

# 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,

VOLUME 14

INDEPENDENCE, MISSOURI, JUNE, 1937

NUMBER 6

## RELIGIOUS TESTIMONY

By Richard M. Morgan

In attempting to write on this subject, the author is conscious that the matter is potentially serious in its effects upon the witness, his or her final reward, and upon the souls of seekers for truth.

Since coming to a knowledge of the true gospel of Jesus Christ, I have been made decidedly uncomfortable by the testimonies I have heard uttered, with great zeal, concerning this latter day gospel work.

Of late this uneasiness has increased to a point where I actually fear for the safety of a host of witnesses who, because there is no visible law-enforcing-agency to cause them to be careful of their utterances, as they must be when testifying before our earthly courts, make solemn and extravagant statements concerning their knowledge of the mind and will of God which, when collected and compared, one with another, could not help but throw an investigating mind into a condition of profound confusion.

It has been said that by our testimony we will overcome the world. Well, according to history, when the stone of Truth rolled forth through the RESTORATION of Christ's gospel, there was plenty of resistance to it, but the testimony of those who heard, believed and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and tasted of the fruits of that Heavenly gift, echoed in convincing harmony around the world, and men and women whose hearts were honest turned to righteousness by the thousands.

Though this writer, together with many others of the same faith in the restored gospel, believes that human inventions and traditions came into the church, yet, because the testimony of the saints was an undivided affirmation of fundamental truths, the conversion of souls continued unabated, until the harmony of united testimony was broken by contradictory voices coming from the various groups into which the parent church divided at the death of Joseph Smith.

This contradictory testimony which was so eagerly offered by each organization to justify its claim to being the church was not accompanied by that love which should have been in evidence had their claims been true.

Please do not misunderstand me. In the few years that I have been acquainted with the restored gospel I have heard wonderful testimonies uttered in the various churches of this faith, which spoke only in defense of the gospel, and not any church. However, in most instances, there were other testimonies declaring that the manifestation of God to them furnished unimpeachable evidence that the church

to which they belonged was the only true Church of Christ, and furnished the only means by which one might attain to Celestial glory.

Thus I have been repeatedly startled and grieved by the reckless abandon with which the saints so often interpret their spiritual experiences to mean divine confirmation of their belief in the divinity of their particular church organization, instead of the gospel, taught by the church, or an expression of the Father's pleasure in their obedience to that gospel.

It may be that nothing can be done to cause the saints who have tasted of the Heavenly gift of God's love to pause, analyze and prove that we thoroughly understand our spiritual experiences before we offer them as positive evidence of the mind and will of God concerning any matter; nevertheless, the subject is really serious when we consider that when ever we offer such testimony, we do so under no less solemn obligation before the Divine bar of justice than would be required of us before an earthly court.

With this thought in mind, does it require too much strain upon the imagination to suppose that the giving of testimony as actual fact, but which may really be based upon no more substantial foundation than human interpretation and conjecture, and that quite often biased, might bring upon us the wrath of a just God?

Some time ago the writer, though an active member in the Church of Christ, was led to visit other churches of the same faith with the following results.

The first visit was with a newly established mission of a faction which I had never visited before. The meeting was advertised to be a fellowship service. I was late and the congregation was standing as the minister prayed in a language which I could not understand. I wondered what he was saying as I stood in the aisle, but was not aware of any especial spiritual feeling, when I suddenly became almost breathless with that spiritual warmth with which I had become so familiar, and I took my seat with the congregation when the prayer was finished, with tears in my eyes.

I was the only person of my nationality present, and though there were some there who knew who I was, no one knew anything of my religion.

The spiritual glow continued with me all through the meeting, and when I arose and testified of my belief in the Gospel and of the experience I was then having; also of the conviction which I felt that the spirit which then prevailed in the meeting was

## DISCUSSION of BILLS NOS. 10, 11, 29

### Concerning The Committee on Working Harmony

By B. C. Flint

During recent months, there have been some rather aggressive articles in the Advocate on the above subject, and by one of members of the committee, in question.

This is the first article to appear on the other side of the question, and we will endeavor to make it as affirmative as possible.

In 1935 this committee came into being with three members of the quorum of Twelve apostles being selected to act as such committee. Their objective, according to their own pronouncement, being as follows:- "We invite you severally AS CHURCH ORGANIZATIONS, to cooperate with us. Let us erect the House of the Lord at the place appointed on the Temple Lot in Independence, Missouri. (Emphasis mine B. C. F.) The above was addressed to the various factions of so called Mormonism, and they continue on this wise: "We invite the various organic divisions of the faith in this Restoration, to each appoint a commission of three, to counsel and mediate together with a commission of three whom the Church of Christ will appoint. The purpose of this joint Commission shall be to establish a more brotherly and sympathetic understanding between the churches; and to reach if possible a basis of working harmony upon which we may finally all agree to unite in building this House of the Lord in the place He has appointed."

The above quotations are from that part of Bill No. 3., of the Referendum of 1935, known as the "Majority Report," and is signed James E. Yates, and C. L. Wheaton.

In the General Assembly of 1935, the "Majority Report" was defeated, but its proponents succeeded in obtaining sufficient signers to have it sent out for referendum, and there it was successful, though protested by a majority of the ministry, who objected to being thus committed to the various factions, for the purpose of building the Temple.

Consistently with the avowed objective of this Committee on Working Harmony, they brought in a report to the recent Ministerial Conference at Independence, Missouri, April 6-14, 1937, wherein they recommended that when the Temple should be built, that EACH FACTION should not only enjoy joint title and ownership, in the Temple, but they should be guaranteed such ownership and title before even the building should be started.

During the two years of the existence of this committee there has been developing throughout the various fields, a pronounced opposition to this committee and its activities, and this opposition crystallized in the form of a protest, signed by seven members of the Quorum of Twelve, which was presented conjointly to the recent conference, with the above mentioned report of the committee.

As a result of this protest, the Committee's report was tabled. They (the committee) then brought in a revised report, which made no mention of temple building, notwithstanding the fact that that was the pronounced objective for which they were created. In this revised report they merely recommended that we get together with the other groups, and

pray with them, mutually occupy each other's pulpits, press, etc. However, since this is so obviously the attitude the entire church should take toward our brethren of the different factions, it removes the necessity for a committee to do the things that every minister and missionary HAS BEEN DOING for years. This report was also tabled. Following which, a document was brought in which called for the resignation of the committee, with the purpose of abolishing it. This was signed by eight of the Quorum of Twelve, two of the Presiding Bishopric, and a number of elders; fifteen in all. This was presented to the conference and passed by a majority of sixteen to three, only the three members of the committee voting against it. Whereupon the committee resigned, subject to the referendum vote.

Now just a word by way of review. This Committee on Working Harmony has been composed of three men who ARE ALREADY APOSTLES. Hence as such apostles, it is already a part of their missionary duties to do all that they recommend as a part of their "committee" duties.

Why then should "three" men of the apostleship be segregated and separate themselves from the rest of the Twelve into a committee of three for the purpose of doing that which it is the duty of all to do? All have been doing it. All major innovation and departures in the church in the past have been cradled in just such innocent looking things as this committee now is, even a First Presidency of three. In fact, what is to hinder this committee of three eventually becoming something of that order?

It will be remembered that in the vision of Geo. D. Cole, that has been published a number of times in the Advocate, that the tree he saw was "dead"; it had been "cut off as the church, but not as individuals". He further saw that the day would come, "When the elders of Israel, (not a committee of three, B. C. F.) should go through the dead tree and gather out the green twigs," etc. We don't need any such committee.

Another bad feature of this committee's activities is that it gives its members an excuse to leave their own fields of appointment to languish, the while they engage in "committee work" all over the church. In the coming referendum, the saints should vote to accept the resignation of our brethren on this committee.

Nothing in the above is intended to cast any reflection on our brethren who have composed this committee during the past two years. They are doubtless as sincere in their convictions that this committee has a place to fill as the majority of us are satisfied that it hasn't.

Let us all continue, as we have in the past, to go out to our brethren of the different groups of the Restoration, and seek to convert their members to that unity enjoined upon us in the purported revelation to Bro. C. L. Wheaton in 1919, wherein we are told:- "Behold this your work, to gather together in one all of my sheep, etc." The church, ministry and membership should be doing this in kindness and love. We shouldn't play politics with the leaders of any of the Restoration groups. It is to the membership of the groups that we have a mission.

## WORKING HARMONY REPORT

By Leon A. Gould

We appointed our Committee on Working Harmony to make recommendations to similar committees appointed by other divisions of the Restoration as to grounds upon which they might come in harmony with the Church of Christ, but for some reason the Committee seemed to think it their duty to make recommendations to the Church of Christ which if adopted would bind the Church to positions that the Ministers' Conference was not willing to endorse.

We concede the right of any committee to make a report to the body that appointed it, but when they attach recommendations to their report that if adopted would have bound the Church to grant equal share and rights of ownership of the Temple, when built, to other divisions of the Restoration, and to guarantee those rights of ownership before the Temple was built, it became quite a serious matter. So the first report of the Committee was tabled, with its recommendations.

A revised report was then presented by the Committee, with quite another set of recommendations attached. This report, after some considerable discussion, was also laid on the table. Feeling that the Committee should have the privilege of getting their report before the people, twelve signers requested it to be sent out for referendum. Were it not for the recommendations attached to this revised report, we would have no objection to it. In the main these recommendations are acceptable, and but reiterate the position heretofore maintained by the Church of Christ. But there is something in the second and third recommendations that make them unpalatable. It is the thought of "working harmony with other ORGANIC BODIES," in the first one, and of "working harmony with the divisions of the Restoration," "AS ORGANIZATIONS", in the second one.

To work in harmony with "OTHER ORGANIC BODIES" of the Restoration, "AS ORGANIZATIONS," would mean that we must deal with church leaders and quorums that have been "rejected," and ordinate the policies of the Church of Christ with the policies of these rejected organic bodies.

The policy of the Church of Christ hitherto has been to deal with individual members of the various divisions of the Restoration who give evidence of not having been involved in the dogmas and innovations that invited rejection. We believe this policy could be adhered to, and a committee is unnecessary for this work.

Because this Bill No. 29 contains these unpalatable recommendations, and because there is no need at this time of a reiteration of the policy of the Church as outlined in the other recommendations, and because our committee has failed to "stay put", and if the report is adopted will use that fact as a leverage to revive the committee, we believe Bill No. 29 should not be adopted.

## WHY I AM NOT IN FAVOR OF THE COMMITTEE ON WORKING HARMONY

By A. M. Smith.

Two years ago, at the April conference of the Church of Christ, in 1935, two bills were presented to the conference to be sent out for referendum.

These bills were the majority and the minority reports of a committee appointed by that conference to consider and bring back to the conference such recommendation as they might think helpful as touching the question under discussion at that time. This committee consisted of Brethren J. E. Yates, C. L. Wheaton and E. E. Long. Brethren Yates and Wheaton brought in their report; Brother Long brought in a minority report. These two reports were presented to the conference as a majority and a minority report. After quite a long discussion the conference adopted the minority report, and ordered it sent out to the people for the June conference. Whereupon Brother Yates announced that the defeated report would be sent out as a minority report, and obtained the necessary number of signers. Thus the majority report to the April conference became the minority report to the People's conferences the following June.

In the tabulated vote of the People's conferences, both the Majority and the Minority Bills carried. This, in itself, is rather a strange thing, and we are sure can only be accounted for in the fact that many of the people did not understand the matter presented to them. (See footnote a.) The minority bill which had been rejected by the April conference, where all the argument both for and against the reports was heard, was accepted by the people, who heard nothing, or at least very little concerning the matter, and they voted for a committee of three to be appointed to meet with and confer with similar committees of the various other groups of the Restoration, that if possible a way might be found by which we might work together in harmony in the building of the temple that had been referred to the committee by the 1935 conference and which had resulted in the Majority and the Minority Bills. One of the movers of this Minority bill, in a speech in favor of the appointing of this committee of three, stated the object of this movement, and explained how each faction or separate group could be allotted its time or day in which to occupy the temple. This, then, is the history, in brief, of the origin of the Committee on Working Harmony. I am not in favor of this committee, and believe it should be abolished in harmony with Bills No. 10 and No. 11 submitted to you this spring.

Now in order that we might better understand the problem which this committee is supposed to

---

Note a. It was plainly stated in the referendum that went out to the people in 1935 that the Ministers' Conference had adopted the minority report by a vote of 36 for it and only 9 against, and yet when the returns from the people's conferences came in, while it is true that the affirmative vote on each bill outnumbered the negative vote, Bill No. 4, which the people were given to understand had been defeated in the Ministers' Conference and which went out by petition of the signers—this bill received a higher number of votes than Bill No. 3, which had been successful in the Ministers' Conference.

It will be remembered that the report sent out as Bill No. 3 was based upon the Fetting messages, which messages the Ministers' Conference rejected the following year.—Ed.

solve, it seems right that we should again refer to history of the past. Perhaps many are well acquainted with this history, yet there may be some who would appreciate the calling to mind some of these facts just before they go to their local conferences. For let us not forget that it is not what the Ministry did at the April conference that shall make history for the church, but rather the final action of the people in June which makes or breaks for good or bad to the church. I have only one object in view and that is to point out, if I can, my reasons for my position as stated relative to this committee.

It is a known fact that apostasy never comes into the body full grown. A careful study of the history of the Church from 1828 to the present time reveals the fact that each and every one of the different factions of the Restoration have been separated from the others because of the teaching or practice of some belief, theory, or doctrine different from the others. These different theories or beliefs are what constitute apostasy. The Church of Christ today does not hesitate to say that certain doctrines taught in the other groups are equal to, in fact are apostasy from the original doctrine of the Church. And while we may pride ourselves to some extent that we are so far free from these things, we should be ever on the lookout lest we in our desire to further the cause we all love so dearly do not become entangled with them now, or permit anything to enter into our organization, theoretically, doctrinally, or organically, that will compromise the Church of Christ with evil in any way.

There was nothing to cause any great excitement when the little show pulled into Kirtland, Ohio, and offered for exhibition two Egyptian mummies, with the parchments they claimed had been found with these mummies. Yet when the church purchased these parchments with the idea of having them translated, we see coming from these seemingly purely interesting events that which has become the greatest of all the influences tending toward division and apostasy in the whole Restoration movement—"The Pearl of Great Price." including the "Book of Abraham." It should be a warning to us to be careful. Thus from this little event came sealing, spiritual wifery, multiplicity of Gods, and out of this, polygamy.

In Nauvoo a man died by the name of Follet. Some one preached a funeral sermon. The theory of the exaltation of man was born, and out of that came the Adam-God idea. At Hiram, Ohio, at a little conference of the church where only a very few were present, some one thought there should be a man chosen to "preside over the high-priesthood," and so Joseph Smith was chosen. Out of this came "first presidency," and from first presidency came the theory of lineal priesthood and the necessity of changing the revelations. Back in the early days of the church some one wrote a letter touching baptism for the dead, and that doctrine has come to be believed in by thousands.

But, one may ask, what has all this to do with the Committee of Working Harmony? Why, these are some of the things that caused the church to be broken up. These are things that brought about factions in Mormonism. These are things which are still to a large extent marks of apostasy among the

different factions, and it is among these the Committee hopes to find grounds for "working harmony." These are but a few instances to show how easy it is for the introduction of the most powerful agencies of evil the church has ever encountered, and I am frankly confessing to you that I fear the church is indeed in danger of a repetition of some of the self-same things that wrought confusion, separation and defeat to the old church. That such committees as this one on "working harmony" carry with them all the potentialities of great harm to the church, and in this present instance I can see no good to come from it at all.

One of the most outstanding instances I believe of the danger of committees of this nature is that found in the history and the work done by the committee appointed to compile the Doctrine and Covenants. We read in the Church History (Reorganized) that they were to take these covenants from the Bible, Book of Mormon, and the revelations which had been received. But the book of "Doctrine and Covenants" as finally offered to the church by this committee contained nothing from the Bible or the Book of Mormon, but only the changed and mutilated revelations found in the 1835 Doctrine and Covenants. Yet the people accepted them, surely because they did not know that these things had been done, and because of their great confidence in those men who had served on that committee.

Now coming down to our day: We find the Church of Christ still striving to bring about a unity between itself and at least one of the factions, coming to that time when so many of us were brought more in contact with the events of history. We see the committee of 1917, '18 and '19 when that famous document known as the Articles of Working Harmony between the Church of Christ and the Reorganization came into existence. This document meant much to me, for it was the one thing that caused me to begin to study the claims of the Church of Christ. When the leaders of the group to which I belonged acknowledged the priesthood of the elders of the Church of Christ, it caused me to stop and study what their priesthood was, and the Church of Christ had accepted the 1835 edition of the book of Doctrine and Covenants. Had they? We found that in fact the Committee had indeed agreed to accept that 1835 Doctrine and Covenants, in spite of the fact that the church had long held that many of the revelations therein had been changed, and that they did not believe in a first presidency.

We do not find fault with personnel of any of the committee. Neither do we accuse them of any deliberate wrong doing. We cite these instances merely to show how dangerous it is to submit matters carrying with them so many possibilities into the hands of any committee. Furthermore, I can not see the need of any such committee. The position of the church is quite plain as to how those who desire to assist in the work of the redemption of Zion, the building of the temple, and in fact all other work that is part of the Restoration can become a member of the church, and thus work in perfect harmony with the Church in all its activities.

Bill No. 19 of the 1936 referendum states. "Therefore, be it resolved, that those who are desirous of uniting with us on their original baptism" may do

so by simply making application through the proper channels, "and if it is proven that they were baptized by those holding the priesthood, that we extend to them the right hand of fellowship; otherwise, they will have to be baptized by those of the Church of Christ who hold the priesthood authority."

This bill makes it necessary that the applicant shall make his contact with the church, not through the committee, but through the eldership of the church. Therefore, to ascribe the duty of making contact to a committee of three abrogates to quite an extent the rights and privileges of the ministry throughout the church.

In the vision of Bother Cole as published (reprinted Ed.) in the Advocate a year or so ago, he said he saw the elders go through the great body of the tree gathering out the live twigs and pruning the tree of that which was good. We notice he said he saw the "elders of Israel," not a committee of three. A further study of this vision, which surely fits the Church of Christ, will reveal the fact that when he looked for the tree that had been cut off, he found it lay just across the street to the north of the temple lot. It consisted of the trunk of the tree and the branches, through which the elders of Israel were to go. Its top turned westward, it is true, but he saw nothing of that larger tree that lies in Utah, nor the one in the east known as the Bickertonites, or the one in Minnesota. So if we are to place as much confidence in the Cole vision as was done in the years of 1925 and on up to the present time, by leading men of the church, it would certainly indicate that there was but one of the factions with which we could hope to do any degree of successful missionary labor. How true this has been proven is shown in a study of the records of the Church Recorder, where it is found that during the years from 1925 to date there have been received by transfer from the Reorganization over two thousand members, while the converts from the other divisions or factions have been extremely few.

In a revelation received May 1, 1927, published and circulated by Brother James E. Yates, we read as follows: "Ye have asked of me to know my will, yet, will ye hearken when I shall speak? Will ye obey if my word shall conflict with the thoughts and beliefs of your imperfect humanity? Behold, thus saith the Lord, I lead my people when they have courage to follow me, and to keep my commandments."

Again, from the same document: "But thus saith the **word of the Lord** to all my people everywhere who will open their hearts to hear the voice of my Spirit as given through my servant in these words: **Verily I have rejected the Reorganized Church, with its sins and its follies and its system-making, because they have departed from me,** and by deceptions of the wicked one their leaders have caused a defilement of much of mine heritage." (Emphasis mine.— A. M. S.)

In the face of these statements I can not indorse the appointing of a committee to seek grounds of "working harmony" with that which God has said he had "rejected". But if a committee shall be appointed to meet with other committees from the various factions of the church, who else can they contact except the leaders of those factions? I am sure that the leaders of the various factions have

not as yet shown any disposition to repent of those things which has marked the differences between them and the Church of Christ.

It is a fact that this committee of 1936 did, in the discharge of the duties placed upon them by the people in June, go to the leaders of the different factions of Mormonism. This is contacting the institutions, and in no way can it be construed as an effort to reach the people, and we well know that the leaders will not let the people hear. As we can not in any degree compromise with these institutions, with their endowments, sealings, baptisms for the dead, prayers for the dead and their secret works, we think it foolish to have men running around spending time and money in a vain, hopeless chasing of a rainbow.

Our church position is one we can well be proud of, with the Bible and the Book of Mormon as the only standard of faith, insisting that all other matter accepted by the church must be in harmony with these two books. Our invitation has been sent out time after time to all factions of this great latter day movement to come and assist us, with the door standing open to all those who have been baptized by the proper authority. What more can we say or do?

It has been said that the church has always maintained a committee of this nature. This is not true. Granville Hedrick and Jedediah Owens were sent to meet and confer with the New Organization, which afterwards became the Reorganized Church. Many years later another committee was appointed which met with a committee from the Reorganized Church. This committee may have been continued for a year or so, but at no time has the church ever chosen a standing committee, or seen to it that a committee was always in readiness. The committee of 1917, 1918, 1919 did obtain, or I should say brought forth a signed agreement between the organizations, but I regard the work of that committee a betrayal of the trust and confidence of the Church, wherein they, the committee, did agree to accept the 1835 edition of the Doctrine and Covenants with its teachings of first presidency, high priest, and many other things which they knew the Church of Christ had long rejected. (See footnote b.)

The danger of such a committee can well be seen in the draft of the original report made to the late conference wherein they proposed to "guarantee" to the other factions who cared to assist us "joint ownership" in the Temple. We can not indorse such a committee because, as we have tried to show, it is unnecessary. Its activities are in direct conflict with what we have believed as the "word of the Lord", inasmuch as by its activities we have sought to make friends with "worldly idols". We can not indorse a committee from the very fact that in the recent Conference of the Ministry the overwhelming defeat of the committee revealed the reaction in the minds of the ministry of this church. I am in favor of adopting Bill No. 10 and also Bill No. 11 as the expression of the people as being in harmony with the ministry of the church.

---

Note b.—The committee of 1917-19 betrayed no trust. They did not originate the article relating to the 1835 edition of the Doctrine and Covenants.

The minutes of the council of 1900 show that the article was adopted then. The later committee (1918-17) simply included in their report the articles that had been previously approved.

Furthermore, had the article originated with the later committee, they would have been no more responsible for it than the church, since their report was approved by the conference of the church.

The consistency of the action is manifest. Had the church accepted nothing but the Book of Commandments, the church would be without support for its peculiar claims, for the revelations pertaining to the building of the temple and the location thereof, as well as the place for the beginning of the building of the New Jerusalem, were not given until after the Book of Commandments had been published.

Because the church had, from the beginning taken the position that the Bible and the Book of Mormon were the standard by which all subsequent revelation would be measured, and this was known wherever the literature or the missionaries of the Church of Christ had gone, it did not occur to the committee or the church that it would be supposed that the 1835 edition of the Doctrine and Covenants would be considered any exception to their rule. When they found it was, they lost no time in proclaiming where they stood.

By the logic of the church's position, the Book of Commandments must submit to the same test as the Doctrine and Covenants.

It might be of value to the membership to know that the late George D. Cole, of honored memory, whose vision is so often quoted, was a member of the 1917-19 committee on "Working Harmony."—Ed.

### CHARITY, KINDNESS, and "WORKING HARMONY"

By James E. Yates

How should the Church of Christ vote on Referendum Bill No. 10 and No. 29?

In former years great bitterness toward each other has been held between different factions of the Church. Many good honest people, sincere in their beliefs, have developed prejudice and malice toward others whose beliefs did not agree with their own in some things. This is not right. The Church of Christ should set a higher example. As a Church we have endeavored to do that. We hope the Church will now act wisely, and continue it's official program for peace and goodwill toward all, and especially toward those whose faith in Christ and in the Latter Day Restoration of the Gospel harmonizes with our own in a great measure.

When this Church of Christ voted recently to promote Charity, Kindness, and possible "Working Harmony" with the factions whose faith is so nearly the same as our own in many things, the good result has been that less bitterness, and better feeling has been brought about in promising measure.

But some of our own dear people have seemed to misinterpret the action of the Church of Christ in seeking to promote friendliness, charity, and goodwill toward the people of the Restoration. They fear this means a compromise with the errors in some branches, and from which the Church of Christ has stood aloof. I, for one, appreciate the caution in the minds of some of our brethren lest we should involve ourselves in some manner of compromise with

doctrines of error; but I am also sure that no compromise is intended, and that the whole Church would, and should resist such a thing.

Our "Working Harmony" purpose and plan, which has been authorized, is fully protected from involving the Church in any questionable matter, by the fact that no mutual activities of any kind could possibly be put into effect until approved by the whole Church. And we declare resolutely against any manner of compromise with error or evil.

The Scriptures enjoin: "Let us do good unto all men, especially unto them who are of the household of faith."—Eph. 6:10. Shall we approve of that? Then we should vote for Referendum Bill Number 29, and against Bill Number 10. For everybody's business is nobody's business, and if we have no committee, to meet other committees, this good endeavor is stifled.

Christ is the "Prince of Peace",—Is. 9:6. Then let us stand for peace, work for peace, and vote for it in these church measures.

Our brethren of the various factions believe and teach some error. Dare we assert ourselves to be free from all error? Their faith is parallel with ours in many points. Many of their works are also good. The Church of Christ has endorsed a proposal for working harmony with them on those specific points which are good. To do so most effectively it was recognized that we need a Committee to meet with their Committee, to confer, and to thus encourage mutual friendliness, tolerance and charity. The Church of Christ appointed it's committee. Others appointed theirs. We are sure that a general better feeling and a foundation for progress in better friendliness than we have had at times before, has been the result. But now that the issue is raised for re-affirmation by the vote of all the Church, very naturally the people to whom we have made proposals for friendliness, will wait till this vote is in, to see whether the Church of Christ really means to be Christian, and friendly, and brotherly, or whether our first action in the matter was merely a gesture.

Our Committee appointed by the Church consisted of Brethern C. L. Wheaton, Thomas Barton and the writer. We were making encouraging progress in the work assigned to the Committee, when some of our good people felt that the Church should take this vote over again. So the matter is now before the Church the second time for approval, or disapproval of the plan to encourage a greater cordiality and good-will.

The Committee does not wish it's own personnel to stand in the way if there are others whom the Church prefers to carry this responsibility and to continue this good work which has been started. So, in order that more efficient Committee-men may be chosen, if the Church desires a change, we have resigned. If the Church shall now re-affirm it's approval of the plan to promote Christian good-will the Committee is quite willing to give place to whom-soever may be chosen, or to continue to serve, if that should be the will of the body.

The principle of working harmony with all that is good, is the important thing. If we are for that, let us vote "Yes" on Bill Number 29, and "No" on Bill Number 10.

Even the harlot Rahab, was "justified" by her

"good" works.—Jas. 2:25.

Should we disdain harmonizing our works with the good works of another, merely because, in some of her doings, she may have been a Rahab? And if we joined our works to be in harmony with that part of her works that are good, and for which works the Scriptures teach that Rahab was "justified", would that mean that we had endorsed her former wickedness? Surely not.

Not that we would say that the factions claiming to be the Church of the Restoration are as lewd as Rahab; for the spiritual life of thousands of their people is evidently being approved of God, by the spiritual grace he bestows upon them in many ways. But even though as organizations they may have partaken in any degree of spiritual lewdness such as might in the extreme analysis class said **organic structures** as figurative Rahabs, yet shall we make ourselves also to be partakers of the lewdness of heresy by declaring that they can not be "justified" for the multiplied good works they are doing?

Without partaking of their false theories and errors, let us as friends and brothers, and with christian charity and kindness, stand ready to engage in any **proper** working harmony with them in their **good works**, rather than to be content to have malice, envy and hatred prevail between us.

#### Peace On Earth. Good-wil to Men

The prime message of our Lord and Savior was "Peace on earth, good will to men."—Luke 2:1. Let's **work** in that direction, and **vote** for it too, as well as to **preach** about it so much.

"Have peace one with another."—Mark 9:50.

"**Live in peace; and the God of love and peace shall be with you.**"—2 Cor. 13:11. What a glorious promise! How may the Church of Christ avail itself of that promise? We may have that blessing from the God of peace, if we believe in peace, practice peace, vote for peace, and work for it's blessed benefits.

"Be at peace among yourselves and be patient toward all men."—2 Thess. 5:13-14.

"**Follow righteousness, faith, charity, peace, with them that call on the Lord out of a pure heart.**"—2 Tim. 2:22. We know that thousands of our dear brothers and sisters who are members of the various factions, are calling on the Lord out of a pure heart, if we have any spiritual discernment at all. The above Scripture enjoins us to a working harmony "**with them,**" by following after righteousness, faith, charity and peace **with them,** who thus out of a pure heart call on the Lord. Shall we do so? Then let us **vote** for that, and **work** for that. To vote for Bill Number 10, would be a direct vote against these exalted principles of righteousness, when the above Scripture is rightly applied.

Some of our dear coworkers have feared lest the Church of Christ might propose too much working harmony with certain divisions, or faction, and that the time might come when we might be asked to share title of the Temple Lot with somebody. But such a thing could not be possible without the approval of the Church. And, after all, if the honest in heart from all parts of the faith of the Latter Day Gospel should be led of the Lord to build the House of the Lord, where is the rule of justice which would deny them the right to enjoy its benefits providing the Church should agree thereto? The apprehen-

sions of fear lest some might get a share-title to the Temple Property, is groundless. That fear is a mythical "**bogie man**".

If our brethren of the factions are theologically lame, let us endeavor to make straight paths for their feet, and with brotherly kindness assist them to walk therein; "**lest that which is lame be turned out of the way; but let it rather be healed. Follow peace with all men, and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord.**"—Heb. 12:13-14. If we believe these things, let us **vote** and **work** the way we believe.

"**Be not wise in your own conceits,\*\* if it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men.**"—Rom. 12:16-18. Does that mean all men **except** those who are members of rival churches? Surely not.

"Endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." Let us do that.

"And now abideth faith, hope, and charity, these three; but the greatest of these is charity."—1 Cor. 13:13. Let us vote for the greatest, and work for it, as well as to preach it.

"Stand fast therefore in the faith, quit you like men, be strong. Let all things be done with charity".—1 Cor. 16:13-14. "Add to your faith virtue, knowledge, brotherly kindness, and charity."—2 Pet. 1:5-7. "In all things, approving ourselves \*\*\* in patience by kindness, by the Holy Ghost, by love unfeigned."—2 Cor. 6:4-6.

We must make no empty pretenses about this thing of charity and kindness toward our brothers. It must be love **unfeigned**.

#### Bitterness and Malice Not Justified

Rival churches develop malice and bitterness toward each other as naturally as water flows down hill, unless we take great care to preserve the spirit of kindness and charity.

"Therefore let us keep the feast, not with the old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and of wickedness; but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth."—1 Cor. 5:8.

The Scripture also warns us against "**Strife of words, whereby cometh envy, strife, railing, evil surmisings,**" etc.—1 Tim. 6:4.

And lastly, I quote the gracious words of our Lord Jesus, Himself: "Do good to them that hate you, pray for them that despitefully use you, and persecute you."—Matt. 5:44.

These commandments, together with those that require that we should do good **especially** to those of the household of faith, make it clear that as a people the Church of Christ should not be unmindful of those who hold to the great fundamentals of faith with us in accepting the Gospel of the Latter Day Restoration. We should be willing to work in harmony with whatever good they are doing, and without compromise with any error. We should be willing to pray with them, exchange pulpits with them upon occasion, stand for the old time doctrine of a free pulpit and an open Bible—and to exchange articles with them upon gospel subjects in their and our Church Publications.

All our members who believe this is right, and believe it should be the attitude of the Church of Christ, should vote "Yes" on Referendum Bill Number 29, and "No" on Bill Number 10.

As the Church has already once approved this

"Working Harmony" plan, according to our constitutional law it would now require a two thirds majority vote to defeat, or to abrogate it. But why should any of us make the mistake of desiring to defeat a measure which is so thoroughly in harmony with the Scriptures, and with every revelation of the word of the Lord?

Let us approve Bill Number 29, and go forward as a church, and thus receive the blessing and approval of our loving Savior.

Post Script:

It is rather an error to refer to Bill Number 29 as a defeated measure. True, it is a **minority** measure and was tabled in the Conference. The first two of the eight clauses in it were approved by majority vote of the Conference. Before the remaining clauses could be voted on the matter was tabled. A Bill is never defeated until it is voted upon by the whole Church. That vote must determine its final status.

#### Legality

Bill Number 29 comes before the Church in a perfectly legal manner. The Twelve names necessary to send a minority measure to the people are signed to it. Our law provides that when twelve signers request a minority measure go to referendum, it must be sent out to the whole Church for decision. This request was legally placed with the Board of Publication and the Referendum Committee. All can see that if only Sixteen votes in a Conference could prevent any measure as important to the whole Church as this one is from going out to be considered by all, it would be a great injustice to the people. But in this way, the justice of our law protects the whole Church.

#### WHY?

One point our writers overlooked, and which we think our readers will want to understand, especially the members who are expected to vote, is. Why did the committee revise their report?

We asked Bro. Yates to tell us. His answer follows.—Ed.

The Church of Christ appointed a Committee on "Working Harmony." The vote for that Committee was by the voice of the People. It was a large majority vote. The purpose of the "Working Harmony" is to promote in a definite, active manner the principles of simple Christianity between peoples sadly negligent of some of these principles—harmonious action with all that is good, even in other churches—and not compromise with any of their error. It is an endeavor to overcome credal hatreds and denominational bitterness.

Why did the Committee on Working Harmony revise its report? Here is our answer, in brief. Some seemed to misunderstand our first report. They imagined it opened the way for compromise with the error which blights so many churches. They were mistaken in that. But we blame no one for being cautious in a matter so important to the Church. So the Committee revised its report and condensed its whole position into eight specific points. These eight points are published on the ballot for referendum in the May Advocate. The Church is now asked to vote yes, or no, on these eight points in Bill Number 29. Read them prayerfully.

We have yet to find the first person in the Church

of Christ who will disagree with any one of the eight points and show sound reason for doing so. If any of our brethren of the other parts of the Restoration care to challenge any of these eight points, we assert for practically the whole ministry of the Church of Christ, that we will meet any opponent to any or all of these eight points, in public or in private discussion, and prove by the Holy Scriptures that they are right. We will show by the word of God that those who are Christians in fact should have a working harmony with each other, and that all such harmony could, and should be based upon these very eight points named by your Committee. The Committee wrote its revised report to make that matter clear, and beyond any possible misunderstanding of purpose. Which of those eight points could any member of the Church object to?

They can not be refuted.

James E. Yates, for the Committee.

#### SHALL THE COMMISSION ON WORKING HARMONY BE ABOLISHED?

Synopsis of a sermon preached on the Temple Lot Sunday evening, May 9th

By C. L. Wheaton

One of the most vital and far reaching questions affecting the future progress of the Church of Christ is now before the membership for referendum vote. This issue, raised by some of the brethren, on what seems to the writer, to be unfounded grounds, is whether we shall sustain or abolish the Commission on Working Harmony appointed by the referendum action of last year, which has only functioned with its present personnel, Clarence L. Wheaton, Jas. E. Yates and Thos. E. Barton, since August 1, 1933, at which time the official returns of the referendum were tabulated.

In this article the writer wants it distinctly understood that he is not seeking to perpetuate himself in an office or on a committee that the church feels he is not qualified to serve on, for the fact that he has tendered his resignation, along with that of his fellow committeemen, subject to the action of the referendum vote, should be evidence that he desires to comply with the will of the body. Therefore, it is not a personal issue, but one that involves principles and ideals for which this church has stood for many years.

As one who has represented the church in the capacity of a member of this commission since 1916. I wish to give a historical review of the appointment of it, and also to make some defense against arguments made by some of the brethren who seek to abolish it. To abolish the commission would be a backward step for this Church of Christ to take. Let us consider the following premises upon which the brethren opposing this policy of the church base their contentions for abolishing it.

First: It was argued at the conference that the appointment of this commission was a new departure, a recent aggressive, reactionary campaign from established practices of the church relative to other groups of the Restoration. A review of the history of the Church of Christ and its policies shows beyond cavil that the appointment of a specified number of men for "working harmony" was not a new departure. Eighty years ago a conference met at Blanchardville, or Zarahemla, Wisconsin, over which Zenos H. Gurley presided and W. W.

Blair acted as clerk. At this time "Brn. (Jedediah) Owens and (Grandville) Hedrick were received as the representatives of the saints in Woodford County, Illinois, and vicinity, and the right hand of fellowship was given them."

This semi-annual conference, called by the Reorganized Church in October, 1857, appointed a joint committee to perform a definite task. We quote:

"On motion J. W. Briggs was appointed to cooperate with Bro. Hedrick in writing a pamphlet setting forth the true position of our doctrine."—Church History (Reorganized), Vol. 3, pp. 233, 234.

This first committee, appointed to perform a task of common interest to both groups, represented, on one side, the members of what we have commonly called "the Crow Creek Branch of the Church of Christ," which formed itself into a separate body from the rest of the early church at a conference held "at the house of Granville Hedrick on Half Moon Prairie, in the winter of A. D. 1852. Preaching by Bro. David Judy. Three elders present."—See Crow Creek Record, page 1.

In later years other committees were appointed for a common purpose or to find common ground, notably the one of 1897, following the famous lawsuit with the Reorganized Church, of which the following editorial is written.

#### "A Noteworthy Incident"

"We publish elsewhere in this paper the minutes of a council or conference, held in the meeting house on the Temple Lot, January 16-21st, 1897.

"This meeting was the result of correspondence begun almost a year ago between the Editors of the Saints Herald and the Searchlight, looking towards an adjustment of the difficulties existing between the two bodies of people.

"Every agreement reached touching the faith was reduced to writing and is published herewith.

"Neither party present was equipped with any delegated powers from their respective bodies, and the articles agreed upon in no wise bind either the Reorganized Church nor the Church of Christ, but simply reflect the views of the several elders present in the council; nevertheless the fact that some of the leading men of both churches were present and participated in the agreements reached, attaches to the occasion considerable importance as indicative of what may be accomplished in the future through the medium of a friendly discussion of points at issue."

"The fact that fourteen agreements were reached shows there is a large common ground upon which a perfect understanding exists between the churches and renders less difficult the task of reaching a harmonious agreement upon all the differences, should such an action be attempted in the future.

"The best of good feeling prevailed and not a single word of harshness was used, and the entire meeting was marked with that earnestness and solemnity befitting the occasion.

"All present appeared to part with increased feelings of respect for each other as earnest men contending for what each believed and understood were principles of Christ.

"When one considers the state of affairs that existed between the two churches during the pendency of the Temple Lot litigation, it is remarkable that such a meeting as the one that has just trans-

pired, could occur.

"The Church of Christ, however, has always been willing to, and indeed has, lifted the "Standard of Peace," as required in the Book of Mormon, and even with victory won, and the possession of the Temple Lot secure, she extended the hand of friendship to those of a similar faith and expressed her willingness to meet in peace, and as brethren, those who lately so sorely beset her, and this conference was the result. (Emphasis mine, C. L. W.)

"Such conduct is certainly commendable and is indicative of the fact that men acting in this magnanimous manner are surely possessed of the Spirit of Christ, and that the cause of Zion is safe in such hands as theirs."—Searchlight for February 1, 1897, pages 97-98.

This editorial reflects the position this church has always taken towards other divisions of the Restoration. It shows beyond cavil that the appointing of such commissions are in harmony with long established policies of the church, and ARE NOT "NEW DEPARTURES", as some have represented it.

The members of this commission in 1897 were Elders Richard Hill, John R. Haldeman, George F. Frisbey, George D. Cole and James A. Hedrick, all stalwart men of the Church of Christ in their day, that were never known to compromise the church in their dealings with other divisions of the Restoration.

In March of 1900 another council was held, called as was the one of January 1897, upon the request of the elders of the Church of Christ, of which the following editorial appears in the Searchlight for March 1900, the official publication of the Church of Christ at that time.

#### ANOTHER COUNCIL

"In response to an invitation six of the representative men of the Reorganization met six elders of the Church of Christ in a council which assembled on Tuesday, March 6th, and continued until the Sunday following.

"The Utah church was invited to send some of its men to participate in the meeting, but they declined to do so.

"The object of the elders of the Church of Christ in issuing the invitation was that a consideration of grave matters relating to the work of the redemption of Zion might be had, and if possible, agreements reached which, when reported to the conferences of the several bodies represented, might result in unity of action in the work of building the temple at Independence, etc. (Emphasis mine, C. L. W.)

"Many questions of importance were considered, and some referred for action to the conferences of the bodies represented.

"The meeting adjourned until after the April Conference."

See Searchlight for March, 1900, page 53.

At the time of this council, the Church of Christ was represented by Elders Richard Hill, George P. Frisbey, George D. Cole and A. L. Hartley. (See Evening and Morning Star, August 15, 1904)

This committee continued to represent the church in these councils for many years. After the death of Elders Richard Hill and A. L. Hartley, the personnel of the committee was changed in 1917, and was composed of the following persons; Elders George D. Cole, J. M. Hartley, and C. L. Wheaton. This com-

mittee represented the Church of Christ at the time the 1918 Working Agreement between the two churches was reached, upon which our present transfer of membership was based, and the church at no time ever released the writer from that commission, but when the new personnel was selected last year he was chosen chairman of the committee. Therefore, to contend that the appointment of the committee was a "new departure" is a fallacy that even the opponents of the measure should not overlook.

Second: It was argued on the conference floor, and one brother in a sermon claimed that the appointing of this committee of three members of the apostolic quorum would lead to the usurpation of authority that would establish them as a First Presidency. If it were not so serious a charge, coming as it does from men who should know better, it would be downright amusing, but when such insinuations are made to the churches, they must be answered. History repeats, that for eighty years these committees have represented the church in such councils, and not once do you find the committees attempting to usurp authority. They have always honored their appointment, and have represented the church, AND NOT THEMSELVES, in that appointment. Every member of this church knows well the position of myself upon this question. Wherever I have preached, debated, or held a public discussion of any kind with other divisions of the Restoration, I have successfully maintained the position that a first presidency is a modern innovation that cannot be supported by the scripture. In 1925, after hundreds of members from the Reorganized Church had transferred their memberships to the Church of Christ, the writer, who was then pastor of the local church at Independence, and also presiding elder of the priesthood, introduced a recommendation to "abolish the office of presiding elder over the church," in order to prevent the setting up of a first presidency by those who had so recently been under the domination of such an office. If the writer, C. L. Wheaton, had ever desired to be a member of such a presidency, he had an opportunity to have been so **then**, without using the subterfuge of a committee on working harmony to foist it upon the church **now**. The writer is unqualifiedly, and always has been, opposed to the introduction of such an office of the Church of Christ. The same is true of the other brethren on this commission. So the church should not be deceived by such argument, for it is without foundation.

Third: It was argued at the conference that because the committee would come in contact with individuals upon committees from other divisions of the Restoration who accept free Masonry, baptism for the dead, plural marriage, etc., that they would be influenced to bring the same into this Church of Christ. Again, let the writer remind these brethren and the whole church that our record on these questions is clear. After the action of the church a few years back relative to secret orders, which was sponsored by the writer and appeared in print, he received a clipping from a daily paper, reviewing the action taken by the church on the question, with the marginal note: "You will be taken for a one-way ride for this," yet from that day to this he has not changed his mind on this question, I AM STILL AS UNALTERABLY OPPOSED TO FREE MAS-

ONRY AND EVERY OTHER KIND OF SECRET ORDER NOW AS I WAS THEN, and so are the other members of this commission. AND THAT FACT IS KNOWN BY EVERY MEMBER OF THE TWELVE WHO OPPOSE THIS COMMISSION. Therefore, if these men on the commission are susceptible to such influences, how about all the rest of the eldership whom they contend should make these contacts? Did Christ become a sinner because of the fact "that he was gone to be guest with a man that was a sinner," at the time he abode with Zacchaeus? (Luke 19:1-8.)

Fourth: It was argued that the efforts of this commission to "establish a more brotherly and sympathetic understanding between the churches; and to reach if possible a basis of working harmony upon which we may finally all agree to unite in building this House of the Lord in the place He has appointed," (See referendum bill No. 3 of 1935-C.L.W.) would jeopardize the church in the possession of the Temple Lots, and thus its efforts would become dangerous to the interests of the church.

Let us compare this statement taken from the original recommendations of the present committee, with a similar statement taken from the editorial above quoted from the Searchlight:

"The object of the elders of the Church of Christ in issuing the invitation was that a consideration of grave matters relating to the redemption of Zion might be had and, if possible, agreements reached which, WHEN REPORTED TO THE CONFERENCES OF THE SEVERAL CHURCHES REPRESENTED, MIGHT RESULT IN UNITY OF ACTION IN THE WORK OF BUILDING THE TEMPLE AT INDEPENDENCE, etc." (Emphasis mine. C. L. W.)—Searchlight for Mar. 1900, page 53

From the foregoing comparison we see that instead of the present committee being reactionary, or attempting to introduce a "new departure" from established policies in the church, that they are in harmony with the precedents of the past, and that it is those who are seeking to abolish the committee and the things for which it has been maintained in the church, who are in reality the reactionary element that has caused the confusion of which they complain in Bill No. 10. These brethren are the ones who now seek to introduce a new departure from established policies of the church, not the committee.

But aside from this phase of the controversy, we find that every agreement reached in these councils must stand the scrutiny of the quorum of twelve, the ministerial conference, and the referendum vote of the whole church before they become binding upon the church. This fact is well known to the opponents of this measure, therefore should have no place in an argument to cloud the issues involved.

Fifth: It was argued further in the conference, as the result of certain recommendations made by the committee, that the commission desired to commit the church to giving a guarantee to other divisions of the Restoration and the enjoyment of joint title and ownership of the temple before the temple construction should be begun. Such is not a fact. The committee at no time suggested, nor desired, that such guarantees should be given, except with qualifications that protected the interest of the church in every way. For the benefit of the church,

and to prevent further misrepresentation of the facts, the following excerpts from the recommendations of the committee are quoted, to-wit:

We report progress in the increase of reciprocal kindness, charity, tolerance, and friendliness. Surely those Christian graces are desirable among us all.

**"We make no concessions to the various errors of doctrine and theory held by some of our brethren of other divisions, in order to invite them to a more reciprocal friendliness than has prevailed in the past."** (Emphasis mine. C. L. W.)

"Errors of doctrine and false theories can never be corrected among any of us by holding hatred and bitterness towards others. The first essential therefore to helping to disseminate false doctrine and wrong theories of interpretations, be they held by whomsoever they may, is to reduce the bitterness of feeling which has existed hitherto between rival factions each claiming themselves to be **the church.**"

Upon the basis of such an understanding, as is set forth here by the commission on working harmony in their report to the church, they recommended the following, relative to the ownership of the Temple:

#### "OWNERSHIP OF THE TEMPLE."

"The Church of Christ, present owner of the Temple Lot, while holding full and legal title has, as we know, ever considered itself mere custodians by the will of God, and for His people.

"If the hearts of other organic bodies within the faith of the Latter Day Restoration shall be moved upon to join in erecting the Temple of the Lord, should we arrogantly refuse that cooperation? We believe that such a demonstration of faith in the promises of God upon their part, would entitle them to share in the legal and possessive ownership of the Temple **when it is finished.** Furthermore, they should have guarantee beforehand, that such bonifide share of title **will be faithfully issued when the structure is finished and ready to be dedicated. Why not? If they conform to the requirement of the true faith in Christ, and in accord with His law?"**

From this you can see that this commission DID NOT attempt to give guarantees that would compromise the church or its policies. Such guarantees were contingent upon the condition that "they conform to the requirements of the true faith in Christ and in accord with His law." And if other divisions of the Restoration shall be willing to lay down their innovation doctrines and practices "and conform to the requirements of the true faith in Christ," shall we say to them, "Regardless of the fact that you may have repented of your errors, regardless of the fact that you may have been sincere enough in that repentance to assist with the building of the House of the Lord with your means, your talents, your faith and your prayers, you shall not have a guarantee from this church that you shall share in the blessings and benefits to be derived from the use of the temple?"

Yet, should you give your vote to support the contention of those who want to abolish this commission because it recommended a measure that common sense should tell us would be the only Christ-like thing to do, it would be tantamount to refusing our friends any hope of benefit from their sacrifice when that structure is completed and dedicated. It is therefore urged that you vote down the

bill to abolish this commission and let them go ahead with their work.

Sixth: The argument was made on the conference floor, "that the members of this commission are apostles, therefore, it is part of their responsibility to promote working harmony between the churches of the Restoration without being appointed on a special committee of three to do it. And again, if it is the responsibility of three apostles to make such contacts for the church, then that responsibility belongs to all twelve of the apostles."

Such logic!! There is a preponderance of scripture to support the appointing of small numbers of the apostolic quorum on committees for special purposes, and this, too, without infringing on the prerogatives of the council as a whole.

It was further argued by this same brother that all the major innovations and departures from the faith introduced since the early days of the Restoration were cradled in committees similar to the Committee on Working Harmony, and insinuated that there was nothing to hinder the present committee foisting itself upon the church after the order of a first presidency in the Church. If this be true, then the same menace to the church exists in the appointment of all other committees of three, which may be composed of apostles. We have the Temple Plans Committee, consisting of three apostles, namely, Clarence L. Wheaton, Jas. E. Yates and A. M. Smith; the Committee on Referendum Bills, consisting of one apostle, a bishop and an elder; the Committee to draft articles of incorporation for putting into effect the temporal law of the church, composed of three apostles, namely, T. J. Jordan, L. A. Gould and C. L. Wheaton. What is to prevent any of these committees from introducing major innovations or departures from the faith which they may nurse in their bosoms until such times as they may become something of the order of a first presidency? Thus we see that that which proves too much proves nothing, therefore, such reasoning is inconsistent with the facts as they relate to this issue. It should be beneath the dignity of men in the honored position of apostles to use such ridiculous argument in an endeavor to win a point.

In this connection let us consider the following scriptural proof which show that there is no inconsistency nor infringement of the rights of the council of apostles by the appointment of small numbers of that body upon committees for the purpose of performing special work for the church.

1. When Samaria received the gospel under Philip's preaching, did the church send the whole council of twelve apostles there for the purpose of confirming the new converts by the laying on of hands?

No! For "when the apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John, etc." (Acts 8:14.) This was a committee of two, performing ministerial duties that were part of the prerogatives of the whole council, yet was not an infringing upon the rights of others.

2. When the trouble arose in Antioch over the question of circumcision, did the whole congregation of the church at that place elect themselves as a committee of the whole to go up to Jerusalem and lay their grievance before the apostles and elders about the question?

No! "They determined that Paul and Barnabus (two of the apostles, C. L. W.) and certain other of them, should go up to Jerusalem unto the apostles and elders about this question." (Acts 15:2.) This is another instance where a committee of two of the apostles and certain others of the saints at Antioch performed a duty, which though a prerogative of the whole church to do, was more expedient for a small committee to perform, and this too without infringing upon the rights of others.

3. After they "were come to Jerusalem (and), received of the church, and of the apostles and elders," and there had been "much disputing" over the matter, and a decision was reached, did they send the whole council of apostles and elders assembled at Jerusalem back to Antioch to render this decision?

No! For it pleased "the apostles and elders. with the whole church, to send **chosen men** (a committee (C. L. W.) of their own company to Antioch with Paul and Barnabas; namely Judas surnamed Barnabas, and Silas, chief men among the brethren" (Acts 15:22), to deliver the decision for them. Thus upon this occasion a committee of four men were chosen to perform duties that were within the prerogatives of all the twelve and all the eldership to perform, yet it was not considered as an infringement upon the rights of the other members of the apostolic quorum. Neither were these men accused of attempting to set themselves up as a first presidency.

4. When the time came for the gospel to be preached to the Gentiles, did the Lord choose the whole council of twelve apostles for this particular mission? No, for we read in the 10th chapter of Acts that he chose Peter for this special purpose, and when Peter was come to the house of Cornelius he said, "Ye know how that it is an unlawful thing for a man that is a Jew to keep company or come unto one of another nation; but God hath shewed me that I should not call any man common or unclean."

Now the question might be asked, why did the early Christian church perform such important features of their work through small committees, instead of through the efforts of the whole ministry? To me the reason is plain. Certain features of the work required special preparation upon the part of those to whom the responsibility was entrusted. Again, certain qualifications aside from regular apostolic duties were needed to make the work of such special commissions successful. And again the entrusting of such matters to a committee, releases the rest of the apostolic council to go about the duties devolving upon them by ordination and special appointment of the church.

These scriptural precedents should be sufficient authority for our continuing to entrust the responsibility of holding up the "STANDARD OF PEACE" to other divisions of the Restoration to a commission or committee. Such a commission cannot bind the church to any agreement. Such tentative agreements as they may reach in joint council with other bodies must be ratified by the church in its conferences and by referendum. Such a commission cannot embarrass the church by setting forth untenable positions, for they are appointed to represent the church in its doctrines, faith and practice, therefore, they must restrict their activities to the es-

tablished positions of the church on such questions, or if they desire to recommend a change of doctrine, faith or practice, it must be done under the scrutiny of the whole church in conference and subject to referendum action.

Not so however, with the general ministry, for it has been found that some have accepted members into the church on baptism and by transfer who have held to reservations on questions all the way from whether it was necessary to profess a belief in the Book of Mormon, to the question of high priests, presidency, baptism for the dead, and other things in opposition to the established principles of the church, with the result that today we find in the church schisms that prevent the harmonious working together of the whole membership of the church.

A review of the accomplishments of the committees on working harmony in the last eighty years of the Church's existence will show that they have accomplished much good. When such committees have been dormant, or the church has failed to sustain them, we find that the church has gone backward and made but little if any progress in bringing about a unity of effort among the various divisions of the Restoration.

In 1897 the Committee on Working Harmony succeeded in reaching fourteen points of agreement with the Reorganized church, chief among them, the provision whereby we recognized the fact that there was valid priesthood authority and valid baptisms in the different factions of the Restoration.

In 1900 four more points of agreement were reached. In 1918, as the result of the activities of the committee on working harmony, we find that the points of agreement were increased to 24 articles, all of which, with but one single exception, the Church of Christ adheres to, to this day. Chief among them was provision for the transfer of membership from one body of the Restoration to the other on their original baptism, and the priesthood of many was also recognized. Following this agreement, hundreds of persons transferred to the Church of Christ on the Temple Lot, outnumbering the original membership of the church manifold, yet we do not find that the title and possession of the Temple Lot has been jeopardized in the least.

Today the council of the twelve apostles in the Church of Christ includes ten men who were never originally baptized into this church, but transferred their membership from our sister organization, the Reorganized Church. The writer is the only member of the council that is of the original membership of the Church of Christ.

These ten brethren would never have been among the apostles of this church if it had not been for the untiring efforts of the former committees on working harmony to make provision for them to come into the church by transfer. This was a thing that never could have been accomplished except through committee work, yet today, we are faced with the spectacle of the majority of these men wanting to abolish the very means by which they, themselves, found sanctuary in the church.

This commission represents more than just a group of men that have been especially chosen by the body to represent it in councils with other bodies. It stands for an ideal, the very ideal which is the basic principle for this body to exist, namely, "ye

shall be as little Joseph who was carried captive into Egypt. Ye shall yet be the means of saving your brethren, and bringing them to a unity of purpose and action before me, etc." Therefore, it becomes our duty to the whole Restoration to **continue** to lift up the "Standard of Peace" and proclaim to all the scattered sheep of these last days the necessity of uniting together in an effort that "will conform to the requirements of the true faith in Christ," in order to build His house, that He may come and set the whole church in order, and endow his ministry with power from on high to go forth for the last time to prune his vineyard. Let us do this by approving the Committee's report and recommendations as found in Bill No. 29.

Being appointed by the church for a definite purpose, a committee would receive attention that would not be accorded a general missionary who presented himself without any special commission. Can the general ministry, including the apostolic quorum, point to a single contact they have made with leading officials of other bodies in the ten years from 1925 to 1935? Yet the present Committee on Working Harmony, which some fifteen members of the ministry requested to resign, and which you, as members of the church, are asked to abolish, have in eight months accomplished what the combined ministry have not accomplished in ten years. This is not boasting. It is a simple statement of facts you should take into consideration when you vote on Bills Nos. 10 and 11.

This committee, which was approved by you in the referendum of last year, went forth in all good faith, and succeeded in getting four other divisions of the Restoration to appoint similar committees to our own. We had appointments scheduled for this summer to meet with these committees in joint session to review the differences existing between us, find our common ground, and seek to take under consideration what is necessary that we might come closer together. But now we are faced with effort to thwart all this and destroy the good that has been accomplished. Will the membership support these attempts to hinder the work that has just begun? It is hoped not.

Now let us summarize briefly. First: This committee is primarily a committee appointed by the church to meet with similar committees of other divisions of the Restoration relative to differences of faith, doctrine and practice, with the view to reaching common ground upon which they may unite and assist in building the temple of the Lord in Independence, when they "conform to the requirements of the true faith in Christ."

Second: This committee on working harmony has existed in one form or another for the past eighty years. At times it has consisted of as few as two members; and at other times of three, four, five or six members. Each committee has succeeded the other in continuous service.

Third: This committee, although a standing committee, under present arrangement, retires one member each year, re-electing another in his place, and changes personnel each year.

Fourth: The membership of this committee is not confined to persons who are members of the council of twelve apostles. They must, however, hold the Melchisedec Priesthood.

Fifth: This committee does not have power or authority to commit the church, or to bind it to any agreement with other divisions of the Restoration. It may reach tentative agreements with them in joint sessions, but must be submitted to the church in the form of recommendations and be approved by the referendum of the whole church before they become binding on the church.

Sixth: As a general church committee its activities at all times are subject to review and supervision of the council of twelve apostles in quorum capacity, the same as all other committees of the church are, during the interim between conferences. The personnel of the committee may be changed if the church sees necessity for it. Its number may be augmented, or if desired, the church may abolish it.

In conclusion, I wish to review the arguments made on the question relative to the mission of this Church of Christ, which was raised by one of the brethren at the conference, in which the revelation given to the church in March of 1919 was cited as grounds for abolishing this commission. In a sermon on the question the following was quoted:

"\* \* \* this is your work, to gather together in one all those of my sheep who are scattered upon the face of the earth."

From this the brother reasoned that the Church of Christ upon the Temple Lot was **the church**, while all the other organic bodies were branches of this church, that is their memberships were.

But if you will read this revelation, parts of which are printed in the tract, "That Interesting Spot of Land," pages 29-30, you will learn that the Lord referred to these other organizations as "the different branches of my church," and in the concluding paragraph of this revelation this organic body upon the temple lot was referred to as follows:

"I will cause **this branch** to grow and prosper in the eyes of all men, etc."

You may say, "If this branch of the church is not **the church**, and there are "different branches" of the church than this, then of what are they **the branches**?"

Why, of the Church of the Restoration established in 1830, of course.

"Well", you may say, "If we are only a branch, and if they are branches, then to what extent are we better than they?"

I have affirmed, and so have others, that this Church of Christ is a remnant of the Church of Christ established April 6, 1830, and that by virtue of the fact that we adhere more closely to the faith, doctrine and practices of that church than do any other of the divisions of the Restoration, we therefore can truthfully maintain the position that we have more to offer to the world in the way of truth than any of the others. For that reason and because, being located upon the Temple Lots, the place where the gathering is to begin, we are by God's grace in the better position to invite our brethren of the other divisions of the Restoration to **join with us** in building the temple, than they are to so invite us. If this were not true, I would still be seeking a church that had more of the fullness to offer.

But our brother, in quoting the small portion of the revelation to which I called attention above, overlooked a very important statement that follow-

ed. The Lord said further:

"Ye shall **continue** to strive for a unity that ye may in this way be better prepared to meet the world when ye go among them to preach the fullness of the gospel."

At that time we were, as a church, striving for this unity through a committee on working harmony. Just before this revelation was given circumstances arose that caused our committee to consider abandoning the work of reaching a harmonious relationship with the Reorganized church. The priesthood made the matter a subject of prayer and fasting before the Lord, for weeks, and finally on the 11th day of March, 1919, the Lord told us to "continue to strive for a unity."

How—by abolishing the committee?

No! by **continuing** to sustain it in righteousness from year to year with our prayers and cooperation.

Therefore, the Lord placed his approval upon the efforts, as well as the methods we were using to carry out our mission. May we continue to do His way, and not follow after man's way.

"They drew a circle that shut us out—  
Heretics, rebels, things to flout,  
But God and Love had the wit to win,  
They drew a circle that took us all in."

Apologies to Edwin Markham.

P. S. For further information, write me at my home address, 204 West Sea Avenue, Independence, Missouri, and your letters will be forwarded to me.

#### PASTORS AND OTHERS, TAKE NOTICE.

Brother Leon A. Gould, of the Referendum Committee, requests pastors and members to note the following corrections in the Referendum Bills, "so that the vote may be upon the bills as corrected."

Bill No. 1.

In paragraph 4, line 2, the words "and ordinations" should read "an ordination."

Bill No. 17.

Under subheading, "Articles of Association," paragraph "1", change "that" to "this."

Paragraph "3", put "principal," instead of "principle."

Paragraph "4", first line. change "the" to "this."

Under subheading, "The Judiciary Officers," the entire second paragraph should be erased.

Under "Board of Directors and Trustees," put "Henry Johnson," instead of "Herbert Johnson."

Under "Local Officers," after the words, "local group," at the end of the paragraph, add a second paragraph as follows:

"Local organizations shall be organized as nearly as possible along the lines of the General Association."

Under "Organization," in the third line of the paragraph, change "no" to "a".

Under "Colonization," at the end of the first paragraph, after the word "basis," add the following "(See Book of Commandments 59: 64-67.)"

Bill No. 24.

After the name of Roland Sprague, change phrase to read: "as General Assistant Superintendent."

Bill No. 29.

On page 8 of Supplement, 1st Column, third paragraph, 4th line. change "out" to "our".

#### INDEPENDENCE ITEMS

Mother's Day was duly observed on the Temple Lot. An appropriate selection was beautifully sung by Sister Angela Wheaton. Bro. Wm. F. Anderson's sermon was a feeling tribute to mothers. The choir, under the direction of Sr. Anderson, contributed their part. As the congregation sat and listened, and memories of childhood, home and mother came back, tears could be seen trickling down more than one face, and there were not many dry eyes. It is good for us to be occasionally reminded of sacred memories, lest, in the busy rush of these strenuous times, we forget. if that were possible.

Elmer Long, Jr., the youngest son of Bro. and Sr. E. E. Long, is still a very sick boy. On account of the congestion in his head, he can not hear anything, and his sight is double. He needs the prayers of the saints everywhere, and so do Bro. and Sr. Long. Those who have had serious and protracted illness in their own families know what a strain it is.

We have an increase in our church membership. At least, until they come to the age of accountability, we place them on the propect list. We refer to the young son born to Bro. and Sr. Rolland Sprague, May 12th, and to the daughter of Granville Hedrick and his wife, born the same date. Bro. Granville is a grandson of Granville Hedrick, through whom the Lord instructed the little remnant to come to Independence, which they did in 1867, and in 1869 they purchased the Temple lots.

We with the conference visitors, especially those from the north, could see Independence and surrounding country at this writing, May 20th. Nature has spread beauty everywhere in God's great out-of-doors, and prospects for gardens, fruit and field are encouraging, they say.

#### LESSONS FOR JUNE

Lesson 10.....	June 6
Joseph's Readiness for Service Genesis 41: 33-44	
Lesson 11.....	June 13
The Brotherly Love of Judah Genesis 44: 18-34	
Lesson 12.....	June 20
Joseph's Kindness to His Kindred Genesis 46: 1-7, 28-30 Genesis 50: 24-26	
Lesson 13.....	June 27
Messages from Gensis Hebrews 11: 3-10, 17-22	

We have a letter from Bro. Willard J. Smith, telling how he would like to have attended conference, but the distance was too far for one in his health. He was 79 years old on the day he wrote, May 7th. His wife's health is very poor, also, "a severe case of heart trouble." He requests the prayers of the saints, and let us remember them both, and ask that the peace of God may be granted unto them.

Bro. C. L. Wheaton left May 20th for his field in the Northwest.



same as I had come to know so well, their faces red and their eyes filled with tears.

These people visited us and we continued to visit them in their services. They soon began to suggest that we join their church. We tried to explain that we had obeyed the same gospel which they were teaching, but they could not seem to understand that such a thing could possibly be, and when we insisted kindly that we could not conscientiously join with them; that we really felt no need or necessity to do so, although we accepted them as our brethren, their attitude toward us seemed to change. They would listen respectfully to our testimonies, but with coolness and dry eyes, were before they had manifested much feeling as we spoke, and when we had finished, though we spoke only of the gospel and never of churches, they would invariably follow us with testimonies of their knowledge that theirs was the true Church of Jesus Christ.

During this time I also visited another of the churches of Restoration faith, with which I was more familiar, having at one time been a member thereof, and was greeted warmly and welcomed "back home". This cordiality continued until it became evident that I had no intention of re-uniting with that church, after which the atmosphere changed there, also. It became apparent that my presence in the services of any of these churches was a positive hinderance to their spiritual happiness, for they seemed to feel it necessary to adopt a defensive attitude whenever I appeared among them, though I was always careful to show nothing but respect for them or their churches.

I cite these cases only to point to a state of mind which apparently exists to some extent in almost, if not all of the churches which are founded upon a belief in the gospel as restored through the agency of Joseph Smith.

The state of mind in question precludes the enjoyment of the greatest possible happiness in the world. Our greatest pleasure is in communing with God in the company of our fellows, and when we are not able to accept those who come in our midst with the same testimony of the same gospel which we believe, because they do not belong to the same church organization to which we belong, then we are confused and unhappy.

**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.

Every element of human thought and reason demands that there be a basic law upon which to predicate every supposition of fact, and because of this demand, man has of necessity chosen the one WORD OF LAW which is acceptable to all, by which to measure and analyze every declaration of evidence concerning the BEING, POWER, MIND or WILL of God which may appear in any manner, or by any agency, before the court of human reason for adjudication.

If the message which was delivered to the world with the RESTORED GOSPEL (The Book of Mormon) had not been found in agreement with the WORD which was universally accepted as the Word of God, (The Bible) the religious zeal which was aroused would have died at birth but, because

it **did** agree, and at the same time fulfilled certain other prophetic utterances of the original WORD, it was received and acclaimed as a gift from God by thousands who were waiting expectantly and hungrily for it, but was refused and bitterly condemned by other thousands who knew no hunger because they were filled with the product of their own conceit, or were depending upon the arm of flesh to feed them.

When this newly revealed WORD was delivered to man and joined to that WORD by which it was judged, then that which had been declared in the first WORD concerning it was fulfilled, and the FULLNESS of the Gospel was before the eyes of lost humanity.

If such quotations as the following are true, then why, Oh! why do we so disdainfully repudiate our kinship to each other in the family of God, and thereby bring reproach upon that gospel of which we so loudly proclaim ourselves to be the bearers and ministers, thus hindering our efforts in ministering to a dying world?

Our Lord, himself, said that the WHOLE LAW depended upon our LOVE of God and our neighbor, for its sanction.

Paul taught the same doctrine thus,—“For all the law is fulfilled in one word, even in this; thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself”.

Again, Paul wrote plainly of this matter—“For the Kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost”.

“For he that in these things serveth Christ is acceptable to God and approved of man”.

When we read in the WORD that, having entered into the new and everlasting covenant of the gospel of Christ and afterward find ourselves guilty of sin, “we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ, the Righteous”.—1 John 2:1.

If we confess our sins he is faithful and just to forgive our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness”.—1 John 1:9.

If these be true, why do some say that because we have erred in believing certain doctrines which are said to be of man instead of God, that He (God) has repudiated the covenant we made with Him; and that He has set up His Church anew, and that ALL will have to come into it again by baptism in order to have any claim upon the promises of that covenant?

Is this a serious matter, or am I unduly concerned?

Is it possible that the testimonies we offer are to lie in wait to judge us when our Savior comes to make up His jewels, whether we have been always careful to speak truthfully concerning the revelations we have received, or have carelessly used the Lord's name to justify our own desires or conjectures?

Was the gospel which was restored by the angel from heaven full and complete, or have we reason to believe that something was reserved to be added to it later? Think it over.

I thank God for the Church of Christ, which depends upon the “Rod of Iron” to lead to the “Tree of Life”, and teaches that God's Kingdom citizens are to be found in all the churches of the Restoration faith.