

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 23

Independence, Missouri, February, 1946

Number 2

Look Pleasant

We cannot, of course, all be handsome,
And it's hard for us all to be good;
We are sure now and then to be lonely,
And we don't always do as we should.

To be patient is not always easy,
To be cheerful is much harder still;
But at least we can always be pleasant,
If we make up our minds that we will.

And it pays every time to look kindly,
Although you feel worried and blue;
If you smile at the world and be cheerful,
The world will smile back at you.

So, try to brace up and look pleasant,
No matter how low you are down;
Good humor is always contagious,
But you banish your friends when you frown.

Author Unknown.

CONTENTS

Editorial	Page 18	The Standard Bearers	Page 22
A Reminder	Page 19	When Was the Church Established	Page 24
A Testimony	Page 20	The Christian's Memorial Day	Page 26
Killed in Action	Page 21	Succession of Ministerial Authority	Page 27
Independence News	Page 21	Repentance	Page 29
Phoenix, Arizona	Page 21	Do You Just Get Along	Page 32

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

THE FOUNDATION

"How firm a foundation, ye saints of the Lord,
Is laid for your faith in His excellent word."

"According to the grace of God which is given unto me, as a wise master-builder, I have laid the foundation, and another buildeth thereupon. But let every man take heed how he buildeth thereupon. For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ. Now if any man build upon this foundation gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble; every man's work shall be made manifest; for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire; and the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is. If any man's work abide which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward. If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss; yet he himself shall be saved; yet as by fire."—1 Corinthians 3:10-15.

Here the Apostle Paul provides us with some rather profound reasoning, such as must be taken in connection with other scriptures, in order that we may obtain the full force of that in which he here seeks to instruct us.

In the first place Paul says, "I have laid the foundation," but it is very evident that the foundation HE laid was merely through his ministry as representative of the grace of God, "the great master-builder," and not of himself, because he further says, "Other foundation can no man lay than is laid, which is Jesus Christ." NO MAN EVER LAID that foundation. That foundation was laid by the great master architect in the early morning of creation, and through the ages men sent from God have been calling attention to that sure foundation.

However, there is more to the thought than the mere statement that Christ IS that sure foundation. As sure as the natural laws of life that enable us to maintain our being, are of divine origin, so sure is the infallible law of the atonement of the Christ through the

shedding of his precious blood, and the plan of salvation thus brought about, whereby man may again attain to his lost estate. If the foundation is sure, so equally are the principles of the gospel Christ gave as a saving means infallible, and not subject to change nor the manipulation of human idea or design.

However, before we give further attention to the type of material we MUST use acceptably when we undertake to build upon the foundation, Christ Jesus, we wish to notice a little further this idea of "foundation." Webster defines "foundation" to mean, "The masonry or solid ground upon which the walls of a building rests; the basis or groundwork of anything; that on which anything stands or is supported."

Hence, since Paul asserts that Christ is the ONLY foundation, and that no other foundation can be laid "than is laid," we fearlessly assert that human civilization was intended to rest upon that sure foundation and no other. A casual glance at this human civilization in this day and time, certainly should reveal the fact that the crumbling of this civilization is due to one fact only. That fact is that it has attempted to "LAY" OTHER foundations.

Then there is another text of scripture that brings in another phase of this study, and it also relates to the idea of "foundation." It is found in Matthew 16:13-18.

Here Christ is instructing his disciples with reference to his divine Messiahship, and incidentally says, "Upon this rock will I build my church." Here the idea of a foundation enters in, and while it, in no way, vitiates what has already been said, it DOES present another angle of it. The foundation rock here referred to does not mean Christ, because Christ is the speaker and is teaching the same lesson from another angle. The accompanying incidents of this story give us his meaning. His disciples had been out meeting the public as the ministers of Christ. Now Christ wants their reaction. "Whom do men say that I the Son of man am?" The answer is varied. Some said he was Elias or one of the prophets. Whereupon Christ puts them, his chosen disciples, to the test and asks, "But whom SAY YE, that I am? (Emphasis mine. B. C. F.) In other words, "In your ministry have you learned anything about me?" Peter the impetuous one boldly and without reservation answers, "Thou art the Christ the Son of the living God." Boldly spoken and wondrously true, but Peter how do you know whereof you speak? Jesus, overjoyed and gratified at this answer, gives Peter the one and only answer, "Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona; for flesh and blood hath not REVEALED it unto thee, but my Father who is in heaven." Now we have not only the answer as to WHY Peter could fearlessly assert the great truth, "THOU ART THE CHRIST, THE SON OF THE LIVING GOD," but also the source of that knowledge. "Flesh and blood did not REVEAL IT," but God did, and now we have the foundation stone upon which Christ then says he will "build my church." It is the rock of knowledge which Peter had that Jesus was the Christ, REVEALED not to him by flesh and blood, but by direct REVEALMENT from the great God of heaven. In short that "rock" was the "foundation" stone upon which Christ could and did "Build his church." And

whenever in any age the church has rested upon that sure rock of the knowledge of the divinity of Christ REVEALED directly from the great fountain of all truth, God himself, that church has been successful in properly representing the ONLY FOUNDATION to human civilization.

But now we come to the type of material we should use in erecting our spiritual structure, upon that one and only sure foundation. First, comes the belief that we may receive the knowledge by revelation from God, that Jesus is indeed the Christ. Then comes obedience to the principles for which Christ gave his life on the cross to make possible once again attainment from our lost estate. They are the "gold," "silver," and "precious stones." They are the enduring things. They are included in the "all things," that Jesus in his last conference with his disciples, as found in Matthew 28, and Mark 16, enjoined upon his disciples to teach if they were to be his representatives and would "build upon that foundation of life." They were to build upon that foundation, "gold," "silver," and "precious stones." Such building was to merit a reward, but if instead we undertake to build upon that sure foundation, the works and ideas of men, the perishable things that go to make up life in our modern world, the philosophies of men, politically and religiously, the things that divide and make the sacrifice of the Christ on the cross of no effect, then are we building with "wood," "hay," "stubble." And while, as the Apostle Paul, knowing full well the justice of God, says these works shall be burned, also says that the builder himself will be saved, "yet so as by fire." A slim salvation indeed, shorn of all of benefit from a life intendedly built upon the "one foundation," but of perishable material. ALL the work will have the fire test, but some will be inconsumable and will withstand the fiery test. How shall we learn what is "gold," "silver," and "precious stones" and what is "wood," "hay," "stubble?"

The hymn says, "How firm a foundation, ye saints of the Lord, Is laid for your faith in His excellent word."

What foundation is there that is laid in the Word? And what do we mean by the "word?" Do we mean the Scriptures, the Bible? If so, that does not contain the "foundation." The Scriptures are the standard of measurement. They are the "man of our counsel." They contain a record of what God has done for humanity through the ages, and they may have their source mainly in inspiration. But the Scriptures are of human compilation. How do we know they are true, and of divine origin? There are those who discount them and denounce them as fables. What answer do we give to such? There is but one answer. That is the fact of the true foundation having been made, and God proposes to sustain it. Peter in his answer to Christ gives the solution, or rather Christ gives it in commending Peter. "Flesh and blood," (the human word alone) does not reveal it to us, but God does. Paul also understood this because he says, "But I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached of me is not after man. For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ." Galatians 1:11, 12. Here we have the

same thought as was expressed by Christ to Peter.

The source then of the knowledge as to whether we are building upon the sure foundation, Christ, is first, direct contact with God through obedience to the fundamental principles of the gospel of Christ, as enumerated by Paul in Hebrews 6:1, 2, and as also indicated in James 1:5, "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all men liberally and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him."

Having done this, having made the contact with the divine fountain of truth, we may then test it by what "is written." "To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." Isaiah 8:20.

Added to all of the above there is human experience had through the years. It is so plainly manifest that when men have unselfishly given of their all to establish the truths of the gospel of Christ, there has then been builded that which is unperishable, "gold," "silver," "precious stones," because there has been much that has endured the test of time, and mankind has been blessed. On the other hand, when men have gone to war, have engendered hate, selfishness, and chaos, then has the building of "wood," "hay," "stubble," been made manifest.

The gospel has again been restored to earth. The sure "foundation" has again been elevated to where mankind may see it. Upon this foundation have men again sought to build acceptably. Upon this restored understanding of the sure foundation there is evidence of some building of the enduring things, and there has been some building of the perishable. The future lies before us. What will our answer be?

B. C. FLINT

JUST A REMINDER

While we are able to make a very splendid report regarding the progress of your church paper, the Zion's Advocate, there is also a little reminder we would like to make at this time, or in the beginning of this another year. This we will call attention to later, but first, we wish to say that there is no printing debt against the Advocate. This is the first time, we believe, that this could be said since we have been a member of the Church of Christ. In this connection, we would like to report that we have in our possession receipts from our Advocate Business manager for over six hundred dollars, (\$600.00) which has been sent to us direct as editor from all over the field as an Advocate fund. The idea is that our people like the Advocate and want to see it live. Of course, there has also been in addition to this regular renewals and new subscriptions. We do not know how much has gone directly into the office besides what has come to us personally.

Another encouraging thing is the fact that we are receiving requests from members of some of the other restoration groups for permission to reproduce matter appearing in our paper.

Many other encouraging things might be mentioned, but here is the reminder we wish to call to your attention. In looking over our mailing list we note there are still quite a number of readers in arrears on

their subscriptions. Will all readers please check the label on the wrapper of their paper, and see if they are among those in arrears. For instance, if the numbers following your name reads something like this: "10-44," it means that your subscription expired October, 1944. If everyone will do this and then try to bring their subscriptions up to date it will help keep the splendid record, and also help keep the Advocate coming to you.

On the other hand, if there might be those who no longer desire to be numbered among our readers, will such kindly so inform our Business Manager so that those names may be removed from our mailing list, thus enabling him to keep his mailing list representative of our real readers.

Just one more thing. If you know there is anything wrong with the address on your label, kindly let us know so that no one desiring the Advocate will be disappointed by not getting the paper. Thanks and Happy New Year to everybody.

EDITOR.

A TESTIMONY, AND NARRATIVE

By Apostle James E. Yates

(Extract from original letter to his granddaughter.)

The **narrative** concerns our Communion Services in the Church of Christ at Phoenix, Arizona, on Sunday, January 6, 1946.

The **Testimony** is a part of that delivered by the writer in said meeting.

It truly seems to me of late, that the fruitage of my prayers which reach back through long experiences of struggling, hard, tedious years, is being borne to me in richer abundance than ever before in my life.

I speak this, not so much of material things, as I do of the **Increased Spiritual Light** which bursts upon and floods my soul with the Holiest of Spiritual Illumination in the Knowledge of **Newly-Discerned, Eternal Truth**.

At the Church here yesterday, we really had one of the most **Wonderful Spiritual Feasts** which it has ever been my privilege to enjoy.

I state that advisedly and, I am sure, without exaggeration. We had the Chapel fairly well filled at the Sacrament and Communion Service. Elder and Sister Furnier, of Michigan, were with us.

Early in the meeting it was easy to discern that the **Spiritual Harmony** and mental accord of **all present**—young and old—was nearly a **one hundred per cent** unit, in all the features of our worship.

Elder E. Leon Yates, our pastor at the present, was in charge. Elder Oren A. Caviness sat at his left. I sat at his right. While the bread and wine was being served, I was prompted to arise and make a statement to the assembly concerning our dear Brother and Sister Furnier who were in worshipful accord with us, although members of a separate division of the Church of the Restoration, known as the "Bickertonites," a mere nickname, of course.

Being directed of the Holy Spirit to say what was

spoken, the delivery of that brief and simple statement though it was, had the effect to spiritually electrify and inspire the hearts and souls of those present.

Thus it was that when the presiding elder arose to announce that the meeting was open for each and all to occupy as the Holy Spirit should lead, he already having delivered one of the most brilliant and impressive exhortations ever heard in any assembly, Elder Furnier arose and delivered and sang a very beautiful hymn, by the Holy Spirit. It was a hymn of which he testifies that he knew neither the words, nor the music, but which was given upon his tongue in perfect meter and poetic caste and tone as he sang. Also, despite the fact that none of us in the assembly had ever heard either the words or the music, and the further fact that none knew an instant before that such a spiritual gift would be given, yet a number in the assembly **JOINED IN THE SINGING**, at least in humming the air. Some of us also voiced many of the words.

I myself joined in the hymn as it flowed, though there had been no invitation to any, to do so. In order to articulate the words of the hymn, or to voice its tone, it was necessary to obtain it upon the instant as it flowed, in the same manner in which it was being delivered by the voice of our brother who led that singing.

It was almost as on the day of Pentecost when **"there appeared unto them cloven tongues as of fire, and sat upon each of them."**

It was an experience which, for those of us who witnessed it, the meaning of the Scriptures in 1 Cor. 14:26, will stand out with clarity, ever after.

But in this narrative, I can give but little of that **Blessed Peace** which flooded all our souls, as we, in Holy Fellowship, partook together of that Spiritual Feast, in the humble Chapel of the Church of Christ here at our first communion service of the New Year, on January 6, 1946. We are thankful to our Lord for all.

But I must close this letter, as it begins to take almost the form of an epistle to the church. Yours affectionately,

JAMES E. YATES.

EDITOR'S NOTE

In connection with this testimony from Brother Yates, we can say that we are not in the least surprised. We have known Brother and Sister Furnier, Brother Furnier being one of the apostles of the so-called Bickertonite group, for a goodly number of years, and we have felt the sweet spirit and bond of unity that has always accompanied our association. Further we know that Brother and Sister Furnier are far ahead of their group in understanding of the restored gospel, and sometimes DO find themselves out of harmony with all that is done in their group. In Detroit, Michigan, where they live they are real leaders and often do they meet with our people there, and wish to further weld the tie in gospel service with us. They are both very sincere and lovable people. May God bless and lead them is our prayer.

B. C. FLINT

The Standard Bearers

STORIES OF THE RESTORATION

Liberty Jail

In writing these stories of the great latter day restoration, we are sometimes thrilled at the outstanding evidence of the fact that God is in the work and has been leading his ministry and membership in a most marvelous way, thus bringing unmistakable evidence of the truthfulness of the work. Then again we are shocked at the terrible sufferings and brutal persecution with which they were met by those they sought to serve.

True, all along this checkered history we find evidence of the human manifesting itself among the people of God in such a marked manner that we are made to wonder at the paradoxical panorama that covers the long trail from Palmyra, New York, when the young fifteen-year-old boy, Joseph Smith, went to the woods to pray and was there met by divinity, and received instruction that was designed to revolutionize the whole course of religious thought in the world. In short it turned back the pages of time and brought mankind once more into the direct presence of God through the ministration of the gospel according to ALL that God has ever done for his creation.

In all of this it would seem that the pathway thus laid out was so clear and unsullied with human tradition, that there never again would be a reversion to the world and worldly things. Yet, so fickle is human thinking that regardless of all the evidences of divinity in the great restoration movement, the power of duplicity to stampede and sidetrack through diverse inventions and institutions of what others have set up as substitutes, have claimed the attention and interest of even God's own chosen servants. And it has ever been so. The mere fact of Christ being in the midst of humanity DID NOT prevent the things of the world entering in and eventually causing the church of his own fashioning to go into dark and overwhelming apostasy.

The work of the church has ever been missionary, and for the salvation of souls. Yet in every age including our own, many and manifold have been the devices of men to draw attention away from the real purpose of the gospel into that which will build up institutionalism and churchianity.

So, in looking over our history we find this tendency to have often prevailed and with disastrous results. In this, however, we do not wish to detract from the noble sacrifices that have been made by equally noble men and women in their efforts to pioneer a new and unpopular movement.

We have told of the early persecutions that were visited on the founders of the Restoration. We have told of their faithful adherence to their faith in the face of persecution and death. We have told about the cruel massacre at Haun's Mill, and now we will take up the story of the Prophet Joseph Smith's personal share in those shocking experiences.

In connection with the Haun's Mill massacre, and the condition in which the saints found themselves in other adjacent counties, there seemed to be no place in the state of Missouri, where the saints could peaceably settle and live at peace with the Missourians. This doubtless was aggravated by the order of Governor Boggs that the saints should be driven from the state or be exterminated.

We have already told about the effort to set aside Caldwell county as an asylum for the saints, and how that in all other places their property was confiscated, or destroyed, their homes burned and other acts of persecution, and that finally the most bitter persecution came upon them in the very county to which they had been assigned, and in which by written agreement they were to remain unmolested. As a result of a plea to the state legislature, they were awarded the small sum of one thousand dollars in payment for the losses they had sustained from the mobbers. But the same legislature that awarded this small sum also appropriated the sum of two hundred thousand dollars with which to carry on the persecution. And strange to say, a reading of the minutes of those sessions of the legislature discloses some of the most brilliant and able defenses of the saints by members of that legislature to be found anywhere in history. Gov. Boggs exterminating order was called by its proper name, "cold-blooded murder." However, the majority was for the continued persecution and expulsion of the saints; so these friendly efforts by the friends of the saints in the legislature came to naught, except to write high on honor's roll the names of those genuine friends of justice and honor.

Joseph Smith and about fifty-three of his associate ministers were arrested and charged with treason, murder, arson, theft, and about every crime it was possible to humanly conceive of. They were brought before Judge A. A. King of Richmond, Ray County, a staunch Methodist, and one of the bitterest foes of the restoration, who made it clear from the beginning that he intended to find the prisoners guilty regardless of the evidence. He made a great play on the prophecy of Daniel, concerning the statement that, "In the days of those kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom," etc., particularly that part which reads: "and the kingdom and the greatness of the kingdom, under the whole heavens, shall be given to the saints of the Most High," etc., seeking to make it appear that this was the aim and purpose of the saints seeking to settle in Missouri as a land of Zion.

In this sham court it was impossible for the prisoners to obtain witnesses because the court and the mobbers who made up the prosecution witnesses, saw in the naming of witnesses for the defendants a further opportunity to capture more of the saints because every witness called for was immediately added to the prisoner's list. Speaking of which, Gen. Doniphan, who acted as counsel for the prisoners, said: "As to making an impression on King, if a cohort of

angels were to come down from heaven and declared we were clear, it would be the same, for he (King) had determined to cast the prisoners into prison."

As a result of this trial about half of the accused were released and the remainder were to be sent to Liberty jail, in Clay County.

Here is the mittimus consigning them to that old jail:

State of Missouri, Ray County.

"To the Keeper of the Jail of Clay County. Greetings:

"Whereas, Joseph Smith, Jr., Hyrum Smith, Lyman Wight, Alexander McRae, and Caleb Baldwin, as also Sidney Rigdon, have been brought before me, Austin A. King, judge of the fifth judicial district in the state of Missouri, and charged with the offense of treason against the State of Missouri, and the said defendants, on their examination before me, being held to answer further to said charge, and the said Joseph Smith, Jr., Hyrum Smith, Lyman Wight, Alexander McRae, and Caleb Baldwin to answer in the County of Daviess, and the said Sidney Rigdon to answer further in the county of Caldwell, for said charge of treason, and there being no jail in said counties: These are therefore to command that you receive the said Joseph Smith, Jr., Hyrum Smith, Lyman Wight, Alexander McRae, Caleb Baldwin, and Sidney Rigdon into your custody in the jail of the said Clay county, there to remain until they be delivered therefrom by due course of law.

"Given under my hand and seal, on the 29th day of November, 1838.

"Austin A. King."

It is at this stage of the story that the military arm of the persecution of the saints enters in. Generals Clark, Wilson, Lucas, Doniphan and others had been charged with the duty of not only conveying the prisoners to Liberty jail, but also with the carrying out of the Governor's orders to drive the saints out of Missouri or exterminate them. In this last General Doniphan repulsed the Governor's order, stating that "the days of extermination were over." Added to this he was a staunch friend of the saints, and had been the attorney for the defendants in Judge King's court.

The others, Gen. Clark in particular, entered with fiendish glee into the carrying out of every type of persecution. In fact, he and the others seemed to vie with each other in the fact that they had the honor (?) of having the "royal Mormon captives," as they styled them under their particular charge. Gen. Clark assumed full control and ordered a court martial to try the six leading men who were to be consigned to Liberty jail. This court martial found them guilty of a great number of crimes, and sentenced them to be shot on the following Monday.

Gen. Clark selected a firing squad and told them that they were to have the honor of shooting the Mormon Prophet and his associate leaders, and all preparations were made. Then the General stopped to consider just how far his jurisdiction went. Here were six men civilians and ministers of the gospel being sentenced by a military court to be shot. Anyhow, when Monday came the men were not shot, but having caught what he considered a curiosity, he pro-

ceeded to transport them from town to town as a sort of exhibit. This part of the story is very interesting but we will not have space to go into detail. Suffice it to say this very thing led to some interesting results, and we will give just one. Here it is as Joseph himself tells it: "Sunday, 4th. We were visited by some ladies (as we were all in chains) and gentleman. One of the women came up and inquired of the troops which of the prisoners was the Lord whom the 'Mormons' worshipped. One of the guards pointed to me with a significant smile and said, 'This is he.' The woman then turning to me inquired whether I professed to be the Lord and Savior. I replied that I professed to be nothing but a man and a minister of salvation, sent by Jesus Christ to preach the gospel. This answer so surprised the woman that she began to inquire into our doctrine, and I preached a discourse both to her and her companions and to the wondering soldiers, who listened with almost breathless attention while I set forth the doctrine of faith in Jesus Christ, and repentance, and baptism for the remission of sins, with the promise of the Holy Ghost, as recorded in the second chapter of the Acts of the Apostles. The woman was satisfied and praised God in the hearing of the soldiers, and went away praying that God would deliver and protect us. Thus was fulfilled a prophecy which had been spoken publicly by me a few months previous—that a sermon should be preached in Jackson County by one of our elders before the close of 1838."

The Liberty jail to which they were consigned was but little more than a cave in the side of the hill. It was of rough stone with stone floor. No furniture of any kind, and they had to sleep on the floor with rats and vermin crawling over their bodies, and here they languished for six long months. Three times they were administered poison, and nearly died. In fact, in their miserable state they would have welcomed death, were it not for the responsibility they felt they still had to assist in the building up of God's kingdom in these last days. Here it was that one of the darkest pictures in American history was perpetrated. While they were thus incarcerated, the work of plunder and rapine was going on outside among the saints, and human flesh from their dead brethren was fed to the prisoners in the jail. The mobbers called it "Mormon beef." Speaking of this Joseph says, (because the Lord showed him what it was, and he refused to eat it. Lyman Wight was the only one who actually ate it. "I have described the appearance of this flesh to several experienced physicians, and they have decided that it was human flesh. We learned afterwards, by one of the guards that it was supposed that that act of savage cannibalism, in feeding us with human flesh, would be considered a popular deed of notoriety, but the people, on learning that it would not take, tried to keep it a secret; but the fact was noised abroad before they took that precaution."

Finally the guards, realizing that there was nothing going to come of it, told the prisoners that they were going to get some whiskey and have a big time and go to sleep, and if the prisoners were there in the morning they would be foolish. They had even provided horses, and so those weary, starved servants of

(Continued on page 31)

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.

WHEN WAS THE CHURCH ESTABLISHED?

Recently a "Voice of Warning" was handed me, and in glancing at it my eyes rested on a quotation on the top of the first page. "I have established my church in 1929 anew." I have been giving some thought to the above claim, and have wondered about it. Quoting farther, "I have given the message and it must be obeyed, all else is of man, and I cannot and will not accept the follies and traditions of men, for my work is a holy work, and man must be made holy," Message 30:6 by Fetting.

The above statements are vital if true, and dangerous if not true. To claim after a hundred years that everything the Lord did during the years from 1823 to 1830 had been completely rejected is making a very strong claim. In my studies of the prophecies concerning the restoration, I have been compelled to conclude that the work of the Lord as restored during the period mentioned above, was to be permanent and was not to be destroyed, but to stand forever, and to roll till it filled the whole earth, and was to break in pieces the image of Daniel, Dan. 2:28-44, Isaiah 11:12, Isa. 62:10-11, Malachi 3:1-2, "Behold I will send my messenger and he shall prepare the way before me." "Therefore I will proceed to do a marvelous work among this people, even a marvelous work and a wonder" Isa. 29:14-17. "And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, to every kindred and tongue." Rev. 14:6.

If the above prophecies were fulfilled, and the Lord had to reject all that has been done during those first years, 1823 to 1830, then the Satanic forces were stronger than the Lord, and destroyed the force of those prophecies, and the work known as the restoration has completely failed.

We might just review a little of the history of those times, and if possible learn a little concerning the restoration. On September 21, 1823, a young lad became concerned about his eternal welfare, and because of the "lo here and lo theres" he became confused. In reading the book of James he found the promise, "If any lack wisdom let him ask of God" he put that promise to the test and went to the woods to pray, two forces presented themselves. The first force sought to destroy him, and he appealed to the Lord, and the evil force was dispelled. Then he claims to have had a vision of the Father and the Son, appearing to him, and he was given some instructions. You may read that in the history of that time. Following that he had other messengers come to him, and finally the work of translating the records that were placed in his hands came, and as a result we have the Book of Mormon. If the Lord rejected the work of Joseph Smith, then the

Book of Mormon is also out, and I am sure no true believer of the restoration would accept that idea. Space will not allow of going into a detailed report but it would not be out of place to suppose that all believers of the restoration were familiar with the history.

The Book of Mormon was published and placed on sale the latter part of 1829, and during those years from 1823 to 1830 the priesthood, or right to represent God, was restored and men were called of God to represent him. I wonder if those who believe the church was established in 1929 anew, consider the priesthood that was conferred on those men of those early days was valid.

If the prophecy of Daniel is true, then that church to be set up in the latter times was not to be destroyed or left to other people, but was to continue till it filled the whole earth. Then the claim that the church was established anew in 1929 fails flat. Either Daniel was wrong and Fetting right or vice versa. I ask, dear reader, which will you accept? The Lord through the prophet Isaiah said, "To the law and the testimony, if they speak not according to this word there is no light in them." Either Daniel was in harmony, or was not.

The Bible and the Book of Mormon are the standard books. They contain the fulness of the gospel, and that which does not agree with them is not to be trusted. The Lord will not contradict himself, and he says he changes not, his course is one eternal round. If that which says there must be a new church established comes from God, then God does not keep his word.

When the angel came to Joseph Smith he gave instruction as to the establishing of the church, and we find that they proceeded to organize; and on the sixth day of April, 1830, there was a partial organization effected. We find the Satanic forces were endeavoring to thwart the designs of God, and man was, and is, subject to the suggestions of both forces. We are told that Satan has the power to transform himself into an angel of light, and because of the inexperience of the men of that day they were led into error, and evils crept in. But the work of restoring the priesthood, the right to represent God, was not altered. Men had been chosen, and while some of them went astray, all did not follow the suggestions of the Satanic forces, and while the church was broken up during the period following the death of Joseph in 1844, the work commenced was not completely destroyed. True, it had a setback, but there were those who believed they had been called of God, and had received the evidence of said call, and refused to follow the leadership of those who set themselves up as successors to the prophet. God in his wisdom preserved a remnant or will I say remnants, and when the evils of polygamy

and kindred evils began to be known, they refused to accept, and withdrew themselves. And, to make a long story short, we find a movement being started under the ministry of Briggs and Gurley, from which developed what is known as the Reorganization. For years they struggled for a foothold, and finally under the leadership of the late Joseph Smith became a well founded group, and the Lord did bless them, and they prospered spiritually. But there came a time when a move was made, and succeeded in placing power in the hands of one man, or will I say three, known as the presidency, again the charge of apostasy was laid at the door of the church. Man sought control, and succeeded. Many refused to accept the innovation, and cast about and sought to know what to do, or where to go. They did not want to set up a new church.

There was a little group on the Temple Lot who had held their identity through the years. They had refused to follow any of the various divisions, but held to the idea that the church did not need to be reset up, or reorganized, but that there should be a continuation. And, while there had to be some adjustments made, and as the years passed they began to, and did repudiate evils that had made their appearance, they were preserved as a remnant through the years, and in 1864 they were told to prepare to move to Independence in 1867. They made the necessary preparation, and moved to Missouri early in 1867. They were never molested, and gradually bought up the parcels of land composing the Temple Lot. At the spring conference of 1918 of the Reorganized Church a working agreement of harmony was established, and the Saints' Herald of April 24, 1918, has this to say, Elbert A. Smith being the writer, "This assembly conceded that our Church of Christ brethren had established their claims so far as they may be involved in tracing baptism and priesthood back to valid and original sources. As an organization they have held to the fundamental doctrines of the church, and have been guilty of no moral lapse.

"In fact in the face of adroit efforts to bribe and seduce them from their trust they have kept themselves clear from evil forces and designing men. Hence no charge of apostasy from the original faith could be supported were there any among us inclined at this time to make such a charge."

Efforts have been made since 1925 to make it appear that the Church of Christ had departed from the faith, but they have continued to adhere to the principles of the gospel as outlined in the Bible and the Book of Mormon, and have steadfastly refused to accept of any innovations. Therefore, the charge that they have departed is far from being true. For a time there was an approval set on the so-called messages through Otto Fetting, but when the attempt was made to introduce the dogma of re-baptism, they refused to accept of such a drastic change, that everyone should be re-baptized, and of course there was a break, some pulling away, and then the charge of apostasy or rejection was made. Yes, they rejected the idea that they all had to be re-baptized, but at no time has the Church of Christ rejected, or apostatized from the

"original faith" of the gospel, therefore the charge falls flat, and the claim that the church was established anew in 1929 is not from God, but of man, or some other source.

The question, "Is the church led by God or man?" is as vital today as at any time in the past. Satan still has power to transform himself into an angel of light, and man is seemingly as easily deceived as at any time in the past. In the first message through Otto Fetting we note that the Messenger said, "I will not hold you accountable for the mistakes of others," yet in the 12th message he said to be baptized to rid themselves of the sins (mistakes) and traditions of men. It seems to be a direct contradiction from the first. But in this same 12th message we note a thought "for the Lord has reserved unto himself this remnant on the Temple Lot to set his church in order." Now in the 13th message we note in paragraph 6, "The Church of Christ will never again be destroyed, for it shall continue on its work until Christ shall come."

The above quotation was given prior to the October conference of 1929 and there was no thought of the Church of Christ being rejected, or being established anew. There had been no separation at that time. Surely, the Lord had sufficient foresight to know that a setting up of the church again would take place. It was only a very short time following that message that the conference convened, and the division took place. It might be interesting to note that in the 14th message reference was made to Walter L. Gates taking charge of the work at the office on the Temple Lot, and other information as to the work; no hint of rejection.

Now dear reader, if the church on the Temple Lot had gone astray, why was it necessary to set up the church "anew," why not a continuation? Surely, if the Fetting idea was right it should have been a continuation rather than a new start.

In the 14th message, 6th paragraph we note, "as the people of the Lord who have a desire to cleanse themselves of the traditions of men shall come to the Lord's servants, baptize them." Please tell me where in the Bible or Book of Mormon do we find that the Christ ever asked his people to be "baptized to rid themselves of the traditions of men"? Or, where at any time he held one person responsible for what some other person had done? Now in the 15th message we note, "And inasmuch as they have done this, the Lord has rejected them and their work." This was dated October 13, 1929, just a few days after the conference in which the action was taken against re-baptism. Surely, God is not inconsistent in his dealings with men. He would not reject a person, or persons, for refusing to accept, even if true, council he had given. He would, or rather history shows that he has dealt more leniently with folks. He knows the workings of contending powers much better than humans.

But this is getting lengthy and I must not monopolize space at the expense of others.

God has given man the power to reason, and when man allows revelation to supplant reason he destroys the force of both. True revelation will appeal to the reasoning powers of man, and not in any way

destroy it. The Lord through Isaiah said, "Come now and let us reason together." God reasons with man. He does not reject a people for one or even two offences, even if they do offend; which in this case was not an offense, but a rejection of that which was honestly believed to be false.

Following the 12th message and the departure from the church by those who continued with the messages, we have no further plans for the temple. The claim was made by Mr. Fetting that he had the plans in a strong box in a bank; but since his death, no trace of them have been found, at least I have never heard of such a claim.

I might add that the setting up of a church by Mr. Fetting did not take place till their conference in April, 1930. They refused the invitation by the Church of Christ (Temple Lot) to return and take their places in said church; thus, there was no church set up in 1929 if considered in the light of facts.

The Lord has not been the author of division, and he does not scatter his people. The plea of the Master was for unity, and the group on the Temple Lot has ever held out the invitation to unite; and where differences exist that it be taken to the Lord with a willingness to set aside individual or group ideas, and thus with open minds approach the Deity. They still occupy such a position and will gladly meet with any and all groups in such a move. There must be a unifying of the forces of righteousness if the task allotted is ever accomplished. It cannot be done by a divided people.

"Come and let us reason together saith the Lord." Surely, every honest thinker would be willing to let the Lord decide which is right, and be willing to be guided by him.

Yours for the final accomplishment of the purposes of the Lord and with good wishes for all.

WM. F. ANDERSON.

THE CHRISTIANS MEMORIAL DAY

It has often been said, "There is reason in all things" and surely there should be. There are different "days" observed by different nations and peoples, as special memorial days for them.

Our own nation, the United States of America, continues in loyal reverence to Fourth of July when the Declaration of Independence was approved and signed liberating the thirteen colonies from a foreign government. This Fourth of July day, the victory gained by the events of that day, is of special interest to the people of this nation. It is well known that the people of Ireland have their own special memorial day—17th of March. The people of Texas observe with sacred devotion the 21st day of April when Sam Houston and his brave Patriots won the victory over Santa Anna, the Mexican General, and made Texas the Free Lone Star State.

The colored people of the South are loyal to their Emancipation Day—June 19. It was my pleasure to observe this devotion in 1891—working as a bricklayer in Texas. The colored laborers refused to work on June 19. When the boss mentioned the question, they solemnly declared, "No sir, boss, this is our holiday." Therefore it is plain to observe that different na-

tions and people have their own special memorial day.

The Christian people have their day—the Israelites or Jews have theirs. We have no national law, or any divine law that the strict observance of any of these memorial days will secure or hinder our salvation in the kingdom of God.

The Seventh Day Sabbath was a local affair, restricted and applied to Israel, and to them alone. No mention is made in the Bible of any other race who was commanded to observe that day. **The Day or the Event** did not apply to any other people. Why should other nations or people in that time be compelled or commanded to keep that Jewish Memorial Day? The fact is they were not so commanded. No **reason** existed then nor now that any other people should be required to sacredly observe, or to give any attention whatever to this Jewish Memorial Day. There is not a line or a verse in the writings of Moses to indicate that any other people except the Jews who were liberated from Egyptian bondage, were to observe that day.

What **reason** could be suggested that the Germans should be compelled to observe the 17th of March as their memorial day; and if they refused to observe the day, send them to hell for neglect. Or if the Italians and Japs refuse to honor and observe the 19th of June as a sacred memorial day—well, the thought of it is too absurd and unreasonable to give the question even human consideration. But we are today surrounded by a zealous army of people known as Seventh Day Adventists who insist and demand that all Christians must observe that Old Jewish Sabbath Memorial Day or be lost in the jungles of torment. **Christians**, who had no part, lot, or interest in the flight from Egypt, or the safe crossing through the Sea; **Christians** have something better to observe; something broader and more lasting, more sacred, and applying to the whole race of mankind. A principle of eternal salvation embodied in the Gospel of Jesus the Christ—the day when Christ won the glorious victory over all the powers of earth and the grave—**his resurrection from the dead**. Then meeting his devoted but sorrowing disciples, he gave the shout of victory—"Behold, I am alive forever." And by his glorious victory over all powers of earth he made it possible for all men to pass through the waters of baptism—over to the land of safety which leads on to the Promised Land. All nations of Christians may join in celebrating and observing this, **the Christian Memorial Day**. Moses was not the universal and Divine Savior—he was the "Type of Christ," shadow of things to come. He was a law to "Bring us to Christ." That law of Moses—not being perfect, can never bring the comers unto perfection. In the sacred lines, Moses' law is referred to as Hager—the bond woman: Cast out the bond woman and her son: "Nailed to the cross": a school master to bring us to Christ. The human tradition of the Jews made them firm for the law of Moses. So in our day we have those blinded by tradition clinging to the carnal commandments and the law of Moses. Christ is our law giver—he is our Savior.

His right to give credit where credit is due—give

Moses credit for what he did—he opened the way for a few thousand slaves in severe bondage to find freedom in a better land. The work and victory of Christ made it possible for all men to be free from the bondage of sin and death and a better, yes, a most glorious place where Christ is, "There ye shall be also," a life eternal in divine glory.

History is worthy of our confidence when it records the observance of Sunday, the day of the resurrection, when the early day Christians had their sacred gatherings on the first day of the week, the very day when the Lord arose from the dead. That established the day of final victory, then the Christ won the victory over death. Christians celebrate that day as their—Christian Memorial Day.

RICHARD MICHAEL MALONEY.

1518 N. W. 44th St., Oklahoma City, Okla.

SUCCESSION OF MINISTERIAL AUTHORITY

Where to be Found

(Reviewed by B. C. Flint)

There has come to our desk a neat little fourteen page pamphlet under the above heading and written and circulated by Elder B. L. McKim, of the Protest Group.

This little pamphlet is well written and quite plausible in its arguments, and withal written in a kindly, Christian spirit which invites a reply in kind. So we undertake a review briefly of its outstanding features, which to the person unacquainted with church history, might seem quite convincing.

On pages 2 and 3, our brother makes this very splendid statement concerning the mission of the Church of Christ, restored in these last days, and which we believe to be fundamental to any age. He says, "Going into," all the world and preaching the gospel is the primary object of the Church of Christ, and the church is the machine, or body, organized so that work can be better accomplished. It is the gospel that saves men and not the church. It is possible to belong to the church and yet not be saved by the gospel.

"In the church being built for that purpose then we can expect that so long as it is functioning toward that end the Lord will be working in and through it and the people will be blessed with the greater blessings of God in connection with it. (The blessings, or gifts, mentioned in 1. Cor. 12, are mostly had in organized bodies of peoples who are of "one mind and one heart.") But on the other hand it is only reasonable to believe that if the time ever came when the church was being run in a way contrary to God's purpose, in the preaching of the gospel as of first importance, and its work was being directed towards ends not needed in the carrying out of its fundamental purpose, and was using its time, money, and energy, in trying to put over some other program, or policy, regardless of what that program might be, and thereby lessening its primary duty, of missionary work first, then we could expect the Lord to withdraw his support from it and no longer sustain it by his power."

Then on page 4 of this pamphlet we read this very fine and logical analysis of the prerogatives of

priesthood or the ministry: "When those men were called to be ministers for Christ to work in connection with the church, they were to establish, it only seems reasonable to believe, that since their authority gave them the right to build the church, that it would give them the right to "watch over the church," and see that it functioned for the purpose it was intended to function too. In not getting their authority, to preach the gospel, from the church, the church being the child of authority, and authority not a child of the church, then in their "occupying" they had a responsibility to see that the church worked continuously toward the end for which it was organized. If needed their mission was crying repentance to the church too. In fact, if there were things entering the church, which was bringing about a change in its purpose, and policy, from that intended, then would not duty demand that those who saw the changes cry out and warn the church of her danger?"

Yet after thus placing the responsibility of bringing the physical church organization into being squarely upon the shoulders of the ministry called of God, our brother invokes the history of the rise and progress of the Church of the Restoration, and shows that early in that history innovations of various types began to make their appearance in the body and prevailed, regardless of the "crying out" on the part of many of the ministry through the years, and that eventually it resulted in the complete apostasy and rejection of the church at the time of the Prophet Joseph Smith's death in Nauvoo. In this he insists that the rejection was complete, and touched every part of the church, even the remote locals which had no part in, nor were, in any way responsible for the innovations that brought about the state of rejection.

THEN, because of this COMPLETE rejection of the WHOLE church nothing was left on earth but individual priesthood, and that the only way that the church physically could again come into being would be FOR GOD to take a hand and start a NEW church. This he claims was done as note the following on page 6 where speaking of the course followed by those ministers who refused to follow any of the factions or leaders of factions, he says: "They did not go back into the "Old Church," which went out West, from which they were cast out and join in her worship, for the Church never repented but continued her downward course; but they went back to where Christ stood and will always stand. They renounced all of the different leaders, and factions, and **came together**, and stood for the purpose the objective, Christ intended in building his church. Then it was that he directed them to again build his church as at the first. And thus by command of God their authority was transferred to be used in connection with the "New Church" they were directed to build. That was the beginning of the Reorganization. The building of a "New Church," by the direction of God, which the "Reorganization," is, establishes another fact of great importance."

Our brother then follows the line of reasoning that since the WHOLE church was rejected that there was no such thing as there remaining a "remnant," of the original church which might act as a nucleus

which God might be able to use through which to continue his work. All groups of the "old church," are placed on a par and are made partakers of the "rejection" insisted upon having taken place. In this he strongly criticizes the working articles of agreement. He strongly criticizes the statements of Elbert A. Smith and Frederick M. Smith wherein they contend that there was valid priesthood, and valid administration among the group on the Temple Lot, and that the position thus taken, that those old timers were not guilty of apostasy but held their priesthood in righteousness before God, was inconsistent and that there was no room for anything but a "New Organization," and that in this the Reorganization qualified as the ONLY bonafide and true Church of Christ on earth. He quotes the late Joseph Smith wherein he claims a revelation in which it is stated as follows: "The Saints reorganizing at Zarahemla and other places is the only organized portion of the church accepted by me." Church History vol. 3, page 263. Upon this purported revelation he bases his whole contention that anything in conflict therewith MUST be false and unethical. AND all of this was the order until the Reorganization in turn, in 1925 again went into apostasy, and is consequently another "rejected church," which, if true, will make it necessary for God, or the valid priesthood, or somebody again starting another "New Church." And so on ad infinitum.

Now let us examine this whole proposition. In the first place we can hardly accept to the degree that it is here presented to us, that the WHOLE responsibility of bringing the physical church into being rests with valid human authority. God DID have a large part in the forming of the church in the beginning of the restoration. If our brother is correct, church organization in the first instance was a "child," of authority, but in the case of the Reorganization it came into being by "command" of God.

So much for that, we do not want to make this paper too long. We will now notice the idea of "Church Rejection." The only official statement which we have that the "Old Church" was rejected is found in connection with the doctrine of "baptism for the dead." In this we are told that there was to be a font in the new Nauvoo temple wherein was to be performed the rite of baptism for the dead. They were told that they were to be given a sufficient time in which to complete that building, and that until such building WAS completed their baptisms for the dead were acceptable in the river. (History reveals that such baptisms for the dead were being performed in the river regularly.) History says the work on the temple went on leisurely, until presently the startling announcement was made by revelation (?) that their baptisms for the dead were no longer acceptable in the river and that "they stood rejected as a CHURCH with their dead." As stated this is the only direct official statement that the "Old Church" was rejected. We do not know if it is to this incident that our brother refers when he informs us that the ENTIRE church was rejected or not. We hope not, because this would commit God and the priesthood authority to one of the grossest of the innovations. He infers that the death of the prophet and conditions at Nau-

voo was the cause for rejection, but we feel that it is very illogical to seek to drive any stakes on this matter, because there had been the innovations of High Priests as an order in priesthood, a first presidency of three, a fantastic city of Zion, military orders and many other things that we now feel were foreign to the plan of salvation; and not the least of which was that while the purported temple of the Lord lagged in the building there in Nauvoo, they DID build and complete a Masonic Temple at Nauvoo. So in our efforts to drive a stake as to the exact date of rejection we find ourselves in something of a labyrinth of confusion. AND, since many of the old timers, who were in an equally organized condition with the local in Nauvoo, were in no way a party to the innovations there, why should they be held to be in a rejected condition? Is our brother going to take the position that the CENTRALIZED form of government which had its seat in Nauvoo with Presidencies, High Priests, Military organizations, WAS IN FACT THE CHURCH? And if it was the church did that mean that it had power to drag down to divine rejection those faithful local churches which not only were NOT a party to the above mentioned innovations, but were in open opposition thereto? And if there were such faithful local churches, could not one of them be a "remnant" of the church and not a "faction." Webster defines faction to mean, "A party in disloyal opposition, etc." The fact that both Elbert A., and Frederick M. Smith were forced to admit that no charge of apostasy could be alleged against the church on the Temple Lot, shows that they were definitely NOT a party in disloyal opposition to the church as originally fashioned, and which being true **could** act as a nucleus for a continuation of the Church of Christ restored in these latter days.

But again reverting to this idea of a complete rejection of the church set up as a restoration of the gospel in these latter days. The ministry of that restoration have had no trouble through the years in pointing to scriptural prediction after prediction that provides for a complete restoration of primitive Christianity. There is Christ's statement in Matthew 24, that, "this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world as a witness and then shall the end come"; or, John on the Isla of Patmos that an angel was to bring back the everlasting gospel before the hour of God's judgment, and the hundred and one others that we have used through the years. But where are the texts that it would be logical to conclude would be found to tell us about the repeated apostasies which were to be a part of that restoration of the gospel, or which would indicate that God would be under the necessity of again and again starting the church "anew"? The very texts referred to seem to indicate that this restoration was to be for the last time, because it was to be "Before the end came," and "before the hour of God's judgment." Nowhere is a COMPLETE apostasy or rejection indicated. We DO find some scriptures that indicate that there might be individual falling away, such as where Paul speaking of the latter days, says: "SOME shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and the doctrines of devils," etc. (Emphasis mine.—B. C. F.) Paul saw

SOME depart from the faith, not all, and we could find many other texts, as our brother well knows that such departing on the part of individuals was predicted.

Now we will give specific attention to his claims with reference to the Reorganized church. The group at Zarahemla were Strangites, as were some of the other groups that were associated with them. Others were Wm. B. Smithites. Of course that would not hurt them if they repented of those connections. BUT here is the big fly in the ointment. This NEW organization was **not** organized "as at first," as our brother contends. It was organized as "AT LAST" in Nauvoo, with high priests, presidencies, and the added innovation of the doctrine of lineal priesthood, in the very unscriptural office of a first president. Now who would our brother have us believe was responsible for this gross error in this "new" God commanded (?) organization? Was it God, or was it the human authority that was resident in those men, "re-organizing at Zarahemla and other places?"

O, we are not going to discount nor discredit the splendid work done by the ministry of the Reorganization through the years, in doing the very thing our brother contends IS the primary reason for the existence of the Church of Christ on earth, but we are going to contend that it was because there was within that body men who held valid priesthood that God blessed their honest efforts to preach the gospel, and that too in spite of their human form of organization.

And as to the organization of those forming that group, the writer of this article was raised in the very vicinity of that reorganized group's birthplace, once called Zarahemla but later Blanchardville. My father was born within three miles of that place, and personally knew the Gurleys, Briggses, Clines and others. Of course, he being prejudiced, we will not undertake to use any of the wild stories that regaled our childhood with the misdoings of those early founders of the Reorganization. But we are not dependent upon any of these stories. The elder who baptized me February 16, 1896, spent much time in Blanchardville, stayed in the home of A. Blanchard, who, while not a member of that early church group, was very friendly to them, and this elder repeatedly told me because of things he learned while there, not to try to get the reorganization back of 1860 when young Joseph came to it because we would run into a lot of "muddy water." I could recite considerable of what that "muddy water" consisted of, but it would have no place as argument in a paper of this kind. But it DID give me sufficient insight into that early nucleus to cause me to be very slow to accept what Brother McKim now presents to us as the workings of the Spirit of God. Of course, I do not know anything of the lives of the saints in Woodford County, Illinois, either, but this much I do know: John E. Page, one of the apostles of the old church, associated himself with them, and through his efforts they DID labor to get back as closely as possible to the original form of church organization. In this we are more than willing to measure swords as to who was a "faction," and who was a "remnant," and as to whose claims to legitimate organization is the most scriptural and consistent. The fact that the Reorganization was a "new" church,

and that, too, patterned after the church as it was "at last," in Nauvoo, when rejection, (whenever that was) took place and not as it was "at first," inclines us to contend that it fits Webster's definition of "faction" to a nicety.

There is no provision in scripture, history, nor in the kingdom of God for a continual repetition of "re" organizing of Christ's church. This last dispensation of the gospel was to be final, and that too in spite of human errors that would occasionally cause division and confusion.

REPENTANCE

By B. C. Flint

"In those days came John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judea, and saying, Repent ye: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand."—Matthew 3:1, 2.

What Is Repentance?

"Now I rejoice, not that ye were made sorry, but that ye sorrowed to repentance: for ye were made sorry after a godly manner, that ye might receive damage by us in nothing. For godly sorrow worketh repentance to salvation not to be repented of: but the sorrow of the world worketh death." II Corinthians 7:9, 10.

By the above we can readily understand why the principle of "repentance," comes second in the plan of salvation, because of having heard of God. Having believed in Him. Having established that faith that makes us understand our relationship to God as our creator, as our kind Father in heaven. Having been made to realize that through the fall of man, and our own transgressions, we are aliens, and that there is a chasm between us, that must be bridged by ourselves, and that Christ came into the world as the gift of God to His creation with a plan to enable us to accomplish that end, we normally sense a desire for the bridging of that chasm. In other words, we begin to "repent." I say begin to repent, because repentance is a matter of progression, the same as faith is. Our text from Second Corinthians proves this, because it says: "For godly sorrow WORKETH repentance to salvation not to be repented of:" Thus we see, that just as we grow in faith until we receive a perfect knowledge of God, (And this continues throughout life), just so, as we realize more and more our need of repentance, so will our godly sorrow increase.

In our latter day revelations we have been told to "say nothing but repentance to this generation." This is not to be understood as meaning that we shall preach on no other subject, but the gospel principle of repentance, but it does mean that ALL we say on ANY subject should have for its purpose the bringing of us closer to God.

Therefore repentance, rightly understood, will follow faith as naturally as night follows day. We can not have gospel faith without repentance.

The great evangelist Sam Jones, once said that repentance means to: "quit your meanness." That is very good so far as it goes, but "quitting our meanness" is not always repentance. Some peoples' meanness reaches the point where society protects itself, by taking up the transgressor, and lodging him in prison, and there he MUST "quit his meanness," be-

cause there is nothing else that he can do.

This lesson was brought forcibly home to me when in the early days of my missionary experience, my route took me past the grim old walls of the Wisconsin State Penitentiary, at Waupun, Wisconsin. Inside those walls some nine hundred and more unfortunate human beings had "quit their meanness" because they had to. It may be true that some of them did actually repent in the true sense of the word, and yet I couldn't help but think, should any such force be needed to cause human beings to truly repent?

Another lesson was learned from this same experience. From the flagstaff on the big central tower of that prison, floated the stars and stripes, old glory, and I thought, here, over the heads of those nine hundred delinquents, was displayed what to me, and all law abiding citizens of our country, was an emblem of liberty, of freedom. But, to those under its folds there, it was not an emblem of liberty, it was an emblem of power. And I thought of the contrast. God also can enforce obedience, can enforce repentance; but will he? No! He wants me to be sorry that I have done wrong, not sorry that I got caught at it. He wants a godly sorrow for sin committed.

Again a godly repentance is not merely the turning away from sin, and forsaking it. It is not merely deep regret for wrongs done. Judas was so remorseful for his act of selling his Lord for thirty pieces of silver, that he went out and hung himself. God don't want us to do something like that. Had Judas' remorse led him to have dedicated his life to an effort to have undone the wrong he had committed, it would have had much more value to the human race. Peter too, forgot himself and betrayed his Lord. He denied Him and cursed and swore, the Bible tells us, but his remorse led him, not to take his own life but to give it doubly to the cause of the Master, and he became one of the greatest evangelists of his day, and finally died a martyr to the cause of Christ.

Restitution then is as much a part of true repentance, as the ceasing to do evil is. It is true that we may not always be able to make restitution to the one we may have injured, but if it is true repentance, God will find ways in which our acts of restitution will be vastly beneficial to mankind in general. So whether either Peter or Judas could ever make up to Christ the wrong they did Him or not, it is to be remembered that Jesus Christ, the man, was not all that is included in the Christ idea, or the idea of a Messiah. Christ was the impersonation of a system. God's system for the salvation of mankind and the redemption of all of God's creation. We may "sell" Christ today, yes, we may even crucify Him, and much of the world today is doing that very thing, hence the command to "say nothing but repentance to this generation." Here a slight digression might illuminate the principle of repentance. We are told in the book of Revelations that "Christ was "a lamb slain from the foundation of the world." This brings out the thought then that the work of Christ had its beginning with man's need for it, or at the time that man fell and so separated himself from God. God had no intention of making man, whom He had created in "His own image," an automaton, or a machine in His (God's) hands. He made man a free

agent. One who could act for himself and accept the consequences of his own act. One place in scripture we are told that: "Adam fell that man might be, and men are that they might have joy." This is simple, and it is logical and scriptural. Had man remained in the state of innocence such as he was in the Garden of Eden, before he brought death upon all of God's creation, there would have been nothing but pure stagnation. There would have been no children born, because they would have changed the simple creation of our first parents, and our first parents would have had no joy because they knew no misery. Therefore it was very plainly God's purpose to give man his agency, so that by exercising a right of choice, he might become a man, and work out his own salvation.

And because of that, God had prepared His own sacrifice, to bring about the atonement for fallen man, by giving His own Son as a "lamb slain from the foundation of the world." Thus we see that the plan that this slain lamb, would bring to humanity, would be a simple plan, but it would be a natural one, and one that man could comply with in an intelligent manner. Man must learn by faith to know God. Having done that he MUST repent, and return to God. There is no question but that Adam learned to have faith in God, immediately after his expulsion from the Garden of Eden, but he had to learn repentance, by the bitter experiences that followed his entrance into the changed earth that he had become responsible for, and "Adam" in the form of the human race have been learning that lesson ever since.

Another sidelight on this question may be drawn from the manner in which Christ the Saviour and Redeemer undertook this great task, the task of winning man back to God, for he never for one moment considered the idea for "forcing" man to repent. His was to be a plan of love, and an appeal to the nature of man that had been created godlike, or what we term the "better side of man's nature." We will try to visualize Christ in meditation, while contemplating the great work before him. I presume that it is fair to suppose that he took into consideration all of the obstacles and difficulties that would be entailed. The very fact of man having been made a free agent would of itself, make him a difficult problem. Then there was the force that had been let loose, in the beginning, to tempt and lead man astray, to meet and overcome. In short, how would he go about it? What would be the most effective thing that he could do? Should he send legions of angels to herald the message from one end of the world to the other? No, that would only antagonize men, because man was not yet an angel. Should he cause the message to be emblazoned in letters of fire, across the great expanse of heaven, so that man might thus read the message? No, that would only engender fear on the part of man, and it was not fear but love, that Christ would want from man as his brother. Should he cause the world to be flooded with a written message, so that man might read it at his leisure? No, if that were done, man would resent it and ask, "Why am I chained to earth while you remain in your secure heaven?"

"I know what I will do, I will go down to the earth,

and live with man. I'll live his life, and learn to see things from his viewpoint." "So the word became flesh and dwelt among men." And we are told concerning him and his life here on earth, "Though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered." Hebrews 5:8.

Early in man's experience on the earth we find that God coupled the idea of repentance with that of restitution, for in Leviticus 6:1-5 we read:

"And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, If a soul sin, and commit a trespass against the Lord, and lie unto his neighbor in that which was delivered to him to keep, or in fellowship, or in a thing taken away by violence, or hath deceived his neighbor; or have found that which was lost and lieth concerning it, and sweareth falsely; in any of all these that a man doeth, sinning therein: then it shall be, because he hath sinned, and is guilty, that he shall restore that which he took violently away, or the thing which he hath deceitfully gotten, or that which was delivered to him to keep, or the lost thing which he found.

"Or all that about which he hath sworn falsely: he shall even restore it in the principal, and shall add the fifth part more thereto, and give it unto him to whom it appertaineth, in the day of his trespass offering."

Of course, we all understand that the above was given under the old Mosaic covenant and was enforced by the magistrates. However, the principle is the same as that which Christ undertook under his plan of salvation, through love, as the following striking example will show:

"And Zaccheus stood, and said unto the Lord; Behold, Lord, the half of my goods I give to the poor; and if I have taken any thing from any man by false accusation, I restore him fourfold." Luke 19:8.

This is the story of Zaccheus the publican who climbed up in the sycamore tree to see the Master as he passed by, because he was a man of small stature, and whom Jesus, knowing the man's heart encouraged by making a visit to his home, and it was on this occasion that he made the statement just quoted from Luke. Now publicans of that time were revenue collectors, or collectors of Roman tribute.

"The principle farmers of this revenue were men of great credit and influence, but the under-farmers, or common publicans, were remarkable for their rapacity and extortion, and were accounted as oppressive thieves and pickpockets. Hence the Jews classed them with sinners, and would not allow them to enter the temple or synagogues, to partake of the public prayers or offices of judicature, or to give testimony in a court of justice." Peoples' Dictionary of the Bible, by Edwin W. Rice, D. D. p. 181.

This little side light enables us to understand the Pharisees' feelings toward the Master when they saw him accept the hospitality of a sinner of this type. The interesting thing in the whole account, is the type of repentance that Zaccheus manifested and which won him the approbation of the Savior.

Repentance as One of the Six Gospel Principles

"Therefore, leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ, (another and obviously better translation, says "not leaving the principles," etc. B. C. F.) let us

go on unto perfection; not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith toward God. Of the doctrine of baptisms, and the laying on of hands, and of the resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment." Hebrews 6:1, 2.

Here we find the principles of the doctrine of Christ, mentioned as "Faith," "Repentance," "Baptisms," "Laying on of Hands," "Resurrection of the Dead," and "Eternal Judgment." The reason we interjected the better translation, is because it should be quite evident to everyone, that we could scarcely expect to attain much perfection outside the principles of the doctrine of Christ. It is the "foundation for them" that we are not to try to "lay again." These six principles are fundamental to Christian life and development. They are the "foundation" upon which Christ built his work, and they follow man clear down to the time of the judgment. The first four are initiatory and are designed to induct mankind into the visible kingdom of God, the church on earth, and, we are told that "other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid." This refers to Christ, and we have already shown that Christ, as a man, was and still is the impersonation of the divine system of salvation He came to the earth and shed his blood on Calvary to make effective for our salvation. So repentance is and logically so, the second one of these foundation principles. It, with faith are the natural prerequisites to baptism in water, and the baptism of the Holy Ghost, that by the operation of God through his Spirit makes us citizens in the divine kingdom of God. Heirs of God and joint heirs with Jesus Christ.

We have faith in God. We repent of our sins. We have those sins remitted in the waters of baptism, and receive the birth of the Spirit through the laying on of hands.

This makes us full fledged citizens in the Kingdom of God, the Church of Christ, on earth. By this we are "baptized into Christ." We, "put on Christ," and by receiving the Holy Ghost, are able, now, to "Go on unto perfection, not laying (again) a foundation," upon dead works.

The next tract in this series will be: Baptism in water for the Remission of Sins. That, in turn will be followed by the one of the Baptism of the Spirit, received through the Laying on of Hands.

STORIES OF THE RESTORATION

(Continued from page 23)

God did avail themselves of this break, and as Joseph put it, they took a change of venue to Illinois to rejoin their anxious families there.

Part of the old jail still stands and can be visited. It forms part of the basement of a residence, just a short distance from the Court House square in Liberty. The old flagstone floor is still there and one may try to visualize the state of those poor men spending six months, and winter at that, in that nauseous place. By late issues of the Kansas City papers we learn that the Utah church is preparing to restore the jail to its original condition.

PHOENIX, ARIZONA

(Continued from page 21)

Keep your MIND and your HANDS busy at some worthy work.

The most important daily "alert" for all of us is: "Resist the Devil." Otherwise death and hell is sure to be our DOOM.

It is often said: "There is no EVIL but THINKING makes it so." Some folks even think that silly statement is in the Bible.

When the cold steel of a murderous bayonet is violently and viciously thrust through the quivering flesh of an innocent child—IS THAT EVIL? Or, is it just merely some "erroneous thinking" that makes it so?

When someone deliberately deceives you, and deprives you of something which is justly yours by right—Is that EVIL?

If you should tell a lie, would that be EVIL?

If some of your personal deportment should be such that you would LIE TO HIDE IT, would that be EVIL? Would there be any EVIL involved?

The truth is: There are opposites in all things, LIGHT, DARKNESS, TRUTH, LIES, and he who allows to himself the latitude of telling "Little White Lies" is in danger of allowing himself the luxury of BIG BLACK ONES soon.

In the opposites there are height—depth; honor—dishonor; purity—corruption; morality — immorality; chastity — whoredom; health—disease; facts—fraud; clean—filth; white—black; worthy — unworthy; reliability—unreliability; pure love—foul adultery; trust—betrayal; love—hate; fellowship—murder; life—death.

Can anyone check on the foregoing list of opposites and then say there is nothing EVIL in itself, but that only the thinking of it as evil, makes it so?

Even the most seemingly trivial of all that is evil, sustains an intimate relationship to the BLACKEST and DEEPEST of ALL OTHER EVIL.

All which is EVIL is close kin to ALL OTHER EVIL.

The Devil invited Jesus to cast himself down from the pinnacle of the temple.

The Devil's persuasions to the souls of men is that they are invited with great deceptive persuasion to follow the course of least resistance.

It is always a soul-struggle to climb to higher spiritual altitudes.

Satan's slides to the lower grades of soul activities always lead to the seemingly easier and most pleasant way.

Therein lies their most vicious deception. For the Devil's roads are filled at last with greatest miseries for all who yield to his temptations.

The downward pull of physical gravity.

Every child soon learns that it "hurts" to stumble and fall. They learn that it is best not to disregard gravity in the matter of falling from various heights.

For the law of gravity demands that when material things crash into other material things, then it is that such delicate mechanisms as our fleshy human bodies are, can get hurt, maimed, or killed.

Through the downward pull of gravity, the old earth attracts to itself every dead thing. Similar pulls of gravity brings many living things to their death.

Thus a man falls from a building, or cliff, or casts himself down from some pinnacle and is killed.

The living leaves of life on a tree, and the lovely blossoms there, resist in their beauty during spring-time's growth and summer's gorgeous display, resist the downward pull of gravity.

But feathers, and fluff, and dry, dead leaves may float aloft, for a while, but in the end old earth's gravity pulls them all down, and reduces all their once beautiful forms to dead, inanimate dirt.

Can soul-life, spiritual life, ascend to God's appointed heights for our everlasting life without successfully resisting the downward evil pull of Satanic gravity?

Is the downward pull of sin and spiritual contamination a mere imaginary evil?

Is not sin and temptation the active spiritual gravitation from hell pulling all who yield thereto down to Satan's regions?

The word of God refutes the answering of this question in the negative.

No one is able to conquer an enemy until he has first located said enemy. Sin and the Devil is the common enemy of man.

Through the power of Christ alone, man may conquer this his deadly enemy. But the victories must be won in Christ's way. No other way can succeed.

Christ's way for our salvation is: "Resist the Devil, and he will flee from you."

But weak and wobbly resistance cannot win.

Put on the whole armor of God and fight the good fight.

With prayer—RESIST THE DEVIL.

DO YOU JUST BELONG?

Are you an active member,
The kind that would be missed?

Or are you just contented
That your name is on the list?

Do you attend the meetings
And mingle with the flock,
Or do you stay at home
And criticize and knock?

Do you take an active part
To help the work along,
Or are you satisfied to be
The friend that "just belongs"?

Do you ever go to visit
A member that is sick,
Or leave the work to just a few,
Then talk about the clique?

There's quite a program scheduled
That I'm sure you've heard about,
And we'll appreciate it

If you'll come and help us out.
So come to meeting often
And help with hand and heart,
Don't be "just a member"

But take an active part.

Think this over, member,
You know right from wrong—

Are you an active member,
OR DO YOU JUST BELONG?