

# 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, July, 1944

Number 7

## *Not for a Day*

How shall we ever stop the flood of crime  
That, like a torrent sweeps across the land,  
Unless our public teachers take the time  
To make our growing children understand  
The wide divergence between wrong and right,  
The deadly chasm between bad and good,  
Urging our youth to walk in the white light  
Of righteous manhood and pure womanhood?  
What good all our teaching without God,  
Without nutrition for man's starving soul?  
Is man no more than a decaying clod  
With ultimate corruption for his goal;  
Or was he made for immortality,  
Not for a day, but for eternity?

—Selected.

## CONTENTS

Editorial .....	Page 98	The Standard Bearers .....	Page 107
The Church of Christ (Fettingite Brethren) Makes Overtures .....	Page 100	The Name of the Church .....	Page 106
Rebaptism .....	Page 102	Missionary Items .....	Page 109
Michigan News .....	Page 103	Independence Items .....	Page 111
		All Things Common .....	Page 112

## 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

### OUR COUNTRY

This is the July number of Zion's Advocate, and on July 4, we Americans of every type of original nationality assayed to celebrate what we call our National birthday of freedom from European domination.

It might be well for us to again refresh our own minds as to what should be our attitude as a church toward this wonderful land of liberty; and in doing so we will simply turn to the scriptures that we have accepted as being the word of God, and wherein we will find the divine pronouncements concerning the land we have so often referred to as the "choice land," the land of liberty to the gentiles. They are so clear in their declarations that there should be no difficulty in understanding our obligations and responsibilities, and as these records seem to indicate those obligations and responsibilities are enjoined upon us by Almighty God.

In latter day revelation we read, "And now, verily I say unto you, concerning the laws of the land, It is my will that my people should observe to do all things whatsoever I command them, and that law of the land, which is constitutional, supporting that principle of freedom, in maintaining rights and privileges belongs to all mankind and is justifiable before me; therefore, I, the Lord, justifieth you, and your brethren of my church, in befriending that law which is the constitutional law of the land; and AS PERTAINING TO THE LAW OF MAN, WHATSOEVER IS MORE OR LESS THAN THESE, COMETH OF EVIL. I, the Lord, maketh you free; therefore, ye are free indeed; and the law maketh you free; nevertheless WHEN THE WICKED RULE THE PEOPLE MOURN; wherefore honest men and wise men should be sought diligently, and good men and wise men, ye should observe to uphold; otherwise whatsoever is less than these, cometh of evil." (A revelation given to the church in August, 1833. Emphasis mine.—B. C. F.)

Again concerning the constitutional law of the land we read, "Therefore, it is not right that any man should

be in bondage one to another. And for this purpose I established the Constitution of this land, by the hands of wise men whom I raised up, unto this very purpose, and redeemed this land by the shedding of blood." Revelation of December, 1833.

Going now to the Bible, we read what the Apostle Paul has to say with reference to God's interest and watchcare over the nations of men: "And hath made of ONE blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and THE BOUNDS of their habitation." Acts 17:26. (Emphasis mine, B. C. F.)

This statement, of course, covers the nations of the world in general, but I have emphasized two statements that I believe are specific. First, we are told that ALL NATIONS are of ONE BLOOD, indicating the kind of brotherhood that should exist, and the other text indicates the type of isolationism that God has Himself provided for. Their BOUNDS are set by the Lord.

The above fact will appear with greater clarity when we take up the land of America and read what God has said relative to her standing and responsibility among the sisterhood of nations.

In 2 Nephi 1:1-24 we read considerable about God's estimate of this "choice land," and His intentions concerning it. Lehi is instructing his children and beginning with the sixth verse says, "But, said he, notwithstanding our afflictions, we have obtained a land of promise, a land which is choice above all other lands; a land which the Lord God hath covenanted with me should be a land **for the inheritance of my seed**. Yea, the Lord hath covenanted this land UNTO ME, AND TO MY CHILDREN FOREVER! And **ALSO** all those who should be **LED OUT** of other countries, by the hand of the Lord." (Emphasis mine.—B. C. F.) By the above we see that God had designs for this country that was different from that of any other land, and in order to enjoy the privileges thus predicted, those of other countries **MUST BE LED OUT** of those countries and not remain **IN** them. This did not imply that the type of isolationism indicated was to cause them to be shut up by themselves, but that under the divine leadings of Almighty God this land was to be the land from which benefits was to flow to every other nation under heaven, but not to be in any way responsible for the destruction of any other land.

But we will proceed, "Wherefore, I, Lehi, prophesy according to the workings of the Spirit which is in me, that there shall none come into this land, save they shall be **BROUGHT BY THE HAND OF THE LORD**. Wherefore, this land is consecrated unto him whom He shall bring. And if it so be that they shall serve Him according to the commandments which He hath given, it shall be a **land of liberty** unto them; wherefore, they shall never be brought down into captivity: if so, it shall be **because of iniquity**: for if iniquity shall abound, **CURSED SHALL BE THE LAND** for their sakes. But **UNTO THE RIGHTEOUS, IT SHALL BE BLESSED FOREVER**.

"And behold, it is wisdom that this land should be kept **AS YET FROM THE KNOWLEDGE OF OTHER NATIONS**; FOR **BEHOLD MANY NATIONS WOULD OVERRUN THE LAND**, THAT there would be no place

for an inheritance." (Emphasis mine throughout.—B. C. F.)

This type of instruction continues through the twenty-fourth verse of this chapter, but we forbear lest the article get too lengthy. The reader may continue at his leisure.

There may be some that will insist that this language refers **only** to the ancient Nephites and Lamanites who were the ones directly addressed, but we will go further and note that it refers to EVERY nation that inhabits this "choice land." So we again read, "But behold, this land, saith God, shall be a land of thine inheritance; and THE GENTILES shall be blessed upon the land. And this land shall be a land of liberty unto the Gentiles: and THERE SHALL BE NO KINGS upon the land, who shall raise up unto the Gentiles. And I will FORTIFY THIS LAND **AGAINST ALL OTHER NATIONS**; and he that fighteth against Zion, shall perish, saith God; for he that raiseth up a king against me, shall perish. For I the Lord, the King of heaven, will be their king; and I will be a light unto them forever, that HEAR MY WORDS." 2 Nephi 7:17-21. (Emphasis mine.—B. C. F.)

A continued reading here shows what it would be that would alter this wonderful promise concerning this "choice land" and those who dwell on it. It would be when "secret abominations, wicked alliances, and other abominations would find place among those who would dwell on the land. And so again in the thirty-first and thirty-second verses of this same seventh chapter we read as follows, "For it is a choice land, saith God unto me, **ABOVE ALL OTHER LANDS**; wherefore, I will have ALL men that dwell thereon, that they shall worship me, saith God."

However, we can find further and more emphatic commandment from God along this line, in His instruction to an entirely different race of people who had inhabited this land ages before the Nephites and Lamanites were here, and they too were given prophetic reference to the Gentiles who would later be the happy inhabitants of this land, or in other words, those who were referred to in the latter day revelation we have cited. In short, **OUR NATION**.

In Ether 1:1:31-35, we read of the commands of God to the ancient Jaredites, who came to this continent from the plains of Shinar at the time of the dispersion from Babel, two thousand years before Christ, and who likewise were given a prophetic vision of America's future. Here we again hear God warning against iniquity and ungodly, man-made rule. Listen! "And now we behold the decrees of God concerning this land, and it is a land of promise, and **WHATSOEVER NATION SHALL POSSESS IT, SHALL SERVE GOD**, or they shall be swept off when the fullness of His wrath shall come upon them. And the fullness of his wrath cometh upon them when they are ripened in iniquity; for behold, this is a land which is choice above all other lands; wherefore he that doth possess it shall serve God, or shall be swept off; for it is the everlasting degree of God. And it is not until the fullness of iniquity among the children of the land, that they are

swept off. And this cometh upon you, O, ye Gentiles, that ye may know the decrees of God, that ye may repent, and **NOT CONTINUE** in your iniquities until the fullness comes, that ye may not bring down the fullness of the wrath of God upon you, **AS THE INHABITANTS OF THE LAND HAVE HITHERTO DONE**. Behold, this is a choice land, and **whatsoever NATION SHALL POSSESS IT, SHALL BE FREE FROM BONDAGE, AND FROM CAPTIVITY, AND FROM ALL OTHER NATIONS UNDER HEAVEN**, if they will serve the God of the land, who is Jesus Christ who hath been manifested by the things which we have written. (Emphasis mine.—B. C. F.)

Does the above need any analysis? All that will be necessary is for the leaders of our nation to examine themselves in the light of past history and see if they fall under the condemnation also noted in this Nephite record, which is particularly a record of America, past, present and future.

Here we see some of the things that will disqualify any nation inhabiting this choice land, from prospering and enjoying the blessings of God on this choice land. First, they **ALL MUST** serve the "God of the land who is Jesus Christ." Is Jesus Christ **NOW** occupying as the "God of the land?" How could he, he being the Prince of Peace? Second, the types of iniquity that would disqualify are enumerated in 2 Nephi 7:34. "And thus commanded the Father that I should say unto you, At that day when the Gentiles shall sin against my gospel, and shall reject the fullness of my gospel, and shall be lifted up in the pride of their hearts above all nations, and above all the people of the whole earth, and shall be filled with all manner of lyings and deceits, and of mischiefs, and all manner of hypocrisy, and murders, and priestcrafts, and whoredoms and **SECRET ABOMINATIONS**; and if they shall do all these things, and shall reject the fullness of my gospel, behold, saith the Father, I will bring the fullness of my gospel from among them," etc. (Emphasis mine.—B. C. F.)

Where do we now stand in the light of the above? For in Ether 3:92-102 we are told that when "Secret combinations" get control of a nation that it will eventually bring about the downfall of that nation unless they repent.

Is it any wonder, in the light of what we have said, that we read of the warnings along this line by the great Washington, the Father of our country. And what Fourth of July oration would be complete or appropos without reference to the work that Washington did? We as a people are committed to the idea already mentioned, that he was among those whom **GOD RAISED UP** to make this country an example in righteousness to all nations, that in times of trouble and distress we might be a beacon light, and not a mere party to the confusion and destruction that others might be responsible for.

We are glad to add his warnings and testimony to that of other wise men of God, and in his Farewell Address he emphatically warns against "foreign entanglements" and tells us how to avoid them, and also

what should be our relationship to other nations. He advocated not "Isolationism" in the odious sense that some have tried to make of the term because there may be extreme advocates of that idea, but isolationism for America in the sense that God intended, in its being a "choice land above all other lands." On this 4th of July, 1944, we recommend to all true Americans a re-reading of Washington's Farewell Address.

B. C. FLINT.

(Note: All Book of Mormon references are from the Reorganized Authorized Edition.)

### THE CHURCH OF CHRIST. (FETTINGITE BRETHREN) MAKE OVERTURES

Thinking that we were to hold a conference this spring, the following letter addressed to the Church of Christ, was received at our general office, and because we were on the ground it was handed to us to make reply. We did so, and feeling that the beautiful spirit that is breathed in this communication will be of general interest to all saints we herewith give it to our readers. The entire correspondence thus far will be given.—The Editor.

To the 1944 General Conference of the  
Church of Christ on the Temple Lot,  
Corner Lexington and River Streets, Independence, Mo.  
Greetings in Christ's name:

We that are seeking to establish truth among the honest in heart, by proclaiming the everlasting gospel have considerable in common. Therefore as I raised my eyes to the calendar I was reminded that your conference begins the 6th. Hence this communication.

There is a great work to be accomplished by the several peoples or groups that have named themselves The Church of Christ—yet in past years so many things have arisen to spread them farther apart. That condition we know is sponsored by the Satanic powers. The world is in a horrible condition and many are seeking for Christ and his church. I feel that we are falling short of our duty as followers of Christ when we treat so lightly the seriousness of that lack of unity. I pray that each and all may consult our Heavenly Father in the name of his Son Jesus Christ often in behalf of and to the interest of unity in THE CHURCH.

I have, for years looked forward with great spiritual anticipation to the time when we all would again be united on that sacred spot. The work here on earth will not progress as it should until that time comes; and as to how this condition shall be brought about, I cannot say. It may be that we all are considerably lacking in sincerity and humble determination.

Let me say that I wish you every spiritual success in your conference, and may the turn of each event be to the best interest of all peoples that love and support Christ and his cause. I personally have always had a warm feeling toward the people on the Temple Lot, and have always enjoyed a friendly welcome in your presence. May that feeling grow stronger among both your people and mine.

With every good wish, I am,  
Yours very sincerely,  
(Signed) L. M. THORNTON,  
Secretary of the Twelve.

### Our Reply

Independence, Mo., April 17, 1944.

Apostle L. M. Thornton,  
West Plains, Missouri.

Dear Brother Thornton:

Your very valued communication, addressed to the 1944 Conference of the Church of Christ, on the Temple Lot, has been handed to me, to make reply, and I can assure you at the outset that the beautiful spirit of kindness, and desire for fellowship, is fully reciprocated.

We too recognize the signs of the times; and that, now, as never before should the people of God be a unit, in the carrying forward of a program that will break down the forces of destruction that are so apparently at work everywhere in the world. I may also say that the division that occurred in our ranks following the fall conference of 1929, was one of the saddest experiences of our lives.

You speak of the possible grounds upon which we might again find unity. This statement was certainly indited by the good spirit of God, and while, in order that later misunderstandings might not mar our peace, we will endeavor to be perfectly frank, such as I fully believe you would wish me to be. I will therefore state, as a simple beginning, that IF we can dissolve the situation that was responsible for that split in 1929, the **real** grounds upon which we may be reunited will have been found, and a lasting union will be effected.

As one of the active participants in that sad period, I feel that I can speak freely without giving offense, when I make a brief analysis of what I feel was the real ROOT of our difficulty then.

To begin with, as a result of the deflection in the Reorganized Church from 1925 on, large numbers of the membership and ministry of that group found refuge and welcome among the little group of old-time saints with headquarters on the Temple Lot. There we worked harmoniously through the years 1926, 1927, 1928, and until June, 1929. True, there were some who had left the Reorganized Church with an "ax to grind." They had been thwarted in their efforts there to put over some pet hobby and they seemed to feel that the freedom experienced within the Church of Christ made an open field in which they might spread and unfold their peculiar philosophies. This made some little ruffles of strife and disunity, but resulted in no real open breaks. Among these movements may be mentioned that of F. F. Wipper with his absolute local autonomy doctrine. This did little, however, to hinder our general progress, and we went on until a purported messenger began coming to Brother Otto Fetting

This began in February, 1927. To these messages no one offered any serious objections. In fact they met with quite general favor and no doubt would have continued to have done so, were it not for the peculiar innovations that finally were suggested, which in their interpretation by some, especially the Twelfth, caused the beginning of division.

And here may I quote from a letter that I wrote to one of the brethren at that time. To one who was leaning favorably to the interpretation mentioned. I said: "From the messages received thus far, our work up to now has been pleasing to God, to the church, and to the Fetting Messenger, because every one of the messages, up to now, have commended us on our work

and our faithfulness before God, as note the opening statement in the Fifth Message, where we were told that God had been directing in our affiliating ourselves with the Church of Christ, and also in the Twelfth where we are told that the Lord had "reserved unto himself this remnant on the Temple Lot, to set the church in order." Now the only NEW thing that appears on our horizon is this requirement to ALL to be rebaptized. To me, this looks like an experiment. If we have thus far pleased God, the Messenger, and the church, why disturb this God-accepted harmony and peace by trying to do something else? And that too something that is not expressly commanded in the message, and is only given to us in the INTERPRETATION placed upon the message by some among us."

I am glad to report that this view of the matter saved that brother from falling into the error, as I verily believe it was, and still so believe.

Now, dear brother, what I am saying here is with no thought nor desire to reopen the controversy, but merely to refresh our minds as to WHAT it was that caused the split which now fills us all with sadness. That the priesthood and membership of those who came over from the Reorganized Church from 1925 on were valid in the sight of God, is amply proven by the Lord's endorsement of them in the beginning of the Fifth Message. That is, conceding that this was really a message through a messenger from God. And I may further add that it was this **new** invitation to some of us so-called "old timers" to leave what was, thus far, a God-endorsed line of procedure, and follow after something NEW, that caused us later to reject entirely the claim of Brother Fetting for his so-called "messenger visits."

And right here let me say that I am quite sure that the acts of the conference of 1936, while Sister Flint and I were in Europe on our mission there, wherein they, by conference enactment, rejected the messages, was a vital mistake. Not that I feel that they were wrong in discounting the genuineness of the messages, but they had no need to do so by conference enactment and vote. I, of course, speak this as my own opinion, and I do it from the honest conviction I have that, if our philosophy concerning so-called modern revelation is sound, wherein we say that ALL purported revelations are to stand on their own merits and be tested by the arbitrament of time, then we could well have afforded to have done that with the Fetting messages the same as we had done with other purported revelation, and had I been present at that conference I would have voted against so repudiating by vote those messages. That move was not consistent with our position, as I see it. And the further heartache and bitterness of that act could have been avoided. So much for that.

Now as to the incidents leading up to the teaching of rebaptism itself. In conversation with Brother Fetting himself, and in the presence of others, (in fact, he made a similar public statement from the stand in the church on the Temple Lot), wherein he stated frankly that he did NOT interpret the language in the Twelfth Message, "Let those who come to the Church of Christ, be baptized," to mean that we who had had our gospel ministry and baptisms endorsed by years of spiritual

experience and the manifestations of the Holy Spirit, should be again baptized. He felt, as ALL of us then felt, that the messenger had given full endorsement of that, as already noted in the earlier messages, and that, "Let those who come to the Church of Christ be baptized," referred to all who had NOT been baptized by the God recognized priesthood of the restoration. AND it was ONLY when some who had accepted the new interpretation, made the statement, (and I understand among them was his own wife) that if they came in by baptism they would not be baptized by anyone who had not themselves been rebaptized, then he says he yielded to their persuasions, and was baptized. It seems that the leading spirit in this multiple baptism theory was T. B. Nerren, and his subsequent course indicates that he is just full of excuses for being baptized upon any and all pretexts. So it is unfortunate that Brother Fetting, like Joseph Smith with Sidney Rigdon, permitted himself to be influenced to take this NEW, UNTRIED STEP; which has NOT brought added light and unity to God's people, as the history of the lapse of time has demonstrated, and as your beautiful letter amply proves.

Now, just a word there. I am sure that no one will quarrel with the unqualified statement, "Let those who come to the Church of Christ be baptized." ALL of us believe that, but this calls up the question: "Who are the Church of Christ? In the light of all scriptures that I can find, the Church of Christ, are the membership of the body of Christ. "As many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ," as Paul says. Very well then, the idea that we are baptized into the church does nothing but institutionalize the body of Christ. It reduces it to a mere institution under the control of men. It also strikes directly at the "one baptism," or the "new birth," the most beautiful thing in all of God's plan. SO, when in 1844 the saints were scattered, as a result of the death of Joseph Smith, a thing, in itself, that came about through the institutionalizing of the work prior to his death. THE CHURCH, in the persons of ALL properly baptized members who received their baptism in direct succession from the angel, went ignorantly and innocently with each of the self constituted leaders. In other words, IT WAS THE CHURCH THAT WAS SCATTERED, and so, if I see anything of value in the Twelfth Message, it is the statement that the work of the Church of Christ on the Temple Lot was to "SET THE CHURCH IN ORDER" once more, and this they assayed to do, but, of course, the powers of darkness, like in the beginning of the restoration could not endure the wonderful prospects thus presented, so those forces took the very means designed of God to bring about unity, and by wresting the language turned that chance for unity, into the very opposite, and instead brought division in the church.

For all I have said I invite your attention to the Book of Mormon, in the 12th chapter of 3 Nephi, where it says: "Then is it my church, if so be it is built upon my gospel." Thus we see that organization and institutionalism were secondary, and only followed acceptance of the gospel of Christ. Just so in 1820-30. John says, "I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven having the everlasting gospel," etc. The angel then

(Continued on page 110.)

# 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.*

## REBAPTISM

By Apostle B. C. Flint

Since the matter of Rebaptism was one of the causes of division in the Church of Christ back in 1929, and has continued to this day to interest some of our brethren in the other groups, especially among those who were and are affected by it, it therefore seems still to be a live issue.

This being true, and the passing of time having smoothed over some of the bitterness that was incident to its introduction, it should now be possible to approach the matter dispassionately, and with only the desire for truth being the prompting motive. We have learned to discuss other principles in this matter, and certainly at all times brethren should be able to study vital issues in the spirit of love and brotherhood; and in that spirit we now approach this question.

No one will deny that when it was first advanced, through the interpretation placed upon language found in the so-called twelfth message given by Elder Otto Fetting, that it was a new idea. It will also be conceded that it was then new ground, and came upon us unexpectedly, and as subsequent events proved, carried some off their feet and they responded and were rebaptized and later "cooled off," and repudiated what they had believed, and what we still believe to have been an error.

In the Bible and the Book of Mormon, we find the principle of baptism outlined very explicitly. Its object, scope and intent is plainly taught. It is called "The birth of the water," and as such was a leading part of the "New Birth," and was made possible as a saving means through the shedding of the blood of our blessed Lord and Master. That being a fact, certainly no true Christian would knowingly seek to violate or set at naught the cleansing blood of Christ as typified in water baptism. This desire to follow Christ is equally held by both sides of this controversy. Those who believe that it is a sacrilege to try to keep repeating the ordinance of baptism, in the event of the following of the traditions of men for a time, are as desirous of keeping the commandments of Christ as are those who feel it a requirement to be again baptized.

To begin our study we will strike a balance in restoration teaching, by stating, that it has been a fundamental teaching in the restoration movement, that baptism, as taught in scripture, is for the remission of individual sin, and is a door of entrance into the kingdom of God. Our attention is called to the case of Nephi in the Book of Mormon who had been preaching baptizing and pointing the people to Christ, yet when Christ actually came, they were all required to be baptized again. In fact, this is the only scripture that actually furnishes us with this situation. True, inference

is drawn from other texts, but this is the ONLY one that can be referred to that actually shows the saints being baptized a second time. It is unfortunate that the matter is left there as it is, without further explanation as to the why of this requirement. It may be that it was because while the people under Nephi had been baptized for their personal individual sins, Christ had not yet set up his church or kingdom among them and it was necessary for them to enter that kingdom THROUGH THE DOOR, the only door known to scripture.

However, be that as it may, here comes the problem that presents itself to us. First, is Paul's statement in Ephesians 4:5, that there is "ONE LORD, ONE FAITH, and ONE BAPTISM." Of course, an explanation for this might be found were there not so many other scriptures that lead in support of this statement of there being JUST one baptism. For instance, Paul also tells us, that "as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ." Galatians 3:27. Very well, with Paul we ask, Was Christ divided? Or when we were baptized "into Christ" did we only partially put him on? In fact, how much of Christ did we put on at our baptism? If by that act we put on Christ entirely, then Christ has suffered for sins ONLY ONCE. See 1 Peter 3:18. Also we are told that the baptism in water is a new birth into Christ. Very well, if the illustration of Christ himself to Nicodemus wherein he made the comparison of the birth of the water to the natural birth of man, then it would seem as ridiculous to feel that we could be born a second time of water, as it would be to be born a second time a natural man, and this idea is increased by other references to this same matter. In 1 John 2:1-2 we read, "And if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: And he is our propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world." Here the problem presented by the idea of needing a second baptism thickens. If we have put on Christ by baptism, we have clothed ourselves with that spiritual power that is the propitiation for our sin, and have an advocate with the Father in the person of the Christ we have put on. But, here we come upon a direct statement that clarifies the whole situation. In Hebrews 6:4-6 we read, "For it is IMPOSSIBLE for those who were ONCE ENLIGHTENED, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost and have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, if they shall fall away, to RENEW THEM AGAIN UNTO REPENTANCE; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame." (Emphasis mine.—B. C. F.)

This seems to plainly indicate that there is no place for a rebaptism, by any who FALL AWAY. O,

but, says our rebaptism advocate, the need for rebaptism is not for those who sin WILLFULLY, but for those who innocently and ignorantly follow the sins and traditions of men.

This then opens up the second phase of our study. All must concede that when the people of Nephi were baptized at the command of the Master, that NOW the kingdom of heaven, had been set up in their midst, and that, too, regardless of what may have been effected by their earlier baptism, or what was its purpose or result. So in like manner, IF as a result of the angel message of these latter days, to Joseph Smith, and wherein baptism as a dual obligation was restored, and the kingdom of God set up, as the messenger to Otto Fetting said it was, THEN we and the people of Nephi, after Christ set up his kingdom among them, are occupying upon the same ground or in a parallel position, and in that case it remains for the advocates of successive baptisms to show a single case of another baptism among the Nephites after Christ came to them. We shall await an answer to this. It will not do to say that they remained so faithful that they did not fall into the sins and traditions of men, because the record shows that they did.

Furthermore we do not have to leave it there. We can go to the New Testament and we will find Paul writing letters to the church in Galatia, the church in Ephesus, to the church at Thessalonica, and all of the other churches and we find him rebuking with sharpness and showing them how far they were wandering from their first love, but not IN A SINGLE INSTANCE do we find him commanding them to be baptized for the sins and traditions of men, as a remedy for their heartwanderings. O, what a rich field of opportunity was here opened up for a renewal of their covenants by being baptized again, if such were the requirement, but no, IT WAS NOT THE REQUIREMENT. Paul fully understood that they had been baptized into Christ, had put on Christ and so had him as their advocate with the Father, the propitiator for their sins. He knew that to ask them to repeat their baptism would be a sacrilege. He knew that it would be a reflection upon the blood of Christ as a cleansing agent applied in the waters of baptism to ask them to TRY to PROPITIATE for themselves. He knew it would be a crowding of Christ out of the picture and the instituting of water in his stead. O, so much might be said along this line, but we forbear.

The third phase of our study of this question has to do with WHO we are. The messenger to Otto Fetting said we were indeed the Church of Christ, and that God had reserved this remnant on the Temple Lot to set the church in order.

Very well, then the next question is, What was restored by the angel to Joseph Smith? Was it the church or kingdom of God, or only part of it, to be again brought into being by the Messenger to Otto Fetting?

There is only ONE conclusion to be drawn. If the angel restored the gospel with the authority to administer the rites and ordinances of the kingdom of God then we are in the same class as the Nephites after Christ set up his kingdom among them, and the same

class as the various groups of saints that Paul addressed his epistles to and if that is true, Christ IS NOW our advocate with the Father and we, having put on Christ, by being baptized in water, would only crucify to ourselves the Son of God, if we sinned willfully, and Paul says that it would be impossible to renew us again to repentance. Yet so long as Christ remains our Advocate with the Father he IS our propitiation for our sins, and so ten thousand baptisms would avail nothing, should we try to substitute baptism for the precious blood of Christ, after having already availed ourselves of that state under God.

It is not a question as to what we may think, about whether we NEED another baptism or not. Our thinking does not enter into it. It is a question as to how we will treat our Lord in this matter, and what he will think about our conduct. If we fall into the sins and traditions of men the thing for us to do is to REPENT and plead with God through Jesus Christ to forgive us our sins and trespasses, not try to again atone for them ourselves through some act of penance, which savors too much of Catholicism. God grant that we may strive to do God's will, and not be led away by some strange doctrine originating with men.

---

## MICHIGAN NEWS

### Keego Harbor, Michigan

On Sunday, May 28, 1944, we had an all-day meeting in the Community Hall at Keego Harbor. It was a lovely place for such a meeting and we had plenty of room.

The first meeting was Sunday school at 10:30 a. m. Instead of having regular classes, Brother L. E. Welch gave us a short talk on "Salvation to All." At 11:30 a. m. Brother R. D. Davis preached to us. Dinner was served around 1:00 p. m. We had a pot-luck lunch which everyone enjoyed. Then, because the young folks all volunteered, they washed and wiped the dishes and song service was put off an hour. In this time Brother Welch preached a sermon. Then at 3:40 p. m. we had our song service, led by Sister Betty Morgan. The state orchestra, the few of us that were there, played several selections. Then we had duets and solos by all. After this Brother C. W. Morgan preached and at 5:00 p. m. a light lunch was served. We regret that several had to return to their own locals for evening services. Those who remained heard Brother Ivan Inch talk.

This ended our day, and we all went home filled with the goodness and kindness of the love of God. Saints attended from Wyandotte, Flint, and Detroit.

Our state conference is soon to be held, so a group of us young people are all going up together.

There is to be a very happy event this 4th of July. Sister Erentta Orton of Farwell, Michigan, is to be married on this date. Brother C. W. Morgan is preaching, and Sister Betty will sing. Erentta's sister, Dora, and myself have the honor of being her attendants. We all wish this young couple a very successful and happy marriage.

State Reporter.

# The Standard Bearers

## STORIES OF THE RESTORATION

### Mobbings

It may seem strange that in all ages of mankind, that when real light and truth are about to be brought forth for man's benefit, the very powers of hell seem to be let loose, not only to hinder the progress of that light, but to actually destroy it if possible. In short, it seems that man has ever been ready to crucify his saviors. And as a consequence every man who has arisen and pointed mankind to a higher and better way, or to bring to light some new and untried discovery, at once becomes the target for persecution and opprobrium. Why this is so, is one of the paradoxes of life. It cannot be fathomed nor explained. All that we know is that it is so. When Columbus contended that the earth was round he was laughed to scorn, and it was nothing but the intervening power of God that enabled him to set sail and discover this great land of ours. And in spite of his success and the vindication of his idea, so great was the power of those in control of public opinion of that day, that the great Columbus died in disgrace. Why, at one time, there was an edict making it a capital offense in the Catholic Church to teach that the earth was round. Their opposition with all others did not alter the fact as to the earth's roundness.

When Fulton invented the steamboat, he too stood the ridicule of his fellows. His boat was dubbed, "Fulton's folly." Then there was Edison, Firestone, DuPont, Whitney, Howe, and the whole galaxy of great American benefactors and all others, who were derided, scorned and ostracized. But, while this is true of all who take advance ground in invention, science, and medicine, nowhere has the storm of persecution raged so fiercely as against those in the ranks of our religious teachers, and among whom Christ, our great King and Redeemer, comes first. Of himself he says, "If they have called the master of the house Beelzebub, how much more shall they call them of his household?" Matthew 10:25. And to his disciples he said, "Behold, I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves: be ye therefore wise as serpents, (another translation says, "wise servants,"—B. C. F.) and harmless as doves. But beware of men: for they shall deliver you up to the councils, and they will scourge you in their synagogues; and ye shall be brought before governors and kings for my sake, for a testimony against them and the Gentiles. But when they deliver you up take no thought how or what ye shall speak: for it shall be given you in that same hour what ye shall speak. For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you. And the brother shall deliver up the brother to death, and the father the child: and the children shall rise up against their parents and cause them to be put to death. And ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake: but he that endureth to the end shall be saved."

The above is only a small part of what might be quoted from the Scriptures concerning this type of per-

secution, but the history of the martyrs from the days of Christ and his apostles bears testimony in thunder tones, of the divinity of this statement of Christ. Furthermore the nearer the truth the teacher was the greater the persecution, which is not strange when we consider that this very fact takes honest followers of Christ farther and farther from the grip of infidelity, and superstition that is the real delight of the Satanic forces.

So, it is only to be expected that when God sent his angel to the young seer of Palmyra, that the flood gates of persecution and death would increase in fury, as compared to any other period of religious history. Christianity had in its general makeup, become quite popular with humanity generally, so when their equanimity began to be disturbed because the real light of the gospel was about to shine forth, we can read that mobbings and every other type of persecution was resorted to in the hopes that the "New" faith might be stamped out if possible. And among the leaders of this persecution was to be found the priests of the day, who like in the time of Paul began to fear because their "craft was in danger."

In this matter of the great restoration, however, we are willing to recognize many of the great reformers as advance agents in the coming era of light, and so we find that they too were subjected to the most abominable types of persecution. Among those that we wish to notice in our young people's stories of the restoration are the Wesleys, John and Charles. These noble men had fearlessly proclaimed against the lack of true Christianity among the professors of religion of their day, and they had also predicted that the day of restoration was near at hand. In short it seemed that they regarded themselves as forerunners of that restoration, which indeed, they no doubt were. Just an illustration or two to show this. In John Wesley's book of sermons we read this, "The times which we have reason to believe **are at hand**, (if they are not already begun,) are what many pious men have termed '**the latter day glory**'; . . . And yet the wise men of the world, the men of eminence and renown, cannot imagine what we mean by talking of any extraordinary work of God! They cannot discern the signs of these times! They can see no signs at all of God's arising to maintain His own cause, and **set up his kingdom** over the earth." And Charles Wesley in a beautiful hymn sings of the time when God would send forth again his apostles in these latter days. Do not these things mark these good men as having had their spirits enlightened by the prophetic unction of the Holy Spirit?

Very well, here is what happened to the Wesleys. In the writings of Archdeacon Farrar, D. D., in a book called the "Contemporary Review," we read of the persecutions that overtook them. "We might think it strange that the desire to preach the gospel of Christ should invoke such deadly opposition, alike of the so-called respectable and religious classes, and the rude



and ignorant multitude. Yet so it was. . . . Every form of opposition, we are told, was tried against him. Milldams were let out; church bells were jangled; drunken fiddlers and ballad singers were hired; organs pealed forth, drums were beaten; street vendors, clowns, drunken fops, etc., were hired and incited to blow horns so as to drown his voice. He was struck in the face with sticks, he was cursed and groaned at, pelted with stones, beaten to the ground, threatened with murder, dragged and hustled hither and thither by drinking, cursing swearing mobs, who acted the part of judge, jury and executioner, etc."

So also Luther, Calvin, Knox and others all had their Calvary, but if so bitter against the reformers, why should we be astonished when it came finally to the man who in his boyhood, became the "last prophet," looked for by Wesley; the latter day prophet Joseph Smith?

We are not surprised to read the history of the great latter day restoration, nor to read that most bitter persecution and mobbings that had yet been perpetrated upon God's servants was reserved for him and his associates.

We will not burden our young readers with a long list of these mobbings, because they continued almost unabated down until the time that his life really was taken in the ignominious environment of a dungeon jail. However, one or two of those that overtook him in his early ministerial work will show the truthfulness of what we are telling you here.

We have already told you about the attempts of mobs to prevent the Book of Mormon being published, so we will now tell you one as described by Joseph Smith himself, and as relates to his experience at the hands of mobs, and was doubtless some of the things related by the preacher Smucker in our last story, where he tells of the thankless task Joseph experienced in trying to move forward the cause of Christ in these latter days.

"On the 25th of March, 1832, the twins before mentioned, which had been sick of the measles for some time, caused us to be broken of our rest in taking care of them, especially my wife. In the evening I told her that she had better retire to rest with one of the children, and I would watch with the sickest child. In the night she told me I had better lie down on the trundle-bed, and I did so, and was soon after awakened by her screaming murder! when I found myself going out of the door in the hands of about a dozen men, some of whose hands were in my hair, and some hold of my shirt, drawers, and limbs. The foot of the trundle-bed was toward the door, leaving only room enough for the door to swing. My wife had heard a gentle tapping on the window, which she then took no particular notice of (but which was unquestionably designed for ascertaining whether we were all asleep), and, soon after, the mob burst open the door and surrounded the bed in an instant, and as I said, the first I knew, I was going out of the door, in the hands of an infuriated mob. I made a desperate struggle as I was forced out, to extricate myself, but only cleared one leg, with which I made a pass at one man, and he fell on the door steps.

I was immediately confined again and they swore by God they would kill me if I did not be still, which quieted me. As they passed around the house with me, the fellow I had kicked came to me and thrust his hand into my face all covered with blood, (for I had hit him on the nose), and with an exulting horse-laugh, muttered, 'Ge, gee, G-d D-n ye I'll fix ye.' They then seized me by the throat and held on till I lost my breath. After I came to, as they passed along with me, about thirty rods from the house, I saw Elder Rigdon stretched out on the ground whither they had dragged him by the heels. I supposed he was dead. I began to plead with them saying, You will have mercy and spare my life I hope... To which they replied, G-d d-n ye, call on yer God for help. We'll show ye no mercy'; and the people began to show themselves in every direction; one coming from the orchard had a plank, and I expected they would kill me, and carry me off on a plank. Then they turned to the right, and went on about thirty rods further—about sixty rods from the house, and thirty from where I saw Elder Rigdon—to into the meadow, where they stopped, and one said, 'Simonds, Simonds,' (meaning I suppose, Simonds Rider), 'Pull up his drawers pull up his drawers, he will take cold.' Another replied, "Aren't ye going to kill him? Aren't ye going to kill him?" When a group of mobbers collected a little ways off, and said, 'Simonds, Simonds, come here;' and Simonds charged those who had hold of me to keep me from touching the ground (as they had done all the time), lest I should get a spring on them. They went and held a council, and as I could occasionally overhear a word, I supposed it was to know whether it was best to kill me. They returned, after a while, when I learned that they had concluded not to kill me, but pound and scratch me well, tear off my shirt and drawers, and leave me naked. One cried, 'Simonds, Simonds, where is the tar bucket?' 'I don't know,' answered one, 'where 'tis; Eli's left it.' They ran back and fetched the bucket of tar, when one exclaimed, 'G-d d-n it, let's tar up his mouth;' and they tried to force the tar-paddle into my mouth; I twisted my head around, so they could not; and they cried out, G-d d-n ye, hold up your head and let us give ye some tar.' They then tried to force a vial into my mouth, and broke it in my teeth. All my clothes were torn off me, except my shirt collar; and one man fell on me and scratched my body with his nails like a mad cat, then muttered out, 'That's the way the Holy Ghost falls on folks.'

"They then left me, and I attempted to rise, but fell again. I pulled the tar away from my lips, etc., so that I could breathe more freely, and after a while I began to recover, and raised myself up, when I saw two lights. I made my way toward one of them, and found it was Father Johnson's. When I had come to the door I was naked, and the tar made me look as though I was covered with blood and when my wife saw me, she thought I was all mashed to pieces, and fainted. During the affray, the sisters of the neighborhood had collected at my room. I called for a blanket, they threw me one and shut the door; I wrapped it around me and went in.

My friends spent the night in scraping and removing the tar, and washing and cleansing my body, so

that by morning I was ready to be clothed again. This being Sabbath morning, the people assembled for meeting at the usual hour of worship, and among them came also the mobbers, viz., Simonds Rider, the Campbellite preacher, and a leader of the mob; one McClenitic, son of a Campbellite minister; and Peletiah Allen, Esq., who gave the mob a barrel of whiskey to raise their spirits; and many others. With my flesh all scarified and defaced, I preached to the congregation, as usual, and in the afternoon of the same day baptized three individuals."—Times and Seasons, vol. 5, page 611.

The foregoing is not a very pretty picture, we know, but it gives us a slight insight into the experiences of those whom God had raised up in these latter days as instruments through which to restore the beautiful gospel of his dear Son.

Truly, if they called the Master of the house Beelzebub, we should not be surprised at this treatment of his disciples.

The history of the restoration is just one long story of like persecutions and mobbings, and they were not confined to the early latter day disciples alone but to many of the ministry who have succeeded them. Personally we could tell of some similar experiences.

## THE NAME OF THE CHURCH

By Elder Willard J. Smith

(Continued from last month.)

### Chapter Four

Going back to that Kirtland conference of May 3, 1834, permit me to say, the change of the name of the church evidently originated with the First Presidency, as it was Sidney Rigdon who made the motion; (and as he was "equal with thee (Joseph) in holding the keys of this last kingdom."—See Doctrine and Covenants 87:3), and Joseph himself was presiding over that meeting and put the motion before the house which motion passed unanimously, a candid reading of the minutes of that conference, and taking into consideration that the highest authorities of the church were there, and participated in its passing, makes clear to the unbiased mind that it was a preconcerted arrangement to change and make valid the new name under which the church was to function—The Church of the Latter Day Saints. And the instructions sent out to the various churches by the authority of that conference that the various churches in making their proceedings should do so under the above title, proves, conclusively the design in thus passing that resolution was to change, or rid themselves of the name of the Church of Christ by which for over four years they had been legally, morally, spiritually and organically known among men; and to thus change that wonderful name in order to get rid of the jeering, scoffing, ignorant rabble they divorced the sacred name of Christ was **sacreligious**, it seems to me. And although my readers may criticize some of the expressions as extreme, I excuse myself therefor by referring to the following testimony of the venerable David Whitmer who solemnly before God testifies that:

"In June, 1829, the Lord gave us the name by which we must call the church, being the same as he gave the Nephites. We obeyed his commandment, and called it The Church of Christ until 1834, when, through the influence of Sidney Rigdon the name of the church was changed to 'The Church of the Latter Day Saints,' dropping out the name of Christ entirely, that name we were so strictly commanded to call the church by, and which Christ by his own lips made so plain."—See David Whitmer's Address, page 73.

Notwithstanding this plain affirmation of David Whitmer—one of the three witnesses of the Book of Mormon—whose testimony is accepted by the whole Restoration—still our Reorganized brethren seek to uphold the argument that "**It was not the intention of the conference to drop the name of Christ, but to add the words—'Latter Day Saints.'**" If this was the intention of that conference, why in the name of common sense did not the conference make known in some way that that was their intention? Why did they not add these words and put them with the original name in the minutes? Those men were in the lead of the church, and were intelligent enough to embody their intentions in the minutes of that meeting and publish them to the world. Hence, if they had intended to add the words "Latter Day Saints" to the original name they would have done so. But they did not do that! Instead thereof they made a motion which was properly seconded and argued before the conference, "That this church be known hereafter by the name of 'The Church of the Latter Day Saints.'" And if that is not a clear stated understandable motion, meaning just exactly what it says, then I am incapable of understanding anything.

David Whitmer also testifies that Sidney Rigdon at that conference "made one of the most powerful and eloquent speeches he had ever heard, a speech that moved the congregation. Sidney Rigdon was naturally a powerful orator, one of the greatest of his days, and at this particular time the devil helped him wonderfully. At the close of his speech the congregation took a vote on the question, voting to change the name of the church as stated. He said the arguments and reasons which Rigdon produced for changing the name of the church were that the church might be clearly distinguished from all other churches some of which had names similar to the Church of Christ, saying: 'We are the Saints of God, and these are the latter days.' **The Lord has revealed to me that the name of the church must be changed to 'The Church of the Latter Day Saints.'**"—See Zion's Advocate for October, 1925, page 5.

This proves conclusively that if David Whitmer's word was worth the paper it was written on, that the change there made, **and intended to be made**, was the change that was made from that of "the Church of Christ," to that of "The Church of the Latter Day Saints," as published in the minutes of that Kirtland conference; and all efforts now being made, or which have been made in the past, to make it appear that the words, "of Latter Day Saints" were intended to be merely **additional** to the name of The Church of Christ, is hardly supportable when viewed in the light of the

facts in the case. However, taking the testimony of William B. Smith, and William E. McClellin (as testified to by Brother Luff) at its face value, that the Church of Christ, and the Church of Jesus Christ, as also the Church of the Latter Day Saints, together with other names were frequently heard prior to that conference of May 3, 1834, as also at that present time, and after. Yet that would not make any one of those titles which they may have made, or called, its legal name! For me to stand off and refer to the Reorganized Church as "The Mormon Church," or "The Latter Day Saint Church," or "The Re-organites," or "The Josephites," or "The Smithites," would in no way effect, change, or disannul the original incorporated title or legal name of "The Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints." So too, the calling of any names whatsoever prior to the third day of May, 1834, did not constitute any one of those frequently subjoined names its legal name other than The Church of Christ which was its ONLY LEGAL NAME; and back to the month of June, 1829, it recognized no other name as valid. Nor could any other name be made to appear as valid before any court holding jurisdiction. But from the third day of May, 1834, when that resolution passed in that Kirtland conference changing the name of the church from that of The Church of Christ to that of The Latter Day Saints, making the Latter Day Saints its legal name, ever after it continued to be such until by **expressed** revelation it was again changed on the twenty-sixth day of April, 1838, of which we shall consider more definitely further on. But now referring back for one more glance at that Kirtland conference, the probabilities are that Sidney Rigdon brought to bear his master stroke when he affirmed: "**The Lord hath revealed to me that the name of the church must be changed to the Church of the Latter Day Saints.**" undoubtedly influenced that congregation very largely to vote unanimously for the passage of that resolution, as he was "accounted EQUAL with Joseph in holding the keys of this last kingdom"; (Doctrine and Covenants 87:3). So I now say: If all this did not change the name of that church called by Christ the Lord himself—The Church of Christ—to the very human name of "The Church of the Latter Day Saints," then I have neither perception nor understanding.

That conference action was passed with the whole of the First Presidency there; and with such stalwarts as David Whitmer, Oliver Cowdery and Frederic G. Williams and other leading men under the captivating oratory of Sidney Rigdon, and his claim of a direct revelation from God that "The name of the church must be changed to the "Church of the Latter Day Saints—thereby cutting out the name of Christ entirely—so astounded the whole multitude that the resolution passed without a single dissident. Not a soul there to raise his voice against it; and thereafter it was acquiesced in by the great majority of the whole membership of the church, and was thus recognized as the official name of the church.

### Chapter Five

After the foregoing resolutions were passed it is ascertained that the official use of the new name was recognized throughout the whole church, by referring to

the Doctrine and Covenants, which see as follows:

"At a General Assembly of the Church of The Latter Day Saints."—Doctrine and Covenants, section 108A.

"To arrange the items of doctrine of Jesus Christ, for the government **of his Church of the Latter Day Saints.**" Ibid, paragraph 1.

"After a hymn was sung, President Cowdery arose and introduced the **'Book of Doctrine and Covenants of the Church of the Latter Day Saints.'**"—Ibid, paragraph 4.

And when the Doctrine and Covenants was issued in August, 1835, it appeared under the new name. The following is a copy of the title page:

### "DOCTRINE AND COVENANTS of the

### "CHURCH OF THE LATTER DAY SAINTS"

Brother Luff, as also The Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints in general, still clings to the idea that the words of "Latter Day Saints" was an addition instead of a new name. The following is from the Reorganized Church History, volume 1, page 454.

"It has been stated that in this action the name of Christ was entirely disregarded, but it will be observed that it is called in the beginning of the minutes, 'The Church of Christ'; so we conclude that the appellation given in this resolution was intended to be additional."

But what could they do otherwise than to recognize the original name of the church in the beginning of that conference before the name of the church was changed? This, however, is completely overcome by the statement of William W. Blair, a member of the First Presidency of the Reorganization, and one of her most brilliant and shrewdest of her logicians, who testified in the Temple Lot suit as follows:

"So far as that conference is concerned, the minutes of which I have read, the name was changed, and you will observe that it is referred to as The Church of Christ, which I take it to be THE NAME BY WHICH IT HAD BEEN KNOWN, and then by resolution it was CHANGED to THE CHURCH OF THE LATTER DAY SAINTS."

Again he says: "Another reason lies in the fact the church in 1834, in conference assembled, saw fit to denominate itself OFFICIALLY, 'THE CHURCH OF THE LATTER DAY SAINTS.'"—Abstract of Evidence, page 124.

Another reason, we may add, the claim of Sidney Rigdon, one of the First Presidency, who claimed that by a direct revelation from God, he knew that the name of the church should be **changed** to The Church of the Latter Day Saints. And the whole First Presidency and the leading men of the church conceded the change and gave their consent to the proposition. And whereas the name of the church was given by Jesus Christ himself more than nine months before the organization of the church on the sixth of April, 1830, when it was named THE CHURCH OF CHRIST; and for more than four years The Church of Christ was its official title, it matters not if a hundred or more sub-titles were called upon it, no one of them, nor all of them combined, could form any legitimate excuse for changing the heaven-

appointed name, "The Church of Christ!" And when those church dignitaries assumed the right, and assented to the change to the God-given name of the church or Bride of Christ and renamed it after man—they sold their birthright for a bad mess of pottage—giving it over entirely to humanity as a human institution—the result of the stern rebuke of the Almighty foreseen and foretold in Doctrine and Covenants 83:8; and disaster and blood followed the church continuously thereafter until the martyrdom of her noblest sons, and the wreckage of the church into various corrupt institutions, the larger body of which formulating, and *en masse* emigrating to the Great Salt Lake Valley in Utah. I presume it will be quite generally conceded by my readers that "We ought to obey God rather than man."

### Chapter Six

Brother Luff, on pages 6 and 7 of his pamphlet refers to an appeal published in the Evening and Morning Star, dated July, 1834, which reads as follows.

"Whereas the Church of Christ, recently styled, 'The Church of the Latter Day Saints,' contumeliously called Mormons or Mormonites, . . . "In the body of the document, the church is also referred to as The Church of the Latter Day Saints," and cites that as proof that "there was no thought in their minds that the one name meant the discarding of the other." I therefore sincerely ask: In the name of common sense, What did those men who wrote that "appeal" refer to the "recently styled Church of the Latter Day Saints" at all for were it not that those Missourians were criticising the change made in the name of the Church? They knew full well that the church from the time it first entered Missouri was called "The Church of Christ" and the question now being revolved in their minds were, Why, and for what purpose do they come before us with a NEW NAME, if it is not for deceptive purposes. And the writers of that "Appeal" in order to modify their action of May 3, in changing the name called attention thereto to if possible, impress the thought of their being the same church, though having for convenience in worldly affairs changed the name or "styled" it, "The Church of the Latter Day Saints." And to this end this affirmation in the opening of that appeal, as also in the seventeenth paragraph—which declares, "The faith and religion of the Latter Day Saints are founded upon the old Scriptures, the Book of Mormon, and direct revelation from God"; is signed by twelve of the leading men of the church—and for the entire appeal, see Church History, volume 1, pages 505-515. And, although Joseph Smith's name is not signed to that document, yet it is said, he was there at the time, and, of course, assented to the appeal. And in the light of the foregoing evidence of real design in changing the name of the church, Brother Luff will have to dig up something more to the point—something more tangible—to convince thinking people that, "There was no thought in their minds that the one name meant the discarding of the other."

In fact I cannot imagine what method of speech could have been employed by those men engaged in that action of May 3, 1834, and the subsequent history

thereof, which would more clearly show that "The Church of the Latter Day Saints" was clearly substituted, designed, and fully intended to take the place of the former name of the church, The Church of Christ; and that the whole church be subject to that change, and be constrained to make out all their reports and church proceedings, and do all the business of the church in their newly acquired name, "The Church of the Latter Day Saints." Call me dense, if you choose, and perhaps I am; but I freely and fully confess I cannot see it in any other light; nor do I think I could form a resolution which would more clearly express such action as that acted upon by those men engaged in the changing of the name of the church at that Kirtland conference.

Again, on page 7, Brother Luff states that "In a Messenger and Advocate editorial in defense of the name Saints as belonging to Christ's Church members, in referring to the early "Church of Christ and Church of God' are both used" etc. Also, "Elder Harrison Burgess in Messenger and Advocate, page 381, uses the name Churches of Christ."

Well, then what? Does it therefore follow that men using those names and expressions out of all reason and out of place that therefore they acted wisely knowingly and approvingly to the church? And that the church is responsible for their foolhardy action? Because of those men using those names as you say they did, does not prove anything. But providing those men made the statements you say they did, for a long time they had been accustomed to calling the church as you say; and then after the sudden change that was made they would be quite likely to refer to the former name, incidentally, or otherwise, as it would be quite an unusual thing for them to get away from the use of the original name all at once. Nor were they representing the church in its official capacity, as the official name then was, "The Church of the Latter Day Saints."

Would you, Brother Luff, have us to think that when you were publicly speaking and writing of your own church and called it "The Josephites," that that was the original title for "**The Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints?**" Then why be so hypercritical in trying to make it appear that everything spoken or written either officially or unofficially is perfectly legitimate and consistently used when in controversy with the Church of Christ people?—See Autobiography of Elder Joseph Luff, pages 240, 241, 258.

Beginning with page 16 and onward in the pamphlet, "The Name of the Church," Granville Hedrick comes in for criticism. Brother Luff says:

"On page 145 (April, 1865)" (of the Truth Teller I suppose, W. J. S.), appears a revelation which was given through him which starts out with these strange words: "Hear, O, ye people, who call yourselves the Church of Christ. Harken to the counsel of your Lord and Saviour JESUS CHRIST." Was that a divine revelation? If so, was the wording of it intended as a rebuke or a correction?"

Personally, I do not think it was intended either way; and I presume you think it must have been one way or the other because they were calling themselves

"The Church of Christ, and Christ had, in the same breath represented HIMSELF by the name of Jesus Christ, I think this was your intended criticism by your emphasis which I have copied, otherwise there is no force to your interrogation. We should long ago have learned that Jesus Christ is represented throughout the entire scriptures—the Bible and the Book of Mormon—as **The Bridegroom, and the Church is represented as His Bride**; the relationship of which I will try to impress upon your mind by turning to your autobiography pages 97 and 108 where we learn that you, during a certain experience in life, became acquainted with a young lady by the name of Janet Parker; and you tell us that acquaintance eventually ripened into a love affair the result of which was—on May 28, 1873, "Together we went to London, Ontario, and on the following day, at the residence of her parents, and in the presence of all the family, celebrated the birthday of Queen Victoria by getting married, Reverend W. S. Hughan of the Methodist Church, officiating."

Question: Did her name then become "Joseph Luff" or "Janet Joseph Luff?" or was it simply Janet Luff? If her name did not become changed in any other way than in the fact of its thus becoming permanently exchanged from Janet Parker to Janet Luff, and in that transition your Christian name "Joseph" was **in no way transferred to her as a part of her name**, nor otherwise interfered with, and both you and her being literal personages. Why then continue to seek to fasten "Jesus" the Christian name of the literal Christ to his mystical bride, the Church

This illustration will become very much in evidence should you in selling a piece of property which requires a deed to be signed by both you and your wife, should she attempt to sign as Mrs. Joseph Luff. You will find instantly then that she will be restrained from so signing, as Mrs. Joseph Luff is **not her legal name**; and if she signs at all she must sign her own legitimate name, Janet Luff; otherwise the deed is not legal. And the only reason that **Mrs. Joseph Luff** would not be permitted as a legal signature on a deed of transfer is because **THAT IS NOT HER NAME**. And if it is reasonable and just that your own wife is restricted from a participation in legal acquirements of using your adjoining or Christian name, your attempt to saddle off on the Bride of Christ that which is in no sense allowable in Christian jurisprudence is simply an inexcusable mistake.

(To be continued.)

### MISSIONARY ITEMS

Last November the undersigned, while still in Phoenix, Arizona, was invited to go to Milwaukee, Wisconsin, to speak before an organization there of Economic students studying the Responsibilities of Citizenship as pertains to Government in a land where the people by their votes are supposed to at least approve, or disapprove of **good laws, or bad laws**, as the case may be.

As per usual with a missionary in the Church of Christ where ministers do not draw a salary, and where call of the Lord to his missionary ministers is **"take no thought for the morrow, . . . I have sent you, go,"** the matter of **just how** best to try to go, becomes a problem at times, to those thus sent.

So when I estimated the fact that the one thousand five hundred miles from Phoenix, Arizona, to Independence, Missouri, is a long stretch of miles for a man to travel who is to depend upon faith, and upon such gratuitous contributions as the Lord must move upon some to give, if he is to respond to such calls; and then the further fact that from Independence, Missouri, to Milwaukee, Wisconsin is the best part of another 600 miles, I merely responded to the invitation by letter, to say that **"possibly, sometime,"** I might be able to meet those people, and to deliver the message of life and salvation which I am humbly grateful to be commissioned to bear.

But after arriving in Independence, Missouri, to visit my dear companion there, who has been too ill to travel with me for several years now, and to attend to missionary matters en route, and in Missouri, the Milwaukee folks found out in some manner that I was in Missouri, and that much nearer to them, so they renewed their request. I prayed over the matter earnestly, and was directed to go, regardless of the fact that it seemed a question whether the amount of money I could scrape up, would get me there, and supply my needs enroute, and the further fact that there was at the time no visible means in sight as to how I would get back, I started by bus. The sequel to the story is that in addition to my economic lecture work in Milwaukee, I was able to interest a number in our wonderful message of the latter day restoration of the gospel of Christ; and that the people in Wisconsin responded so well to my work there in general, that they paid all my expenses of the whole round trip, hotel expenses and all, with a few dollars left over when I got back to Independence. Mrs. Arleala Johnson in Milwaukee, a prominent leader in a woman's organization, as well as in a new Constitution Party movement, who has been reared in the Lutheran faith; gave attention to our message, and began reading the Nephite Record of ancient America. Last week she asked for baptism, and came from Milwaukee, Wisconsin, to St. Louis, Missouri, to meet with the Church of Christ at Ferguson, Missouri, and to be baptized. This was arranged with the Church of Christ pastor at Ferguson, Missouri, Elder Robert McClain, and we had the pleasure of receiving our sister into the fellowship of the Church of Christ by baptism there, and of conducting the confirmation service in the Church of Christ chapel. This was on Friday, May 12, 1944. The following Sunday, at our service a sister of the Reorganized Church came forward at the close of the sermon, and asked to place her membership in the Church of Christ. Brother McClain there, takes care of the matter of receiving this sister into the church.

Sister Arleala Johnson, whose conversion and baptism is mentioned, having been greatly dissatisfied with the contradictory teachings of churches for years, has been devoting her time in an endeavor to do good in the world outside of the churches; and by her continued endeavors to serve those in trouble or in need by giving sound and helpful advice as to the best way for anyone to obtain help in times of critical need in all the complicated affairs of life, is to **help themselves** by rendering such a strict obedience to true scientific law, as to entitle them to obtain help and power from

God, who is the author of all good, and the creator of all, which operates by his true scientific law.

Our sister has thus built up a large circle of friends who come to her for help and advice and exhortations in the doing of those things which are right, as the best means to obtain the good things which God has in store for all who will learn and obey his commandments. We here insert an extract from Sister Johnson's letter to Vida and I, since her baptism.

4351 S. Austin St., Milwaukee 7, Wis.

May 26, 1944.

Mr. and Mrs. James E. Yates,  
Independence, Missouri.

Dear Brother and Sister:

Upon my return home from St. Louis, there were many cases of maladjustment here which were brought to my attention. One case was that of a woman who was over-exerting herself in ambition to accumulate things material, and she was losing her health, and becoming a slave driver to her whole family. This case took hours of my time before she got a glimpse of the truth that **she must want spirituality**, and strive to get, in all her getting, **understanding**; that this was the first foundational pole she should raise within herself. To build the temple of Christ within, for the individual, is the only way for salvation, said I.

All these things have caused delay in not writing to you sooner.

I now direct this part of the letter to Mrs. Yates, personally, to thank you, Sister Vida, for the lovely card: "A Confirmation Wish," and also the photo of Apostle James E. Yates. I can not express in words just how much indebtedness I owe you both, for leading me into the arms of the beautiful Church of Christ. For only Christ can give the consolation and help I need, to do the work in his cause that he requires of us. Before becoming a member and receiving the baptismal rites—no more bitter grief was ever endured by me than at times I drank **alone**. All sacrifices that I made in humble effort to extend helpfulness to humanity was condemned by critics, and I was chided by some who are closest to me. The question was asked me: "Why fritter your time away on all those people? You are giving all your time and energy to these people who take all, and **give nothing in return.**" But I kept on alone, not knowing that in return I was to receive the great blessing of becoming a member in the Church of Christ, and in meeting people who think with me on subjects religious and spiritual, and even upon the science of true political government. Your generous way, dear sister, of extending love to me is fully appreciated, and I recognize in you a sweetness, that is rich in its delicacy and in an understanding that is supreme, in the illuminated spirituality of your being.

I thank you, Apostle James E. Yates and Mrs. Vida E. Smith Yates, as the two keepers at the gates for me, of this beautiful Church of Christ, allowing my entrance. And I firmly state that our Lord and his church, the Church of Christ, shall receive henceforth, my humble servitude.

With love and devotion to the great cause wherein the Lord's people are called to serve, and may the

grace of God be with you all, and with all the faithful, in the holy fellowship of faith.

Your sister in the gospel of our Lord,

Arleola Johnson.

The church, we feel sure, extends to our sister a spiritual and happy welcome into this precious fellowship of faith, and we pray that she may be instrumental by her life and by her testimony, in helping other honest souls to find the way into the celestial path of our redeemer.

With abiding faith in the gospel of our Lord,

JAMES E. YATES, and VIDA E. YATES.

### FETTINGITE BRETHREN MAKE OVERTURES

(Continued from page 101)

was to bring the GOSPEL, not church organization. So, as in Boo kof Mormon times and in New Testament times, the simple church organization will come into being automatically when individuals accept Christ and are baptized into him. One of the main scourges of the restoration movement, has been the persistent propensity to organize, Organize, ORGANIZE, and organize some more, and this statement is not designed to minimize the necessity of fashioning the church organization of the church here on earth now, after the pattern given of God, but it is intended to place the idea of organization and institutionalism in its proper place. Just here, in this connection, let me relate a little incident that happened in my ministry about the time of the split under consideration. You will note that myself and two others were mentioned in the Fifth Message as being called to the apostleship. (Personally, I have never regarded that message as my call to the apostleship, because I had received such a call nearly a year before the giving of that message. In fact, I think I was because such a call was know about, that my name was included in that particular message. If Dan McGregor were living he could give some interesting information on this, and what is more, I believe that had he lived, that he had influence enough to have prevented that split in 1929.)

So much as a side light. I will now resume my story. In May, 1929, I baptized two men in Des Moines, Iowa. At that time the Twelfth Message had not been made public, so it must be supposed that my ministry was still good even with the messenger. So, when a year later these same two men were again baptized, I visited one of them, and asked him how he could reconcile his course with the work of the messenger? Because, if, as he certainly must believe, I was a Messenger-called apostle, and as such had baptized him. Now he was baptized again. I asked him why. I said it seemed that by his act he was repudiating the messenger whom he professed to be following. He said he supposed he was baptized INTO the Church of Christ. I asked him, "What Church of Christ? Was it the one just organized in April, 1930 by Otto Fetting and others?" and he said, "Yes." I then asked if it was necessary for us to be baptized into that church in order to be saved and again he said, "Yes." I then called his attention to the fact that this church had no existence yet at the time that Otto Fetting was himself rebaptized, during the previous summer, so that Otto

Fetting himself was not in his own church and would need another rebaptism. This brother laughed and said, "I guess we are making a monkey of the whole thing." Yet this shows the situation in which many were placed at that time who were honestly seeking to comply with the new requirements.

SO, it would seem to me that the only REAL means for a reuniting would be the repudiation of that which caused the division in the first place.

For myself, I stand and preach on the same platform that I occupied prior to the so-called messenger visits, and God has blessed that ministry when I sought to be humble and full of love for all mankind, and as I feel toward you brethren, and would rejoice and thank a kind loving Father in heaven if we could all be reunited on that sacred spot as suggested in your letter. But to merely unite without doing it acceptably to God would only further complicate the situation.

With kindest regards and a prayer that God may bless and direct you. I am your brother in Christ,

(Signed) B. C. FLINT.

#### INDEPENDENCE ITEMS

Independence again. We have had the most unusual weather—rain, rain, and more rain, day after day; floods worse than we have ever had. The fifth of May we had snow and a heavy freeze. Want to come to Independence? No? Listen, that's all passed now, it is warm and the glorious sunlight is doing its perfect work, and this most busy quaint little town is a beautiful place in which to live. I have criss-crossed this land of ours. I would rather be here. There are better climates, more beautiful cities; it's that spiritual something, the knowledge that some day the Master's feet will walk on the streets of the city, when the sacred heart of America is cleansed.

The sun shone beautifully on Mother's Day, warm and tender, like the hearts of all good mothers. Our little program at the church was very much enjoyed with solos, duets and readings honoring mother. While a trio were singing "My Mother's Prayer," little June Smith handed to each mother a gift. Our most talented visitor, Brother Harold Buseth, rendered some lovely piano solos. The pastor then gave us a short sermonette on "Mother." We all went home feeling it was good to be a mother.

The recent speakers that I can remember were Brother James E. Yates, C. LeRoy Wheaton, Rolland De Los Sprague, James M. Case, W. J. Caldwell, T. C. Romney, and William F. Anderson.

This is June now, and "What is so rare as a day in June. Then if ever come perfect days." It's rain and more rain, storms and thunder, and when we get a "rare" day we certainly appreciate it.

Well, Sunday, June 18 was beautiful, not only in sunshine, but in the love and joy we felt at our gathering, for we celebrated, if we can use that term, a "Home Coming." Also Father's Day. Almost a hundred registered. The eleven o'clock hour was devoted to the Father above and to the earthly fathers of men, with solos and readings. During the duet "That Silver-haired Daddy of Mine" little Jackie Sprague passed out to each father a tie. The pastor then spoke words of honor and admonition to the fathers.

A bountiful table was spread at the noon hour. The dining room was filled to overflowing, and the joyousness of "getting together" in love and friendship was very apparent. About two-thirty we had a series of songs in the upper room, interspersed with readings and quartettes, and best of all the treat of having with us Brother and Sister Floyd Denham and their wonderful family, all talented with music. Ten in all that make up the orchestra. Their songs and instrumental numbers were grand to hear. Prayer meeting at six-thirty, preaching at eight, by our pastor. What a day! It was glorious!

METTA L. ANDERSON.

#### ALL THINGS COMMON

By Apostle B. C. Flint

"And it came to pass that the disciples whom Jesus had chosen, began from that time forth to baptize and to teach as many as did come unto them: and as many as were baptized in the name of Jesus were filled with the Holy Ghost. And many of them saw and heard unspeakable things, which are not lawful to be written: and they taught, and did minister one to another; and they had all things common among them, EVERY MAN DEALING JUSTLY, ONE WITH ANOTHER." 3 Nephi 12:10, 11.

"And it came to pass, in the thirty and sixth year, the people were ALL CONVERTED UNTO THE LORD, UPON ALL OF THE FACE OF THE LAND, BOTH NEPHITES AND LAMANITES, and there was no contention and disputations among them, and every MAN DID DEAL JUSTLY ONE WITH ANOTHER; And they had all things common among them, therefore there were not rich and poor, bond and free, but they were all made free, and partakers of the heavenly gift." 4 Nephi 1:3, 4.

"And again, Alma commanded that the people of the church should impart OF THEIR SUBSTANCE, (OF THEIR SUBSTANCE, not ALL of their substance—B. C. F.) every one ACCORDING TO THAT WHICH HE HAD; If he had more abundantly, he should IMPART MORE ABUNDANTLY; and if he had but little, but little should be required; and to him that had not should be given. And thus they should IMPART OF THEIR SUBSTANCE, OF THEIR OWN FREE WILL AND GOOD DESIRES TOWARD GOD, and to those priests that stood in need, yea, and TO EVERY NEEDY, NAKED SOUL. And this HE said unto them having been commanded of God; (What was commanded of God? Alma was commanded of God to TELL the people that they should do these things of THEIR OWN FREE WILL, and not that it was a command from Him to do it, otherwise it would not have been FREE -WILL—B. C. F.). And they did walk uprightly before God, IMPARTING TO ONE ANOTHER, (Where was the common storehouse?—B. C. F.) both TEMPORARILY and SPIRITUALLY, according to their needs and their wants." Mosiah 9:60-64.

"And when the priests left their labor, to impart the word of God unto the people, the people also left their labors to hear the word of God. And when the priest had imparted unto them the word of God, they all returned again diligently unto THEIR labors; And the priest, not esteeming himself above his hearers; for the preacher was no better than the hearer, neither was the

teacher any better than the learner: and thus THEY WERE ALL EQUAL, and they did all labor, every man according to his strength; And they did IMPART of their substance every man according to that which HE HAD, to the poor, and the needy, and the sick and the afflicted. (In all cases it was an individual matter and not directed from some church head.—B. C. F.). And they did not wear costly apparel, yet they were neat and comely; And thus THEY did establish the affairs of the church; and thus **they** began to have continual peace again, notwithstanding all their persecutions. And now because of the steadfastness of the church, THEY began to be exceeding rich; having abundance of all things whatsoever THEY stood in need; An abundance of flocks and herds, and fatlings of every kind, and also abundance of grain, and of gold, and of silver, and of precious things; and abundance of silk and fine twined linen and all manner of good homely cloth. And thus in THEIR prosperous condition THEY did not send away any who were naked, or that were hungry, or that were athirst, or that were sick, or that had not been nourished; And they did not set THEIR hearts upon riches; therefore THEY were liberal to all, both old and young, both bond and free, both male and female, WHETHER OUT OF THE CHURCH OR IN THE CHURCH, (It evidently was not a church matter at all but an individual matter, and of their own free will.—B. C. F.) having no respect to persons as to those who stood in need; And thus THEY did prosper and become far more wealthy than THOSE who did not belong to the church." Alma 1:37-47.

That all of the above was done under individual ownership and not by common ownership as a church program, is proven in the following language: "And it came to pass in the eighth year of the reign of the judges, that the PEOPLE OF THE CHURCH began to wax proud BECAUSE OF **THEIR** EXCEEDING RICHES, and **their** fine silks, and **their** fine twined linen, and because of **their** many flocks and herds, and **their** gold, and **their** silver, and all manner of precious things, which THEY had obtained by **their** industry." Alma 2: 8, 9. This is the **same** people and the **same** church mentioned in the first chapter of Alma, so it was the individuals and not the church who practiced the "ALL THINGS COMMON," mentioned in the first chapter.

"Now this was a great cause for lamentations among the people, while others were abasing THEMSELVES, succoring those who stood in need of **their** succor, such as IMPARTING their substance to the poor and the needy; feeding the hungry; suffering all manner of afflictions, for Christ's sake, who would come according to the spirit of prophecy, looking forward to that day, thus retaining a remission of their sins." Alma 2:20.

Notice the word "IMPART" is used in nearly all of these texts and Webster defines "impart" to mean: "To bestow a share of."

Consequently there is not a single syllable in any of the above texts that even hints at the common ownership of all property. It recognizes man's individual responsibility in his stewardship. Neither do the texts indicate that God ever gave a law that would require the members of the church to give ALL of their prop-

erty into the channels of church government to be controlled by any type of church official. The all things common practiced was the sharing of their goods in common with ALL who stood in need. In short, to live as Christ would have them live and IMPART of their substance to those in need, even regardless of whether they belonged to the church or not.

Latter day revelation bears out this thought for in chapter twenty-nine of the Book of Commandments, in a revelation which says it was given to the Church of Christ in September, 1830, we find this language: "Wherefore, verily I say unto you, that all things unto me are spiritual, and not AT ANY TIME have I given unto you a law which is temporal, neither any man, nor the children of men; Neither Adam your father, whom I created; behold I gave unto him that he SHOULD BE AN AGENT UNTO HIMSELF." Book of Commandments 29:41, 42. It therefore naturally follows that all the children of Adam are likewise free agents, but who have a stewardship under God over the things they possess, and should hold these possessions in common with their fellowmen, for the well being of the whole, but not that they should consign THEIR stewardship to some one to manage for them as a collective group.

In March, 1830, Martin Harris was counselled to "Impart a portion of thy property; yea, even A PART of thy lands and ALL save the support of thy family." Book of Commandments 16:36.

These are in perfect harmony with the other texts I have cited you to, and since the Bible and the Book of Mormon are basic, any purported revelation that conflicts with them may be spurious, and the position of the Church of Christ is that they must so harmonize with the basic scriptures.

In Acts 4 we read: "And the multitude of them that believed were OF ONE HEART AND ONE SOUL: neither said any of them that ought of the things **they** possessed was his own; but they had all things common, . . . neither was there any among them that lacked: for as many as were possessors of lands or houses sold them and brought the prices of the things that were sold, and laid them down AT THE APOSTLES' FEET: and distribution was made unto every man according as he had need. And Jones, who by the apostles was surnamed Barnabas, . . . a Levite, and of the country of Cyprus, having land, sold it, and brought the money, and laid it AT THE APOSTLES' FEET." Acts 4:32, 34, 35, 36, 37.

Again, in the above there is nothing that indicates that what was done was by a command of God. They did it of their own free will, the same as those in Book of Mormon times did, and because they had developed that state of brotherly love that they wanted to live in common with each other. Neither is there any actual proof that they sold ALL of their possessions, because in the next chapter we read that Ananias and his wife sold "A POSSESSION," and Peter in rebuking them did so because they lied and not because they did not give the whole price of the possession they sold to the apostles for the use of the church. Read the story there.

In the above article all of the emphasis is my own. The quotations are also from the Authorized Version of the Book of Mormon put out by the Reorganized Church.