

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 9

INDEPENDENCE, MISSOURI. AUGUST, 1932

NUMBER 8

What Evidence Have We from a Bible and Book of Mormon Standpoint that God Placed in the Church a First Presidency?

By an Elder of the Reorganization

First of all, let us examine the claims made for Moses, Aaron, and Hur, as having been set apart as a First Presidency of the Church of Christ in the wilderness. By turning to Exodus 17:8-13, we read of a war going on, and that Aaron and Hur held up the hands of Moses (verse 12). True; but how do we know that the church had been organized at that time, this being only about two or three months after their departure from Egypt?

Next we take up Exodus 18:12-26. In verse 18 we learn that Jethro said to Moses: "Thou wilt surely wear away, both thou and this people that is with thee; for this thing is too heavy for thee." What had become of Aaron and Hur? Gone fishing, eh? Oh, no; we find them in Exodus 24:14, with quite a body of people.

Going back to verse 13, we read that Moses rose up, and his *minister Joshua!* And Moses went up into the mount of God. And in verse 14, he said unto the elders, "Tarry ye here for us, until we come again unto you. And behold Aaron and Hur are with you; if any man have any matter to do, let him come unto them." Seemingly Aaron and Hur were simply his servants upon this occasion, to look after matters and things while his real minister, Joshua, would be with Moses up in the mount of God, and the elders were to tarry with the people until their return.

But if Aaron and Hur were really officers of the First Presidency, why were they not permitted to go up into the mount of God with Moses (in line with Peter, James, and John in New Testament times) instead of Joshua? And why should Moses make mention of ministers and elders, and not include Aaron and Hur, if they held any office at all at the time? And they possibly did not, for later on in Ezekiel 28:1, also 28:8, 9, and again in Exodus 30:30, we read of the ordination and anointing of Aaron and sons to what is known as the Aaronic or lesser (perpetual) priesthood. And if Aaron and his sons ever held any other priesthood, we have failed to find it in any of the books; and no mention whatever of Hur being ordained to any priestly office, high or low.

But let us return to Exodus 24:14, where Moses

said: "Behold Aaron and Hur are with you; if any man have any matters to do let him come to them." Then by turning to Exodus 32:17-23 we learn that while Moses and Joshua were on the mount during the forty days, the people gave orders as to what must be done. Well, what was done? Why, Aaron made a golden calf, and they had a glory hallelujah time of it—a real, old-fashioned camp meeting: singing, making a big noise, shouting and dancing, and *naked at that, for Aaron had made them naked*—possibly Hur might have been his helper? Anyway, when Moses and Joshua returned from the mount there was something doing. And we wonder what Moses thought of his two counselors! Quite a bad showing to begin with for a First Presidency, if indeed one was in existence.

But let us turn to Numbers 11:11-25, and in verse 11 Moses said unto the Lord, "Wherefore hast thou afflicted thy servant? And wherefore have I not found favor in thy sight? That thou layest the burden of all this people upon me?" And in verse 14, "I am not able to bear all this people alone." *Surely Aaron and Hur must have gone fishing again.*

In verse 16 the Lord tells Moses "to gather seventy elders to stand with him, "that thou bear it not alone." Why all this "alone" talk and complaint if Aaron and Hur were with him as a part of a First Presidency?

Next we turn to Deuteronomy 1:3-9, and 12:4 and 17. In verse 17 Moses still complains and says, "I am not able to bear you myself alone." In verse 12, "How can I myself alone bear your cumbrance? and your burdens and your strife," etc.? Well, we must come to the conclusion, first and last, that if Aaron and Hur were ever a part of a First Presidency, *they were not on the job.* There is not even a shadow of evidence of their holding that office and calling, judging from the foregoing citations. Anyway, the two so-called counselors seem to be missing and Moses all alone just a few days before his death.

In Doctrine and Covenants 104:11, we are informed that the three officers of the First Presidency must be of the Melchisedec priesthood; and in the Herald for September 30, 1925, page 1027, the writer there tells us that "Moses had in the church in the wilderness the lesser officers, including the bishop, or high priest

of the lesser priesthood." And as Aaron held the lesser, we will have to let our imagination stretch considerably to make ourselves believe either he or Hur ever held the higher priesthood, or had any part in what is termed the First Presidency. In fact, that office is not known to the Bible or Book of Mormon.

In Doctrine and Covenants 83:4 we are informed that "Moses as well as the holy priesthood was taken out of (the way) their midst. And the lesser priesthood continued." Having now weighed the evidence of a first presidency in the church in the wilderness in the balance and found it wanting, we now move forward to the New Testament church, and take up the threads of the Peter, James, and John first presidency, if indeed there be any.

In Matthew 17:1-3, we note that Jesus took them up on the mount of transfiguration, and there appeared unto them Moses and Elias (but why not Aaron and Hur too, if they were counselors to Moses as a First Presidency); but neither on the mount, nor at any time later on, do we find any record of Peter, James, and John as having been set apart as a first presidency over the church, either by ordination, anointing or otherwise. We dare not add to or deduct. Why then set up a standard that can not be substantiated? And why try to build on an *if* or a *guess* in a matter of great importance? The facts and proof are lacking. And it must be borne in mind that the James that was present at the transfiguration with Peter and John, was in fact John's own brother in the flesh—the son of Zebedee, and was murdered by King Herod. (See Acts 12:1, 2.)

And James the Lord's brother, that rendered the decision or sentence at Jerusalem, was not even a member of the church while Jesus was on the earth. James seemingly had not faith in his brother's mission. (See John 7:5.) And he was not on the mount of transfiguration, but came into the church later on, and was ordained to the apostleship. And in Acts 1:2-26 we note that Peter, James, and John were still members, or numbered with the quorum of the twelve. And mark it well, that if Peter and John were members of the higher office—the first presidency—sure the apostles at Jerusalem took upon themselves authority that did not belong to them, when "they sent" Peter and John of the First Presidency (?) down "to Samaria" (see Acts 8:14,) to lay hands on those who had been baptized by Philip. Where can we find another transaction like that? In fact, that does not seem to sound just right—something wrong. The facts are, Peter and John were simply apostles and sent to Samaria by the other apostles about one or two years after the day of Pentecost. And Peter, James, and John, remained with the quorum of twelve till death.

But let us now weigh the seemingly strong points in favor of a first presidency: In Galatians 2:9, we read: "And when James Cephas (Peter) and John who seemed to be pillars" . . . "they gave me (Paul) and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship, that we should go to the heathen, and they unto the circum-

cision" (Jews), all five to do missionary work among Gentiles and Jews. Not localized as a presidency; and others of the twelve could well look after and take care of the trouble we read of in Acts 15, as well as other church matters, without a so-called first presidency. In fact, that office is not made mention of in either the Old or the New Testament, nor yet in the Book of Mormon when Jesus Christ organized his church on this continent—America. Yes; something really strange; in fact, if that office was really in existence.

In 2 Corinthians 12:11 Paul said: "In nothing am I behind the very chiefest of apostles." Then why the reference to James, Cephas, and John, as seemingly pillars, if in fact they were of the so-called first presidency? There could be no "seeming" about it, for they would be the real pillars, if they composed the first presidency. Was Paul not a strong man? And as much a seeming "pillar" as James, Cephas, and John? or any of the apostles? In 2 Corinthians 11:22-28 we read: "Are they Hebrews? So am I. Are they Israelites? So am I. Ministers of Christ? So am I. Are they seed of Abraham? So am I," etc. Besides having the care of all the churches. Listen. Does that sound as if James, Peter, and John as a first presidency were in charge? And had greater authority than Paul?

In 1 Corinthians 15:9, 10, Paul said: "I labored more abundantly than they all." But, says one, "What about that decision, or sentence by James at Jerusalem?" "Don't that show there was a first presidency?" To a man, or set of men that have gotten themselves into a tight place, and looking for an outlet, that might look somewhat reasonable. A drowning man will grab for a straw. But let us turn and read Acts 15:1-20, about the first presidency—oh, no; about the apostles and elders. (And don't let us forget that James was not on the mount of transfiguration with Peter and John). Another prop gone from the first presidency scheme.

And what do we get from that Jerusalem conference? Simply the opinions of Peter and Barnabas, followed by the sentence, (or opinion) of James, the bishop of the church—all apostles. But what is the meaning of the word "sentence"? See the New Universities Dictionary: It reads: "Judgment, opinion, decision." Hence, all gave their decision, James included. "But," says one, "Peter must have been one of the first presidency, judging from what Jesus told him in Matthew 16:19. Well, if that be the case, possibly all of the apostles were members of the first presidency, for we find about the same statement was made to all the apostles. See Matthew 18:18, and John 21:23, all having the same keys, power, and authority. All in the same office and calling. God had not provided for more. John in Revelation 12:1, did not see fifteen stars in the woman's crown, simply twelve. No room there for a first presidency. And in Matthew 19:27, 28 Jesus said that the twelve should sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel. While Jesus sits in his own throne of glory,

but fails to provide a throne for a first presidency for some cause. Are they to be slighted and forgotten, have nothing to say, and nothing to do? and be compelled to go down to the foot of the class, or to be left out altogether, which seems to be the case?

As God spoke through the apostles and others, and when trouble or matter of importance confronted the church, the apostles attended to it. See Acts 1:16-26, Acts 6:1-6, and Acts 15:1-22. And we are made to wonder why that in all the sayings of the prophets, from Adam to Malachi, and the sayings of Jesus Christ and all the officers of the church from Matthew to Revelation, that they never made mention of a first presidency, if, in fact, there was one in existence. Even Luke, who wrote the Acts of the Apostles, made no mention of a higher office in the church than the apostles; and in Book of Mormon, 1 Nephi 3:78-248, Nephi in his wonderful vision of Jesus Christ and his church, made no mention of seeing a first presidency. But the work of the twelve is spoken of about sixteen times in said vision. He also saw that the twelve apostles should judge the twelve tribes of Israel.

Well, having also failed to find a first presidency in the New Testament church, as well as in the Book of Mormon, we shall now undertake the task in the restoration movement. In Doctrine and Covenants 16:6, Oliver Cowdery and David Whitmer were by revelation through Joseph Smith in June, 1829, commanded to search out the twelve apostles, which they failed to do for some cause for about six years. But in the meantime, they (Oliver and David as well as Joseph Smith) had been baptized and ordained to the apostleship, and the church organized on April 6, 1830. But not a word from God by way of revelation to the church providing for a first presidency. But in Doctrine and Covenants 20:1 the Lord said, "I have caused this last covenant and this church to be built up unto me, even as in days of old." And in Church History, vol. 1, page 78, we find the following: "In accordance with commandments and revelations given by him to ourselves in the last days, as well as according to the order of the church as recorded in the New Testament." Then in the Doctrine and Covenants, section 17, we have all the officers of the church named, one by one, but not a hint of a first presidency, but seemingly in full agreement with Matthew 10:1-5, 1 Corinthians 12:28, Ephesians 4:11, and Nephi's Vision as recorded in the Book of Mormon.

The next step will be to compare chapter 6 in the Book of Commandments, with Doctrine and Covenants, section 7; for right here is where the first presidency egg is beginning to hatch. For in the self-same revelation in the two books we find 112 words in the Book of Commandments and 255 words in the Doctrine and Covenants, and it now begins to look a little suspicious. In Church History, volume 1, pages 221 to 228, and 249, we learn that Joseph Smith himself was the one that "carefully and prayerfully prepared the revelations in the Book of Commandments and

dedicated them to God" and ordered three thousand copies printed. This was in November, 1831.

Some contend that the Book of Commandments was never completed. Well, let us see about that. *The Evening and The Morning Star* (the church paper) for May, 1832, refers to the Book of Commandments as "now in print," and it appears that it was in press about the middle of April. Anyway David Whitmer said, "I have a copy of it which was finished complete." Brother Jacob Whitmer gave his copy to Brother John C. Whitmer: his son now has it. And upon the title page in large letters "A BOOK OF COMMANDMENTS FOR THE GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCH OF CHRIST ORGANIZED ACCORDING TO LAW ON THE 6TH DAY OF APRIL, 1830, ZION. PUBLISHED BY W. W. PHELPS AND CO., 1833. Then the following: "The book was finished complete and bound in paper covers." *Evening and Morning Star*, vol. 13, no. 1, page 1. Another: The Library of Congress still possesses a copy of the Book of Commandments of 160 pages and signed Feed W. Ashly, Chief order of division. This was in reply to an inquiry dated December 12, 1911. Another inquiry of November 30, 1911, reads, from the New York Public Library, "We secured a perfect copy of this work. This copy has no marks of previous ownership. It consists of 160 pages." Signed H. M. Lyemberg, Reference Librarian.

We have a number of inquiries and replies, but the foregoing will be quite enough. The fact remains that chapter 6 of the Book of Commandments was changed and added to as it appears in Doctrine and Covenants section 7.

But of course that is not the only one of the revelations that has been tinkered with in order to make room for a first presidency. Possibly the ancient way of spelling presidency was "Pillars" (seemed to be). Well, anyway, at Amherst, Ohio, on January 25, and April 26, 1832, at Independence, Missouri, Joseph Smith was set apart to the first presidency, and the events were both *special* conferences. There was no revelation directing such a matter. It was done exclusively by a resolution. See Church History, vol. 1, page 244. And why was not the setting apart of a first presidency deferred until the voice of a *general* conference should be heard? And thus have conserved the law of common consent, as the law of God provides. Well, for the best of reasons: This first presidency scheme was a new departure—unheard of and unread of, and a general conference body might have spoiled the whole project by citing them to the law already given, and to Amos 3:7, etc.

"Oh but," says one, "section 104 in the Doctrine and Covenants provides for the office of first president." True enough. But for cause it has no date. However, by turning to Joseph Smith's history of himself as published in *Millennial Star*, vol. 15, pages 245, 246, we learn that this revelation, section 104, was not given until after March 28, 1835—some three years and three months after Joseph Smith was ordained president of the high priesthood, and over

two years after the first presidency was fully organized. See vol. 1, Church History, pages 282, 283. Also Doctrine and Covenants 87, p. 3.

In a revelation given April 6, 1830, 19:1, it is stated that Joseph Smith shall be called a seer, a translator, a prophet, and an apostle of Jesus Christ, also an elder of the church through the will of God the Father, etc. Nothing said, however, about a first presidency. In Book of Commandments chapter 24, and Doctrine and Covenants 17:1 (same revelation) it will be noted that we already have three apostles. And in Book of Commandments 15:27, we read:

"And now behold there are others who are called to declare my gospel both unto Gentiles and unto Jews; yea, even unto twelve." But in Doctrine and Covenants 16:5, the word "unto" is left out entirely. The intention originally was to add nine more apostles to the former three.

In Church History, vol. 1, page 541, Joseph Smith said (February 14, 1835), "The first business of the meeting was for the three witnesses of the Book of Mormon to pray each one, and proceed to choose twelve men (not nine) from the church as apostles, after which the following men were chosen to be apostles of the Church of Christ: Lyman E. Johnson, Brigham Young, Heber C. Kimball, Orson Hyde, David W. Patten, Luke Johnson, William E. McLellin, John F. Boynton, Orson Pratt, William B. Smith, Thomas B. Marsh, and Parley P. Pratt.

From the above it will be noted that not one of the former three apostles is included. Hence we can now see why the word "unto" was left out of the revelation in Doctrine and Covenants 16:5—for a nest egg. So in 1835, we have fifteen apostles in place of twelve. But before that we had a full first presidency and secondly a quorum of twelve apostles? Quite out of line with the New Testament and Book of Mormon church. See Matthew 10; 1 Corinthians 12; Ephesians 4; Doctrine and Covenants 17 and 42.

Elder William H. Kelley, a former member of the Quorum of Twelve in the Reorganization, said: "It is believed by some that after the crucifixion of the Savior, Peter, James, and John were advanced to the presidency of the church; that their authority henceforth transcended that of the other apostles; but unfortunately for their theory there seems to be little or nothing to support it."—Presidency and Priesthood, page 72.

On the same page he says: "There is no evidence showing that either Peter or John ever acted in that capacity, but rather that they continued in the very offices and authority to which they were appointed when they were first called to the apostleship by the Master." And his statement to Peter in Matthew 16: 19, as to the keys of the kingdom, had the same bearing on the balance of the twelve and ministry, and had nothing to do with leadership or presidency of the church outside of his own quorum. He was simply the chairman of the twelve apostles. So where are we?

In Doctrine and Covenants 99, page 6, we read: "The president of the church, who is also the president of the council, is appointed by revelation and acknowledged in his ministrations by the voice of the church. And it is according to the dignity of his office that he shall preside over the high council of the church. And it is his privilege to be assisted by two other presidents, appointed after the same manner that he himself was appointed."

Quite the reverse took place on January 25 and 26, 1832, if we have been truthfully informed. In Doctrine and Covenants 43:1 we read: "Ye have received a commandment for a law unto my church through him whom I have appointed unto you to receive commandments and revelations from my hand. And this ye shall know assuredly, that there is none other appointed unto you to receive commandments and revelations until he be taken, if he abide in me."

Now we have it, and now we don't have it, but are made to inquire if there really was a first presidency in the Old or New Testament church? Where can the revelation or revelations of appointment be found? And more, where are the revelations they received for the church? It is true that James in his epistle gave some very fine counsel to the church as an apostle, but not a revelation. And an apostle he was, and for all we know, he might have been a bishop of the churches, some writers so contend, and may have had a hand in helping the balance of the twelve in giving orders, and ordaining the seven deacons spoken of in Acts 6:1-6, as the deacon's life would naturally be a part of the financial law business of the church, and in case of the bishop or bishops and under their jurisdiction.

In our missionary labors we are very much inclined to cite our hearers of the world to Isaiah 8:20: "To the law and to the testimony if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." Surely this citation equally applies to every Latter Day Saint, first, last, and all the time, no matter to what faction they may belong.

In conclusion, may God by the power of his Spirit help us all to become as one, and be made to see eye to eye; for united we stand, but divided we fall. So mote it be. Amen.

Notice

Have you moved or changed your address?

A new ruling of the postal department has added a little more expense to the publishing of the Advocate. When you move or change your address without notifying us of the change, the first time the Advocate comes to the old address they send us a notice of the change and this costs us two cents postage due.

This last issue cost us quite a bit for this reason, so please notify us at once when you change your address.

A. M. SMITH.

ZION'S ADVOCATE

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

BOARD OF PUBLICATION

A. M. Smith, Louise P. Sheldon, Pauline Handcock,
B. C. Flint, H. E. Moler

Editor: H. E. Moler Holdin, Mo.

Assistant: A. M. Smith, Box 232, Independence, Mo.

Address all matter for publication to the Editor
Address all orders and send all monies to A. M. Smith,
Business Manager, Box 232, Independence, Mo.
Subscription Rates: One Year, \$1.00; Six Months, 75 cents.

In bundles of twelve or more for missionary purpose,
\$1.00 per dozen.

Canadian and all Foreign Rates \$1.25

EDITORIAL

The Present Political Situation

Another presidential campaign is now on in full blast. And the fact that many leaders in both political parties are clamoring for the repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment makes many of us wonder what our country is coming to. The Democratic platform comes out boldly and squarely in favor of the absolute repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment, while the Republican Convention in their adopted platform have "straddled the fence" by favoring a resubmission of the prohibition question to the voters. In the case of both parties, or either party, it is a step backward. After the debauching, sinful, soul-wrecking record that "booze" has made, why intelligent people should clamor for its return is more than we can understand.

It is indeed a sorry spectacle, after the adoption of a prohibition law, and in force for years, to see statesmen, governors, congressmen, and so-called high society women all clamoring for the return of strong drink and the bringing back of the open saloon, or its equivalent. But these are the facts we are now facing. Many temperance people in both old parties are perplexed to know what to do. There are people who have a superstitious loyalty to party, who will vote for anything presented by their party, even though it be contrary to their own convictions.

There is some talk of the establishment of a third party which will stand squarely for maintenance of the Eighteenth Amendment. But at this writing there has nothing definitely been done aside from the Prohibition Party. However, we hope that by the time this editorial appears in print that something definite will have developed.

If this question could be submitted directly to the people without the confusion of party lines, we would not need to fear the results. But as it is, and the existing confusion and the blind loyalty that many hold to the old political parties, the results are a conjecture.

With the present-day increase of high speed ve-

hicle travel, when it requires the clear-sober-brained and steady-handed driver, we tremble to anticipate the results from accidents and destruction of life that shall occur, if strong drink is again publicly sold. It will then be almost unsafe for a sober person to venture out on our highways.

It is argued by those favoring repeal that strong drink is just as easy to obtain now as it was when we had the open saloon. But that statement is not true. It is true that much illicit liquor is being manufactured today, but it is not nearly as easily obtained as when we had the open saloon, and what drinking is done today is done, not in public or in the open, as formerly, but is done secretly and under cover. We do not see drunken men on our streets and highways as formerly. In fact the editor has seen but one intoxicated person in all the years since prohibition went into effect nationally. It is not as easily obtained as when we had the open saloon.

"But," says the objector to prohibition, "we are deprived of our liberty; we should be privileged to drink if we wish." We should remember that there are restrictions in liberty. One man's liberty ends where another man's rights begin. No man has the right to annoy others, or terrify his wife and children by his drinking; no man has a right to take the money he should spend for food and clothing for his wife and children to purchase strong drink for himself and comrades.

Again is argued, "Prohibition does not prohibit, and therefore should be abolished." We answer: The prohibition law does prohibit; but there are those who disobey the law. All States, and the Nation, have a law against *murder*, but that does not prevent hundreds being murdered every year. But who would think of repealing the law against murder, because that law is violated? Why not be consistent? We know that the law against murder serves as a deterrent and prevents murders that might otherwise take place. So with the Eighteenth Amendment: It serves as a deterrent. Notwithstanding the illicit drink made and disposed of, we are a sober nation compared to our record with the open saloon.

Will the Eighteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States be repealed? We do not know. We do believe that it is the minority who have been making the great big fuss against prohibition, whereas the majority—the common people—have kept quiet. And while we may be mistaken, we can not avoid believing that this great majority, (at present quiet), when it comes to counting the votes will make themselves heard.

However, we must not forget we are living in the last times, when the Evil One has great wrath; so we need not be surprised at the worst that may come. Let us then stand together in holy places until the day of the Lord comes. And if repeal comes, may it not come as the result of the vote of any member of the Church of Christ.

The Forest Sanctuary

JAMES E. YATES.

'Tis Sabbath morning, while over all adorning
Now mounts the silver sun.
How sweet this hour in nature's bower
Where holiest passions run.
Shadows are lifting while in majesty drifting
Like chariots in the sky
Are the clouds of fleece that seldom cease
In their glory marching by.

Sweet devotion there seems everywhere
As the feathered choir sings,
While upon the breeze and through the trees
The sacred anthem rings.

'Tis an hour of prayer in cathedral rare
In the heart of nature's thought,
Where the mountains say, as the fountains play:
Behold what God hath wrought!

O, holy Temple here so ample,
In the fastness of the forest grand,
Thy leafy halls and granite walls
Proclaim the Master's hand.
Without fear or falter at this altar
Is filled with praise the hour;
O, Lord today, teach us to pray
And lead us by thy power.

Was there ever sweet incense so meet,
So fit for the soul's pure sifting,
As this breath that frees flung on the breeze
Laden, loving, lifting?
O, Spirit of the living Lord!
Blessed, holy, sacred cheer,
We pray not for thy coming now,
But praise that thou art here!

For in this grandeur thou hast spread,
And by thy grace and power,
We feel thy majesty o'erhead
And thy presence in this hour.
This sparkling dew the grasses through
In pure sacrament is given,
And thy broken bread is in the forest spread,
Of hallowed life the leaven.

Hark! cometh then, the grand amen;
No discord, no doubts, no fears!
The rocks and rills the trees and hills
The King of all reveres!
How chastened there the heart of prayer,
How strengthened here the soul;
Purged white in the fire of pure desire
For worship maketh whole.

Centralia, Washington., June 12, 1932.

News From the Field

Immediately after the conference, I left for Dalby Springs, Texas, with the view to holding a few meetings. I had hardly landed than I was informed that Elder A. M. Baker was ready to do battle against the Hedrickites if I would consent to the battling. Accordingly I sent him a signed copy of the same propositions that were debated at Dekalb, Illinois, with Curtis. He wrote back and said there was too much red tape to them and that he thought I didn't want to meet him. Well, I sent a very reassuring letter to him to the contrary. Advises to me today, are that he is not to be located in his usual haunts. Neither Brother Cox at Dalby, nor Elder Sharpe of the Reorganized Church know what has become of him. I sure didn't mean to frighten the brother out of his district.

Arrived at Douglas, Arizona, on the 15th of May, after a brief stop at Houston and San Antonio. At Houston had a brief set-to with the Adventists, which proved amusing as well as interesting. At Douglas we busied ourselves with preparations to move into our new field of service. By invitation from the local pastor there I occupied the Reorganized pulpit the only Sunday I was there. Had good attention and interest. It was rather a three-cornered service. A Utah elder occupied a few minutes of the time on the tobacco question. Everyone enjoyed his lecture. My time was taken up in emphasizing the necessity of all

believers in the Restoration coming to a unity of the faith in harmony with the teachings of Christ in the Bible and the Book of Mormon. My message seemingly was appreciated by all. Before leaving Douglas we enjoyed two social gatherings with these brethren occasioned by our leaving the community. These folks have the genuine gospel spirit and we regretted that we were compelled to leave them behind.

Our next stop was at Phoenix, where we held a service or two, and visited with the Saints there. They seem real happy in their new church home. We wish them every blessing and that they shall continue to make progress. At Gila Bend, Arizona, we were given a warm welcome by the family of Elder O. A. Bender. Being there for the first Sunday of the month, we held a sacrament service with them. This seemingly was quite comforting to all that attended, especially Brother Bender, who because of his isolation from the church has been deprived of this privilege. We also held four preaching services, which though not largely attended, were marked with a goodly degree of the Spirit. We all felt to profit by our sojourn together. Leaving Gila we made a hot trip across the desert country of southern Arizona and California to San Diego. This trip was without event except the sharp report of two old tires exploding on the hot pavements. Sister Wheaton had a ther-

ometer in
ad occasi
pon our a
id that in
rees coole
et hot in
e desert
reciate th
After ou
ohn Har
ngement
ow morn
have ple
Wheaton,
ope for a

(Since w
as finishe
ncouragin
n to Utah
eing exhi
here some
he work
nown it-

To the
ould like
ve left yo
The reason
The Indian
hailed ou
quiry have
failure to
tremendou
along the
to be in S
and after
Caledonia

We will
visit to H
visit has
think you
our humb
by our br
with any
meetings,

After le
but there
portunity
We enjoy
Sister J.
about hal
destinatio
distance c
we found
River at
Construct
ing the r
after trav

ometer in the pocket of the car door, and when she had occasion to take the temperature of the children, upon our arrival at the coast it registered 108 degrees, and that in the shade of the car which was many degrees cooler than out in the open sunshine. It may get hot in Missouri, but it takes the sizzling heat of the desert without any shade trees, to make one appreciate the land of Zion.

After our arrival here at the coast we located Elder John Harris and daughter at National City. Arrangements have been made to start meetings tomorrow morning. It is hard now to forecast the results. I have plenty of help, with the music of Sister Wheaton, and the cooperation of Elder Harris. We hope for a good time.

Sincerely,

CLARENCE L. WHEATON.

(Since writing the foregoing news Brother Wheaton has finished his work here for the present and gone encouraging, stating that a much better attitude is on to Utah, where he reports things are looking most being exhibited towards our work than when he was there some two or three years ago, and the outlook for the work there is much better than he has ever known it.—A. M. S.)

Flint, Michigan, July 4, 1932.

To the Editor: No doubt many of your readers would like to hear from us in our wanderings, since we left your hospitable home about the first of May. The reason for this belief is that we were heading for the Indian country in Ontario, Canada, from whence hailed our Lamanite brother. Many letters of inquiry have come to me relative to this matter, and our failure to have reached there ere this is due to the tremendous demands made upon our ministry all along the line. We are still in Michigan, but expect to be in St. Thomas, Canada, for the coming Sunday, and after a short sojourn there we will go directly to Caledonia, to meet with the Indians there.

We will refrain from saying anything about our visit to Holden, as your very kind reference to that visit has already occupied space in the *Advocate*. I think you attached altogether too much importance to our humble efforts. The kindly response accorded us by our brothers and sisters there had as much to do with any success that may have resulted from our meetings, as what we did ourselves.

After leaving there we went direct to Warrensburg, but there it seemed that there was absolutely no opportunity accorded us to do anything among them. We enjoyed a friendly evening visit with Brother and Sister J. E. Bozarth there, and then hit the trail at about half past four the next morning, our intended destination for that day being Rockford, Illinois; a distance of well over five hundred miles. However, we found the short cut that crossed the Mississippi River at Louisiana, Missouri, closed, "Road Under Construction," so we had to take the old route, crossing the river at Alton, Illinois. The result was that after traveling the five hundred miles we were so

exhausted that we camped for the night nearly one hundred miles short of our destination. We resumed our journey the next morning fully refreshed, and after a couple of days pleasant and profitable intercourse with our dear old Brother and Sister Daer, at Rockford, we again resumed our journey, stopping one night at DeKalb in the hospitable home of Brother and Sister Lusha. While there we also had a very nice visit with a Sister Hoague, whose people nearly all went into the Fetting movement. Sister Lusha and her son Clarence, (known to many in Independence) are nobly caring for the interests of the Church of Christ in DeKalb.

On the sixth of May we completed our journey into my field, arriving at the home of Brother and Sister Robert Housh, Detroit, Michigan, which, from that time forth became "our home" in Michigan. And when we say that, we do not forget that every home of the Saints over here is our home so long as we wish to make it so. But living in a suitcase, as we do, we must needs have a sort of central place to "unload" our personal belongings, the while we journey afield.

We remained in Detroit for over six weeks, and believe that our ministry there was fruitful of some good in the way of unifying and solidifying our work there, that being the thing that they seemed to need. In this our work was augmented and strengthened by the assistance of Brethren William Anderson and A. M. Smith, of the Twelve, who had been sent by the quorum to answer an appeal from the local at Flint to adjust some difficulties there that had apparently gotten beyond their control. These brethren together remained with us about a week, and to say that I appreciated their association and assistance is putting it very lightly indeed. Brother Anderson had come in about a week before Brother Smith was able to get here, and he rendered inestimable assistance in getting the work in Detroit on the good working basis that I believe now exists there.

Influences have been at work there for a long time, as is well known, that had for their object the complete overthrow of our work there, or at least so it appeared. However, we felt that the main need was a series of spiritual meetings that would take their attention away from their local difficulties. This was attempted, and we believe that this, together with the success we had in segregating the source of the trouble, that the work there now is on a solid foundation, especially if the brethren of the priesthood there (a fine group of men, but inexperienced), can succeed in keeping their ministry on the high plane that the gospel of our Savior and Master makes possible, and I believe they will. One experience we had while there I think worthy of mention, because of the beautiful spirit of brotherhood that seemed to prompt it.

It so happened that the twentieth anniversary of Sister Flint's and my earthly pilgrimage together, came on the 4th of June, and the Saints of Detroit gave us a very pleasant surprise in the evening of that day. They all met at the home of Brother and Sister Housh and the social intercourse of that occasion will

never be forgotten. We were asked to again appear as bride and groom, and Brother William Anderson was asked to officiate, and his kindly words of felicity and brotherhood will remain with us as treasures while life shall last. To the splendid Saints in Detroit we wish to express our undying appreciation. This includes some not yet of us, notably the Gifford and Duell families. While at Detroit, Brother A. F. Ettienne was baptized. He is a bookkeeper for the McKay Construction Company. He is a fine man and the church will yet hear from him.

The results of the work of Brethren Smith and Anderson, here in Flint, are really more than we expected. There has been a wonderful reaction and we are here even now, attempting to build constructively on the work accomplished by the brethren. Everything seems to be as it should be. Yesterday two young brethren were called and ordained to the eldership, and one young man was baptized. The young brethren ordained have already been very active, and their ministry is a recognized institution here. At the service last night the church was nicely filled, notwithstanding the fact that there was a regular downpour of rain. Many of those present were members of the Reorganization.

We spent nearly a week at Grand Rapids, but the opportunity to do much of a constructive character there seems somewhat remote, although the few Saints there are zealous and earnest, but the depression in the world generally has hit them pretty hard, and their resources are certainly very limited. While at Grand Rapids we visited our daughter, Mrs. Robert Henkel. She, too, is a member of the Church of Christ. While Brethren Smith and Anderson were in Michigan we visited the local church at Coleman, and Brother Arthur preached for them one evening. Brethren Postma and Welch of the Seventies both live in Coleman.

From Grand Rapids we went to Midland where our brother, F. J. Parkinson, and his family and Sister Kuhn live. Brother Parkinson is a live man and is doing a splendid work there in Midland. He is a priest. Through his efforts an all-day meeting was held there on the old fair grounds, now a tourist park, on June 26. There was a large auditorium available and there were Saints there from all adjacent points in Michigan, and a wonderful day was spent. A goodly number of our Reorganization brethren were present, among them the pastor at Midland, Brother Earl Falconer. The spirit of fellowship that we were able to develop among them resulted in our being asked to occupy in their church in the evening. This we were very glad to do, and we have a very cordial invitation to return there. On the following evening we spoke at the home of one of our members there in Midland, and again there were a goodly number of the Reorganization Saints present. One old sister walked in from the country a distance of over four miles. We expect to return there as soon as we can

get over into Canada and supervise our work there.

At present we are here in Flint holding a series of meetings that are very well attended. We will leave here later in the week for Port Huron en route for Canada via the ferry into Sarnia, Ontario.

Brother Norman Nellis is pastor here and is ably assisted by Brethren Willard Graves, Don Housknecht, and our beloved old Brother Pinder. The first two named were the young brethren ordained to the eldership yesterday. They have been priests hitherto.

After our experience among the Lamanites in Canada we will try to have something else of interest to relate. As it is, our faith and love for the work of God increases with the passing of time. Notwithstanding the terrible condition of depression now prevalent everywhere, we feel that the work is onward, just as the prophecies indicate it would be in this period. Not so much in great numbers as in the increase of spiritual power. Chastening must be our lot, and the missionary must be willing to struggle with the rest of the Saints.

May God richly bless his work throughout the world is our prayer. "THE FLINTS."

Obituary of John Stade

John Stade, son of Mr. and Mrs. Frederick Stade, was born October 7, 1862, in Elmwood, of Bruce County, Ontario, Canada, and passed from this life July 5, 1932, at his home one mile east of Cameron, Missouri, at the age of 69 years, 8 months, and 28 days.

Death was the result of heart disease, following an attack of influenza.

Mr. Stade moved from Ontario to Chilliwack, British Columbia, in 1883. He was married to Mary Elizabeth Snider in 1889. To this union were born nine children, five girls and four boys, Mrs. Floyd Cawthorn of Kingston, Fred L. Stade of Cameron, Mrs. N. C. Berbaum of Kansas City; Charles, who passed away in young manhood; Mrs. Maynard Case of Cameron; Daniel of Kansas City; Frank of Flint, Michigan; Mrs. Cassius Stubblefield and Mrs. Thomas O'Connor of Cameron.

In 1907 they moved from British Columbia to Cameron.

In 1900 he joined the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints. Later he transferred to Church of Christ of the Temple Lot.

Those left to mourn his departure are his wife, eight children, fifteen grandchildren, one sister, Mrs. William Karnstedt of Indianapolis, Indiana, and one brother William Stade, of Hanover, Ontario. Also many friends composed of all those who knew him.