

Vol. 9.

No. 2.

THE
GOSPEL BANNER.

JUNE, 1901.

Subscription, 20c Per Year.



**OBJECTIONS
EXAMINED**

By President
Joseph Smith



Issued Quarterly by the Ensign Publishing
House, of the Reorganized Church of Jesus
Christ of Latter Day Saints, Independence, Mo

Entered at the Independence, Mo., Post
Office as Second-Class Mail Matter.



OBJECTIONS EXAMINED.

Sermon delivered by President Joseph Smith, at Washington Park, Sunday, September 2, 1900, near Independence, Missouri.

A gentleman shook hands with me this morning with the remark that he was glad to shake the hand of the leader of a spiritual or religious movement that was born after he was, if I understood the statement. At the Parliament of Religions in 1893, we had made an application to be heard with all others whom we supposed should have the right to be represented in the Parliament of Religions—the World's Religions was the term as it was presented to the people on the bill.

There were present at that parliament, Elder B. H. Roberts, of Utah, to represent that branch

of the so-called Mormon church, and on behalf of this Reorganized church, Elder Wm. W. Blair and myself were the accredited delegates to that parliament. It had been understood that Utah should be permitted to represent itself; it was also understood that the Reorganized church should have the opportunity to represent itself; but it so transpired through the will of those who had the controlling interests, that neither of these so-called factions of what was understood to be the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, or Mormons, was heard; and no single portion of the various remnants that seemed to have been left after the death of Joseph and Hyrum Smith was permitted to be represented there. Bishop Kelley, commenting upon that statement and our exclusion from the parliament, simply remarked that it was very appropriately styled a "Parliament of the *World's* Re-

ligions," and that the religion of Jesus Christ was excluded. I am not responsible for this remark, neither am I responsible for having been excluded; but it must strike the average thinker, both in the churches and out of them, that it is something remarkable that the only religion that is indigenous to American soil was excluded from that parliament; that the only organized religious body that had its incipient rise, and has had its continued existence and success of organization, on American soil should have been excluded from the representation in the "World's Parliament of religions." Is not that singular?

I may be pardoned this morning if my discourse be somewhat discursive, and I review, as rapidly as I may, some of the things which have been done in the spiritual realm of controversy since this church was organized April 6, 1830. In the first place the statement made

by the angel to him who was chosen as the earthly instrument by which the church should be represented abroad, and should find its organization, was that the declarations of belief, or the creeds, were an abomination in God's sight. At the start this was considered to be the utterance of a madman or a fanatic and it brought down upon his devoted head, together with those who were with him in the after movement, all the wrath of the proscriptive element in the various organizations of the churches at the time. But I, as his son, have lived to see the time come when many of the ministers of the different churches existent in the United States, met in solemn conclave, and as they did so, were strongly reminded while in that conclave, that the creeds *were* an abomination in the sight of God.

Now I come to you this morning representing no specific creed except what I understand

to be the truth. While we have our articles of belief and faith, briefly stated, we are bound by no specific utterance of human kind, bound together by a creed of human origin, if any portion of that utterance of belief shall discard or disregard the revealed will of God as expressed in what we understand to be the Holy Scriptures. And while we say that, we do not adopt the unreasoning reverence for the so-called word of God that makes us, with the Bible shut, say that we believe it all to have been the result of plenary inspiration from the first to the last, for we know better. But we take the Bible to be what it represents itself to be, and while we strive to avoid the one extreme of worshiping and worshiping blindly, we try to avoid the other extreme of having a statement of religion so loose that there is no specific form or value to its representation.

One of the first things that

was struck out by this new religion was the old time theory that man was, by nature, totally depraved, and that he was conceived in sin and born in iniquity, and that there was no good thing in him. The reason why this other proposition was struck out was, that we read in the book of God that He made man in His own image, and I myself have been obliged to combat that idea during the forty years of my ministry in different places and at different times, upon the hypothesis that it was supposed that this was the real creation of man. But when I challenge the proposition just as it has been challenged by those who preceded me, and I am but two years younger than the church itself, we challenged it upon the just proposal that if God made man in his own image, was it a material or a moral image, that was referred to?

I have been tried, in connection with my comrades, upon the hy-

pothesis that we have degraded the character of God in believing that man was made in His physical image; but when we ask these supporters of this old time creed, "Does the statement mean that God made man in His physical image?" And they say no, and that we have degraded Him thus, and brought Him down to the level of man. Then we ask them, "Did God create man in His own moral image?" And when they say, yes, we then ask, "Is it a credit to the Godhead that He created a being like Himself that was morally depraved?" I don't know whether there are any listening to me who have accepted and hold to that old-time theory or not, but if they have, pray tell me upon which of these two horns of this religious dilemma do you prefer to hang your religious faith and fate?

The next thing that was struck at directly by the intervention of this new faith, was that God

had always had upon the earth a people, and that the voice of inspiration had ceased when the scriptures or the cannon of scriptures was full; as a consequence, from that time on down through the history of the earth, there had not, and was not, and would never be, any further revelation from God. This thought was struck at because that there could be found no specific line in the enactments called the New and the Old Testament scriptures, by which, if the old time law had become abrogated—there was not a single line written in all the New or Old Testament in which it is stated, that God would no more reveal himself unto the human family; but on the contrary, there was much in the New Testament scripture to warrant the thought that wherever and whenever God had a people upon the earth there would be found a line of spiritual communication from the heavens to that people,

through those whom he might choose, who might be surnamed prophets, apostles, evangelists, pastors and teachers. And Joseph Smith dared the reprobation of the world in his presentation of this new theory, the new doctrine, whatever you may call it, which culminated in the institution of a church, April 6, 1830, by saying that he had received the visitation of an angel. Their theory of meeting that was that Joseph Smith did not see an angel, simply because there were no angelic ministers sent to the earth at the time.

That was a strange thing. I have never been to London nor to Paris. There are a great many things in this world that I know by observation and hearing and reading, that I am thoroughly apprized exist; but yet if my testimony is to be taken, I do not know anything at all about them; but if my neighbor proposes to tell me what he has seen or heard in other

climes, under other skies than this, may I too say, because they never passed under my observation that he never saw nor heard anything of the kind? That, to me, is the supreme height of nonsense—I was going to say—maybe that is too strong, but I will guarantee this, that if I were to go into the courts and undertake to impeach the testimony of any other wise, honorable man on such a proposition as that, the judge would rule me down.

Some of the things that were said by the angel to Joseph Smith have come so literally true that it is worth while for me to mention them; among them was this: that while he was to be made the instrument of an institution of a new faith, so-called in the world, his name should be had for good and for evil, wherever it should be heard in the world; and from that time to this, there has never been, and there is not now, any place

where I may go, or where my brethren may go, where the name of Joseph Smith has been presented, but that it is reprobated by one class and it is extolled by another. The angel surely told the truth in that respect. I am an instance in the fulfillment of this prophecy simply from the fact that go where I will, from the time that I was twelve years old until now, I have been followed invariably, north, south, east and west by the prefix, "The son of Joe Smith, the Mormon prophet;" and I have had otherwise good, intelligent, honorable, virtuous, religious, noble citizens turn their backs upon me rather than to be met on the street; and I have been avoided otherwise in such things as that, but so little has been known in respect to me, though I have now been before the world for forty years, that on this ground I was asked the question if I resided in Salt Lake City. I do not know but

what the next question might have been, "Mr. Smith, please tell me how many wives you have?" Well, so far as that is concerned, I apprehend I am like a good many married men now present, I have one, and she would not let me have another.

Another thing that was struck at—and you will see in that the result of belief in present revelation—was that this manifestation of the Spirit named in the 12th chapter of Paul's letter to the Corinthians, should be a part of the so-called christian church; as there were manifestations of the spiritual life of the body of Jesus Christ, we were warranted in making inquiry touching the kingdom or the church of Christ. If they did not find this spiritual manifestation of the life in the body of Christ, they were justified in saying that there was reason to believe that that body of Christ was not alive.

I propose to talk plainly; I do

not want anybody to go away and misrepresent what I say, and I will try to make it as plain as I can in this sense. This is a hot day, and it may be possible for some person to be stricken down with heat and overcome with the infirmities of the flesh, brought in here as apparently dead. A physician is summoned to make inquiry whether life is extinct or not. He comes in to where this body lies, and, lifting up the arm, it falls inert. Opening the eyes, he looks to see whether he can discern through the windows of the soul, life shining out; then he puts his hand on the heart to see whether there is motion in the seat of life. If he finds none of these evidences, he turns to those by whom he may be surrounded, and says, "The man is dead."

Now we propose to put, if we can, the body of Christ into examination. It is claimed to be the body of Christ; we take the scriptural description of the

body of Christ and make inquiry, Is there the spirit of prophecy in this body? Is there the manifestation of the speaking in tongues in this body? Is there the spirit of prophecy, or the healings of the sick, or the discernment of spirits, or the interpretation of tongues in this body of Christ? Are there any of these mysterious tokens that manifested or marked the body of Christ under the administration of the apostles? Are they found in this body? If they are not, what is the conclusion to which a man standing near and watching the examination will inevitably come?

When I was a lad I remember reading a sort of legendary teaching something like this: An individual had gone among the Indians and had preached quite awhile there; had incited quite a degree of controversy and inquiry, and, distributing his Bibles, he gave one of them to an intelligent looking Indian.

After awhile the Indian came back to him and said, "I like to read your book; now sir, will you please allow me to ask you some questions?" Of course the missionary was quite willing, as they almost always are. He says, "I would like to see an apostle. Will you please tell me whether you have apostles in your church and where I may see him?" "Ah no," says the missionary, "we have no apostles in our church; the apostles were in the days of the disciples, but they ceased, and there are no longer any of them;" or, "they are no longer needed." "Have you any apostles in your church?" "No, sir, none in our church." "Very well, then, will you please tell me whether you have a prophet or prophets in your church, and will you please let me see and hear one of them?" "No, sir, we have no prophets. Why, people believed in prophets in the olden time, but they do not believe in them now and

they are not in our church." He say, "Do you have the speaking in tongues?" "No, sir." "Do you have the interpretation of tongues or prophecy, the healings of the sick and the laying on of hands?" No, sir, all these were for the ages that were past and not now." He quietly took the book and handed it back to him and said, "This book is of no value to me, sir, for I read in it that the church called the church of Christ had all these things in it, and if your church hasn't these things in it, I cannot regard it as the church of Christ."

Now I know I am talking in modern times when there is a strong tide against superstition, when there is a strong element arrayed against undue priestcraft, and against that which brings the minds of men into subjection to the minds of other men. I am living in a day when there is a great deal of elementary belief in the peculiar personal magnetism of those who address

the public, and I myself have been accused of hypnotizing the people to make them believe as I believe. I am not very much given to the belief that I could hypnotize an intelligent audience on American soil.

But here we have the difficulty, and once when I preached in a little town called Colchester, in Illinois, before a number of the Christian brethren, and indeed, it was in their chapel that I made my effort, that in the afternoon I attended their Sunday School service, and heard one of their deacons reading from the 12th chapter of 1 Corinthians, the manifestations of the Spirit of Christ as found in the church at that period of time; and when he had read it clear through, he shut the book, laid it down on the seat, and said to those who were listening, "My brethren,"—and I was astonished at the sadness of the voice—"I heard Elder Smith, the other evening, and he said

that these things were for the Christian church. I have read in this book these things from the 12th chapter of 1 Corinthians, as stated by the Apostle Paul, and I find no warrant in my belief for believing that God ever deliberately set a time when these things should cease to be characteristic of His church. Now, all I have to say, brethren, is this, that if these things should be in our church, may God help us, for we have not got them." His brethren silenced that deacon and would not permit him afterwards to exercise the rights of his office, because, they said, he was drifting into apostasy, and in two years from that time the poor man died without a christian hope.

Now, pray tell me, what and where is the consistent objection? If the Bible be the word of God; if this is the New Testament or the last will and testament of Jesus Christ the Lord, to the world, when and where is the

time and place that God has ever set that these things should cease to characterize the body of the church or the body of Christ? I have sought diligently for it; my brethren have sought diligently for it, but in not a single instance can we find a line of authentic declaration made by God or by Christ, that authorizes us to believe that He has abrogated this will or these privileges; and if we may be found fighting against the great majority while the world shall stand or we live, I propose to go up before that great judgment bar and answer to Him, that "I had your word as you gave it to us, and by it we stand or fall before you for our belief in the Testament and our acceptance of that word.

Personally I am going to do just like I told the people in Utah once that I would do, when I was out there and preaching our view of the marriage covenant. I did not attack the

situation there; said no unkind word of a single minister of that church in any form. I simply told our phase of it, and showed by the three books that the Bible did not sustain polygamy, or plural marriage, that the Book of Mormon did not sustain it, and that the revelations of God to the church did not sustain it; and I told them that I proposed to go into the judgment day and standing before that great august Judge, I should take the books which He had given us by revelation to be the doctrinal standards of the church, upon which to base our doctrinal beliefs and teachings, and then say to the Judge, "If you can condemn me on that, I am content to be condemned." All worldly minded men, and honorable men would have commended me for that, because of having dared to undertake the defense of a faith, that, to a great degree, had found objections with the world by the introduction of a something that

was not found in the books, and doing it from the standard authority of the books—we cannot revert back to unbelief or to our condition of letting these things pass away. Now can we?

Among these things that were presented so early in the history of the church was the healing of the sick through the laying on of hands. It was, for a long time, a standard objection, and it was, for a long time, a constant source of reproach even within my own memory; but I have lived long enough to know that when I first began preaching, wherever we went, it was a constant source of objection and of scornful laughing at us because we believed that through the laying on of hands the sick might be healed; but I have lived with my confreres to see the time come when a convocation of religious ministers, gathered in Chicago some years ago, went to work deliberately and passed a resolution which said that the

laying on of hands for the healing of the sick is not only scriptural, but it is a reasonable and tenable doctrine. I am thankful that they did that.

There was another theory that was extant about that time, that became punctured a little later on, and we know what it is worth now; but some of the ways that it was done were a little singular. For instance, I had a discussion with a Baptist lady in private conversation at one time, and she very seriously objected to us, as a people, because she said we limited the power of God. I wondered how that could be when we accepted the power of God as being equal to anything; the only thing that we denied He could do, was that He could not lie. She said that we did not believe that God created the world out of nothing. Well, I wondered just then how I was to get away from that theological knot. I understood it to be a prevalent idea, I had heard it

when I was a boy. It grew up, in a sense, to my manhood with me, as being a standard teaching, that the world was created by the executive power of God out of nothing. I denied it, and those men who came forward with the Reorganized church in 1830, denied it, and they said the Bible itself said nothing of the kind. About all that it does say is, that "In the beginning" God created the world. He said, "Let there be light and there was light," but we are given to understand that there was in existence a great mass of chaotic matter, by which it was made possible for the world to be created as it now stands, by the fiat of God.

I could not make any impression on the lady. We were sitting in a station in Plano, Illinois, waiting for a train; we were sitting by the stove, and the janitor came along, opened the door and shoved a stick of wood into the fire. This suggested to me

a thought. I said, "What becomes of that wood, is it destroyed?" "No, sir. It is resolved into ashes, the different quantities of solids may be taken out of the ashes, and the balance of it ascends in smoke, and the vapors arising also become mingled with matter." Are they destroyed? "No, sir. It always exists thereafter." It has not been destroyed, and cannot be destroyed? "No, sir. God himself cannot destroy it." He may change its form but not destroy it? "No, sir, once existing, it is always existing in some form." Then I laughed and said, "My dear lady, you are finding fault with myself and my brethren because we limit the power of God, because we say God did not create the world out of nothing; but yet you deliberately turn and say to me that God has created a thing, that He cannot destroy. Pray, which is the worse?" Some of our conferees over in Canada under-

took to get rid of this conclusion, and this is the way they did it. "I do not believe that God created the world out of nothing, but He created the world out of that which had *been* created out of nothing." That is the way they got rid of that theological knot. We accept neither.

So we run along down through the history, and, one by one, we have seen some of these peculiar theories that have come to us, as, I believe, from the dark ages, or from the ages before, reformed little by little, until there was what I believed to be the presentation of a lucid and clear statement of what the Bible teaches us for the salvation of men.

Let me present the single thought that our so-called declaration of faith, every single portion of it from first to last—I believe I remember seeing on the back of one of the church's creeds this morning twelve declaration—that each one of the

important portions of this declaration of faith can be traced directly to the teachings of Jesus Christ, either in personal teaching or in personal conduct. As, for instance, the doctrine of baptism. "Baptisms," in the Word as given by the Apostle Paul in the 6th chapter of Hebrews, is plural; the baptism of water for the body, the baptism of the Spirit for the spirit.

Now, when Jesus came, and it was stated of Him by John the Baptist, "Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world," that word which had preceded John was that he was to "Prepare the way of the Lord, to make his paths straight." "God does not walk in crooked paths," is the teaching of the old book. If John the Baptist came to make His paths straight, then He may not walk in them unless he does so make them straight.

One of the first things Jesus did, before engaging in the general ministry, was to go to John

the Baptist and ask baptism at his hands; and why? First, that there might come to that body of Abrahamic origin which had been prepared for Him, a power by which it might exist, and finally be laid down in the grave, and taken up out of the grave; and that to each succeeding generation it was for the purpose of giving spiritual sight, that the language of the Savior to Nicodemus might be fulfilled, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." It is necessary for him to receive the new birth in order that he can see. There is something belonging to our visual organs of peculiar character.

There is something that attaches to the gray matter behind the skull that sometime makes individuals deaf and blind. Though I may have two good eyes, apparently, there is one thing I do not see, and see clearly, and that is the beauty of colors. You men and women see the har-

mony of colors, and the exquisite shading and rejoice therein. I am one of those who may be called color-blind. I would not be chosen as a brakeman or pilot, or for any service that required the accurate distinction of colors, for just as soon as the lights are a little ways from me, I cannot distinguish the colors. I have been laughed at because I sometimes call things that are green, red, and blue, green. How much would I have given to have had that peculiar organization of the brain, in some way made better, that I might see and understand colors; but how much more to be deplored is the condition of the man in the world with the darkness over his moral vision so dense that he cannot see; and when the time should come that he desires to do something for his salvation in making the wise choice, he is unable to see, and sometimes must wait until the force of circumstances brought to bear upon him, com-

pels him unto a conclusion, and compels a belief.

I have heard persons excuse themselves for unbelief because they had not yet had brought to to bear upon them the force of evidence by which conviction was sealed upon them: I believe, not because I have been compelled to believe; I believe because, to me, it is the better course to pursue. When there comes presented before me two courses from which to choose, I believe in bringing my mind to the element that is in me, the power to receive and reason upon the two courses, and take that one that offers to me the better ending; to do it from choice, and because it has come to me with such evidence as I have been able to gather, and make it a proper choice in me.

No man can say when he proposes to enter into the service of God, just what God purposes to, nor what God may, fully require of him from the first to

last; but he must put himself into the way of receiving something from God or he never can have it. If he proposes to stand out and keep himself from the intervention of God's mercy, he will have to stand out until the lapse of time. I know that the example of the Apostle Paul may be cited here in apparent antagonism to this proposition. There was but one Apostle Paul.

Will you wait until there comes to you a conversion like that given to the Apostle Paul? Will you continue to wait until God, by personal intervention, bespeaks your sins forgiven? or do you not think it the wiser plan to accept the general law of amnesty, and make your calling and election sure under that?

When the southern army laid down its arms, and the government was established again, was it better for those who had rebelled against the authority of the government to wait until, by slow succession, there had been

introduced into the legislative halls of the Union specific and private bills by which their sins of rebellion were condoned, and they again rehabilitated as citizens of the United States, or was it not better that there should be a general amnesty law declared by which, when they took the oath of allegiance, they might then be considered American citizens? You all know the amnesty law was the better way.

When God recognizes that the world is in sin, He does not propose to deal with each recurring sin; He proposes to leave man in the intelligent exercise of his individual powers and give him an opportunity to make the wise choice, and to accept His general law of amnesty; and under that provision receive the remission of sins for which He can make no personal reparation either here or hereafter.

In order that you may understand me, I want to make a recitation of a little circumstance

in my own life. Several years ago I was privileged to be present at a lecture delivered by a gentleman by the name of Webster. There may be some here who know something about the man. He was a spiritualistic lecturer, and in the course of his lecture, he made the statement, as I had read it in Andrew Jackson's work, that there were spheres, grading from the lower to the higher, and that each gradation held the key to that which was beyond; that if anything that would prevent an individual below from ascending higher because of something which he had done to his fellows, then he could not go into the higher sphere until he had received forgiveness from the lower sphere.

He recited an instance of a seance being held in a place and this kind of a manifestation being made, that the spirit of a man who was in a certain sphere in another world was present,

wanting them to send for a certain individual in the village against whom he had done a grievous wrong while in the flesh; that this man in the flesh, held the key to the sphere above him, and until he got his forgiveness, he could not go into the other sphere. They sent for the man and he heard the message, and gladly forgave him, and there came from the spirit world the joy of a spirit relieved from its thralldom. At the closing, he having said something about the utility and in-utility of the christian's belief, I asked to be allowed to ask three or four questions. The privilege being granted, I then asked if it was true in his philosophy, that a man having transgressed against one in the flesh could not progress beyond the sphere into which he was first admitted, until he had secured the forgiveness of that one in the flesh who is here now?

“Yes, sir.”

“Suppose from any unforeseen contingency this man cannot obtain the forgiveness of the man on the earth, what is the result?”

“The result is he must continue to be kept in that particular sphere and can not progress further.”

I asked if there was any rule by which this kind of forgiveness between individuals could be wrought out in this philosophy. He said no. I asked him then the question if it would not be proper and better that in the consideration that there are sins which men commit against their fellowmen for which they can make no possible reparation either here or hereafter, that there should be a specific law of amnesty by which the sins that men could not repent of against his fellows, could be condoned, and such sins forgiven? I will tell you, that instead of answering that question, he simply turned to the man who had charge

and said something to him, and he told me that Mr. Webster was too weary to answer any further questions. You can see the reason why. He had attacked the position taken by myself and other religionists, that in Jesus Christ there was the opportunity for the condonement and remission of sins, for which it is not within the power of human beings, either here or on the other side, to make reparation for themselves.

As, for instance—I am going to put this case just as strongly as I know how—suppose that I, when a young man, had, under the promise of marriage, or otherwise, deceived one of Eve's fair daughters, and brought her into shame and disgrace; and when I had done that, I had gone my way, as hundreds of men have done and are doing now, and left her to suffer the scorn of this world, and the condemnation against such characters in the spiritual realm, if there is

such a one. Afterwards I succeed in gaining the affections of another woman, and marry her, thus making it utterly impossible for me to repair that injury I have done that woman. How am I ever to make reparation for that crime? I know what the sentiment of a large portion of this congregation is, that it never should be forgiven in this world, or the world to come. Should I echo that sentiment here and now, it never will do; but the man who does it, must pass under the rod until such a time as there has been a reformation in his spirit; then when he makes this reformation, and makes it apparent unto the Almighty, there must be some reason, and some way, by which he may be absolved from the further consequence of that sin, or God is made a vindictive Being, whom neither you nor I can worship intelligently, or trust as confident children.

I have only named one in:

stance; but I can go up into the town of Independence on the morrow, and may there slander the reputation of a man or woman, and sow thorns in their path which shall wound their weary feet as they travel upward, and I never have opportunity to make reparation for that wrong. Now, if I see what I have done, and subsequently want to repair the wrong so far as I may, I cannot restore the blush to the peach or plum. I cannot erect the broken blade of grass that I so ruthlessly destroyed, but I may, so far as my spirit is concerned, bring myself into such relationship with the powers we are under, that I ought to be relieved from further consequence of my evil; and I must find this in the general rule of amnesty in the law of God, or I am lost. Pray, tell me, what is there wrong in this? A hope engendered within us in the restoration of the gospel of the Son of God by which this

general law of amnesty is to be proclaimed, and those who may not make right the wrongs they have committed in the flesh, may have the restoration of that which is taken from them; the same as our penitentiary people can, through the clemency of the governor, have their citizenship retained for them on account of their behavior.

You people in the state of Missouri here, have strong laws against horse stealing. You prize horses higher than we do in Iowa, and very reasonably, for you have a much finer strain of horses. Your law provides that a horse thief must suffer the extreme penalty of the law. If I steal my neighbor's horse, he proposes to punish me for it. The law began with the state's existence, and until the state of Missouri is wiped out, I do not believe Missourians will ever change their policies in this regard; and though I may steal a thousand horses, I shall be a

thousand times punished according to the law. It is the eternal law of punishment, provided as the eternal punishment, but it can exist upon one person only until the limits of the term which the law fixed as the due punishment or penalty for my crime. That is what we call an eternal punishment. It is directly against the favorite theory that has been in the world for a long time, that which was struck at directly by Joseph Smith and others; it destroyed the idea of an eternal punishment forever and forever, a never ending hell fire for the man that did wrong.

But in the application of this principle I have referred to, if I am arrested and convicted for stealing a horse, and am put in the penitentiary for a term, when I have passed the limit of that term, and have tried to behave myself properly, there are two ways to treat me. One is to let me suffer my penalty clear

out, and lose my right of suffrage; or when I have behaved well, the governor remits a part of the sentence and thus saves me my citizenship. Then when, in like manner, an individual has done wrong in the world which he cannot make right here, neither in the world hereafter, so far as the person against whom he has sinned is concerned, he passes under the operation of that everlasting, eternal law of God, and is punished by virtue of that eternal law. That is what we understand by an eternal punishment and to my mind it is perfectly clear and consistent.

I have covered some portion of the ground. I have only one little thing left and that I am going to present.

Martin Luther brought to pass a reformation in the church, and King Henry the Eighth brought to pass a reformation in the church. Alexander Campbell likewise; and it was said that Joseph Smith and Sidney Rigdon

originated a church. Sidney Rigdon was a member of the Christian church when he became allied with Joseph Smith. It was said that he was one of the most eloquent men that there was in the Western Reserve. He had been instrumental in converting hundreds of individuals, and when he united with Joseph Smith in the church that was organized in 1830, it became a source of reproach among his former companions, that he had done so. If Martin Luther had the right to undertake to reform the Catholic church because of abuses that he discovered when he went to Rome and there took counsel around the Vatican, and could not reconcile what he saw and heard, with that which had been taught him in the north of Germany; if he had a right to interest Melancthon with him, and other citizens of the northern empire and undertake a reformation, and if King Henry the Eighth had a right to reform and create a new church by statutory enactments; if John Wesley and Alexander Campbell and John Calvin had the right to undertake to reform the church in

which they were members, so had Joseph Smith and Sidney Rigdon a right to start a reform movement, and reform the church. Can anyone dispute that, intelligently? Answer the question, men, intelligent men, upon the proposition of human rights, of that right which undertakes to make the worse the better. What evil is in this, that if Joseph Smith and Sidney Rigdon have been able to succeed in placing a church before the American public that has better claims for divince relationship and a more intelligent compliance with the provisions of the New Testament Scripture than by a study of itself was had, are these men entitled to credit for that, for helping to sweep the cobwebs and myths from the spiritual horizon of man and open up before them the visions of eternity and the good that might be received by them here and hereafter? By so much as they did this, are they entitled to the credit and respect of mankind; and by so much as myself and my brethren here are able to present an intelligent reason for our faith, and that it more nearly conforms to the New Testament Scriptures in theory, in doctrine and in practice, we are entitled to be heard, and then we have succeeded in establishing the claim for consideration, that we feel it is difficult to be defeated upon intelligent grounds.

