thou wilt hold  
My hand in Thine,  
Though the way may be hard  
I will not decline.

To follow where Thou  
Leadest me,  
Although the end  
I cannot see.

Hold Thou my hand  
And lead me where  
Thou wouldst have me go  
For I have no fear.

When Thou art with me  
I am safe,  
No power can thwart  
Thy saving grace.

I'll look up to Thee  
Increase my faith—that  
I may say:

Thy will not mine  
Be done  
For aye.

Composed July 4, 1929.

## PREDICTION AGAINST ASKALON FULFILLED

Askalon was a chief Philistine city, on the rocks by the sea. It was the birthplace of Herod the Great. Zechariah prophecies against it: "Askalon shall not be inhabited," Chapter 9, 5; while Zephaniah declared, Chapter 2, 4: "Askalon shall be a desolation." And again, verse 7; "and the coast shall be for the remnant of the house of Judah; in the houses of Askalon shall they lie down in the evening; for Jehovah, their God, will visit them, and bring back their captivity."—What does this prediction tell us? This. While the inhabitants should cease from Askalon, and itself should become desolation, it should nevertheless not pass out of existence but remain even unto the ingathering of Israel. "In the houses of Askalon shall they lie down in the evening!"

What is the fact? Has a fate like that described overtaken Askalon? Has it become desolation? Are the ruined houses of the city waiting to receive the returning children of Israel?

Listen to its checkered history! Askalon, the city of a Philistine lord, Joshua 13, 3, retained its strength until near the end of the 13th century. Then it became desolation. It was destroyed during the Crusades by the Saracens, the Sultan Bibars of Egypt tore down its fortifications and filled its harbor up with stones. It was rebuilt, however, "and held by a Turkish garrison so late as the beginning of the seventeenth century" (Urquhart.) But since that time it has "not been inhabited."

But what about the ruins? Do they still stand? Yes, they do. And the site which they occupy is very dreary. Says Dr. Thompson: "No site in this country has so deeply impressed my mind with sadness." He is of opinion, however, that some day Askalon will be rebuilt, since the "position is altogether too advantageous to allow it to sink into total neglect." Neither is the place doomed, as many others are, for want of water. There seems to be an abundance of it. When for example, in 1840, Ibrahim Pasha removed part of the ruins to bivouac Egyptian troops, "he uncovered no fewer than twenty wells of water." The cleared place has been converted into gardens.

The prediction of Scripture has some true, therefore. Askalon is not inhabited. It has become desolation. But, as the prophet said, it was to see, it is waiting, as day of restoration. That will be when "Jehovah will visit the children of Israel, and bring back their captivity." What has been fulfilled already is guarantee enough that the remainder will also be fulfilled in due time.

—From the Rocky Mountains.

## ORIGINAL ARTICLES

### REORGANIZATION OR CHURCH OF CHRIST—WHICH?

Anent the discussion of the position of the Church of Christ, in the Saints' Herald for July 10, 1929, the following historical digest, and conference action, makes mighty interesting reading at this time. It will be noted that the Church of Christ people invariably made the overtures for a closer relationship. It will be noted, too, that while an attempt is made to place an ugly charge against the Church of Christ, the purported revelation through Alexander H. Smith makes the Reorganization culpable. Needless to say, the Reorganization has never ceased to "strive for the mastery."

#### "CHURCH OF CHRIST"

"The following report from a committee on consultation with representatives of the Church of Christ was read:

"During the dark and cloudy day that followed the disruption of the church, at the death of Joseph and Hyrum Smith, and the apostasy of the leading elders of the church at Nauvoo, Illinois, there were many attempts made by the disappointed saints to find safe ground, and the true light. Several of these, seeking to find the better way, united to form the nucleus of the reorganization of the church. One of these groups of old-time Saints, which was striving to honor the law revealed in the restoration of the gospel, was located in Woodford County, Illinois. As early as 1856 *these Woodford County Saints sought to unite their efforts with those forming the Reorganization*. Elders Granville Hedrick and Jediah Owen, who had been elders in the old church, were sent to represent them, and were accepted and given the right hand of fellowship by the conference of the brethren of the Reorganization. No definite union, however, was formed, and the Woodford County Saints continued their work alone, gathering to themselves other elders who had received their ordination from the church, before the death of Joseph Smith, among them being Zebulun Adams, David Judy, John E. Page, and Adna C. Haldeman.

About 1867 these with others removed to Independence, Missouri, and organized, or *rather continued the branch organized by these brethren in Woodfod County, Illinois*. Elder Granville Hedrick was the presiding elder until his death. Subsequently the branch has been presided over by elders who received their authority through ordination, from these older and their successors; and have always maintained an honorable name and place among men, and have held their priesthood in righteousness before God.

At various times since 1856 efforts have been made by the eldership of the Church of Christ and of

the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints to form a working basis of harmony between them.

During the annual General Conference of April, 1885, held at Independence, Missouri, a committee consisting of Elders W. W. Blair, Stephen Maloney and I. A. Rogers of the Reorganized Church, were appointed to confer with a committee consisting of Elders Richard Hill, George P. Frisby and George Hedrick of the Church of Christ. A free exchange of views held by both organizations was had and a friendly discussion of the differences existing between them conducted.

In 1897 *overtures were again made by the elders of the Church of Christ*, and a joint committee composed of Elders Richard Hill, John R. Haldeman, George P. Frisby, George D. Cole and James A. Hedrick of the Church of Christ, and Elders Joseph Smith, Alexander H. Smith, Roderick May, George E. Harrington and William H. Garrett of the Reorganized Church. This group of men conferred from January 16 to 20, reaching a number of points of agreement.

Again in 1900 another joint committee, composed of Elders George P. Frisby, Abraham L. Hartley, Richard Hill, Alma Owen, George D. Cole and John R. Haldeman of the Church of Christ, and Elders Alexander H. Smith, Edmund L. Kelley, Herman C. Smith, Joseph Luff, Roderick May and Richard S. Salyards of the Reorganized Church conferred from March 6 to 11. They affirmed the agreements of the former committee with slight alterations and amendations, and adopted a further series of agreements, and adjourned; no permanent mutual working basis was then established; but a much better understanding of the grounds held by each organization was gained.

During the latter part of the year 1917, *a desire was expressed by the Church of Christ* for further conference upon the question of a working basis of harmony, and accordingly, on December 30, 1917, a joint committee, composed of Elders George D. Cole, Clarence L. Wheaton and James M. Hartley of the Church of Christ and Elders Francis M. Sheehy, Walter W. Smith and Mary H. Siegfried, of the Reorganized Church, met. There were also present by invitation of the elders of the Church of Christ, Eslie Stafford, Thomas J. Sheldon and Israel A. Smith, the latter acting as secretary of the meeting. The former articles of agreement were adopted with slight alterations and amendations. The whole ground of differences was reviewed in a spirit of candor and brotherly solicitude for the welfare and progress of Zion. Adjournment was taken to January 27, 1918, when an additional article of agreement, and a plan for submitting these articles for the approval of the two organization at the April General Conferences was adopted.

We most respectfully submit the following articles of agreement adopted by the joint committee, and recommend that they be adopted as the working basis of harmony between the two organizations:

#### AGREEMENTS OF WORKING HARMONY

1. Agreed, that we believe in the restoration of the gospel, and the angel's message through Joseph the Seer.
2. Agreed, that so far as the fundamental principles of the gospel of Christ are concerned, both organizations believe the same, as per copies of the epitome attached.
3. Agreed, that the Book of Mormon is a divine record, and the redemption of Zion must be by purchase.
4. Agreed, that we indorse the revelations contained in the 1835 edition of Doctrines and Covenants.
5. Agreed, that we indorse the revelation found in the letter from Joseph Smith, the Seer, to W. W. Phelps concerning the "one mighty and strong," dated November 27, 1832.
6. Agreed, that we indorse the articles on Marriage and of Governments and Laws in General, in the 1835 edition of Doctrines and Covenants.
7. Agreed, that we believe that there are individuals in the different factions who hold the priesthood.
8. Agreed, that where there are six or more regularly baptized members, any one of which is an elder, there the Church exists.
9. Agreed, that an organization is necessary and such an organization as the number of members, and the will of God enables them to attain to.
10. Agreed, that whenever a branch exists the power of church extension exists, when acting in harmony with the law.
11. Agreed, that any man holding the priesthood, and possessing the proper qualifications, may be chosen by the church, by acting in accordance with the law to act in any specific position.
12. Agreed, that faith and righteousness and the call of God are the chief essentials for the possession of the Melchisedec priesthood.
13. Agreed, that in the opinion of this council, in order to accomplish the work of the Lord committed to his people, it is necessary for them to unite in one organization, in harmony with the law of God.
14. Agreed, that the city of Zion will be built at Independence, Missouri, and that the saints of God will gather there.
15. Agreed, that the principle of consecration is necessary to the establishment of Zion.
16. Agreed, that the law of Christ requires that every man be a steward, and that none are exempt from this law who belong to the church of the living God, whether officer or member and that all shall be equal in temporal things, and that not grudgingly,

in order to be united according to the law of the celestial kingdom; and that the time has fully come to apply this law in Zion; and that we will labor together to see that it is enforced as soon as possible.

17. Agreed, that we believe in the literal gathering of Israel, and the restoration of the 'Ten Lost Tribes.'

18. Agreed, that Christ will reign personally upon the earth, and the earth will be restored to its paradisaical glory.

19. Agreed, that the question of who the one 'mighty and strong' is, whether Christ or man, be left an open question until further revelation from God shall definitely determine who it is.

20. Agreed, that the doctrine of baptism for the dead (by proxy) be not taught as a part of the faith and doctrine of the Church, unless commanded by a revelation accepted by the church.

21. Agreed, that what is known as the "King Follet sermon" and the book of Abraham be not accepted as the basis for doctrine.

22. Agreed, that the branch of the Church of Christ on the Temple Lot, which was presided over by Elder Granville Hedrick and his successors, shall be continued, and that no change be made in the custody of the Temple lot.

23. Agreed, that all other minor points of difference in belief and practice, that may exist between the officers and members of the two organizations, be left to the elders for settlement as they assemble in council from time to time.

24. Agreed, that whereas the Church of Christ and the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints consist of members who have been baptized by men holding authority, conferred by ordination under the hands of the servants of God, called during the ministry of Joseph Smith, who have remained true to the original faith of the church, organized April 6, 1830, and, whereas, both organizations stand for and maintain the *same fundamental doctrine and practice*, and have the *same purpose and ideal* in their church government and work; therefore, be it mutually agreed, that *each recognize the standing of the other as representing Christ, the Master, and the priesthood of each as legally constituted, and the administration of each as equally binding before, when done in accordance with the law.*

Resolved, that these articles of agreement be submitted to the General Conference of both organizations, which are to be held April 6, 1918, at Independence, Missouri, for approval as the working basis of harmony between the Church of Christ, and the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints.

FREDERICK M. SMITH, *Chairman.*

WALTER W. SMITH, *Secretary.*

*For the Committee.*

APRIL 6, 1918.

The report was adopted with but one dissenting vote.

We wish to call particular attention to Agreements 8, 9, 10 and 11, where the law touching minority rights is defined. With this fundamental law, the late President Joseph Smith was in strict accord when he testified under oath:

"A dozen individual would have the right to assemble in a church of their own free will and accord, and there was no restrictions in that, except of course they must have been members of the old original church."—Abstract, p. 70.

There can be no misunderstanding of this. The Reorganization can not consistently assume any other position, for it was born that way. If a dozen or more scattered individuals could withdraw from the Church, and with "no restrictions," organize and exercise the power of church extension, surely, a regularly organized branch that never was disorganized or disconnected with the "old original church," would have as much authority to exercise the power of church extension; especially is this true since it is admitted that they "have always maintained an honorable name and place among men, and have held their priesthood in righteousness before God."

It will be noted in the Committee's Report that the Woodford County branch was transferred to Independence and the organization continued. It has continued ever since, and from 1918 to 1926 was in fellowship with the Reorganization. Why was that fellowship discontinued? We shall see.

It is charged that the Church of Christ vitiated the Agreements of Working Harmony, though nothing is offered to sustain the charge other than mere assertion. The following from the Joint Council, dated April 7, 1926, and which was adopted by a unanimous vote of the General Conference, shows the animus of the Reorganization, which of itself vitiates Articles 8, 9, 10, 11, and 24 of the Agreements. It reads:

"And Whereas, constructions have been put upon the articles of agreement by the 'Church of Christ' people which evidently were never by the Reorganized Church intended to obtain, under which we are represented as having made concessions which we do not believe were intended to be made by the conference which adopted the articles of agreement, which conference evidently did not intend to concede the 'Church of Christ' people on the Temple Lot to be the church in succession or that it had power of expansion to become the church in succession or that its priesthood had authority to include any power of expansion into organized quorums as the organic church in succession.

"And Whereas, we hold and verily believe the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints to be the church of Jesus Christ in direct succession to the church organized by commandment from heaven on April 6, 1830, so recognized by the

courts of the land, and so recognized by our heavenly Father whose Spirit is still the guiding force in the work of the Great Restoration, its priesthood in organized quorums having been organized, built up, and recruited by divine call and legal ordination until the present day, which fact herein set forth seems not to be consistent with the present claims and policies of the 'Church of Christ' people;

"Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the 'Articles of Working Harmony' adopted by the conference of 1918 be and are hereby rescinded and declared null and void and no longer binding upon or representative of the church."—Conf. Min., pp. 4029, 4030.

It is quite clear from the foregoing that in the 1918 Agreements the Reorganization did not act in good faith. Article 24 of the agreements contains no ambiguity. It is clear cut and makes no distinction between the standing of the two bodies, and in no degree does it give the Reorganization prior or superior rights. They were both placed on an equal footing before God. The priesthood of each was declared to be legally constituted, and this tardy attempt to exalt the Reorganization and debase the Church of Christ because the latter refused to be "absorbed" comes with poor grace.

The Church of Christ may, "about 1921," have expressed an adverse opinion regarding Article 4, but that act no more vitiated the "entire articles of agreement" than did the adoption of the dogma of supreme directional control in 1925. It did not take the leaders of the Reorganization very long after the 1925 conference to discover a very dangerous loophole in the Agreements of Working Harmony. Saints who were in "sorrow and distress," found a ready means of escape from the "effective discipline" being meted out to those who protested out loud and they sought and found an asylum in the Church of Christ where they could enjoy the freedom of conscience and the liberty of action that had been their portion through the years. Let the honest, unbiased reader compare the present attitude of the Reorganization with the attitude in 1918. Let them ask the leaders who now are making such frantic efforts to belittle and discredit the Church of Christ, why the change of front? E. E. L.

### COUNTING THE COST

Did you shoulder your cross to seek for the lost,  
In the vineyard of the Lord?  
Are you from your labors trying to shirk  
For what this world can afford?  
Did you count the cost of profit and loss  
When the call you accepted, divine?  
Oh, ye who are called to labor and work  
And step right out in the line?  
If you intend to build a tower,  
Be it great or very small,  
Then stop and consider this very hour—  
Are you sure you can build it at all?

Roy S. Adams.



## THE FORUM

This department is intended as a safety-valve for the escape of surplus energy, with the governor in working order at all times. Direct, personal reference may be made in a friendly manner; but accusation and recrimination are taboo. Govern your contributions accordingly.

### "THE VOICE OF THE PEOPLE"

The above caption is given to an Editorial in the *Advocate* for June (1929) wherein the Editor quotes and discusses the proposed document of the "Twelve" on Church Government.

The document, the Editor tells us, was proposed by the "Quorum of Twelve" and presented to the late conference, but, says he, "because of a misconception on the part of some, it did not receive the consideration which it should have received, and it was left an open question."

Thanks, Bro. Editor, that we may still discuss the proposition, tho we may have a "misconception" of the matter. Some of us may think as much of your position. By discussion, however, we may find some misconception on both sides which we may be able to eliminate to the advantage of a better understanding.

#### THE DOCUMENT *EN DESHABILLE*

"\* \* \* \* hereafter, local churches and a General Conference, *composed of the Eldership*, shall initiate legislation; and that all matters of sufficient importance to the whole church shall be referred to the local churches, and that thus the majority vote of all the people shall express the common consent. Sixth—the Churches themselves may decide what questions are of sufficient importance for referendum vote, *and instruct the ministry sent by them* to the General Conference, according. Seventh—In like manner *the ministry in Conference assembled may decide*, in accord with instructions from their local Church *what questions are of sufficient importance to be sent to all churches for referendum vote.*" (Italics mine, C. E. B.)

Just to what extent "the late conference" considered the method of representation to General Conference and the "Modus Operandi" of obtaining the "voice of the people" we cannot say. We do know, however, that the question is not a new one, and dare say that the church by its conference disposition of the matter proposed, was not so rash as might be implied.

The question of representation came up for consideration before the 1926 Conference: "After considerable discussion, it was decided to let the local churches settle this question as follows: Resolved that the manner of the matter of representation at the next general conference, whether it be a delegate or mass conference, be by the church secretary referred to the various churches, they to decide and report to him, he to notify the church through the columns of the *Advocate* of the result."—Zion's

*Advocate*, May, 1926.

The next conference was a delegate conference, and so constituted by "referendum." The credential committee being Margaret McGregor, Clifford Spillsbury and Frank Griffiths.—*Advocate*, May, 1927.

From these items of record it appears, does it not, that the "Modus Operandi" of the referendum has already been installed by precedent at least? And, too, the "voice of the people" was in favor of the delegate system.

The question again came up at the conference of 1928 when the following resolution was passed: "Resolved, that we approve of a delegate system, one delegate to each six members, or fraction thereof."—*Advocate*, May, 1928.

By "An Opinion adopted by the Quorum of Twelve," Sept. 7, 1926, and approved by the general conference of 1927 the "referendum" was officially installed. See *Advocate*, Sept., 1926, May, 1927.

The "Opinion" provides, "That it shall be within the province of any such general conference to determine the advisability of taking a referendum on any matter that may come before it."—*Advocate*, Sept., 1926.

The "ministry" according to the 1929 proposition of the "Twelve" would have the final say as to what matters are to be referred for referendum. See provision seven of the document. A little suggestive of priestcraft?

By action of the general conference of 1928 "the right to initiate legislation shall rest with the members of our church as follows: (a) Local churches through their delegates; (b) Quorum of Twelve; (c) Quorum of Seventy; (d) any ex-officio member of the conference; (e) any six scattered members, properly brought before the body in conference assembled."—*Advocate*, May, 1928.

To the writer, in view of all this, it appears that a charge such as made by the Editor of the *Advocate* that "because of a misconception on the part of some" the proposed document of 1929 "did not receive the consideration it should have received," is not well founded.

By the references cited it is obviously established that we already have the "referendum" and that even scattered members may "initiate" general church legislation.

So long as the church transacts business through conference action it must be either by delegated authority or by mass meeting. Whether the delegates be ministers or members the proposition is unaltered.

The proposed document would therefore still leave us with the delegate system of representation as it is not proposed to do away with conferences, but it would restrict "the voice of the people" in their selection of their delegates to a decreed list of

eligibles, "the eldership."

At present "the voice of the people" may choose whom they will to represent them, and still if desired, they may further express themselves by referendum. Hence, in the proposed document, we are approached with the strange proffer to give up a liberty that we now have for another which we also already have.

If "the voice of the people" of any local church prefers representation in general conference by their eldership what is there to prevent such a choice?

Again, if the lowly populace of the church are to be trusted with referendum and veto power over the proposed "elders' conference," why exclude these laymen from a voice and vote on the conference floor? The proposition from the "Twelve" presents, does it not, a rather complex and insoluble mixture of legislation by class and legislation by popular vote.

If to obtain the voice of the people "in the largest possible measure" is the undefiled purpose of the proponents of the document in question, then we would suggest, that we not smother that voice by refusing them choice of their own representatives, whether they prefer elder, priest, lady, or laymen.

Woe to the "lesser priesthood" if the proposed document should become law! You, of that order, may "preach, teach, expound, exhort, baptize" and administer the sacred emblems of the broken body of our Savior, and represent the church as a missionary, but never could you enter the sanctum sanctorum of the "elders' conference."

We wonder where the "misconception" lies?

"Elder" C. E. Bozarth.

## DELEGATES OR REFERENDUM

By Clarence L. Wheaton

When the Twelve introduced a resolution before the general Conference, last April, bearing upon the question of a correct representation of the Church of Christ in matters pertaining to its welfare, they were well aware of the agitation that existed in the minds of some. Being in position where they have the watchcare of the whole church, it is only natural for members of the various local churches to communicate with them in reference to vital issues. Such communication and discussion is not confined to the Eldership of the church but in the majority of cases emanates from the membership at large.

Naturally when such vital issues are raised, they deem it of utmost importance that the laws governing the church should be cited. Such has been their procedure in this instance. Since October, 1925, there has been a constant agitation of this question, and an effort made to find a solution of the problem. A careful perusal of the Advocate will disclose the fact that the voice of the church might be had on the proposition as to whether the General Conference, a Mass Conference or an Elders Conference,

To this day there has not been a clear-cut expression on the part of the people on the question. Therefore, as a matter of expediency we have used the Delegate system.

However, this issue was crystalized in the recommendation of the Twelve, which was based upon two urgent appeals for reconsideration and definite action. One initiated by the action of the local church at Centralia, Washington, and the other from a delegate to the last Conference. These communications came to the attention of the Twelve during their pre-conference sessions. It will be seen from the following that it is the membership of the church at large and not the Twelve.

Communication to the Conference:

In consideration of such letters received by the Twelve and by the Conference as the following:

April 4th, 1929,

Grain Valley, Missouri.

To the Quorum of Twelve:

Dear Brothers in Christ in conference assembled:

I received a card today telling me I am a delegate to general conference; according to my understanding I am not eligible as a delegate to General Conference.

In the Book of Commandments for the government of the Church of Christ, on Page 40, I read in Paragraph 43: "The several elders composing this Church of Christ, are to meet in conference once in three months, or from time to time as they shall direct or appoint, to do church business whatsoever is necessary." That is part of the Articles & Covenants of the C. of C. given in Fayette, N. Y., June, 1830. This I understand is general conference.

On page 42, par. 1, I read: "It shall be the duty of the several churches composing the Church of Christ, to send one or more of their teachers to attend the several conferences, held by the Elders of this church, with a list of the names of the several members, uniting themselves to the church since the last conference, or send by the hand of some priest, so that there can be kept a regular list of all the names of members of the whole church, in a book kept by one of the elders. I understand all delegates should be teachers or priests.

We as a church make many mistakes and sometimes establish systems contrary to the laws laid down in the beginning of the church; this causes confusion, we do not claim to be perfect, but we are striving to become perfect.

So I do humbly beg of you as God's chosen ones as leaders of His church, to consider this matter and let us get back to the law as given in 1830, not only to say but to do.

Now, because of circumstances over which I have no control, it is impossible for me to attend conference this year.

My heart is sad because of this condition, for it is the great desire of my heart to be with my brothers and sisters of like faith.

I pray God's spirit may guide you all in each matter which comes to your attention that God's will may rule and not man's.

Pray for me.

Your sister in Christ,

MIRIAM HALDEMAN MASON.

At a special business meeting of the Centralia Church of Christ at Centralia, Wash., the following resolution was adopted, to be sent to the general conference of the Church of Christ to convene April 6th, 1929, at Independence, Mo.

Resolved: That all matters of major importance coming before the Church of Christ in general conference shall be referred to all the Churches of Christ before becoming binding on the Churches of Christ, and that all matters of minor importance shall be voted on and adopted by the delegate vote of the general conference.

Be it further resolved, that we favor a delegate conference.

VERNON DUNNING,

Presiding Elder.

PEARL A. HEADDING,

Clerk.

We, your brethren of the Twelve, have taken consideration and hereby recommend to the conference as follows:

Whereas:

1) The Book of Mormon teaching is that Church business shall be by the voice of the people:

And Whereas:

2) Neither the Delegate system nor Mass conferences have proven successful in securing the voice of the people except in a very limited and unsatisfactory way;

Therefore be it resolved by this 1929 General Conference:

3) That the method of referring all business affecting the general Church to each local Church for their decision, shall be studied and considered by the whole Church until the month of November, 1929.

4) And that in said month each Church shall cast their vote upon this question, either to approve or disapprove the referendum method of securing the voice and vote of all the people of the whole Church.

5) Also: That at that same time, all the local Churches shall consider the proposal herein made, that hereafter, local churches and a General Conference composed of the Eldership shall initiate legislation; and that all matters of sufficient importance to the whole Church shall be referred to the local churches, and that thus the majority rule of all the people shall express the common consent.

6) The churches themselves may decide what

questions are of sufficient importance for referendum vote, and instruct the ministry sent by them to the General Conference, accordingly.

7) In like manner, the ministry in Conference assembled may decide, in accord with instructions from their local churches, what questions are of sufficient importance to be sent to all churches for referendum vote.

8) Be it further ordered by this Conference: That by December 1, 1929, after all the churches have approved, or disapproved this proposed system of representation, they shall send the results of their vote to the Secretary of the Twelve.

8) The Twelve shall announce the result of the referendum vote by publishing same in Zion's Advocate for January, 1930, and shall issue a call for the 1930 General Conference in accord therewith.

While some may feel disposed to look with suspicion on the Twelve, as though they were seeking to arrogate to themselves the control of all the affairs of the church, the Twelve wish to safeguard the interest of all the Church, by giving *each individual* of it an opportunity to express his or her opinion.

The whole proposition is expressed in paragraphs 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7.

Paragraph three provides for "*referring all business affecting the General Church to each local church for their decision.*" If this is carried into effect it will forever prevent such things as picked delegations to general conference, the control of legislation by the Twelve or other quorums of the priesthood, and the foisting of class legislation by a small minority upon the body of the church. It will place the responsibility where it belongs—with the individual members of the church.

Paragraph four provides for the "*referendum method of securing the voice and vote of all the people of the whole church.*" Is this "vicious" legislation that would ensnare the membership of this church in such way as to place them under the control of the Twelve? Never! But on the other hand it places the Twelve in the position where the "whole church shall be able to scrutinize their every act and if they should attempt anything of a "vicious" nature it could be checked.

Paragraph five provides that "*local churches and a General conference composed of the Eldership shall initiate legislation.*" This is in harmony with the action of conference in 1928 which provided that legislation could be initiated by the Twelve, any ex-officio member of conference, the local churches, any delegate or by six members in good standing. Thus the entire body of the church has the same privilege as the Twelve. Can any fairer provision be made for the safeguarding of the interests of the "whole church"? This paragraph also provides that "*all matters of sufficient importance to the whole church, shall be referred to the local churches, and that thus the majority vote of all the people shall*

*express the common consent.*" If adopted by the next conference, we can readily see that instead of the Twelve "controlling" all the affairs of the church as some charge, that this power will rest with the "whole church" as "the majority vote of all the people shall express the common consent." The following clipped from the article of Sister Pointer in the Advocate for June, 1929, is pertinent:

"On page 555, top of the page, 'They had altered and trampled under their feet the laws of Mosiah, or that which *the Lord commanded HIM TO GIVE UNTO THE PEOPLE.*' These laws then, which stand out so forcefully that government shall be by the 'voice of the people,' was a command of the Lord. In par. 64: 'For as their laws and their *governments* were established by the voice of the people.' Note here, the word governments in the plural, showing that in both the religious and national governments the voice of the people was supreme. *We are not told just how the vote of the people was obtained in religious matters, but we do know that the people met together in great numbers at their temples to worship, and it would have been very easy to have obtained their voice at such times.*" (Emphasis mine. C. L. W.)

The position as suggested by our good sister expresses the point that the Twelve had in mind, that is, to obtain the voice of the people "at such times" as they "met together in great numbers at the places where they hold their regular services.

Paragraph six provides that the local "churches themselves may decide what questions are of sufficient importance for referendum vote, and *instruct the ministry sent to the General conference, accordingly.*" The argument has been made that we already have the right to a referendum provided for in conference action. This argument is based on Article 10 of the "Opinion of the Twelve," as adopted by the conference of 1927, which I quote with the one which precedes it:

"That in addition to the regular General Conference of the church, that it shall be considered within the province of the Twelve to call a special conference of the Church at a time and place they may deem most prudent, to adjust the emergency that may arise.

"That it shall be within the province of any such General Conference to determine the advisability of taking a referendum on any matter that may come before it."

Thus we only have a referendum provided for so far as those composing a General Conference under the present system may "determine the advisability of," while the recommendation of the Twelve makes it possible for the local "churches themselves" to determine "what questions are of sufficient importance for referendum vote." Therefore any "vicious" tendencies on the part of any quorum of the church can be successfully thwarted.

Paragraph seven provides that when the Elders shall meet in conference, that they "may decide, *in accord with instructions from their local churches,* what questions are of sufficient importance to be sent to all the churches for referendum vote." Can the interests of the church be better conserved than by such provisions as these? Does this indicate that the Twelve are trying to take the rights of the people away?

The writer has noted with interest the articles appearing in the "Forum" on this important issue. They show a very fine spirit, which is commendable. It is to be regretted that we must differ, but it is said that in the multitude of counsel there is safety. Of especial note is the splendid article of Sister Pointer, appearing in the June Advocate, from which we quoted above. We are forced to admit, after a careful reading, that the sister presents an able defense of her position such as it is and is representative of the position taken by those of that side of the question. But no solution is offered to our present situation.

When this matter was under consideration at the last conference, the writer requested the Credentials Committee to give him a statistical statement of the number of delegates present and the number of local churches represented. The following startling figures were given:

Local churches organized January 1, 1929.....	33
Local churches represented April 6 to 13, 1929..	23
<hr/>	
Total not represented .....	10
(Note: Later reports indicate there were 40 local churches organized by April 6th.)	
Membership of all local churches.....	1232
Delegates authorized (6 to 1) .....	206
Delegates in attendance at the conference.....	90
<hr/>	
Delegates absent .....	116

Thus we see that of 33 local churches existing prior to April 1929, only 67 percent were represented in the conference, and that of 1232 enrolled members only 566 or 45 percent of them were represented by delegates. Of the 90 delegates present, 30 of them were chosen to represent the local church at Independence, Missouri. In addition to these this local church had 11 ex-officio votes. As time goes on this percentage will increase, for more people will gather to this point than any other, as it is the center place. At this time the membership has already made an increase of about 30 percent and the eldership has been augmented by 5 members. In time the church at Independence by its delegates and ex-officio vote will control the affairs of the whole church. Foreseeing this condition and knowing the injustices that can be worked upon the church at large, seems justifiable reason enough for the recommendation of the Twelve, if no other should exist.

## WOULD FOLLOW THE GOLDEN RULE

To my Brethren of the Church of Christ:

As one of you, I want to protest once again against using Zion's Advocate to cast unsavory remarks about the Reorganized church. To my mind it was painful to see in the current issue of the Advocate, both to individuals and the church, we were casting remarks that is not worthy of our calling, as members of Christ's body.

A few days ago a recent issue of the Saints' Herald was put in my hand wherein we were accused of hurling little thunderbolts at them for four years (although I fail to see in the article any cause for accusing Brother Moler of advocating supreme directional control, as he was speaking of General Conference enactments.) The points at issue, to my mind and way of thinking, is that we shall not grow in favor with God or man if we incessantly keep on with this warfare.

Let me here point out, especially to those of our brethren who feel that they have been unjustly treated by the Reorganization, whether silenced or accused unjustly, to the words of our Lord and Master:

"If ye love them that love you, what reward have ye? Even the publicans do likewise, but I say unto you, love your enemies, bless them that persecute you, and pray for them that despitefully use you, that you may be rewarded of your father which is in heaven."

Again, when he under the lash of scourging—even to the supreme sacrifice of shedding his most precious blood, reviled not again. Tho reviled, he cried out, "Father forgive them for they know not what they do."

Now, if we are to win our brethren who do not believe as we do, whether they be leaders or laymen, let me remind my brethren of the heavenly Messenger's word: "Go in love to your brethren who do not believe as you do"—etc. Especially in our writings, we must show to them that Christ-like character, that they may be able to say of us, as Pilate said of our Lord, "I find no fault in him."

I am reminded of 1 Peter 3:8-17 wherein we are admonished to undergo suffering, as follows:

"Finally, be ye all of one mind, having compassion one of another, love as brethren, be pitiful, be courteous.

"Not rendering evil for evil, or railing for railing, but contrarywise blessing.

"And who is he that will harm you, if ye be followers of that which is good?

"But if ye suffer for righteousness sake, happy are ye: and be not afraid of their terror, neither be troubled;

"For it is better, if the will of God be so, that ye suffer for well doing, than for evil doing."

I plead with you for true Christian charity and a heart full of humility that will move us to win

men and women to the Church of Christ.

I find in Utah the way and only way of getting the message before the Mormon brethren is not to knock them, or I shall meet the same as I do here from the Reorganization. That is, we are always finding fault. Now this should not be, and that is why I ask my brethren to avoid the unsavory epithets, whether it be the church or individuals.

Now, I am not accusing my brethren who are toiling earnestly for the Master and trying their utmost to push on his work, in the sense that I am fault-finding; but that our Advocate may be the means of carrying to our brethren, even the Reorganized, sentiments from our brethren that will help them to exclaim: how we have been with Jesus and leaned of Him.

Yours in the Master's service,

GEORGE CUMMINS.

## THE HOLY DAY

### As Taught by Joseph the Prophet

Desiring to quote early teachings of Joseph Smith, according to the Inspired record, we feel that the reader should first know what this book claims to be.

#### THE INSPIRED TRANSLATION

purports to be "The Holy Scriptures, translated and corrected by the Spirit of Revelation, by Joseph Smith, Jr., the Seer."

This being true, Joseph would evidently have noted the fact if the Lord had made any change in the day of rest, "the holy day," or any other principle of the gospel of salvation.

The writer of this article is a strong believer in both the angels' message and the restored gospel. Jesus, we believe, taught the fullness of the gospel, and when it was restored, it was restored in its fullness; otherwise it could not have been a full restoration; and likewise, when Jesus was here preaching "the everlasting gospel" he taught the "doctrine of his Father." (See John 7:16.) This being the case, the "doctrine of God" and "God" being unchangeable, it is the same doctrine that was aforesaid taught, and in these latter days restored by the angel. (See Gal. 1:6-9.)

#### THE SANCTIFIED DAY

When Jesus was here, preaching the gospel of "eternal life" *he did not, according to the writings of the latter day Seer, omit or dishonor the day which he had created (John 1:1-5 I. T.) in the beginning, and sanctified and commanded it to be "kept holy."* (See Gen. 2:2, 3 I. T.; also Exodus 20:8.)

One may say this is a part of the law of Moses.

According to the teachings of the Bible, Moses was not born for more than 2,000 years after the Lord God "blessed the seventh day and sanctified it," as the Sabbath, the day of rest. Then why

should we, because Moses honored, respected and taught this principle of the law of an unchangeable God, call it the law of Moses, any more than we would call it the law of Paul, who also taught that God did rest the seventh day from all his works. (See Heb. 4:1, 11.)

Why not call it the law of Smith, the prophet? For in a revelation given by this prophet, in August, 1831 (see Book of Commandments 60:18, 19; also D. C. 59:2) he says this, in part: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, with all thy heart. And that thou mayst more fully keep thyself unspotted from the world, thou shalt go to the house of prayer and offer up thy sacraments upon my holy day; for verily, this is a day appointed unto you to rest from your labors, and to pay thy devotions unto the Most High." Here the Lord, according to Joseph, speaks of his "holy day" as a "day appointed unto you (mankind) to rest from your labors."

Joseph, according to the Book which he has corrected by inspiration, informs us that God's "Holy day is the seventh day. (See Gen. 2:3.) In Exodus 20:9 He says: "Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord."

By this we see that God's "Holy Day" is the seventh day. In other words, it is an evidential fact, that from the first day to the sixth day is for man to work, and that the seventh day is "the Lord's day"—a day which He commands *His* children to "keep holy."

Moreover, the Sabbath Day being a precept of the Ten Commandments, it must also be observed as a part of the gospel of Christ; otherwise we have a *perverted gospel*. (Matt. 19:16-19 I. T. and Gal. 1:17 I. T.)

Now, brethren, does it seem that this unchangeable God has at any time abolished, abrogated or repealed his "holy day" of rest? In fact, how could he have done so and still be unchangeable? (Mal. 3:6 and Mal. 4:4.)

Joseph, the prophet, says that "In the beginning the gospel was preached through the Son. All things were made by Him." (John 1:13.) This being the case, it was the "Son" who "rested" and "sanctified" the "seventh day" (Gen. 2:3) and admonished his followers to "Remember the Sabbath (seventh) day, to keep it holy." (See Ex. 20:8, 10.) The keeping of the Sabbath "shall be a sign" between God "and the children of Israel forever." (Ex. 31, 15, 17.)

Brethren, does not this apply to *all who are Israel, in any sense of the word?* We feel assured that it does.

Another witness which testifies in favor of keeping God's Holy Day is the Book of Mormon, a book translated by Joseph Smith, Jr., who makes the claim that it contains "the fullness" of the everlasting gospel." (See D. C. 26:)2 On page 260, verse

56 (authorized edition), Joseph in translating says: "Observe the Sabbath Day and keep it holy."

Had God been the author of the change of the day of rest to the first day of the week, Joseph certainly would have said, "Remember Sunday, the first day of the week to keep it holy." But there is *not as much as a hint* that God or Christ has abolished the seventh day Sabbath. *Neither do the Scriptures state that He has sanctified Sunday as a day of rest, or that it shall be kept holy.*

It is true there was "a disannulling" of the first covenant, but this first covenant according to Joseph's writings (See Gen. 4:5 I. T.) was made in the days of Adam, requiring that they "should offer the firstlings of their flocks for an offering unto the Lord." Verse seven tells us that "This thing is a similitude of the sacrifice of the Only Begotten of the Father, which is full of grace and truth."

*It is plain to be seen that this annulling or abolishing of this first covenant did not affect the Sabbath question in the least, but it refers entirely to blood atonement.* (See Heb. 9:13-16 I. T.)

Here is the vital question: Is this Book which Joseph corrected by inspiration to be relied upon? Or is mortal man more *wise* than inspiration?

Below we quote verses taken from "The Saints Hymnal," a song book used by former Latter Day Saints. The first two verses of hymn No. 286 are as follows:

Hail! Sacred Sabbath; day of rest; (Gen. 2:2)  
Hallowed by God the All Divine (Gen. 2:3)  
And set apart by His behest,  
'Twi'x God and man a sacred sign. (Ex. 31:15.)

A sign that He, the Lord, is God, (Ex. 31:13)  
Who sanctified the souls of men; (Isaiah 56:2)  
Who purifies them by His word, (John 6:63)  
And leads them to His fold again." (John 10:9)

These verses alone give us conclusive evidence that in the distant past those known as Latter Day Saints accepted "*God's word*," even to the "sacred day; day of rest."

Brethren in Christ, according to the writings of Joseph, there is no question but that the Sabbath (as well as all other precepts or principles of the Ten Commandments) is still a part of "the law of God."

To us the all-important question should be, will you and I be faithful to our covenant?

Let us not continue "in the ways of the Gentiles," but let us hearken to Joseph's admonition (See Jude, verse 3) and "earnestly contend for the faith once delivered unto the Saints," is my prayer in Jesus' holy name.

ABNER V. TREGO,

559 Brookside Ave., Kansas City, Mo.

**BUILD THE TEMPLE**

## GENTILES AND INDIANS

In the deepest respect and sympathy, (for I have had many turbulent thoughts concerning this Temple building), I will try to present some of my conclusions, received by study, prayer and observation, which, thank God, is open to us all.

First, the necessity for a Temple must be realized, before any belief can be had in it. Realizing this necessity, the kind of people—their qualifications—must be seriously considered. Only those qualifying can do this great work.

Then, to whom is the promise given to build the Temple?

The Temple spot was dedicated in 1831, and laid unoccupied until a staunch and chosen people came and redeemed it. As guardians, they remained true to their trust. These stern guardians held it against outnumbering, over-powering odds, as far as human man-power is concerned. But the intervening years have proven a Higher Power that stood with the chosen guardians and over-balanced these odds.

No Temple has been started or commanded until this one. This is near the end of the generation "which shall not all pass away, until a House is built" to the Lord.

The people who held it lay dormant, so far as a great showing in the eyes of the world is concerned, until the time for the remnant to begin.

The start to build up Zion is a clarion call to all *faithful* Gentiles, and all Israel who desire, to assist. The remnant of Jacob is especially called on to assist.

According to the Messenger, the spirit of Judgment is going to go hand-in-hand with this work. The people who now occupy are *privileged* and *called* to start the work; if they fail, others can and will be gradually grafted in.

This is a day of choosing, not only calling, according to the Doc. & Cov. And let us not forget the Book of Mormon statement of the *grafting* of the tame olive branches, and the gradual removing of the wild olive branches.

While many of us have not received a personal testimony of this Temple being commanded of God, we have neither received conclusive evidence, a divine revelation, that it is not of God. Any confusion or misunderstanding existing in the church, whether among members or priesthood, can be traced to Satan's desire to blind us and weaken our faith, and to lack of humility, either on the part of the seeker, or on the part of those affirming this work. I hope I am clear in this. For of a surety, there *will* be unity, if we move out as the Messenger has commanded, in love and humility.

The consistency of this Temple erection and preaching the Gospel to all the world lies in the fact there must be an endowment, and a qualifying, consecrated effort to carry the Gospel forth to all nations. And the Temple is to be a school to learn of God's power and goodness. No house in this dispensation has met the requirements necessary for this. The people must of necessity grow and develop as this House progresses. Otherwise, great condemnation will logically fall on us, for indeed, it is not a light thing.

The Temple, a house for God's dwelling on earth, radiating this spirit of power and light, is very different from an auditorium, where pleasure and entertainment was looked forward to, to the extent of the auditorium being planned to provide for these things.

Concerning personal knowledge, do many of us know there is a place of rest, or Paradise? A hell? Or have we received knowledge of the divinity of Christ? Or does not our *faith* bridge these gulfs, that separate the infidel from a comforting faith in these things? Jesus said to Thomas, "Blessed are they which have not seen and yet believed."

My wondering mind led me to this conclusion: The Temple started by our weak efforts, as the Messenger said, will not lack in harmony with Book of Mormon statements, which are certainly profuse, that the Indian will build the New Jerusalem.

A brother with great faith in the calling of the Indians is now laboring with them. And through the past years, others have preached to them. Many have heard the Gospel, and have accepted the Book of Mormon as their Fathers' history. Page 90, Book of Mormon, says one mighty among them will be raised up to mighty deeds and wonders, in order to do a great work in "much" restoration of the Indian. The choice seer has not yet done his work. He is to convince them of the Word of God, already gone forth among them. Page 88.

## A BREEZE FROM PROVIDENCE

BRANCH GLEANINGS is a breezy little sheet published in the interest of the local Church of Christ at Providence, Rhode Island, of which the following "Editorial Comment" is a sample:

"A spirit of peace attended the sacrament service of April 7th. All those present felt the sweet influence of communion, where members meet to be served and refreshed by spiritual substance at the table of the Lord. Here in prayer, repentance and humility we kneel, acknowledging our weaknesses and seeking forgiveness; in thanksgiving and praise we rise to share with another our joys. If there be but few, let us keep this ordinance undefiled by inharmonious thoughts or words, that the flavor of the PERFECT FOOD may be unimpaired."

Page. Meantime Briggs, Gurley, et al., were forming the "New Organization," as they called it, and in 1859 Wm. Marks united with that movement. Thus it is seen that for from eight to fifteen years, those men who formed the nucleus of the Reorganization wandered from faction to faction, receiving various ordinations at the hands of various factional leaders.

In the meantime, the church from which they withdrew—the church organized April 6, 1830—silenced and excommunicated them, precisely as the dominant faction at Independence now does those who are withdrawing from it. Such is the "spectacle" that we on this side of the Pacific, where the scenes and deeds were and are being enacted are viewing at close range, where the smoke screen does not obstruct the view.

During the period from 1846 to 1852, when those men, silenced and excommunicated by those in control of the church machinery, were with James J. Strang, the Yellowstone, Beloit, and Waukesha branches were organized in Strang's faction, and those branches formed the nucleus of the New Organization.

By what authority, may we ask our brother across the sea, did those silenced and excommunicated men, who withdrew from the church, form the New Organization? Remember, it was a NEW organization. There was no prophet, seer or revelator among them. The question touches the most vital spot in the history of the Reorganization. On the answer hangs the fate of every one who has ever been baptized into it. Organically, there is no connecting link between the New Organization of 1852 and the mother church organized April 6, 1830. Whence, then, came the right to organize? Let Joseph Smith, who united with the New Organization in 1830, give the answer. Here it is:

"The individuals who kept this covenant (the everlasting covenant of the gospel) were accepted of Him and were not rejected. nor their standing before God put in jeopardy by the departure of others from the faith. Whatever office in the priesthood each held, under the ordinations ordered by the call of God and vote of the Church, would remain valid. They could as elders, priests, teachers, etc., pursue the duties of warning, expounding, and inviting all to come to Christ, and by command of God, could build up the Church from any single branch, which, like themselves, had not bowed the knee to Baal, or departed from the faith of the Church as found in the standard works of the body at the death of Joseph and Hyrum Smith."—Saints' Herald, Feb. 17, 1904.

No other answer could be made. On that foundation the Reorganized Church was built and stands today. In no other way can they consistently claim authority to represent God. But that answer is fatal to their position now. If a "single branch," or more,

organized by an apostate faction, could form the nucleus of the church in 1862, what shall be said of four branches that never joined a faction, never apostatized, never was reorganized, but who "have always maintained an honorable name among men, and have held their priesthood in righteousness before God"? See Gen. Conf. Minutes, 1918, p. 2608. Nor is that all. Listen:

"As an organization they have held to the fundamental doctrines of the church and have been guilty of no moral lapse." See Editorial in Saints' Herald, April 24, 1918.

Can the writer from over the sea discount the foregoing declarations from the highest authority in the church he represents? They put him in a glass house.

It has been said that comparisons are odious. Be that as it may, we are going to make one right here for the benefit of the brother across the Pacific. Here it is:

"An ordination in the 'Reorganized' Church is of no more effect than is an ordination in the Methodist, Presbyterian, or Catholic Church, for those officiating do not hold the priesthood, and are not recognized of God. When we see this man or that man, or perhaps that woman, or child, giving revelations, as was the case in the 'Reorganized' Church when Jason W. Briggs, Zenas H. Gurley, Henry H. Deam and the daughter of Zenas H. Gurley, received revelations bearing on the organization of their cult, we will know assuredly that these things are not of God."—Origin of the Reorganized Church, by Joseph F. Smith, pp. 91, 92.

Who can fail to see the deadly parallel between the foregoing position and the position of the brother across the Pacific? Thus the church from which the protestors withdrew in 1846 now speaks to those who went out. The analogy is most striking. It simply leaves the Reorganization hors de combat, so far as a case against the Church of Christ is concerned.

Now let our over-seas brother consider this:

In 1864 the word of the Lord came to the branch at Bloomington, Illinois, whose priesthood, it is conceded, goes back to "valid original sources," instructing them to so arrange their temporal affairs that they could return to Zion in 1867 and begin the redemption of the Lords' vineyard, as the way would be open at that time. Obedient to the divine command, they made ready (against the warning raised by leaders of the Reorganization who declared such a venture would result in disappointment and disaster. See Herald for August 15, 1864.) At the appointed time they moved to Independence, and on the first day of March, 1867, they held a conference, the first to be held in the land of Zion since the expulsion in 1833. They openly avowed their identity and purpose. They purchased the "sacred spot" where the

(Continued on Page 119)