

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 7

INDEPENDENCE, MISSOURI, FEBRUARY 1, 1930

NUMBER 3

A CALL TO PRAYER

To the Churches of Christ Scattered Abroad: We the Apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ, and your fellow-servants, called out of the world by his grace, as shepherds of the flock, greet you in the most holy faith that has been delivered unto us by God the Eternal Father, in whom we delight and yield ourselves to serve.

Grace be unto you, and peace, from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ, for we give thanks for you daily, and ever pray for your progress and perfection in Him.

In the beginning of this new year One Thousand Nine Hundred and Thirty since the coming of our Lord into the flesh, our minds reflect back over the experiences of the past, with its hopes, and achievements, and then contemplating the future with its opportunities, there comes to us a desire to make those hopes a living reality, and our achievements more outstanding for the Master. While this is a New Year for the world, we are reminded that to those of the Restoration, this year marks the beginning of a New Epoch, a New Century since the Church of Christ was established by Joseph Smith and others at the home of Peter Whitmer, in Fayette, New York, the sixth of April, in the year of our Lord One Thousand Eight Hundred and Thirty, agreeable to the laws of our country and by the will and command of God.

This year marks the beginning of a new epoch for the reason that our heavenly Father has intrusted much to our hands to be accomplished. The Temple of the Lord must be finished; Zion must be established; a people must be prepared and gathered against the day when the Lord shall be revealed from heaven, when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired by all those that believe, in that day.

We beseech you, therefore as fellow citizens of the household of God, who look forward to the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and also our gathering together unto him, that you should not be shaken in mind, nor be troubled, neither in spirit, nor by word, concerning those who go about making ship-wreck of the faith. Let no man deceive you concerning the schism of re-baptism that some would force upon the body of Christ, to wound it, and to cause the righteous to be sad that the Lord himself has not made sad. For those that have gone out from us, are gone out that they might be manifest that they were not of us. But the rather, brethren, let us pray for the welfare of their souls, that they may see the error of their work and return to the fold of God.

Before the church today lies a field of glorious opportunity for consecrated service in the Lord, who has blessed us with much in the way of spiritual blessings. For that

reason much is required of us in return. We can not therefore, afford to shirk our responsibilities, nor shrink from the trials and sorrow of accomplishment. The church is likened to a woman travailing in birth, pained to be delivered. For that reason let us endure our travail with faith, and run the race with patience. Let us add to our faith those godly attributes enumerated by Peter of old, i. e., virtue; knowledge; temperance; patience; godliness; brotherly kindness; charity. For if these qualities be in you and have the pre-eminence, you shall not be unfruitful in the Lord, nor lack knowledge and wisdom to carry on his work.

Wherefore, brethren, we would persuade you, through Christ, to exemplify your faith in Him, in every avenue of life. In your home; among your associates; in your temporal affairs; your ministry. Be true to your calling, tell the truth. Love your neighbor as yourself. Do good to all men. Pray always, that the enemy of the souls of men may not overthrow you. For in no other way can we expect to be prepared as a people to meet the Lord when he comes.

That these high ideals might be attained; that we may more perfectly serve the Lord, we, your brethren of the Twelve, deem it wise that the whole church should set apart a season of prayer and examination, that we might experience an increased measure of the divine favor. We therefore request all the Churches of Christ scattered abroad, to **set aside the period beginning Sacrament Sunday, March the Second, this year, and continue until Conference convenes, as a season of fasting, prayer, and consecration, that we may purify and cleanse the sanctuary of our souls, and go forth with clearer vision, singleness of purpose and greater spiritual strength and power after the April Conference, in the service of God and humanity.**

May grace and peace be increased for you through the knowledge of God, and of the Lord Jesus Christ, in harmony with his divine power which has given us all things that pertain to life and godliness, through the knowledge of him who has called us out of the world to glorify his name, as saints, through sacrifice and service. For by these things we are given marvelous and precious promises, that by doing the Lord's will, we shall be partakers of his spiritual nature, and being spared the corruption that is in the world through lust, escape his wrath and indignation upon the ungodly.

Issued this first day of February, One Thousand Nine Hundred and Thirty, from the place of the Temple of the Lord, Independence, Missouri.

Your brethren and co-workers in Christ,

C. L. WHEATON, Secretary of Twelve.

ZION'S ADVOCATE

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

BOARD OF PUBLICATION

A. O. Frisby, Louise P. Sheldon, and H. E. Moler.

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

Address all matter for publication to the Editor.

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.

to the thought that there is no such a thing referred to here, nor elsewhere contemplated in any part of the word of God authorizing a RE-creation, or Re-uniting, or a repeating of the Creative act or transfusion between the Branch and the Vine, at least, not until after the Branch has been separated from the Vine. It may be revived by nourishing it with mild processes and tender care, but not by a RE-planting; and this analogy shows that a RE-baptism of any person who has been baptized into Christ is solemn mockery and not of God.

Those who have not obeyed the gospel and desire to become grafted into the tame Olive Tree through the divine process of Baptism, perform a meritorious act by so doing; but whoever heard of a properly grafter Branch being RE-grafted in order to make it receive a larger flow of the Vine, or Tree? And yet this Twelfth Message urges a RE-baptism, "That they may be fit and worthy for the spirit and power of the Holy Ghost."

But we are told that the word "Baptized," as used by the Messenger, is not a RE-baptism, but is the original act repeated by divine authority the same as the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. But this argument is faulty from the fact that Baptism is the divine process ordained by our heavenly Father by virtue of which we become "Grafted into the true Vine or Olive Tree," becoming Branches thereof, and thus "Baptized into Christ;" being delivered "From the power of darkness, and translated into the kingdom of God's dear Son;" and thus we are "No more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God; . . . In whom ye also are builded together for a habitation of God through the Spirit;" all of which proves by reason of the object of its mission or appointment that Baptism is designed to be administered but once. But the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is in its mission and very nature to be administered repeatedly, its object being Commemorative, and not Initiatory, as is clearly stated in the following Scripture:

"For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, That the Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed took bread: and when he had given thanks, he broke it, and said, Take, eat: this is my body, which is broken for you: **this do in remembrance of me.** After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the New Testament in my blood: **this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me, for as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come.**"—1 Cor. 11: 23-26.

Then again, the argument is made from the words found in the Twelfth Message: "Let those that come to the Church of Christ be baptized,"—that this obligation is **retroactive**, and implies all those who have transferred to the Church as well as it applies to all those who may yet come. But the word, "COME," is in the **present and future tense**, and by no stretch of linguistic skulduggery can it be tortured or construed into the **past tense** and made to apply to those who have already become members by transfer.

"Came" is the past tense of "Come," and should have

been employed by the Messenger if he designed baptism to apply to all who had previously transferred to the Church of Christ; and because of the many inconsistencies of the reputed Messenger, I am frank to say: I can not swallow all he is represented as having said.

In the Twelfth Message we are told that Baptism is to be administered to those that come to the Church of Christ, "**That they may rid themselves of the traditions and sins of men.**" A new philosophy, surely! In no place in all the revelations of God to His people can there be found anything like it. It is a false philosophy, a bungling hodge-podge from a bungling conspirator. It is neither human nor divine, but is of Satanic origin as the following will show: First, It is in point blank opposition to the instruction of the First Message given to Brother Fetting in which the Messenger said that Christ "**would not hold us responsible for the mistakes of others**, but would require us to be true to our calling and tell the truth." He said: "**I will hold others responsible for their work in their day.**" If this is true (and it certainly is), then the statement in the Twelfth Message that **we should be baptized to rid ourselves of the traditions and sins of men**, is as false as it is foolish and is therefore not of God.

Baptism is for the remission of individual sins, and is the "**door**" into the sheepfold or kingdom of God; and in no instance is there even a hint in the word of God that any one should be **baptized to rid themselves of some other person's sins or traditions**, or of the **sins and traditions we have imbibed by reason of our associations with them**; but, "If we sin—if WE sin, "we, who have been baptized into Christ, and who are walking in the light of the gospel as Christ is in the light, if WE sin, then if WE CONFESS OUR SINS, he is faithful and just to forgive US OUR SINS, and to cleanse US from all unrighteousness. (1 John 1: 7-10; 2: 1-3.) Does this mean what it says? If so, then this philosophy of the Twelfth Message is wrong. Then again we read:

"He that doeth wrong shall receive for the wrong which he hath done; and there is no respect of persons." (Colossians 3: 25.) And, "The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son: the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him." (Ezekiel 18: 20.) And, "Every one shall die for his own iniquity: every man that eateth the sour grape, his teeth shall be set on edge." (Jeremiah 31: 30.) No such thing in any of these Scriptures, nor in any other part of the word of God, where the iniquities or sins and traditions of others are visited upon any one who is seeking earnestly to comply with the will of God. The visitation of the iniquities of the father upon the son unto the third and fourth generation, is to "Those who hate Me."

The above passages of Scripture is the word of the Lord to all his people; and let it be remembered that "There is not a just man upon earth, that doeth good, and sinneth not." (Ecclesiastes 7: 20.) For "All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God." (Romans 3: 23.) Hence, to place upon one the sins and traditions of other men is akin to baptism for the dead, or the purgatorial flames of Hades to purge one from his sins. Praying the **dead out of Hell**, and baptizing the living for the dead to **get them out of hell**, and baptizing the living to rid him from the traditions and sins of other men in order to keep him from going to hell, is all cut from the same moth-eaten web, and should be relegated to the infernal regions where it was given birth.

When the Special Conference was called last October to consider this matter of RE-baptism, the great majority of those present (among whom were nine of the Quorum of Twelve), turned it down as a present duty, leaving it undecided as a church issue until the convening of the General Conference to be held April 6, 1930; and the apostle most

forward in urging this Twelfth Message baptism as a present duty defiantly declared that if the Conference turned it down as a present duty, and held it in abeyance until next spring, **"I will not obey."** Well, the Conference passed its resolution, and this belligerent apostle very accomodatingly receives another visitation of the Messenger the next morning after the Conference closed, declaring as follows:

"Grieve not over what man has done, this is not your work, but God's work. They have not rejected you, but they have rejected me, and the message I have brought from the Lord. And as much as they have done this, the Lord has rejected them, and their work."

If anything would prove that Messenger to be a consummate FAKE, it is this silly fabrication. The whole law of God as given to the church, both in the Bible and the record of the Nephites, most plainly declare that the church shall make it their law to **"do all their business by the voice of the people"**—by Common Consent. And that the elders should feed the flock of God, not as being **Lords over God's heritage**, etc., etc. This carrying out the law of Common Consent was observed at this Special Conference, and the proposition to leave the whole matter inoperative until the next General Conference was carried by a vote of 110 for, and 67 against, a majority of 43 votes; and yet this belligerent apostle who defiantly declared, **"I will not obey,"** takes refuge under the shade of the FIFTEENTH VISITATION, and drinks deep drafts from its healing(?) waters, because, forsooth, the Message declares: **"As much as they have done this, the Lord has rejected them, and their work."** What!! The Lord reject a people for doing their business by the voice of the people, as He told them to do? Well, hardly. This Messenger is plainly seen to be in point blank opposition to the instruction which God has given, and therefore was not sent of God, but was most probably sent—if sent at all—by **"The prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience."**

One other point in this FIFTEENTH VISITATION which proves that that Messenger who delivered the Fifteenth Message was unmindful of his P's and Q's, is in the above quoted statement: **"They have not rejected you, but they have rejected me"**—me, the Messenger! Now let us observe the Biblical instruction: **"And when they shall say unto you, Seek unto them that have familiar spirits, . . . To the law and to the testimony: If they speak not ACCORDING TO THIS WORD, IT IS BECAUSE THERE IS NO LIGHT IN THEM."** (Isaiah 8: 20.)

Now please turn to 1 Samuel, chapters 8 and 9, and read them, and there you will find that when the Israelites desired a king to reign over them, **"And Samuel!"** (one of the greatest prophets of the Old Testament times) **"prayed unto the Lord, and the Lord said unto Samuel, Harken unto the voice of the people in ALL THEY SAY UNTO THEE, for they have NOT REJECTED THEE, but they have REJECTED ME."** Please notice that the Israelites in rejecting the Message which the Prophet Samuel delivered, in this God declared: **"THEY HAVE NOT REJECTED THEE."** Note this. But this Messenger who visited Brother Fetting at the home of J. G. Pointer, October 13, 1929, declares: **"They have not rejected you"** (Fetting), **"but THEY HAVE REJECTED ME"** (The Messenger), **"and the message I have brought from the Lord."** What a wonderful contrast between these two, Samuel, and The Messenger? And what a vastly different spirit is manifest in the disappointed Samuel, and the disappointed Fetting? Samuel carried out the will of the people; but Fetting stubbornly refuses to do so; and by both words and deeds defiantly shouts: **"I will not obey,"** I might call attention to other things, Mr. Editor, but this Article is getting quite lengthy, and I must abbreviate, and ask your indulgence while I write one more thought.

In the Vision of George D. Cole published some time ago in the Advocate, the elders were represented as pruning the old Tree which had been cut down, the stump of which still stood on the Temple Lot; and in their work of pruning they **brought out the live branches of the Tree**, not the dead branches. And in the revelation given to Brother Yates in May, 1927, the Lord is represented as saying He had rejected the Reorganization; but that he would continue to feel after the honest in heart, etc., or words to that effect. And in the Fifth Visitation, the Messenger is represented as saying to Brother Fetting: **"In 1899 the servant of the Lord laid his hands on you and set you apart from among men to represent Christ, and gave you authority to preach the Gospel and bring others into the kingdom. . . . Again in 1926, you, with your brethren, were set apart as members of the Twelve, to represent Christ and his church, with the same authority as the apostles of old."** Now may I ask the following questions:

Were those who were baptized by Brother Fetting all along down the line from 1899 until the 18th of July, 1929, brought into the church or kingdom of God? If not, how **did he "bring others into the kingdom,"** if at all, thus honoring the authority given him in 1899? And if in 1926, he, with his brethren of the Twelve were **"set apart to represent Christ and his church, with the same authority as the apostles of old,"** since when (in October, 1929), he has continued to receive into the Church of Christ members from the Reorganization by TRANSFER, **are those men and women thus received members in good standing in the Church of Christ?** Or did he act perfidiously (exceeding his authority) by thus receiving them by transfer?

And if the Lord in May, 1927, determined to **"Continue to feel after the honest in heart"** in the rejected Reorganized Church, and the elders, while pruning the old Tree, the stump of which stood on the Temple Lot), brought, as the result of their pruning, only **live branches**, must those people represented as the **"live branches,"** the **"honest in heart,"** of the Reorganized Church, be RE-baptized in order to insure to them membership in the Church of Christ, and a place in the celestial kingdom of heaven? Or has this statement of baptism given in the Twelfth Message been misinterpreted, and twisted, to make it say something it does not say? Or is that baptism statement simply a hocus-pocus affair, void of truth common sense?

WILLARD J. SMITH.

305 13th St., Port Huron, Mich.

ON RE-BAPTISM

By H. E. Moler

Is the Church of Christ in favor of the re-baptism of all its members? This is the question to be decided by the voice of all the members of the church voting in each congregation, where all will have the privilege of participating, and the report of this action of all churches will form a basis upon which the next April General Conference shall take final action.

The term re-baptism itself signifies that one who has formerly been baptized but becoming dissatisfied therewith desires and receives baptism again. We believe there are cases where re-baptism may be justified. In cases where individuals have not lived true to their baptismal covenant, having made serious mistakes in their lives, and desires to be baptized again, we believe this privilege should not be denied. Or, as in some cases, where it was afterward discovered that the minister officiating was,

at the time of administration of baptism, in transgression which caused those baptized by him to become dissatisfied and desire re-baptism. We believe this privilege should be granted. But when it is believed that it is the duty of all the church members to be re-baptized there is something radically wrong somewhere.

There has not been an open declaration of the belief of the advocates of this new doctrine, but in a meeting of the Twelve, one brother in defense of his position made the statement that **"The Reorganization was never in any way the Church of Christ: that the Church of Christ on the Temple Lot was never the Church of Christ, and that the church organized April 6, 1830, was never the Church of Christ in fact because they did not proceed as directed."**

Before the General Conference this position was not so boldly brought out as it was before the Twelve. However, we are very sure this is their belief. This is a repudiation of about all that has been done in the Latter Day Work. The statement was made that we **"Were never in the Church of Christ, but only thought we were."** Well, if **"We were never in the Church of Christ,"** what about those ordinations received in the church which we **"thought"** was the Church of Christ? Can we continue to hold as valid ordinations received in a Church of Christ which was not the Church of Christ? Yet these men seem to hold to all the ordinations they have ever received as being genuine. This is very inconsistent, to say the least. If any former baptism received was not legitimate, then we are still unregenerate sinners, and any or all ordinations received would be null and void. It is a strange idea that would reject a church with its baptisms, and then retain and hold as genuine and valid all official ordinations-honors-received.

There is another phase to this question, which possibly some of our members have failed to consider: We have heard much in the latter-day work, about sinning against the Holy Ghost. It is quite generally understood by all believers in the Restored Gospel that sinning against the Holy Ghost is denying the Holy Ghost after having received it. Many of our members testify of receiving the Holy Ghost after their baptism in water. Now if they are re-baptized, thus repudiating their former baptism, and as the Holy Spirit is given till after baptism, it is particularly a denial of the Holy Ghost. This is a very serious consideration and should cause us to think prayerfully and seriously. Many of us feel we can not afford to do anything of the kind. This would be the direct kind of an apostasy. It is a direct denial of the genuineness of all our former experiences in the latter-day work.

The greatest mistakes that some of our brethren

advocating this new doctrine, is their rebellious attitude to the acts of the last General Conference of the church. The General Conference is the highest authority in the church on earth. Why should those who feel they are right hesitate to comply with the order of General Conference, which said that this question should be referred to all the church for their vote and that the next General Conference in April, 1930, shall finally pass upon the matter. Some people are in favor of a General Conference **IF** it acts in accordance with our views, but if it does not agree with our views the Conference is wrong, and we will go ahead in our own way. This is rebellion and anarchy. Those who feel they are right have no fear of waiting until the voice of the people shall act upon the question. General Conference has referred this question to all the churches for their vote, to be finally acted upon or passed upon by the next General Conference and that in the mean time this doctrine be not taught as a present duty, and that it be not practiced. But there are those who will be laws to themselves.

Another sad phase of this question is that certain churches are depriving themselves of a place in the next General Conference by their rebellious attitude toward the Church of Christ, by their countenancing of re-baptism in their congregations contrary to the action of the last General Conference, and their countenancing the ministrative services of those placed under silence by the last General Conference.

The last October conference could have easily renounced this disturbing doctrine, but instead of doing that they made a referendum of the matter, submitting it to all the churches where all may have the privilege of casting their voice in the matter. And yet after this toleration, and the utmost freedom given to all the people to decide on this matter, there are those who are howling themselves hoarse, crying, **"S. D. C.! We never saw such S. D. C. in the Reorganization!"** Our only answer is, that if this is S. D. C., it certainly is not in the hands of any one man.

These dissenters are doing that very thing, however—taking the *ipse dixit* of just one man as their guide.

Some are separating themselves from the church and holding separate meetings. So the work of insubordination and rebellion goes on. Brethren and Sisters, consider well the course you are pursuing. Turn before it is too late.

Sister William Anderson, two daughters and a son arrived in Independence this week to make their home here. We are glad to have them with us.

According to custom, a community dinner was served at the church on the Temple Lot on Christmas Day, about fifty spending the day together.

AN OPEN LETTER TO W. P. BUCKLEY

Oklahoma City, Okla., January 3, 1930.

Elder W. P. Buckley,
Independence, Mo.

Dear Brother Buckley: Your typewritten circular letter of December 20 reached me several days ago. We have delayed writing, waiting for time and opportunity.

Perhaps you did not expect personal replies to these letters you sent out--and perhaps you did. The nature of the letter justified some comment.

In the second paragraph of your letter you refer to the "facts in the case." This is followed by a statement: that the October Conference action was "illegal in silencing W. P. Buckley on account of his stand with the words of 'The Messenger.'"

I attended the October Conference. I had access to the "words of the Messenger" as referred to. Your "silence" was not imposed because of your "stand with the words of the Messenger" but because you ignored the action of the Conference and rebelled against its decision. The "words of the Messenger" did not intimate, not in the least, that you, and other Church officials should be rebaptized. There was no such meaning in the words of the Messenger. But, even though that some did so understand the words, the Conference decided that we should wait until the April Conference for united action in the matter. Did you wait, or did you and others rebel against the action of the Conference? It does not come now with good grace for you to try and beg the question in sending out letters to "all members of the Church of Christ greeting" pleading for sympathy under the complaint that you were "silenced illegally" for you "stand with the words of the Messenger." That is nothing but a glaring subterfuge. You can not and should not expect me and others to give support to such a plea. I shall be glad for you to understand that I am not dealing simply with you as a man--but with the ideas and principles you teach. It is said: "That actions speak louder than words." Jesus says: "In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrine, the commandments of men." This doctrine and practice in rebaptizing, Apostles, Elders and members of the Church of Christ who are in good standing--no charge or complaint against them--is too ridiculous and absurd for patient consideration.

I shall positively refuse to be a party to advancing or encouraging any doctrine that does not harmonize with the word of God. I have not rejected the "words of the Messenger," but I do reject your false and ridiculous interpretation.

Yours for the right,

R. M. Maloney, 2018 W. 44th.

OBITUARY

Irene Moffat was born July 6, 1844, at Nauvoo, Illinois. Her parents moved to Pleasanton, Iowa, later, where she was reared. At the age of twelve she was baptized by W. W. Blair. Her father and mother were members of the early church.

On June 21, 1873, she was married to E. J. Madden at Bartsville, Mo., by Elder George Spencer. To this union was born eight children, three of whom preceded their mother to the other side. The surviving members of her family are two sisters, Mrs. E. E. Thomas, of Lane, Mo., and Mrs. Nettie Carr of Des Moines, Iowa. A brother, Jud Moffat, of Lamoni, Iowa; her husband and five children who are Mrs. Lillie A. Peek, of Warrensburg, Mo.; S. A. Madden, of McPherson, Kansas; J. N. Madden, Hatchison, Kansas; Mrs. Cora M. Reynolds, of Independence, Missouri, and J. H. Madden, also of Independence. There are fifteen grandchildren and four great-grandchildren.

Funeral sermon by E. E. Long, assisted by M. M. Case.

NEWS NOTES

A letter from Sr. Annetta Langs gives the following information from Port Huron, Michigan:

Sunday, January 5th, Bro. W. J. Smith was elected pastor, Annetta Langs, secretary, and Eva Gardner, treasurer. The members who are standing by the church are Bro. and Sr. W. J. Smith, Bro. and Sr. E. Gardner and daughters, May and Alberta, Sr. M. Duckwitz, Sr. Josephine Cline, Bro. Corey, Bro. and Sr. Simmons, my son Frederick and myself. Since last conference we have lost two by death. Sister Deppe died Nov. 14, 1929, and Bro. F. Deppe died January 2, 1929. Bro. Deppe was opposed to the idea of rebaptism.

Sister Dahlia Weatherby, of Grand Rapids, Mich., writes the recorder's department that they were organized in 1929 with ten members. They have gained sixteen and lost eight, sympathizers with Bro. Fetting. The report closes with these words:

"We may be few in number, but we are faithful and we are looking forward with the blessed hope that the faithful may remain so and that the few may multiply to many as the wonderful light is spread. We are bravely and courageously fighting the battles of the Lord and we want to be found at the front when He comes."

REPENTANCE OR RE-BAPTISM

By C. A. Gurwell

Friends, Your acceptance as a child of God depends upon your continued faith in the atonement of Christ; your continued repentance and humility, and not in the personal merits of the man who baptized you. He did not save you; Christ is your Savior. His personal character has nothing whatever to do with your salvation. If he was a regularly ordained minister of Christ, acknowledged as such in good standing in the church when he baptized you, God acknowledges the validity, the legality as His representative on earth, and that is all that any man can be; none can go higher in authority. If you have ever received the witness of the Spirit of your acceptance of God, do not now make Him a liar by repudiating it. If you have not received this witness, though baptized years ago, as a child perhaps, prove your baptism now, if you are sincere, by putting it to the test.--this test: At the next opportunity, you partake "worthily" of the Lord's Supper, asking a witness of the fact if He has accepted you, and you will get it. But do not deceive yourself. He gives the Spirit to them only who come with a "broken heart and contrite spirit," which is only another way of saying "repentance and humility." A hundred baptisms will do you no good without your sincere repentance. The "cross of Christ" which bringeth "reproach,"--Heb. 13, 13; I. T.--is the condition required, the price to pay. You can not be re-baptized and get rid of your disposition to find fault; to get angry; to gossip; to do evil. Put away these things if you would be the child of God, a brother or sister to Jesus Christ, and show forth his disposition in your daily conduct, thus manifesting his Spirit. "Put away the evil of your doings from before my eyes," (Is. 1:16) and keep His commandments if you would find favor with Him.

Repentance is the condition of your continued acceptance with Him, and not "baptism" only. "But if any man sin and repent, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous; and he is the propitiation for our sins." 1 John 1: 1-2. Ins. Trans. Notice these words, "and repent," repentance is the condition of continued remission of sins. Repent of your unbelief; accept the truth as given in the restored scriptures, "the inspired translation;" keep His commandments; walk in His ways and rejoice in His love and the fellowship of his Spirit. Do not make a solemn mockery of His ordinance, baptism.

ORIGINAL ARTICLES

PRIEST OR MINISTER

It is claimed by some who are believers in the Restored Gospel that the term priest or priesthood has no place in the Church of Christ only as it is applied to the whole membership, and reference is made to 1 Peter 2: 5 to support the claim. This we will notice later.

Webster's definition of priest is "A clergyman. Priestly. Sacerdotal."

Encyclopedia Britanica? article "Priest" (Ger, Priester Fr, "Pretre") the contracted form of "Presbyter" Elder, (See art Presbyter) It is the original form of "Priest." The office of Presbytery is mentioned in 1 Timothy 4: 14. In the English Bible the word is translated elders, "eipies sacerdos" originally designating the ministry of sacred things, in Greek and Roman heathenism. And then came to be used as translations into Greek and Latin of the Hebrew "Koken." Koken epeies sacerdotus—each denotes a minister whose stated business was to perform on behalf of the community, certain public ritual acts, particularly sacrafices directed godwards. Such ministers or priests existed in all great religions of ancient civilization.

And we might add, in all cults both ancient and modern, some form of sacred ministers are recognized, though not always called priests.

Evidently these traditions of heathenism originated from a divine source; and that divine source is found in the Bible and Book of Mormon.

That there were priests in the Old Testament can not be denied, and long before the Law of Moses. (See Genesis 14: 8.) Here mention is made of Melchisedec priesthood of the most high God. "And he blessed Abraham." In Hebrews 7: 6, reference is made to the blessing of Abraham by Melchisedec. "The less being blessed of the better" (verse 7), indicating the two lines of the priesthood. In verse 2 the two lines are clearly defined. The one the ORDER of Melchisedec, the other the ORDER of Aaron.

Book of Mormon, Alma 10: 8, we read, "Now there were MANY BEFORE him, and also there were MANY AFTERWARDS, but none greater, therefore of him they have more particularly made mention."

In Doctrine and Covenants 104: 1, we have this explanation: "Why the first is called the Melchisedec priesthood is because Melchisedec was such a great high priest; before his day it was called the HOLY PRIESTHOOD after the ORDER of the Son of God.

Some refuse to accept the Doctrine and Covenants as evidence, but accept the Book of Mormon. We therefore sight you to the book of Alma 9: 1, where

he speaks of the fall of Adam, and of the plan of redemption. (Verses 18-25.) At the same time, when God gave comamndments to his people . . . that the Lord God ORDAINED PRIESTS, after his holy order, which was after the ORDER of his Son, etc. (Verse 30.) THIS WAS AT THE VERY BEGINNING of God's plan of redemption. Long BEFORE the days of Melchisedec. "Being called and prepared FROM THE FOUNDATION OF THE WORLD, according to the foreknowledge of God. (Verse 31.) "And thus being called, by this holy calling, and ordained unto the high priesthood of the holy ORDER of God, to teach his commandments unto the children of men, . . . this high priesthood being after the ORDER of His Son which ORDER was from the Foundation of the world, without beginning of days or ending of years, . . . FROM ETERNITY TO ALL ETERNITY." (Verse 31.) Which calling and ordinance and high priesthood, is without beginning and end. Thus they became high priests FOREVER after the order of the Son.

Melchisedec was a high priest after this same order. (See 10: 3.) Melchisedec received the OFFICE of the high priesthood according to the holy order of God. (Verse 6.)

In the light of the above, can we truthfully say Jesus Christ was the ONLY HIGH PRIEST? Joseph, jr., may have made mistakes, but we must admit that Section 104, paragraph 1, agrees with the Book of Mormon.

David Whitmer to the contrary notwithstanding. Some seem to think because David Whitmer was a witness to the Book of Mormon and is recognized by all as a good and truthful man, that we should accept his interpretation of the scriptures, without question. But remember, he was a falable man, and wrote his "Address" after many years—and from memory, and makes no claim for its inspiration.

In his argument against high priests (Address, p. 79), he says: "An elder is after the order of Christ—priesthood means authority, and authority is the word we should use. Melchisedec was a priest after the same ORDER. (Book of Mormon, Alma 10: 3). Then an elder is a priest after the order of the Son of God, and the Son was after the order of Melchisedec, and vice-versa. (See Hebrews 5: 16.) So we see this idea of priesthood did not originate in the mind of Sidney Rigdon, as claimed by David Whitmer.

David Whitmer accepts the revelation given in June, 1829, to Joseph, Oliver, and David, making known the calling of the Twelve Apostles. (See Book of Commandments, chap. 15; Doctrine and Covenants 16.) It was given to Oliver and David to search out the Twelve. (Verse 42.) Speaking of the duties of these officers. "And now I speak unto the Twelve . . . behold ye are they which are or-

dained of me to ordain PRIESTS and teachers to declare my gospel," etc. This was given before the church was organized, before Joseph ever met Sidney Rigdon. On same page, David says: "When the church was established in 1829, the officers which were to be in the church were made known at its beginning." Evidently David had forgotten that PRIESTS were mentioned.

My understanding is that an apostle who is an elder (1 Peter 5:), belongs to the Melchisedec ORDER. So then an elder is a high priest, an apostle is a high priest, or in other words, high priests after the order of Melchisedec, who is after the ORDER of Christ.

That there were other priests after Melchisedec, and before the Law, we read of the priest of Midian (Exodus 2:16; also chapter 31), Moses' father-in-law, Jethro. Whether he held the greater or lesser priesthood we are not informed. However, in Exodus 18, we find that he offered sacrifice (verse 12), and counseled Moses (verse 21), and "Moses hearkened and did all that he said. (Verse 24.) Other priests are mentioned in Exodus 19:22-24. So evidently the two priesthoods existed before the Law. After Aaron was set in the priest's office it was called after him. "And under it the people received the Law." (Hebrews 7:11.) It did not cease at the end of the law, but was changed. (Verse 12.)

Now let us examine 1 Peter 5:9: "Ye also as lively stones are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood to offer up spiritual sacrifices." "A royal priesthood." (Verse 9.) This does not mean that all the people are priests, even if Peter was addressing the whole church, for we find the same thought expressed, in almost the same language, in Exodus 19:6, concerning the children of Israel. And we know that not ALL the people were priests, but ONLY the tribe of Levi. (Chapter 9.)

In Isaiah 61:6 is a prophecy concerning the new earth: "But ye shall be named the PRIESTS of the Lord. Men shall call you the MINISTERS of our God." So we are to have PRIESTS or MINISTERS in the new earth. "And I will take OF them (not all of them.—J. R.) for PRIESTS and for Levites, saith the Lord." (66:1.) This agrees with Revelation 1:6: "And hath made us unto our God kings and priests, and we shall reign on the earth." Also 5:10. This certainly does not apply to the entire membership, for if all were kings, who are the subjects? If all were priests, to whom would they minister? Paul makes it plain in 1 Corinthians 12: "And there are differences of administrations." (Verse 5.)

He compares the church to the human body: "If the whole body were an eye, where were the hearing?" etc. (Verse 17.) In verse 29, he asks: "Are all apostles? are ALL prophets?" etc. The Inspired Version answers, "Behold, I say unto you, Nay." Also in Romans 12:4: "All members have not the

same OFFICE." Verses 5-7: "Having then gifts differing—whether prophecy ministry, or teacher." Thus it is clearly shown that priesthood does not belong to ALL the people. It did not in the beginning, nor under the Law, either in Book of Mormon times, New Testament times, or in the new earth, or at any other time. According to Alma 9:33, all those taking upon them the high priesthood "become high priests FOREVER."

"Melchisedec became high priest FOREVER." (10:3.) Jesus Christ high priest FOREVER." (Hebrews 7:21.) The word "FOREVER" in this case is without beginning or ending, from all eternity to all eternity. And applies to all who are ordained to this priesthood, unless they lose it through transgression. Nowhere in all the sacred writing do we find the priesthood conferred upon a woman. So much for 1 Peter 2:5-9.

If an apostle is an elder, then an elder holds the high or Melchisedec order, or Christ's order, as we have proven. In Old Testament times, they were called high priests. In New Testament times they were called apostles or elders, priests, teachers, etc. The apostles being the FIRST officers in the church, whose special duties is to regulate, set in order, all the affairs of the church, with the voice and consent of all the people.

So there is no provision in the New Covenant for a special Quorum of High Priests, High Council, Standing High Council, or a Council of Three High Priests or Presidency of the High Priesthood, Prophet, Seer, and Revelator. All these are titles conferred on men without scriptural authority. And should have no place in the Church of Christ. In conclusion, in the language of the apostle, let us study to show ourselves "approved of God, rightly dividing the word of truth."

J. R. McClain.

BISHOP A. W. BOGUE RESIGNS

January 1, 1930.

To the Quorum of Twelve, C. L. Wheaton, Secretary.

Brethren: Because of the condition of the general church since the October conference; and especially the results following the work of the Twelve in their "reorganization of the office"; insomuch that it changed the personnel of the Bishopric; making void some of the resolutions passed to govern the activities of the Bishopric; also they not having been called together in council, especially that legal action has been started involving the bishopric.

Therefore; I am unwilling to act as one of the bishops, and am inclosing herewith my bishop's license.

Respectfully,

A. W. Bogue.

WANTED

We would like to have a few copies of the August number of Zion's Advocate to complete our files in the office. Any one having one or more copies to spare will confer a favor by mailing to Zion's Advocate, Box 232, Independence, Mo.

THE VINEYARD

BAPTISM, AND THE TWELFTH MESSAGE

By Elder Willard J. Smith

"The law of the Lord is perfect."—Psalms, 19: 7.

"To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them."—Isaiah 8: 20.

"If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed: for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds."—2 John 10, 11.

"But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you . . . than that ye have received, let him be accursed."—Gal. 1: 8, 9.

"Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them. For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple."—Romans 16: 17, 18.

It is reported that Cicero declared, "True laws are right reason conformable to nature,—universal, unchangeable, eternal; whose commands urge us to duties, and whose prohibitions restrain us from evil."

The law commonly known as the laws of nature, and God's Revelations to mankind are unmistakably true, and are inflexible and inexorable, and include in the broadest sense all the revelation God has ever given to man whether doctrinal or perceptive; hence, in conventional modification we refer to the "Law of Moses," "The Ceremonial Law," "the Law of Christ," "The Law and the Prophets," "the Moral Law," etc., etc., each referring to its necessary part of the whole. The infinite God is a law unto himself. It is said of Him: "Because he could swear by no greater, he swear by himself."—Heb. 6: 13,—and on the whole face of Creation is written the unmistakable evidences of order, system and law; and if a law governing such never changes, then that law is eternal, and the facts of the Universe must be coexistent with the universe itself. Hence:

"I know that, whatsoever God doeth, it shall be forever: nothing can be put to it, nor anything taken from it: and God doeth it, that men should fear before him."—Ecc. 3: 14.

With these basic thoughts before us, and their soundness being practically axiomatic, let us proceed to examine the principle, or doctrine of baptism, together with the deductions arrived at from the Twelfth Message, and advocated by some of the Elders belonging to the Church of Christ regarding this very important matter.

The Bible very plainly states that "As many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ."—Gal. 3: 27. And it also says: "Know ye not, that as many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. . . . Knowing this that our old man "that which was carnal and sinful" is crucified with him, **that the body of sin might be destroyed**, that henceforth we should not serve sin. For he that is dead is freed from sin. Now if we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him: . . . For in that he died, he died unto sin once: but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God. Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord. . . . Ye were the servants of sin, but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you. Being then made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness."—Romans 6: 3-18.

These Scripture passages most positively show that those who had obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered unto them, were baptized into Christ, and were made free from sin, and became servants of righteousness. When they were buried with Christ in baptism, this baptismal act with proper preparation preceding it brought them into such joint relationship with Christ, that, as Paul expressed it:

"We are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones. Eph. 5: 30. And, "For, if any one be in Christ, he is a New Creation." "For neither is circumcision anything, nor uncircumcision, but a New Creation."—See 2 Cor. 5: 17; Gal. 6: 15.—Emphatic Diaglott.

If we then, by obedience to the Perfect Law of Liberty, become New Creatures,—a New Creation,—being "Born of water, and of the Spirit,—what law or similitude in all the realm of moral, political, or religious jurisprudence demands of one to be Created again?

If baptism is the method employed and ordained of God as the direct process of a translation from the kingdom or "Power of darkness into the kingdom of His dear Son," then should one be baptized again, or Re-baptized, he must of necessity, and in accordance with all right reason be transferred, translated, or baptized OUT of the kingdom of God into something else which in the very nature of things can not be of God. God's law is perfect: and in all His Creative work we can not find in any instance where He ever did—or caused to be done—a doing over, or again, any work of His Creative power or appointment. RE-baptism is therefore not in harmony with any other creative work or appointment of God, and in no way can it measure up with the "Perfect law of Liberty," and is therefore not of God. Let us follow this line of reasoning a little farther.

"I am the true Vine, and my Father is the vine dresser. . . . I am the vine, you are the branches. He who abides in me, and I in him, he beareth much fruit: because severed from me you can do nothing. If any one abide not in me, he is cut out like the branch, and is withered: and such are gathered, and cast into a fire, and are burned."—St. John 15: 1, 5, 6, Emphatic Diaglott.

Surely this saying of Jesus Christ can not be made plainer by any comment of mine. The perfection of Law is so plainly manifest in this saying of the Master,—and may be sustained every day by Ocular demonstration,—that my only effort here will be to direct special attention to some of the prominent thoughts inherent therein. It will be observed by the careful reader that the relationship between Christ and his People is herein portrayed in the similitude of the **divine union** of the Branches with the Vine; and in all cases the Law of Nature,—which is the Law of God,—is employed in the creation of the Vine, and in the mysterious relationship of this Divine Union of the Vine and its Branches; and in no instance in all the realm of Nature can it be found where the Divine process of uniting the Branch with the Vine had to be, or ever was in any case, repeated. And in order to permit of its being repeated, there must of necessity be a severance of the Branch from the Vine, in which case the Branch becomes "withered: and such are gathered, and cast into a Fire, and are burned."

The Law governing both the Vine and its Branches provides for, and it is shown conclusively, that so long as the Branch remains in the Vine it is entitled to be nourished and fed from the ever-flowing supply of the juices and fatness of the Vine; and therefore there is no need for the divine process of Creation, or transfusion, to ever again be employed. But if any branch becomes bitten with a poisonous worm, or otherwise blasted, and will not abide the Law governing the growth of the Vine with all its associated Branches, it will, eventually, wither and die, and must of necessity be cut out; for if it is left remaining it will eventually destroy the whole Vine. And I may here call attention