

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 21

Independence, Missouri, June, 1944

Number 6

Good Life, Long Life

He liveth long who liveth well.
All else is but life flung away!
He liveth longest who can tell
Of true things truly done each day.

Then fill each hour with what will last;
Buy up the moments as they go.
The life above, when this is past,
Is the ripe fruit of life below.

Sow love, and taste its fruitage pure!
Sow peace, and reap its harvest bright!
Sow sunbeams on the rock and moor,
And find a harvest home of light!

—Horatius Bonar.

CONTENTS

Editorial	Page 82	The Standard Bearers	Page 88
Correspondence	Page 84	The Name of the Church	Page 92
Breakdown of the American Home	Page 86	Michigan News	Page 96

ZION'S ADVOCATE

Official Publication of the Church of Christ.

Headquarters on the Temple Lot, Independence, Mo.

EDITOR IN CHIEF, B. C. Flint, 209 S. Crysler, Independence, Missouri.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS, Margaret Wheaton, 1101 W. Orchard, Independence, Mo.; Marion Denham Sprague, 424 E. Walnut, Independence, Mo.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY BY THE CHURCH OF CHRIST. Entered as Second-Class Matter May 14, 1929, at the Post Office at Independence, Mo., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: One Year, \$1.00; 6 months, 75c. In bundles of twelve or more, for missionary purposes, \$1.00. Canadian and all foreign rates, \$1.25.

Send all subscriptions for the Advocate, Tithes, Offerings, Consecrations and Donations to the Temple Fund and Storehouse to The Church of Christ, (Temple Lot), Box 472, Independence, Missouri.

Editorial

IN THE BEGINNING

"In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." Genesis 1:1.

"For behold they rejected all the words of Ether; for he truly told them of all things, from the beginning of man; and that after the waters had receded from off the face of this land, it became a choice land above all other lands, a chosen land of the Lord." Ether 6:2, Reorganized Authorized Edition.

"In the Beginning," is a vague thought, especially as it relates to the idea of creation. It immediately calls upon our keenest sense of imagination. And were we not provided with a source of information, our imaginations might run riot. In fact, they do, to a certain extent, as it is.

We shall therefore try to confine our discussion of the matter as closely as possible to the beaten path pointed out in scripture, lest we run afield and get lost in the labyrinth of confusion resulting from human effort to interpret.

God, the Master architect, saw His handiwork in prospect, and in the resultant things that are. He has, in a measure, taken us into His laboratory and given us a brief glimpse of it all in His written word. We will seek to understand, as He would wish us to do, and try to learn the wonderful story, as He would tell it to us, trusting to the leadings of the Holy Spirit to illumine our minds as we study.

In the Beginning! Wondrous thought! Can we imagine what might be incorporated in that thought? The next statement that follows in the text says: "And the earth was without form and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters."

Void! Darkness! Waters! Formlessness! Can the human mind comprehend it? Especially when we NOW see shape, light, space, Life? Ah! Work indeed for a Master Architect. Sublime in purpose! Wonderful in design! An uncreated God at work! Shall we, can we follow that work? Where shall we begin?

Webster defines "void" to mean empty, a vacuum. "Creation," he defines to mean cause to come into existence, to form out of nothing. Here, however, is a situation where we find that human words are inadequate to express all that may be implied. The nothingness that seemed to exist, was NOT nothingness, because "spirit" existed, and spirit is material. Spirit co-existed with God. It is substance because it occupies space, and anything that does not occupy space is non-existent or nothing.

Hence, since the unformed matter out of which God created the earth occupied space it could NOT be nothing. A point is the end of space, as an instant is the end or duration of time. Neither is divisible, hence are nothing, while spirit is divisible in that it is subject to both duration and space, therefore is something (substance).

In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. So far, so good. These are things capable of being understood, or of comprehension. They form a part of the story of man, and are inseparably connected with him, throughout time, and in scripture are indicated as being a part of his eternal existence. So we here leave the complex analysis of philosophy, and enter the realm of the things written in the word, as the beginning of the story. In other words, the story says that the earth was "without form and void." It evidently was covered with water. It existed in darkness. It was not a part of the solar system then, in the sense that it was formed in that way, as taught by the "nebular theory," because the sun, the center of the solar system, was not yet created.

The Bible says that darkness covered the waters. Then in the 9th verse of the 1st chapter of Genesis, we read: "And God said, let the waters under the heaven be gathered together unto one place, and let the dry land appear." This indicates that before this time there had been nothing visible on the earth but water, so darkness must have been everywhere present. This is further amplified by the statement in the 10th verse: "And God called the dry land earth; and the gathering together of the waters called He seas." This gives us a picture of the earth in the process of creation.

The third verse says: "And God said, Let there be light; and there was light." What this light consisted of we do not know, nor what, other than the power of God produced it; because we are told that on the fourth day, or period of creation, God made the sun and the moon. Here is the language: "And God said, Let there be lights in the firmament of heaven to divide the day from the night; and let them be for signs and for seasons, and for days and years: And let them be for lights in the firmament of heaven to give light upon the earth; and it was so. And God made two great lights; the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night. He made the stars also. And God set them in the firmament of heaven to give light upon the earth, and to rule over the day and over the night, and to divide the light from the darkness; and God saw that it was good. And the evening and the morning were the fourth day." Genesis 1:14-19.

All of this shows that the earth, as such, existed before the formation of the sun and the moon, because we are told that they were made for the benefit of the

earth. Hence, the earth was not made from a gaseous mass thrown off from the sun as taught by the "nebular theory."

From here on, like the strokes of the artist upon the canvas, the picture begins to take form, and becomes comprehensible. Its design and purpose begins also to appear. It is being made for something, and to some end.

It is well for us to examine carefully these beginnings in order that we may get God's purpose and designs, rather than to allow ourselves to be engulfed in the philosophies of men which might lead us astray; because the world is full of man's theories on all of these simple things. So-called science seeks to set aside this simple story and substitute in its place, an entirely different explanation of the process of creation. It is called Philosophical (Biological) Evolution. A study of it has no place here, so we pass on to the next phase of this study.

Man Appears

"When the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy." Job 38:7.

"Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was; and the spirit shall return unto the God who gave it." Ecclesiastes 12:7.

Having noticed the awe-inspiring picture, God at work fashioning an eternal world, we now notice that it was for the habitation of his crowning glory of creation, Man. Man, made in the image and likeness of God, endowed with spirit and intellect, and capable of becoming Godlike by reason of the free agency accorded him, and the power to contact God by the spirit that was given him. "But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God." John 1:12.

One of the sacred writers in meditation exclaims, "What is man, that thou art mindful of him or the son of man that thou visitest him? For thou hast made him a little lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honor. Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands; thou hast put all things under his feet; all sheep and oxen, yea and the beasts of the field; the fowl of the air, and the fish of the sea, and whatsoever passeth through the paths of the seas." Psalms 8:4-8.

An interesting thought is found in the fact that all of this was created spiritually, or in a spiritual embryonic state, before it was clothed upon by the physical elements of the earth from which the physical creation was to spring.

This we learn from the 5th verse of the second chapter of Genesis. In the twelve last verses of the first chapter we have the description of what was included in the work of life creation. It was man, made in the image of God. It was the animal creation, made every one after its own kind, and not by any process of evolution from one to the other. The same thing was true of the vegetable creation, and we are told that it was all made for the benefit of man, as king of God's creation. But in the 5th verse of the second chapter we are told, "And every plant of the field before it was in the earth, and every herb of the field before it grew; for the Lord had not caused it to rain upon the earth, and there was not a man to till the ground." Yet we

were told of the complete creation of all things in the first chapter. This creation was evidently a spiritual creation, and not a physical creation, because in the 7th verse of this same second chapter we read: "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul."

As an amplification of the above we find this in the Inspired Translation of the scriptures: "For I the Lord God, created all things of which I have spoken, spiritually, before they were naturally upon the face of the earth; for I, the Lord God, had not caused it to rain upon the face of the earth. And I, the Lord God, had created all the children of men, and not yet a man to till the ground, for in heaven created I them, and there was not yet flesh upon the earth, neither in the water, neither in the air; but I, the Lord God, spake, and there went up a mist from the earth, and watered the whole face of the ground. And I, the Lord God, formed man from the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul; the first flesh upon the earth, the first man also; nevertheless, all things were before created and made, according to my word." Genesis 2:5-9, Inspired Translation.

While this text from the Inspired Translation in no way conflicts with that found in the King James translation, it does throw wonderful light upon this very important subject. It answers the heresy sometimes taught, that man is wholly mortal. The very fact that we were told that man, male and female, were made by God in His own image, and then be informed after that, that there was not a man on earth to till the ground makes nothing but confusion, if the first creation mentioned covers the complete creation of man.

A sidelight on the above may also be found in the Inspired Translation where we are told: "And I, God, said unto mine only begotten, which was with me from the beginning, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness; and it was so." Genesis 1:27 (I. T.) and also this: "And I God, created man in mine own image, in the image of mine Only Begotten created I him, male and female created I them." Genesis 1:29, (I. T.)

It can readily be seen that an understanding of man, in his original appearance upon the earth, is essential to an understanding of that which followed, or the subsequent history made by him.

It is also very clear that this was one of the essential truths that was lost through apostasy, and must be restored to earth, as a part of the gospel restored, in these latter days, in order that a people be prepared through understanding, to be associated with Christ when He comes to work His crowning work of redemption.

It has always been a truth that, unless a premise was fundamentally sound, that, that which would follow would, of necessity, be likewise unsound. This is just another reason for the divided and confused state of so-called Christianity. We can scarcely touch a single one of these points without encountering some peculiar erroneous philosophy of man. No wonder that the young Palmyra seer was told to join none of them, and was given a very pronounced reason.

B. C. FLINT.

SOME CORRESPONDENCE

The following correspondence is presented to our readers, since it contains matter of vital interest to saints generally, and especially to our readers.

THE EDITOR.

The Body of a Letter Received by the Editor

"First, however, I should like your opinion concerning an ecclesiastical and historical appellation for the Church of Christ. I propose to divide the Latter Day Saints denominations into three factions:

- (a) Orthodox, (Utah group and Fundamentalists).
- (b) Evangelical, (Church of Christ).
- (c) Protestant, (Reorganites and Rigdonites).

"I want to use these terms since they are exactly familiar to theologians. I consider Orthodoxy to be the state of the church dogma at the death of the Prophet.

"I apply "Evangelical" to your group because it uses Latter Day Revelation to a lesser extent, and relies primarily on the Bible and the Book of Mormon; if you do not approve of the term "Evangelical," would you suggest a distinctive term to apply to the general doctrines of the denomination represented by the Church of Christ.

"My queries:

"1. What edition of the Book of Mormon does your group use?

"2. Why do you reject later editions of Doctrine and Covenants? Why do you not accept all of the prophet's revelations?

"3. You state that your church recognizes the priesthood of Orthodox and Protestant saints; how can it? If these saints followed false doctrines they lost their priesthood,—they had to, just as the early church lost its priesthood, and needed a "restoration."

"4. If the church at Bloomington remained "untouched" by the rampant apostasy in Nauvoo at the death of the prophet, how is it that they were not excommunicated?

"5. I fear I do not rightly understand your argument concerning the First Presidency vs. Apostles. Would you suggest, by the term FIRST APOSTLES that there are apostles who are not in the Quorum of Twelve?

Would you be so kind as to send me the subscription price of your Church Publication, etc."

Independence, Mo., May 22, 1944.

Dear Sir: I think I owe you an apology for my delay in answering your very fine letter of inquiry. However, as you no doubt know, I am a very busy man, and sometimes it interferes seriously with my heavy correspondence.

Coming directly to your inquiries: First, I must object strenuously to your classification of the groups of so-called Mormonism. You have classed the Utah group as "Orthodox"; The Church of Christ as "Evangelical"; and the Reorganized, Rigdonites, etc., as "Protestant."

Webster defines "orthodox" to mean "sound in doctrine, or faith." He defines "fundamental" to mean; "pertaining to a groundwork, or root." With these definitions in mind, nothing could be farther from the facts of history than to refer to the Utah group as either "fundamental" or "orthodox." The church organized

April 6, had neither a First Presidency of three, nor did it teach or practice the doctrines of polygamy, baptism for the dead, Adam-God, nor a great number of other things. Its name was simply The Church of Christ. In all of these things the Church of Christ on the Temple Lot is the only group that could be classed as either "Orthodox," or "Fundamental."

For proof we cite you to the historical fact that all church matter up to May, 1834, uses the name the church then bore, namely, "The Church of Christ." This you can very easily verify. Second, while we question their proof, we will concede for the sake of argument, their claim that polygamy was introduced by revelation in 1843, thirteen years after the Church of Christ came into being. Third, baptism for the dead, a very outstanding and fundamental doctrine among the Utah group was never heard of until January 19, 1841, when revelation touching that matter was given. This was eleven years after the church was organized. Query, If this doctrine was "orthodox," or "fundamental," how comes it that it was NO PART of the gospel as given by the angel to Joseph Smith, and others from 1820 to 1830 and up until 1841?

True, we will admit that many of these innovations had made their appearance in the church prior to the death of Joseph Smith in 1844, and if you confine your statement of the "orthodoxy" to the period just prior to that time, and to the group immediately around the prophet and his associates, THEN maybe you could find some little grounds for your position on "Orthodoxy," but what organization on earth would class such departures as comporting with the idea of orthodoxy? The fact that the prophet himself may have been a party to these innovations in no way alters that fact. Why, according to that type of reasoning, the Catholic church of today is a literal, orthodox, continuation of primitive Christianity.

So much for your classification. You ask what edition of the Book of Mormon we use? We are not committed to any particular edition, but DO prefer the new authorized edition put out by the Reorganized Church because that work was the result of an actual comparison with the original manuscript which is a possession of the Reorganized Church.

Question two: "Why do you reject later editions of the Doctrine and Covenants?"

Why do you not accept all of the prophet's revelations?"

Well, I think I have quite fully answered that question already, especially as to the "why." Unorthodox innovations introduced and based upon conflicting so-called revelations would be just and consistent cause for rejection, we think. Second, "Why do you not accept all of the prophet's revelations?" Well, we can put that question as logically to any other one of the groups, as you can to us. When innovations began to be introduced, many of the prophet's revelations no longer comported with the changed conditions, SO THEY DELETED THEM FROM THEIR BOOK, the Doctrine and Covenants. By actual test there were over a thousand of such changes made in the revelations. Here is a sample. In a revelation given through Joseph Smith in March, 1829, appears this paragraph,

"And thus, if the people of this generation harden not their hearts I will work a reformation among them, and I will put down all lyings, and deceivings, and priestcrafts, and envyings, and strifes, and idolatries, and sorceries, and all manner of iniquities, and I will establish my church, like unto the church which was taught by my disciples in the days of old." Now why do not the Utah, Reorganite and other groups accept ALL of the revelations of Joseph Smith including this one? If they are, as they claim to be, the church established, "like unto my church which was taught by my disciples in the days of old," why reject the revelation that states that fact?

Question number three: "You state that your church recognizes the priesthood of Orthodox and Protestant saints. How can it? If these saints followed false doctrine they lost their priesthood—they had to, just as the early church lost its priesthood, and needed a restoration."

I wonder on what grounds you base such reasoning. Nothing but a total apostasy and a turning away from the truth entirely forfeits an individual's priesthood. Mistakenly and innocently following man in error has never caused God to cast off his people. Anything less than this would constitute men holding valid priesthood as supermen who would become infallible, and not subject to err. Let us see what a revelation accepted by all groups has of say on this point. In a revelation given to Joseph Smith in July, 1828, "Behold, you have been intrusted with these things, but how strict were your commandments; and remember, also, the promises which were made unto you, if you did not transgress them; but behold, **HOW OFT** you have transgressed the commandments and the laws of God, and have gone on in the persuasions of men; for behold, you should not have feared man more than God, although men set at naught the counsels of God, and despise his words, yet you should have been faithful and he would have extended his arm, and supported you against all the fiery darts of the adversary; and he would have been with you in every time of trouble. Behold, thou art Joseph, and thou **WAST** chosen to do the work of the Lord, **BUT BECAUSE OF TRANSGRESSION**, if thou art not aware thou wilt fall, but remember God is merciful. Therefore, repent of that which thou hast done, and he will only cause thee to be afflicted **FOR A SEASON**, and **THOU ART STILL CHOSEN**, and wilt again be called to the work," etc. Book of Commandments, chapter 2, paragraphs 3, 4. Utah Doctrine and Covenants, section 3, paragraphs 5, 6, 7, 8, 9. (All emphasis mine to call attention to that which is a complete answer to your question.)

One point especially worthy of note in the revelation just given and which makes exceedingly logical the position of the Church of Christ, on all points, is found in the promise that if Joseph did not transgress, that the arm of the Lord would be round about him in every time of trouble. He certainly was in serious trouble in Carthage jail when his enemies took his life. Where was the promised arm of the Lord then and why was it not extended in his behalf? Can you think of a reason? The implications certainly are obvious.

Question number four: "If the church at Bloomington remained "untouched" by the rampant apostasy in Nauvoo at the death of the prophet, how is it that they were not excommunicated?"

Frankly, I do not know. Brigham at that time certainly was in the saddle, and was not slow in excommunicating any who challenged his rule. However, we do not claim that the church at Bloomington was "untouched," as you put it. We merely claim that they were able to keep most free of any of the groups from the baneful innovations that were constantly creeping into the church at that time. They consistently adhered to the primitive, orthodox teachings of the restoration, more closely than any of the others; that is all. They also retained the original name, The Church of Christ.

Question number five: "I fear I do not rightly understand your argument concerning the First Presidency vs. Apostles. Would you suggest, by the term "**First Apostles**," that there were apostles who are not in the Quorum of Twelve?"

No, sir, that is one of the main points at issue between the Church of Christ and the other groups, such as the Utah and Reorganization. Both of those groups have a quorum of three, whom they say ARE apostles, yet are not of the Twelve, but are a quorum of a First Presidency; while the Church of Christ contends that in the organization of the church as perfected by Christ himself both at Jerusalem and in America, he placed as the "**FIRST**" officers in the church a quorum of Twelve apostles, and we contend that it was also so intended in the latter day restoration, because in June 1829, there was a revelation given to David Whitmer and Oliver Cowdery to choose out twelve apostles, and the words "unto twelve," is the wording in the original revelation as it is found in the Book of Commandments; however, in all editions of the Doctrine and Covenants the word "unto" is deleted, because, as we infer, that having adopted the NEW order of a First Presidency of three over the twelve the word "unto" was too restrictive.

It seems that this letter is becoming quite lengthy, but we trust that we have made our position on the various points clear to you. If not we shall be very glad to hear from you at any time.

Your inquiry about our church periodicals has been cared for by sending you a recent copy of Zion's Advocate, which we trust reached you o. k.

With kind personal regards, we are, very sincerely,

APOSTLE B. C. FLINT.

LOCAL CHURCH ORGANIZED AT HOUSTON, MISSOURI

Brother J. E. Bozarth recently organized a local church at Houston, Missouri. Brother Paul G. Mercer was ordained an elder and made pastor, and Sister Anna Keeney was made secretary. She reports that there were fifteen members enrolled, three being baptized by Brother Bozarth. A full report from this group will appear later.—Editor.

Original Articles

We solicit articles for this department written in an affirmative manner. An affirmative article is one in which a premise is established, and evidences presented to support that premise. In all controversial articles, contributors will be required to observe the rules of decorum established by parliamentary rules governing deliberative assemblies.

THE BREAKDOWN OF THE AMERICAN HOME

By Dr. M. R. DeHaan, M. D.

Part Two

"And the Lord said, It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him an helpmeet for him. . . . And the Lord caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and he slept: and he took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh instead thereof, and the rib which the Lord God had taken from man, made he a woman, and brought her unto the man. And Adam said, This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called woman, because she was taken out of man. Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh." Genesis 2:18, 21, 22, 23, 24.

In these verses we have the Bible account of the first marriage ceremony performed in the garden of Eden. The groom was Adam who had never had a wife before and the bride was Eve who also had never been married before. To this couple a family was born and became the first human home in history. It was the first unit of society to be created and has remained the basic unit of all society ever since. In politics, around election time we often hear the slogan: "As goes Maine, so goes the nation." But in the moral and spiritual realm we may safely say, "As goes the home, so goes the nation." The nation may well be compared to a body. A human body is composed of millions of tiny cells, which in the aggregate, and working together form that body. Anything which happens to the single unit cell, affects the whole body and if enough of them become diseased, the whole body becomes sick and will ultimately die. The same is true of the nation. Anything which affects the homes of America affects directly the destiny and the future of the nation. If the home deteriorates the nation will deteriorate. If the home becomes godless the nation becomes godless, for our nation is an aggregation not only of individuals but an aggregation of homes, the simplest unit of organized society. Breed disrespect in the home and you will have lawlessness in the nation. Give me a nation of praying homes and I have a praying nation.

Home Broken Down

Undoubtedly the most serious problem facing America today is the breakdown of the American home and the disappearance of the characteristic homes of the early days of our national history, THE CHRISTIAN HOME. We are not going to discuss all the causes of this sad affair, since we have covered many of them in a former series of messages on JUVENILE DELINQUENCY. There are, however, some things we could not treat in detail at that time and so shall

take them up in this and the following messages in this series.

The Divorce Evil

First and foremost among the tragic signs of the breakdown of the homes of the nation we would place the cancer of the home society, DIVORCE. I have the deepest sympathy for those whose homes have been cursed by this evil, not only sympathy for the poor, innocent children who are robbed of a decent chance because of the prevalence of this iniquitous thing, but also for the innocent victims of divorce who have obtained it upon scriptural grounds. I have pity for all who have been to blame for the breakup of any home and pray God that these messages may be used to bring them to repentance and to make restitution to those they have wronged, insofar as is possible. Divorce is not only a sin against God and against the wife or husband and a sin against the innocent children, but it is a sin against society in general and lowers the moral and spiritual standard of the whole community and nation. No nation can rise higher in the scale of morality than the average of the individual members which make up that nation. I bring these messages in the hope, not only that some of you may repent, but above all in the hope that those of you who have not yet fallen into this evil may be prevented from doing so. As a physician I am first of all interested in prophylaxis and the prevention of the evil. In many cases of broken homes the damage is irreparable anyway and the case is hopeless. But to all others I want to say I am bringing you these messages after much prayer in the hope and faith that it will be the means of preventing heartache and disaster and ruin.

Only Scripture

Moreover, I realize that many of you will disagree with me, some of you most bitterly, probably because the shoe fits your foot. And to disagree is your privilege, of course, but if you do, will you believe me when I say that I am in earnest and sincere in what I teach and preach and bring it only with the best of motives and desire to be of help in counteracting this rapidly increasing cancer of society. I will attack the problem as a preacher, not as a judge; as a teacher of the Word, rather than as a teacher of sociology. I am interested only in what God says in his word, and that should, after all, be the final authority.

God made the man and the woman. God instituted marriage and, therefore, His Word must be the court of last appeal.

Now for the teaching of the word of God itself in the matter of divorce. I remember a certain preacher who preached on this subject once and had his head cut off for doing so. His name was John the Baptist. I

hope I shall fare better, but if you feel like doing what Herod did, please remember what happened to Herod also.

When God made man, he made them a pair and not a harem. One man, Adam, and one woman, Eve. This was the ideal of God and, therefore, we read, "Male and female created he them." Now if sin had not entered and upset everything, this would have remained the inviolable rule. The matter of separation and divorce would never have entered and since death would have been unknown, each man would have continued to live forever with his own wife. That was God's directive will. But sin did enter in and man fell and sin brought about a separation. And now while God's will has not changed in regard to this matter, he does make allowance for man's weakness and in his mercy, and according to his permissive will, permits a man or woman to separate or obtain a divorce. Jesus expressed it very clearly when he said, "Because of the hardness of your hearts, Moses SUFFERED you to put away your wives. But from the beginning it was not so."

God in mercy "suffers" things because of our hardness and weakness. This is the only explanation for the practice of polygamy as seen in the lives of Moses, Abraham, Jacob and Solomon. God suffered it, but he never once endorsed or sanctified it. We challenge any critic of the Bible to show one single passage where God ever sanctioned Polygamy. But on the contrary he has caused the record to be written large and clear concerning the deep sorrow and the sad results in every case. Think of Abraham and Hagar. Think of Jacob and his wives. Think of David and Solomon and the record of grief and sin. It is God's own record and what he thinks of polygamy.

So too, divorce is a great evil, and yet because of man's condition certain concessions are made. Now I am sure that every true Christian wants to know the will of God in this matter. Of course, if Christians live as Christians ought to live, this would never even come up among them. If God's pattern for husband and wife as given in Ephesians 5 were followed by all and practiced carefully, there would be no unhappy Christian homes.

But the condition is here and we need to speak plainly. We shall divide the subject into three sections. First, WHO are permitted to be divorced. Then, WHO are permitted to remarry. And finally the EXCEPTIONAL problems.

I. Who Are Permitted to Divorce?

The passages bearing on this matter are few but are very clear. We need not go beyond the word of God. Turn first with me to Matthew 5:31, 32.

"It hath been said, Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement; but I say unto you, that whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery: and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery."

Here you will notice that the Lord Jesus gives one, and one only, reason for divorce. It is unfaithfulness

and infidelity on the part of the husband or the wife. Only one other passage bears on this point and may be found in Matthew 19:3-9.

"The Pharisees also came unto him, tempting him, and saying unto him, Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause?"

"And he answered and said unto them, Have you not read, that he which made them at the beginning made them male and female. And said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh? Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.

"They say unto him, Why did Moses then command to give a writing of divorcement, and to put her away? He saith unto them, Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so. And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery."

Now from these two passages we see that fornication and unfaithfulness is the one ground for divorce.

The second ground for separation at least, is found in Corinthians 7:10-15.

"And unto the married I command, yet not I, but the Lord, Let not the wife depart from her husband: but and if she depart, let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband: and let not the husband put away his wife.

"But to the rest speak I, not the Lord: If any brother hath a wife that believeth not, and she be pleased to dwell with him, let him not put her away. And the woman which hath an husband that believeth not, and if he be pleased to dwell with her, let her not leave him. For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband: else were your children unclean; but now are they holy. But if the unbelieving depart, let him depart. A brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases: but God hath called us to peace."

The ground here you will notice is very definitely DESERTION on the part of the unbeliever. The situation presented here is one of a mixed marriage, namely, a believer with an unbeliever. In such a case Paul teaches the believing husband or wife is not to leave the mate under any circumstances except, of course, for the reasons laid down in Matthew 5 and 19, but to stick through thick and thin. I would that you all might get this point. While separation is permitted in cases of mixed marriages, it is only permitted when the unbeliever voluntarily departs. If you are a Christian, God's command to you is to remain with your unbelieving husband as long as he does not leave you. If the unbeliever departs, the believer is not under bondage but is permitted to let him go.

Now the reason why a believer is never permitted to leave an unbelieving mate is given in the same passage. It is best that she remain with him and live the Christian life before him. The believing wife may be the means of bringing the unbelieving husband to Christ. This way, of course, entail great trial and great

(Continued on page 90)

The Standard Bearers

STORIES OF THE RESTORATION

The Church Is Organized

For the four years from 1823 to 1827, it seems from history that the first attention was devoted to the work connected with the coming forth of the Book of Mormon, obtaining the plates, translating, and finally printing; which we have learned was completed in the spring of 1830.

Now another and perhaps more important part of the Restoration was to be unfolded. A revelation was given to Joseph Smith in March, 1829, that contained this paragraph: "And thus if the people of this generation harden not their hearts, I will work a reformation among them, and I will put down all lyings, and deceivings, and priestcrafts, and envyings, and strifes, and idolatries, and sorceries, and all manner of iniquities, and I will establish my church like unto the church which was taught by my disciples in days of old."

This promise contained wonderful possibilities, but it was all based upon the idea of the people "Of this generation hardening not their hearts." It would also be a fulfillment of two very outstanding scriptural predictions. One in the 24th chapter of Matthew which says, "And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come." Christ was talking about his second coming and of the end of the world and this was to be one of the identification marks of that wonderful event.

The other text is found in Revelations 14:6, 7, and says: "And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, saying with a loud voice, Fear God and give glory to him; for the hour of his judgment is come."

Now it is very evident that if this angel has not flown from heaven with the everlasting gospel, the gospel IS NOT on earth among men today, because, it is the only text in the whole Bible that tells us how the gospel is to get back to earth after the night of the dark ages of apostasy that overtook the church following the days of Christ.

So naturally, since this was to be a complete restoration of God's work on earth among men, it must of necessity include all that would go to make up such a restoration. First it seems that with much arduous and laborious work, the Book of Mormon, another record containing the "everlasting gospel" story, must be obtained and ready for circulation to accompany the preaching of the gospel; and then the other work of preparation thereto might be engaged in. So we are told that, one morning while the work of translation was going on, and Joseph Smith looked into the Urim and Thummim with the intention of continuing the work of translation, instead of the regular text of the record appearing, there was a command to Joseph Smith and his scribe Oliver Cowdery to go to the water and be

baptized that they might continue their work under the added light of the gospel as baptized believers in Christ. They repaired to the water and here a wonderful experience awaited them. While they were in earnest prayer prior to entering the water, a messenger from heaven appeared and conferred divine authority upon these young men to perform this sacred rite. Here we will let Joseph tell the story himself.

"While we were thus employed, praying, and calling upon the Lord, a messenger from heaven descended in a cloud of light, and having laid his hands upon us, he ordained us saying unto us, 'Upon you, my fellow servants, in the name of Messiah, I confer the priesthood of Aaron, which holds the keys of the ministering of angels, and of the gospel of repentance, and of baptism by immersion for the remission of sins: and this shall never be taken again from the earth, until the sons of Levi do offer again an offering unto the Lord in righteousness.' He said that this Aaronic priesthood had not the power of the laying on of hands for the gift of the Holy Ghost, but that this should be conferred on us afterward; and he commanded us to go and be baptized, and gave us direction that I should baptize Oliver Cowdery and afterwards that he should baptize me. Accordingly we went and were baptized. I baptized him first, and afterwards he baptized me, after which I laid my hands upon his head and ordained him to the Aaronic priesthood, and afterwards he laid his hands on me and ordained me to the same priesthood, for so we were commanded. The messenger who visited us on this occasion and conferred this priesthood upon us, said that his name was John, the same that is called John the Baptist in the New Testament, and that he acted under the direction of Peter, James, and John, who held the keys of the priesthood of Melchisedek, which priesthood he said should, in due time be conferred upon us, and that I should be called the first elder and he the second. It was the fifteenth day of May, 1829, that we were baptized and ordained under the hand of the messenger. Immediately upon our coming up out of the water, after we had been baptized, we experienced great and glorious blessings from our heavenly Father. No sooner had I baptized Oliver Cowdery than the Holy Ghost fell on him and he stood up and prophesied many things which should shortly come to pass. And again, so soon as I had been baptized by him, I also had the spirit of prophecy, when standing up, I prophesied concerning the rise of the church, and many other things connected with the church, and this generation of men."—Reorganized History, volume 1, pages 34, 35, 36.

In the above account there are several points worthy of note. First, while they were ostensibly ordained under angelic hands, they were commanded to ordain each other to the Aaronic priesthood. It is obvious that their divine ordination could not be made a

human record which would be recognized in the courts of men. So there was a foundation being laid for the formation of a tangible church that would be recognized by the laws of the land. Second, there was here divine recognition of their obedience to this initiatory ordinance of the gospel and the Holy Ghost was bestowed upon them, not as an abiding comforter, as that was later to be bestowed by the laying on of hands when they should have obtained the higher priesthood. This was the gift of the Holy Ghost as was given to the centurion Cornelius, in Acts the 10th chapter.

Now we have the work started, and soon others began to utter the age-old cry, "What must I do to be saved?" and the answer could again be, "Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins." Some have taken the position that on the sixth day of April when the church was formally organized that there were then only the six young men who met and organized the church, who had been baptized up to that time. David Whitmer however, says there were over seventy members of the kingdom of God in this new dispensation of the gospel baptized by April 6, 1830. This fact seems to be corroborated by Joseph's own record, for he says: "Meantime we continued to translate, at intervals, when not necessitated to attend to the numerous inquirers, who now began to visit us. Some for the sake of finding the truth, others for the purpose of putting hard questions. Among the latter class were several learned priests who generally came for the purpose of disputation; however, the Lord continued to pour out upon us his Holy Spirit, and as often as we had need, he gave us in that moment what we should say, so that although unlearned and inexperienced in religious controversies, yet were we able to confound those learned rabbis of the day, whilst at the same time, we were enabled to convince the honest in heart, that we had obtained (through the mercy of God), to the true and everlasting gospel of Jesus Christ, so that almost daily we administered the ordinance of baptism for the remission of sins, to such as believed."

This was during the months of May and June, 1829, so there must have been a goodly number baptized by April 6, 1830.

Another outstanding feature of the story thus far is the fact that the idea of being baptized into the church is a fallacy, because here was quite a large number of people including Joseph Smith and Oliver Cowdery, who were baptized before there was any church, clearly indicating that we are baptized into Christ as Paul says in the third chapter of his Galatian letter, and not into the church organization.

So now we see the gospel at work, and they are soon ready to effect an organization according to legal procedure.

In June, 1829, another step toward a church organization like the "church taught by my disciples in days of old," was taken, when a revelation was given to Oliver Cowdery and David Whitmer to call twelve men to act as apostles, in the same manner as Christ chose twelve men; and then with that as a beginning of his ministry to carry on the work, he says, "I will build my church," and he did. In short about all there is to church organizing with the Master is to choose his

ministry and put them to work. So now, twelve men were to be chosen to act as apostles in this latter day dispensation.

On April 6, 1830, at least two of those designated to be apostles were ordained, namely, Joseph Smith and Oliver Cowdery; and now the church was ready to function as a church.

The story of the simple organization is as follows: Joseph had been living in the home of old Father Whitmer at Fayette, Seneca County, New York, during the time of the finishing of the translation of the Book of Mormon, and was still there in April, 1830. So here it was that six young men met together and in solemn prayer began the work of the church by selecting men to be its leading ministers.

The history records very little of other business that was done. They merely made the gathering a simple religious service. No legislating of any kind seems to have been attempted.

Here is the account as it appears in the Book of Commandments: "The rise of the Church of Christ in these last days, being one thousand eight hundred and thirty yers since the coming of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, in the flesh: It being regularly organized and established agreeable to the laws of our country, by the will and commandments of God in the fourth month and on the sixth day of the month called April: Which commandments were given to Joseph, who was called of God and ordained an apostle of Jesus Christ an elder of this church; And also to Oliver, who was called of God an apostle of Jesus Christ, an elder of this church, and ordained under his hand." This is an extract from what was called the Articles and Covenants of the Church of Christ, given in Fayette, New York, June, 1830.

The balance of these Articles and Covenants deals with spiritual instruction in general and also the duties of the several officers who were to make up the Church of Christ. None of the officers, such as a First Presidency, that came into the church later are mentioned, nor is there anything to indicate that such officers were contemplated. In short it was the simple form of organization, as can be found in the New Testament under the ministry of Christ himself, showing plainly that God REALLY did start to do the very thing mentioned at the beginning of this article, namely: "establish my church like the church that was taught by my disciples in days of old."

A striking thing was done prior to this simple organization, and that was that not only the members up to that time, but even those who contemplated membership were given the right to vote on the acceptance of the men who were to be ordained to the ministry. Here is the record. "and at length we got together in the chamber of Mr. Whitmer's house in order more particularly to seek of the Lord what we now so earnestly desired: and here to our unspeakable satisfaction did we realize the truth of the Savior's promise, 'ask and ye shall receive, seek and ye shall find, knock and it shall be opened unto you'; for we had not long been engaged in solemn and fervent prayer when the word of the Lord came unto us in the chamber, commanding us that I should ordain Oliver Cowdery to be an elder in

the church of Jesus Christ, and that he also should ordain me to the same office, and then to ordain others as it should be made known unto us, from time to time; we were however, commanded to defer this our ordination until such times as should be practicable to have our brethren, who had been and who should be baptized, assemble together, when we must have their sanction to our thus proceeding to ordain each other, and have them decide by vote whether they were willing to accept us as spiritual teachers or not, etc." Times and Seasons volume 3, page 915.

Thus we see that the law of common consent was adopted at the very beginning of the work.

THE BREAKDOWN OF THE AMERICAN HOME

(Continued from page 87)

patience and denial of self in many things. But no matter how disagreeable, it must be borne as a Christian, no matter what the cost may be, that if possible the unbeliever may be saved.

We have then these two, and only two, as reasons for scriptural divorce and separation. The first from Matthew is very clear and distinct. In the latter from Corinthians, separation must be made by the unbeliever—never the believer. The Bible knows nothing about divorce on any other grounds than just these two. There is no incompatibility, mental cruelty, non-support, etc., as a reason for divorce.

Later we shall take up the matter of remarriage of divorced persons and some of the exceptional and difficult problems which have arisen because of the tremendous increase in divorce. I am convinced that many, many cases are due to lack of knowledge concerning the clear teaching of the word of God in this matter. What the Bible says on this matter of marriage and divorce it says, of course, to believers and with an open Bible in these days, Christians should know the will of God and be examples instead of stumbling blocks to the world. Certainly if believers would pattern their lives after the word of God this evil would cease forever among them. God says in Ephesians, "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it." Ephesians 5:25.

I am sure if Christian husbands followed this admonition that wives would have no trouble following the Lord's instruction to them, "Wives, submit yourselves unto your husbands, as unto the Lord." Ephesians 5:22.

Here and here only is the solution to the problem among believers. Try it out and your life can be happy and blessed instead of the misery and heartache and sorrow which always follows when you disobey the Lord. If there is trouble in your home, before you lose your head and do something you will regret all your life, read together Ephesians 5; then pray about it together and the sun will shine again.

Divorce Statistics

In the year 1901, when I was a young lad, there were 60,934 divorces granted in the United States of America. In the year 1920, only nineteen years later the number had risen to 170,505, an increase of almost TWO HUNDRED per cent. In the year 1940 (twenty years later), the number of divorces in the United States

had risen to an all time high of 264,000, or an increase of over FOUR HUNDRED AND FIFTY per cent over a period of forty years. While the increase of divorces was 450 per cent, the increase of the population over the same period of time was only about 90 per cent. During the year 1901, there were 716,287 marriages, while in 1941 there were 1,679,000 marriages, or an increase of a little over 100 per cent. During the same period of time there was an increase of over 450 per cent in the divorce rate. In other words, the divorce rate has been increasing over four times faster than the marriage rate and the normal gain in population. In the United States at large, there were only five marriages for every divorce. One out of every five marriages went on the rocks. In some states the average was away above these figures, in others somewhat below. In my own state of Michigan there was one divorce for about each four marriages. In one state of the union there were more divorces than there were marriages.

The above statistics were taken from the Bulletin of Vital Statistics, issued by the Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, Washington, D. C., Leon E. Truesdall, chief of the Population Division, wrote me a few weeks ago in a personal letter that these figures were the very latest and therefore the most recent and up-to-date figures obtainable.

At the present rate of increase, and the rate is accelerating, it will not be long until we are a nation of broken homes and when the home is gone there is nothing left. Add to this the fact that while population has doubled and marriages almost doubled in the past twenty-five years the BIRTH RATE HAS DROPPED over 25 per cent during the same period of time. Evidently the number of children bears a direct relation to the number of divorces. The more children the less divorces and the less children the more divorces. The evils of birth control and divorce are closely associated. I have given these authentic statistics in order to awaken you to the gravity of the evil that is gripping our nation and to prove to you that our series of messages on the American home is of grave importance.

We have discussed the Bible teaching concerning the matter of "GROUNDS" for divorce and saw that the Bible recognizes only one ground for divorce and that is "unfaithfulness" on the part of husband or wife. The innocent party then may obtain a scriptural divorce. And only one reason is allowed for "separation," and that was DESERTION on the part of the unbeliever. And now comes the real question.

Who Are Permitted to Remarry?

The second question is this, "How about remarriage of such persons who have been divorced? Many conflicting theories are held but we will limit ourselves to the word of God, and nothing else. Eighteen years ago when I entered the ministry I promised the Lord that if he ever showed me truth in the word of God, I would be willing to preach it no matter what price I might have to pay. Several passages of scripture bear on the matter of remarriage so that there may be no doubt.

Turn again to Matthew 5:31, 32. By examining the passage again it will be seen that while the only reason for divorce is fornication, it does not give such

individuals the privilege of remarriage while both parties are alive. It is on this passage, however, and on the parallel passage in Matthew 19 that the champions of remarriage of divorced persons build their arguments. They say that not only is fornication reason for divorce but it permits the innocent party the privilege of remarriage. Read, therefore, again Matthew 19. Now if these two passages were the only ones in the scriptures there might be question for dispute. The phrase "saving for the cause of fornication" is construed to apply to remarriage as well as for divorce. A study of the two passages, however, reveals that the phrase, "saving for the cause of fornication" applies to the legality of getting a divorce and NOT to the right of such persons to remarry. The question to be decided is whether the phrase "saving for fornication" is given here as the reason for a divorce or the reason for remarriage. I am sure that you all will see that the latter cannot be the case. But since this is the debatable point, the only answer must be found in the word of God elsewhere.

The late Dr. Torrey gives as a rule of Bible interpretation the following in essence, "Never interpret a clear and plain passage of scripture by a doubtful or obscure passage. But always let the clear and plain passage throw light on the questionable one." This is a good rule and we shall apply it here. The truth of Matthew 5 and 19 is given very clearly in many other indisputable passages.

Turn now to Mark 10:11, 12, "And he saith unto them, Whosoever shall put away his wife, and marry another, committeth adultery against her. And if a woman shall put away her husband, and be married to another, she committeth adultery."

Here we have a plain statement which the simplest may understand. No exceptions are made here, but the all-inclusive "whosoever" is used to include all cases. Since there are only two reasons in scripture for separation, it covers both of these.

For further proof turn to Luke 16:18, "Whosoever putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery; and whosoever marrieth her that is put away from her husband committeth adultery."

Again no exceptions are given but merely the clear statement of fact, that the divorced persons under no consideration are ever to remarry during the term of life of both parties. Looking, therefore, at the passages in Matthew 5 and 19 in the light of these, it appears plainly that the clause "saving for the cause of fornication" cannot apply to remarriage which is only given as a reason for divorce.

Now turn to Romans 7:2, 3, "For the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband. So then if, while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress; but if her husband be dead she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man."

Here Paul is speaking under the authority of the Holy Spirit of the relationship of law and grace and uses the illustration of marriage. While it is an illustration, it nevertheless repeats the principle laid down by Jesus in the gospels concerning marriage. Hence

Paul insists in this passage that there is but one thing that can break the marriage and that is death. While divorce and separation are allowed for two reasons, the marriage is still binding and cannot be broken except by death.

But still greater proof is given to us in 1 Corinthians 7:39, 40 "The wife is bound by the law as long as her husband liveth; but if her husband be dead, she is at liberty to be married to whom she will; only in the Lord. But she is happier if she so abide, after my judgment: and I think also that I have the Spirit of God."

In this chapter Paul has spoken at length on the subject of marriage and separation and concludes the chapter with the sweeping and all-inclusive and non-controvertible statement, "the wife is bound by the law as long as her husband liveth." Need any more be said? Surely if we are willing to lay aside our own opinions and our own wishes in this matter and let the word of God speak there should be no question left in our mind.

The Exceptional Problems

One other thought in conclusion which must be given or I fear many wounded hearts whom the Lord does not wish to be wounded would be left among us. The question, How are we as Christians and as a church to deal with the various angles and phases of this subject which come up from time to time? That it is an important subject and should be seriously considered is thoroughly understood from the scripture quoted. That it is a present problem, we all know as the statistics indicated. How shall we as a body of believers and an assembly of saints deal with those who seek fellowship? That is an important issue.

While divorce is a result of sin and is wrong, nevertheless God made allowances of old. Jesus said, "Moses allowed a bill of divorcement although in the beginning it was not so." So too, we believe that God can and does forgive this sin if done in ignorance and is truly repented of. Four classes of cases present themselves as follows.

1. Where Christians obtain a divorce on any other grounds than the ones given in scripture, the party is guilty of gross sin and must be denied fellowship. If, however, the divorce is obtained on the scriptural grounds the innocent party is justified in obtaining a divorce but is never to remarry while both parties of the first marriage are alive.

2. When a Christian professing to know Christ has been divorced either before or after being saved, he or she is to remain single. If any divorced Christian therefore remarries before her first mate is dead, such a person must be considered an adulteress and immediately barred from fellowship, unless restored and corrected.

3. In the case of unbelievers who marry—then divorce—and then are saved, they are to remain unmarried or to be reconciled to the wife or husband. 1 Corinthians 7:10, 11, "And unto the married I command, yet not I, but the Lord, Let not the wife depart from her husband: but if she depart, let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband: and let not the husband put away his wife."

Surely to anyone wishing to do the will of God this passage is clear enough.

4. When unsaved people who are divorced and then remarried, and after that are saved, and see their error but cannot rectify it, we believe that the Lord forgives just as he does any other sinner who believes and repents. Such individuals should be received into fellowship. The rules and regulations covering divorce and remarriage apply particularly and especially in the passages which we have used above to those who have professed salvation in the Lord Jesus Christ. Hence while unbelievers may be divorced and remarried, when they accept the Lord Jesus Christ as their Savior, God forgives and we trust also forgets. While it is a matter to be lamented and while we know that it was not so in the beginning, nevertheless, because of our weakness, God suffers with us. This sin is placed under the blood together with any other.

Just one or two considerations before we close. In the light of all the above it is evident that divorce should never so much as be mentioned among believers. Since many are saved after the damage is done, the problem will always be here, but among Christians it should never come up.

Since most of the difficulty arises from mixed marriages and the unequal yoking of believers with unbelievers, the admonition to young people is urgent. Very clearly does the word of God state, "Be ye not unequally yoked." 2 Corinthians 6:14.

"Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel?"

Oh, young people, you who listen in today and read these words, please remember that the surest way and shortest path to wrecking your future career is unequal yoking. It is a well known fact that a great number of divorces result from hasty marriages and from unions between believers and unbelievers and folks who hold such divergent views that they can not have agreement. No Christian has any right to keep company with, or contemplate marriage with one who is not a Christian. God demands absolute separation in regard to this matter. Break off the unholy alliance if you are to be happy. Regard the admonition of the Lord when he says, "Come ye out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord. And touch not the unclean thing, and I will receive you and will be a father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty."

"Having these promises, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and be perfect in holiness and the fear of God." 2 Corinthians 7:1.

Editor's note: This closes the series of radio talks by Dr. De Haan that we have received thus far. Of course, the opinions expressed are those of Dr. De Haan. The people of the Restoration know that latter day revelation has definitely defined divorce and remarriage. We feel, however, that Dr. De Haan has given us matter for deep and serious thought.

EDITOR'S NOTE

The following article was found in our general office. It was an answer by Elder Willard Smith, to a pamphlet written by Elder Joseph Luff, attacking the position of the Church of Christ on the Temple Lot, with reference to the name of the church.

And since it was a reply, it partook considerably of the nature of controversy. However, since it contains so much valuable historical matter anent the changes made at various times in naming the Church of the Restoration, we feel that it should be given to our readers.

We have therefore condensed it considerably, and deleted from it ALL of the controversial matter and much of the personal reference, but without in any way interfering with the logic and reasoning of the brilliant mind of our deceased brother, whose life work contributed so much to the building up of the restored gospel. We give his reasoning and historical data verbatim. It is quite lengthy, so will appear serially.—The Editor.

THE NAME OF THE CHURCH

By Elder Willard J. Smith

In order that a proper understanding and remembrance of created things or manufactured articles may be had and distinguished the one from the other, it is essential that proper and separate names be given to whatever may be brought into existence, and distinctively made when conferred upon the human family as to whether or not applied to the male or female; for notwithstanding in the beginning, at the beginning of the creation of this world of ours, at the creation of the first pair of human beings the male was called the man, (Adam), and by him, his counterpart, (the female) was called woman. The Hebrew name for woman is the feminine, not of Adam, but of **Ishi**—man; so denominated not from his origin, but from his sex—a male—whence **Ishah** which we render "woman," is the female, the feminine of male. The same word is rendered "wife," in the next verse, (Genesis 2:23, 24), and the terms are used interchangeably throughout the scriptures. "And Adam also called his wife "Eve," (a special designation), "because she was the mother of all living." Ibid 3:21.

For a correct and adjoining history of what we have thus so briefly introduced, and to accomplish the end sought, it may be well that we go back to the basis of this whole affair, so we turn back to the first chapter of Genesis, and we there read:

1. "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.

2. "And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.

3. "And God said, Let there be light, and there was light. . . .

26. "And God said, Let us make **man** in our image, after our likeness: and let **them** have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth.

27. "So God created man in his own image, in the

image of God created he him; male and female created he them.

28. "And God blessed them, and God said unto them, be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it; and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth."—Genesis 1:1, 2, 3, 26, 27, 28.

From these verses we learn that man, (on the sixth day of creation), was created, male and female. They were therefore created spirit-beings, for in Genesis 2nd chapter, verse 4, we read:

4. "These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth when they were created, in the day that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens,

5. "And every plant of the earth before it was in the earth, and every herb of the field before it grew; for the Lord had not caused it to rain upon the earth, and there was not a man to till the ground. . . .

7. "And the Lord God formed the man out of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and the man became a living soul."

This was the formation of the physical man: for, "Thou hast clothed **me** with skin and flesh, and hast fenced **me** with bones and sinews. Thou hast granted **me** life and favor, and thy visitation hast preserved my spirit."—Job 23:8. And,

1. "The burden of the word of the Lord for Israel, saith the Lord, which stretcheth forth the heavens, and layeth the foundation of the earth, and formeth the spirit of man within him."—Zechariah 12:1.

80. "Seest thou that ye are created after mine own image? Yea, all men were created in the beginning, after mine own image?

81. "Behold this body, which ye now behold, is the body of my spirit; and man have I created after the body of my spirit; and even as I appear unto thee to be in the spirit, will I appear unto my people in the flesh." Book of Ether 1:80, 81.

And so, considering the fact after God had formed man out of the dust of the earth, and among all the creation of God with whom Adam was found to have commingled there was not found his complement, or life-partner, notwithstanding they—on the sixth day of creation—had been created male and female; yet now it became necessary in the wisdom of the Almighty to cause a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and he slept; and he, (God), took one of his (Adam's) ribs, and closed up the flesh instead thereof: and the rib, which the Lord God had taken from man, made he a **woman**, and brought her unto the man. And Adam said, This is now bone of my bone, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called woman, because she was taken out of man." And the inspired writer has told us that **The Word**, (The Christ of God—He, unto whom God in the creation said: "Let US make man in OUR image, after OUR likeness), made the declaration that:

22. "The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his way, before his works of old. 23. "I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning of his way, before his works of old. . . . 29. "When he appointed the foundations of the earth. 30. Then I was by him, as one brought up with him: and I was daily his delight, rejoicing always before him. 31. "Rejoicing in the habitable

part of his earth; and my delights were with the sons of men."—Proverbs 8:22-31.

Thus we learn that man is a dual being composed of a physical body of flesh and blood, bones and sinew, and an intellectual spirit which is sometimes called "soul," to which we have already called attention by showing that man was first created spirit beings on the sixth day of creation, after which they were given material forms, or bodies of flesh and blood; therefore we read:

"This is the book of the generations of Adam. In the day that God created man, in the likeness of God made he him; male and female created he them; and blessed **them and called THEIR NAME ADAM**, in the day when they were created."—Genesis 5:1, 2.

This being the name of them both—the legal or family name. And I now wish to call attention specifically to the fact that on the sixth day of creation—the day when God created man—He created them male and female and called **their name Adam**. It was not the male alone which was thus named, but it took both the male and the female to constitute **the Adam**; and it was God himself who thus named them; and He gave them this name in the day when they were created, notwithstanding it being the family or surname; although for an interval of time they were disassociated for a purpose. And after physical forms had been furnished each of them, and they were now presented to each other, Adam exclaimed: "This is now bone of my bone, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called woman, (Ishah), because she was taken out of man. Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and **they** shall be one flesh." And the Apostle Paul in the fifth chapter of his letter to the Ephesians endeavors to show that the **same relationship existing between couples in the marriage relation** as above specified is a beautiful simile of the relation existing between Christ and his Church. "For," says he, "As many of you as have been **baptized into Christ have put on Christ**."—Galatians 3:27, "For we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones. For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall be **joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh**. This is a great mystery. But I speak of CHRIST and the CHURCH."—Ephesians 5:30-32.

Chapter Two

I have called attention to all this for the express purpose of impressing the relationship existing between the husband and wife in the marriage relation, and to directly specify that when they are thus joined together they become "One flesh"; the wife partaking of the husband's name as in the beginning, at the creation of the male and the female when God "CALLED THEIR NAME ADAM." However the name is the simplest, and most general word for that by which any person, or other object, may be called. Formerly persons were designated by one name only such as Cain, Abel, Seth, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joshua, David, Solomon, Daniel, etc., but since the Christian Era, a change has been made. At just what time, where, and by whom, or how, I cannot tell, as I have never tried to find out; but at the present day, and since the beginning of the

Christian Era, the name a person bears—in most countries—is double; consisting of the family or surname; and the Christian or distinctively personal name; which latter name ordinarily precedes the surname, or family name, such as Willard J. precedes the name Smith—Willard J. Smith. And here permit me to say, when my wife and I were married we became "one flesh"; and we "are no more twain, but one flesh." See Mark 10:8. Her surname at that time became changed from Drager to Smith. "For the woman is bound by the law to her husband only as long as he liveth." Romans 7:2. She then partook of my surname, but in no sense did she partake of my Christian name; and should she today sign as her name: Mrs. Willard J. Smith on any legal document, it would be a violation of law, and would not be accepted in any court of jurisprudence anywhere. And to make her signature valid on any legal document she must sign her name, Rachel C. Smith—Smith being the only part of my name to which she is entitled by reason of our marriage. And notwithstanding any change which may have been wrought in me by virtue of that ceremony performed in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ which made us "one flesh," and gave her to share with me my family or legal name, yet this name in all its parts still remains unchanged; nor did it become affected in a single scintilla of its original inheritance, or that conferred upon me when I was christened as a babe and known to be my Christian name. But if doing business of any kind through an agent, I may give that agent the power of an attorney which would authorize that agent to sign my name, and it would then be as legal as though I signed it myself.

So too, when I was baptized, I first renounced the devil and all his pomp, and took upon me the name of Christ, (Book of Mormon page 762, Cpt. 6:1-4), and was then baptized into Christ, (Galatians 3:27), and thus became a member of his body, (1 Corinthians 12:13, 27), the church, (Ephesians 5:30) which is also called his bride, (2 Corinthians 11:2, Revelations 19:7; 21:9); the act of baptism being then performed by an elder holding the Melchisedec priesthood, and was received into a branch of the Reorganized Church by unanimous vote of its membership, believing that church to be the best expression of faith, doctrine, and organization that had as yet come under my consideration. And for a long number of years I remained within their fellowship, but gradually, as I began to get an enlarged view of some of the enactments of church government, and new, and what seemed to me to be unscriptural theories of doctrine by some of the leading men of the church, doctrines of which I was not at first made acquainted, I finally transferred my membership to another branch of the Restoration movement that had long previously denounced those objectionable points of doctrine, prominent among which was the name of the church, and they have earnestly contended that the church should be called: "The Church of Christ," nothing more nor anything less. But recently the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints have put out a tract furnished by one of her most brilliant pulpiteers, Doctor Joseph Luff, who has made an attack upon the position taken by the Church of Christ, claim-

ing that the term "Jesus" should be added thereto, and that the words, "Latter Day Saints" being made a part of the name does not make it any the less the real true church of the Son of God. In fact, Joseph Smith in the late Temple Lot Suit while under oath said:

"I cannot see that if at the time of the presidency of the church by my father, it had been called the Methodist Church, and the church I now belong to, was called or designated as it is, that it would make any difference, if as a matter of fact the principles were the same; the name has very little to do with it, if the doctrine, rules, and practices are the same."—Abstract of Evidences, page 60.

Chapter Three

Of course, Joseph really had to say something like that in order to try and bolster up the title, or name of the church with which he then stood identified, as from its first reorganization in 1852 down through the cycles of time for a number of years it was called the "New Organization." They did not dare to call it the "Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints" as that was the name given the old church at Far West on the 26th of April, 1838, in a professed revelation, and that church thus named was led by the president of its Quorum of Twelve Apostles—Brigham Young—to the great Salt Lake valleys of Utah; and that is the seat of their government and the official name of that church still. Hence originators of the new organization dare not call their new structure, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints for fear of getting into trouble with the Utah contingent as that name belonged exclusively to them; hence the new organization was the subjoined title bestowed upon the new structure.

Joseph the Prophet said of this: We adopted the word reorganized as a kind of distinctive title from that of the church in the Utah valley at Salt Lake, or Deseret. We did not get it by revelation, nor out of the Book of Mormon, nor the Book of Doctrine and Covenants, nor out of the Times and Seasons, nor the Millennial Star; we did not get it out of any of these, Colonel; we got it from the apparent necessities of the time, and our disposition in regard to it. I cannot give you the date when the church was first designated as The Reorganized Church; **the name was formally and definitely adopted at our conference.** I do not know that any title had been agreed upon in 1860, at the time I became connected with it."—Abstract of Evidence, page 68.

At the General Conference of the church which was held near Sandwich, Illinois, from the 6th to the 9th of October, 1860, being the first conference over which Joseph Smith presided, "Elder Sheen, editor of the Herald reported that he was almost daily receiving letters from the different states, Utah, Canada and Europe, expressing friendship for the NEW ORGANIZATION, and . . . a notice in the Herald of April, 1861, that "Emigration from Utah is to be commenced this spring (God willing) on a large scale, by the saints of the NEW ORGANIZATION, to western Iowa."—Life of Joseph the Prophet by Tullidge, pages 634, 635.

On pages 631, of the Tullidge History is a letter from a writer in England who "hastened to address the editor of the Herald." He wrote:

"As to the Latter Day Saints in England, some of the very best men and women they had have left the church and thousands are scattered all over the country, disgusted with the conduct of men who professed to be shepherds, but invariably were ravenous wolves, scattering and destroying the flock. The greediness for money knew no bounds. The doctrine of polygamy has made thousands ashamed to confess they belonged to them, and those who have wisely withdrawn may be divided into three classes: first, those who would gather again. The second, would be more diffident, and look on a long while, shaping their conduct according to the success or non-success of the NEW ORGANIZATION. The third are those who are so keenly stung at having been deceived by the Brighamites, that they would never join any so long as they live. . . . Yet we feel assured, if the Lord has indeed bid you gather his people, it will be done and go on prosperously and not be frustrated."

The above extracts will be sufficient to establish the fact that in the beginning of what is now frequently termed the Reorganization was from the beginning of its organization, known, wherever known at all, throughout the United States, Canada and Europe, under the title of THE NEW ORGANIZATION. And the reason why they did not adopt the name of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints at the beginning was that that name was the distinctive title of the Brighamite Church, and had been since the 26th of April, 1838, when Joseph Smith by revelation authorized the church to be so-called; and when the Brighamite faction crossed the plains to the Great Salt Lake valley they still clung to that name and carried it with them, and it is still their legal name. And when the NEW ORGANIZATION laid claim to being the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints in succession, they adopted the word, Reorganized "as a kind of distinctive title," as quoted above, and it has been made by conference resolution a distinguishing part of the name of that church as much as any other part of the name, notwithstanding the supreme effort of some of their leading men to deny that fact, Elder Luff with the rest as we shall show in the proper place.

Chapter Four

This was accomplished on a parallel with that which was done on the 3rd day of May, 1834, at a conference at Kirtland, Ohio, the published minutes of which are as follows:

"Minutes of a conference of the elders of the Church of Christ, which church was organized in the township of Fayette, Seneca County, New York, on the 6th day of April, 1830.

"The conference came to order, and Joseph Smith, Jr., was chosen moderator and Frederick G. Williams and Oliver Cowdery were appointed clerks.

"After prayer the conference proceeded to discuss the subject of names and appellations, when a motion was made by Sidney Rigdon, and seconded by Newel K. Whitney, that this church be known hereafter by the NAME OF THE CHURCH OF THE LATTER DAY SAINTS. Appropriate remarks were delivered by

some of the members, after which the motion was put by the moderator, and passed by unanimous voice.

"Resolved that this conference recommend to the conferences and churches abroad, that in making out and transmitting minutes of their proceedings, such minutes and proceedings be made out under the above title.

"Resolved that these minutes be signed by the moderator and clerks, and published in the Evening and Morning Star."

Joseph Smith, Jr. Moderator; Frederick G. Williams, Oliver Cowdery, Clerks.

See Reorganized Church History, Volume 1, pages 453, 454.

Of this Brother Luff says, "To me it sounds like the refinement of absurdity to suppose that a group of intelligent and God-fearing men whose sole object was to establish Christ's Church on earth, would deliberately and without cause or reason get together and amuse themselves by changing the name of Christ's church, if it was intended as a change."—See Name of the Church, page 10.

Now the fact remains that that conference of the third day of May, 1834, was properly called at Kirtland, Ohio, and was properly organized, its moderator, or president, and the clerks were duly chosen and appointed; and after prayer the whole conference proceeded to discuss the subject of names and appellations, showing conclusively, the object of their gathering was to **change the name of the church**, and for that alone; and not with the least thought of "amusement" in their minds; while the minutes of that meeting show no other business was done nor suggested save the changing of the name of the church, and the notification of all the churches abroad of the change which had been made, and from thence forward, "In making out and transmitting minutes of their proceedings such minutes and proceedings be made out under the above title." And the official name of "CHRIST" was **dropped entirely**, and the new name was substituted; and not a thing in any account given to show it was done for the least degree of "Amusement."

Brother Luff tells us that "William B. Smith, and William E. McClellin have said in conversation that they found themselves forever running up against difficulties while the Church was being called The Church of Christ, for they were forever being confounded in the minds of the people hearing them preach with another church which also called itself the Church of Christ."

What a pity the Lord could not foresee such an event and give them a name that would not be counterfeited, or give them a name in the start which no one else would want to have?

But does it not seem strange that the Lord himself should give instructions to call his church the Church of Christ, and then because some other people should affect to call their human institutions churches of

Christ, we should deliberately and without CAUSE or REASON get together and AMUSE ourselves by changing the name of Christ's church? The reason for the change is given by a quotation from Grafton's Life of Alexander Campbell, that,

"It appears that for a long time prompters of the movement which Mr. Campbell was prominent in was in dispute was the name their new church should bear. And indeed no final settlement was reached regarding the matter." And:

"It was unfortunate that these good men could not have come to an agreement and saved the interminable confusion that has since resulted from the interchangeable or local use of the names 'Disciples of Christ,' 'Christian,' 'Churches of Christ.'"

Thus the Church of Christ surrendering its name in 1834 because of the Campbellites trying to distinguish themselves as the Church of Christ was ineffectual in its results as they as yet are not fully decided as to their official name, whether it is the Disciple Church, the Christian Church, or Christ's Church. And is it not peculiar in itself that Sidney Rigdon after the breaking up of the church in Nauvoo did in 1844-5 organize a church calling it The Church of Christ? So too did William E. McClellan in 1888-9 organize a church calling it the **Church of Christ**. Likewise William B. Smith in 1845 organize a church, calling it The **Church of Christ**; and David Whitmer also, in 1848-9 who always contended that the name of the church should be **The Church of Christ**.

(To be continued.)

MICHIGAN NEWS

Flint, Michigan

The Flint local has a monthly all-day meeting the second Sunday of each month. On Easter Sunday an all-day meeting was held with Brother Ed Welch visiting. There was a very good turnout.

Brother and Sister Don Houshnekt have a baby boy, who was born March 21, 1944. Brother and Sister C. W. Morgan have bought a small home at Farwell, Michigan. Brother and Sister Weldon Hartzog also have a new baby, a girl, born February 5, 1944.

If anyone wishes to write to the son of Brother and Sister W. Hartzog, his address is:

A/S. Kenneth E. Hartzog
36884255
Squadron A. 62nd C. T. D. (Air Crew)
University of Florida,
Gainesville, Florida.

Michigan State Reporter.

LITTLE NUGGETS, FROM JOSH BILLINGS

Life is made up of little things. Life itself is a little thing. One breath less—then comes the funeral.

A penny is a very little thing, but the interest of it from the days of Cain and Abel would buy out the globe.

The acorn is a little thing but the black bear and his family live in the oak that springs from it.

A word is a little thing, yet one word has been many a man's destiny—for good or evil.

A kiss is a very little thing, but it betrayed the Son of God into the hands of His enemy.

A spark is a little thing, but it can light the poor man's pipe or set the world to burning.

An egg is a little thing, but the huge crocodile creeps into life out of it.

A star is a little thing, but it can hold this great world in its arms.

The tongue is a little thing, but it fills the universe with trouble.

BETTER GO FISHING!

Ernest Edward Yates

Why quarrel and fight? It just will not do,
With Nature so kind, in gay garments, new!
It leaves one in gloom, with feelings of dread,
With sickness of heart and pains in the head.
I think, should a man with tackle and hook
Go seek out a pond, a river, or brook;
There cast out his lines, then solemnly pause,
His soul would forego all troubles because

The ripples that kiss the face of the pond,
And wreck all reflections that correspond
To banks and the willows, the cottonwood,
Whose sibilant song makes fishing so good,
Draw millions of sparks from clear, open skies,
Coquettish in gleam as love-laden eyes,
That messages bring to sober the mind,
A something that says, "Reflect and be kind!"

So potent that Force if men, one and all,
Should get out their lines and answer the call,
Their envy would fade, for Spring has a way
Of tuning the soul, in April or May,
"Til men are redeemed and cease being "cranks,"
By casting their lines from cool, shady banks,
And feeling this Force that whispers again
To bring back his love for all fellowmen.