

Vol. 9.

Extra A.

THE  
**GOSPEL BANNER.**

APR., 1902

Subscription, 15c Per Year.



**Utah Mormons Repudiate  
Joseph Smith, the Prophet**

By Amante Luce.



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.



UTAH MORMONS REPUDI-  
ATE JOSEPH SMITH  
THE PROPHET.

---

IF HE WAS RIGHT, THEY ARE  
WRONG; IF THEY ARE RIGHT,  
HE WAS WRONG.

---

BY AMANTE LUCE.

Reader, are you a member of the Utah Mormon church? If so, read this pamphlet. It is written especially for *your benefit*.

Do you expect its pages are filled with misrepresentation and abuse; that it manifests a harsh, unjust, vindictive spirit? Then your expectations shall be happily blighted.

We address you as equally conscientious, intelligent and desirous of knowing the truth, as ourselves. Our only motive for writing this tract is to assist you to determine the value of your own religious system.

[www.LatterDayTruth.org](http://www.LatterDayTruth.org)

You believe Joseph Smith was a prophet of God. Therefore, let us compare *the most important doctrine* of the Utah church with his revelations, as published in *your own edition* of the Doctrine and Covenants.

To determine what the doctrines of your church are, we shall appeal to the teachings of its recognized authorities, as set forth in *your own church publications*.

If the comparison thus made proves that many important doctrines of the church in Utah *contradict* the revelations of Joseph the Seer, consistency and your own conscience will call upon you to either renounce the Utah Mormon church, or repudiate the prophet. You must choose between the two. "Every plant which my heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up."—Jesus, Matt. 15:13. In this case, which should be "rooted up," the revelations of God, given through the prophet, or the contradictory doctrines of your church?

#### CONTRADICTION 1.

"Zion," the "gathering" place of the Saints; Missouri or Utah; which?

About "Zion," the "gathering" place of the Saints, the revelations of Joseph Smith say:

"Ye are called to bring to pass the gathering of mine elect. \* \* \* Wherefore, the decree hath gone forth from the Father that they shall be gathered in unto one place upon the face of this land."  
—D. & C. 29:1-8.

Again:

"And I [the Lord] hold forth and deign to give unto you greater riches, even a land of promise, a land flowing with milk and honey, upon which there shall be no curse when the Lord cometh: and I will give it unto you for the land of your inheritance, if you seek it with all your hearts: and this shall be my covenant with you, ye shall have it for the land of your inheritance, and for the inheritance of your children forever."  
—D. & C. 38:18-20.

Where do the revelations of Joseph Smith locate this "one place" where the Saints should "gather?"

"Hearken, O ye elders of my church, saith the Lord your God, who have assembled yourselves together, \* \* \* in the land of Missouri, which is the land which

I have appointed and consecrated for the gathering of the Saints: wherefore this is the land of *promise*, and the place for the city of Zion.”—D. & C. 57: 1-2.

The Mormon elders *today* overlook Missouri *entirely*, and point their new converts to Utah instead, as the place of “gathering.”

As proof of this, I cite you to the teachings of one of the most popular books now used by the Mormon church in its evangelical work, entitled: “Mr. Durant of Salt Lake City, That Mormon.” It is published by the “Southern States Mission,” Chattanooga, Tennessee, January, 1899, for Ben E. Rich, the author. Of its wide use, the preface says: “During the year just closed,—1898,—over seven hundred thousand of these little pamphlets have been circulated in the United States alone.”

Respecting “gathering” on pp. 163-4, the author says:

“The Father desires that his children shall be gathered in unto one place where their hearts shall be prepared against the day when tribulation and desolation shall come upon the wicked.”

Hear this author locate the "one place" where the Saints should "gather!"

"Isaiah, looking to the future, saw that in the last days the mountain of the Lord's house should be established in the tops of the mountains to which all nations should go."—Isa. 2:2. There are ordinances, too, to be performed in the holy temples, for the living and the dead, that can not be done elsewhere. It is not well, however, that this act of gathering should be considered thoughtlessly and in haste, but rather with deliberation and careful forethought." There is not a word in the book about Missouri as the place of "gathering." "Deliberation and careful forethought" indeed, concerning "gathering!" What advice from a church which professes to believe Joseph Smith was a prophet of God, and yet ignores the place of "gathering" pointed out in his revelations, as completely as though no such revelations were known to it! A church that perverts a Bible prophecy to make it apply to its home in the mountains!

Does Isaiah 2:2 refer to Utah, her people or temples? The first

verse of the chapter reads: "The word that Isaiah, the son of Amoz, saw concerning JUDAH and JERUSALEM." This the author *omits*, and then applies the next verse to UTAH. But we often hear the retort: "The prophecy has never been fulfilled in Judah and Jerusalem and never can be" Did the Lord make a mistake in naming those places as the locality for its fulfillment? No Bible believer could entertain such a thought, nor demand that we defend the word of God against such a charge.

Nevertheless, for the benefit of the skeptic and those who have been made such by the unfounded charge that this prophecy has never been fulfilled in Judah and Jerusalem and never can be," we submit the following:

"The word that Isaiah, the son of Amoz saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem. And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the LORD'S house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it. And many people shall go and

say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the LORD, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the LORD from Jerusalem. And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people: and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."—Isa. 2:1-4.

Objectors inquire,

(1), "Did 'all nations' ever 'flow unto' Jerusalem?"

Answer: "And there were dwelling at Jerusalem Jews, devout men, out of every nation under heaven."—Acts 2:5.

(2) "Did that occur 'in the last days?'"

Answer: "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners, spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son."—Heb. 1:1-2.

(3) "Did the word of the Lord ever 'go forth from Jerusalem?'"

Answer: "And that repentance and remission of sins should be

preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem.”—Luke 24:47.

(4) “Did those devout men out of every nation under heaven learn ‘of his ways’ and ‘walk in his paths’ at Jerusalem?”

Answer: “And they that gladly received his word were baptized: and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls. And they continued steadfastly in the apostles’ doctrine.”—Acts 2:41-2.

As “the last days” have not yet expired, there is no occasion for fear. There is ample time for the fulfillment of the few remaining items of the prophecy, concerning nations learning “war no more,” etc. The prophecy recorded in Micah 4:1-3 is the same as Isaiah 2:1-4. Hence, it does not require separate consideration. Where one was fulfilled the other was.

Elder B. H. Roberts, in his work, “Succession in the presidency of the church,” 2nd ed., p. 126, (p. 102, 1894 ed.) is guilty of the same misapplication of Isaiah 2:2. He also fails to quote the first verse, the reading of which would expose his distortion of the word of God. And

all this to prove(?)—"The twelve lead the church of God to the place indicated as its abode in the last days, both by ancient and modern prophecy."—Roberts, p. 126.

By "modern prophecy" the author means the revelations of Joseph Smith. To his revelations, therefore, we appeal, to find, if possible, clearer justification for the location of your church in *Utah* than Isaiah 2:2 affords.

Revelation given through Joseph Smith at Nauvoo, Illinois, January 19, 1841, D. & C. 124:45:

"And if my people will hearken unto my voice, and unto the voice of my servants whom I have appointed to lead my people, behold, verily I say unto you, they shall not be moved out of their place."

Was the church at Nauvoo "moved out of its place?" And *why* "moved?" Reader, now are you confronted with—

#### CONTRADICTION 2.

You are called upon to choose between this plain promise of the Lord: "If my people will hearken unto my voice \* \* \* behold, verily I say unto you, they

www.LatterDayTruth.org

shall not be moved out of their place," and the contradictory announcement of your church, viz: "the twelve lead the church of God to the place indicated as its abode in the last days both by ancient and modern prophecy."

Listen again to the voice of God.—D. & C. 101:20, 21:

"And, behold, there is none other place appointed than that which I HAVE appointed; neither SHALL THERE BE any other place appointed than that which I have appointed, for the work of the gathering of my Saints, until the day cometh when there is found NO MORE ROOM for them; and THEN I have other places which I will appoint unto them." (Capitals mine, author).

In the light of these revelations, where is the "place which I have appointed for the work of the gathering of my Saints?" It is MISSOURI, as already shown and the country *immediately* adjoining.—D. & C. 101:70, 71:

"Purchase all the lands \* \* \* which can be purchased for money, in the regions round about the land which I have appointed to be the land of Zion, \* \* \* all the land which can be purchased in Jackson county,

and the *counties round about.*”

As the country described above is not yet all occupied by the Saints, and the revelation states that “no other place” shall be appointed for the “gathering of my Saints” until there is “no more room” for them *there*, how can Utah be the “abode of the church of God in the last days?” If the location of your church in Utah is right, these revelations are wrong; if the revelations are right, the location of your church is wrong.

On page 112 of Elder Robert’s book, is this curious statement:

“The Twelve turned their faces toward the west; for they remembered that Joseph himself had prophesied that the Saints would yet be driven to the Rocky Mountains, and there become a mighty people.”

Could Elder Roberts prove that Joseph Smith ever uttered such a prophecy, how would it affect the Utah church? It would simply establish the guilt of its transgressions; for, had not the Lord said: “If my people will hearken unto my voice \* \* \* behold, verily I say unto you, they shall not be moved out of their place!”

But did Joseph prophesy, *August 6, 1842*, that the Saints would be driven to the Rocky Mountains," as Elder Roberts states, on page 102 of his book? October 1, 1842, Joseph wrote an article in the *Times and Seasons*, of which he was then editor, in which he states:

"The word of the Lord is, 'Build my house,' and until that commandment is fulfilled we stand responsible to the great Jehovah for the fulfillment of it, and if not done in due time we may have to share the same fate that we have heretofore done in Missouri."

What was the "fate" the church had "heretofore shared" in Missouri? Expulsion from the state. The same "fate" actually befell the church in Illinois, when so many were driven away from Nauvoo. Why did the expulsion from Illinois and exodus to the Rocky Mountains occur? Was it because "The Twelve led the church of God to the place indicated as its abode in the last days both by ancient and modern prophecy," as asserted by Elder B. H. Roberts; or, was it a scourge inflicted because the temple at Nauvoo "Was not

finished in due time," as explained by the Prophet? Which do you prefer to rely upon, the explanation of the Prophet, or the contradictory and unsupported declaration of Elder Roberts?

Remember, too, the explanation of the prophet, attributing the expulsion from Illinois, should it occur, to the failure of the church to erect the temple "in due time" was made less than two months after he is said to have predicted "the Saints would yet be driven to the Rocky Mountains," etc. Had the man of God forgotten all about such a remarkable prophecy in so short a period of time? Impossible. Therefore, we are forced to the conclusion: (1) Either no such prophecy was revealed by him; or, (2) if revealed, the prophet understood it very differently than do Elder Roberts and other modern interpreters of the Utah church.

But *did* the Twelve "remember" that Joseph had "prophe-sied" that the Saints would become "a mighty people" in the "Rocky Mountains," as quoted above, from Elder Roberts' book? They did not seem to

“remember” anything about it, when, November 1, 1845, the “Twelve” published an “Epistle” in the *Times and Seasons*, Vol. 6, pp. 1018–19, from which I extract:

“There are said to be many good locations for settlements on the Pacific, especially at Vancouver’s Island, near the mouth of the Columbia river.”

What! the “Twelve” considering a removal of the Saints to the “Pacific” coast, to “Vancouver’s Island,” so soon after Joseph’s death, when he had “prophesied” they should “become a mighty people” in the “Rocky Mountains?” and they “remembered” it, too, you know, for so saith Elder Roberts!

### CONTRADICTION 3.

Brigham Young, though President of the Utah church for thirty years, repeatedly proclaimed that he was not a prophet of God. The revelations of Joseph Smith teach that the president of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints must be a “prophet, seer, and revelator.”

Proof:

“The duty of the president of

the office of the high priesthood is to preside over the whole church, and be like unto Moses. Behold, here is wisdom, yea, to be a seer, a revelator, a translator and a prophet; having all the gifts of God which he bestows upon the head of the church."—D. & C. 107:91,92.

Brigham not a prophet;—Over his own signature, in an "Epistle of the Twelve," published in "*Times and Seasons*," Vol. 5 p. 618, August 15, 1844, a few weeks after the death of Joseph Smith, Brigham Young said:

"You are now without a prophet present with you in the flesh to guide you."

Farther along in this "Epistle" he indicates that neither he nor any of the apostles had, at that time, any ambition to become president of the church, declaring emphatically:

"The Twelve apostles of this dispensation stand *in their own place* and always will."

At a special conference held at Nauvoo, Illinois, August 8, 1844, Brigham said:

"For the first time in the kingdom of God, in the nineteenth century, without a prophet at your head, do I step forth to act

in my calling in connection with the quorum of the Twelve, as apostles of Jesus Christ unto this generation \* \* \* You can not fill the office of a prophet, seer and revelator. God must do this. You are like children without a father, and sheep without a shepherd. You must not appoint any man at your head \* \* \* You can not take any man and put him at your head; you would scatter the Saints to the four winds; you would sever the priesthood. \* \* \* I again repeat, no man can stand at our head except God reveal it from heaven.”—Life of Joseph, the prophet, pp. 633-4.

Little more than three years had elapsed until he had forgotten his declaration: “you can not take any man and put him at your head; you would scatter the Saints to the four winds; you would sever the priesthood;” also his promise to “stand in his own place,” as an apostle, and allowed six of his quorum to elevate him to the first presidency of the Utah church. As this elevation did not make him a prophet, God, of course, did not “reveal it from heaven.” Four years later, to quiet the suppo-

sition that he was a prophet of God, he published the following disclaimer, *Millennial Star*, Vol. 16, p. 442:

“A person was mentioned today who did not believe that Brigham Young was a prophet, seer and revelator. I wish to ask every member of this whole community, if they ever heard him profess to be a prophet, seer and revelator, as Joseph Smith was?”

Reader, you are called upon to either renounce the first presidency of your church for thirty years, under the reign of Brigham Young, or repudiate the revelations of Joseph Smith. And your renunciation must not only include the thirty years of Brigham's presidency, but that of all his successors, as well. For, if either Jno. Taylor, Wilford Woodruff, or Lorenzo Snow, were “prophets, seers and revelators,” why was not one of them chosen to preside over the Utah church at the first, rather than Brigham Young? Brigham frankly confessed his ineligibility to preside over the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, by acknowledging that he was not

a prophet of God. His successors, mentioned above, were no better qualified to preside over the church than he. This is acknowledged by the Twelve in their Epistle of August 15, 1844: "You are now without a prophet present with you in the flesh." This statement compromises Brigham Young, John Taylor, Wilford Woodruff and Lorenzo Snow. All these men were in the flesh then; hence, neither of them was a prophet, and consequently neither was eligible to the presidency of the church.

#### CONTRADICTION 4.

Shall the president of the high priesthood (or president of the church, D. & C. 107:91.) be ordained to that office? The law given through Joseph Smith says, "Yes," your church says, "No." Which is correct, the law given of God, or the rule and *practice* of your church?

The law is:

"Every president of the high priesthood (or presiding elder); bishop, high counselor and high priest, is to be ordained by the direction of a high council or General Conference.—D. & C. 20:67.

This instruction is general, applying to "Every president of the high priesthood." The following is specific referring directly to Joseph Smith's *successor* in the presidency of the church:

"For verily I say unto you, that he that is ordained of me shall come in at the gate and *be ordained* as I have told you before, to teach those revelations which you have received and shall receive through him whom I have appointed.—"D. & C. 43:7.

Was Brigham Young, whom you consider Joseph Smith's successor, ever *ordained* president of the high priesthood? In *Millennial Star*, your church paper, Vol. 16, p. 442, Brigham says:

"Who ordained me to be the first president of this church on earth? I answer, it is the choice of this people and that is sufficient."

Equivalent to saying no one had ordained him. But the answer to the above question does not depend upon inferential evidence. It is shorn of all uncertainty. Elder C. W. Penrose, counselor to Angus M. Cannon,

president of the Salt Lake Stake, answers it very plainly. I quote from a letter of his, the authenticity of which he will not care to question, dated Historian's office, 60 E. South Temple Street, Salt Lake City, Utah, May 18, 1898. It was written to J. O. Long, an inquirer, Higdon, Alabama. This brief extract will suffice:

"Now, my dear sir, to your question: Was Brigham Young properly ordained as president of the church after Joseph Smith's death, and if so when and by whom?" "No man is ordained president of the church. \* \* \* The question might be asked, when was Joseph the prophet ordained president of the church?"

Thus does this writer admit that Brigham was not ordained president of the church, and seeks to justify this transgression of the law by claiming no one *else* has ever been so ordained, not even Joseph the prophet. He thus perverts the history of Joseph Smith, written by himself and published in *Times and Seasons*, Vol. 5, p. 624, as follows:

"On the 26th [April 1832] I

called a general council of the church, and was acknowledged as the president of the high priesthood, according to a previous *ordination* at a conference of high priests, elders and members, held at Amherst, Ohio, on the 25th of January, 1832."

I quote another high authority; F. D. Richards, then and until his death, historian of your church. In a letter dated Salt Lake City, Utah, March 7, 1898, addressed to Mr. Jehu B. Clark, Eula, Alabama, he says:

"In the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints no one has ever been ordained to be president of the church \* \* \* Neither Joseph Smith, Brigham Young, Jno. Taylor nor Wilford Woodruff were ordained presidents of the church."

This letter complete and the one preceding it, in "True Succession in Church Presidency" by Heman C. Smith, pp. 149-154. Like Elder Penrose, Mr. Richards perverts the history of Joseph Smith, in order to justify his church for failing to ordain Young, Taylor and Woodruff.

Were these men legally installed in the presidency of

the high priesthood, without an ordination *to that office*; when the law of God makes such an ordination *obligatory*?

#### CONTRADICTION 5.

The law of the Lord provides that the Prophet Joseph should appoint his own successor. Pres. Lorenzo Snow testified, under oath, that Brigham Young was not so appointed.

The law:

“And this ye shall know assuredly that there is none other appointed unto you to receive commandments and revelations until he [Joseph Smith] be taken, if he abide in me. But verily, verily, I say unto you, that none else shall be appointed unto this gift except it be through him, for if it be taken from him, he shall not have power except *to appoint another in his stead*; and this shall be a law unto you, that ye receive not the teachings of any that shall come before you as revelations or commandments; and this I give unto you that you may *not be deceived*, that you may know they are not of me.”  
—D. & C. 43:3-6. (Italics mine).

Was Brigham Young appointed to succeed the Prophet in the

presidency of the church, by Joseph Smith? If not, and you persist in accepting him as Joseph's successor, one of two things is true; Either you are "deceived," or Joseph Smith was a false prophet. For the Lord says respecting the law that Joseph should appoint his successor, etc.: "This I give unto you that ye may not be deceived." And not only are you "deceived" but the whole Utah Mormon church is "deceived," and has been for half a century and longer.

Testimony of Pres. Lorenzo Snow, in the Temple Lot suit, 1893, between the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints and the Church of Christ, of Independence, Missouri, Abstract of Testimony, pp. 316-23:

"Lorenzo Snow, of lawful age, being produced and sworn on the part of the defendants, testified as follows: 'Brigham Young took the presidency of the church after the death of Joseph Smith. \* \* \* He was not appointed by Joseph Smith as the president. I do not understand that Joseph Smith designated him as his successor, and Brig-

ham Young never claimed that he did."

Certainly not. Here is Brigham's testimony: "Did Joseph ordain any man to take his place? He did. Who was it? It was Hyrum."—*Times and Seasons*, Vol. 5, p. 681.

#### CONTRADICTION 6.

All the "temples" in Utah were built without the authority of a command of God so to do, in violation of the following revelation to Joseph Smith, viz.:

"By the ordinance of my holy house which my people are always commanded to build unto my holy name."—D. & C. 124: 39.

If "My people are *always* commanded to build my holy house," what right have they to erect a temple *until* the Lord commands? The authority for the erection of a temple at Nauvoo, Illinois, is found in verses 25-27 of the above revelation, and in the verse following the language quoted above, viz.:

"\* \* \* Let this house be built unto my name."

And this, authorizing the building of the Kirtland temple:

"Ye have not considered the great commandment in all

things, that I have given unto you, concerning the building of mine house," etc.—D. & C. 95: 3.

No attempt was made to erect a temple under the presidency of Joseph Smith without the authority of a divine command. Neither would the prophet permit the rule—"Which my people are always commanded to build"—to be violated, as the following shows:

"The previous summer [August 5, 1837], the authorities of the church in Missouri had resolved in council to go on moderately and build a house unto the name of the Lord in Far West. When Joseph arrived there, he counseled that the building of that house should be postponed until the Lord should reveal it to be his will to have it commenced."—Jensen's Historical Record, Vol. 7, p. 434. Jensen is assistant historian of the Utah church.

Now, reader, did the Lord "reveal it to be his will" that any "temple" should be "commenced" in *Utah*? Is there any *pretense* of the authority of divine commandment for their construction? If so, where is such command written? For

revelation to Joseph Smith teaches the church must “not only *say* but *do* according to that which I have *written*.” (D. & C. 84: 57). But for the sake of certainty, let Pres. Young answer. His answer will be conclusive, as all the temples in Utah were built or began under his administration. February 14, 1853, he said:

“Some might query whether a revelation had been given to build a house to the Lord, but he is a wicked and slothful servant who doeth nothing but what his Lord commandeth, when he knoweth his Master’s will. I know a temple is needed, and so do you; and when we know a thing, why do we need a revelation to compel us to do a thing?”  
—*Millennial Star*, Vol. 15, p. 391.

That settles it. The temples in Utah were built *without command of God*, and in violation of the revelation of the Lord: “Which my people are *always commanded* to build unto my holy name.”

Reader, which will you renounce, the revelations of Joseph Smith or the temples in Utah as mere human structures? Nay, more; as edifices which bear this

false and deceptive inscription over the door, "The House of the Lord!"

#### CONTRADICTION 7.

Your church practices "baptism for the dead in every temple in Utah. (See Robert's book, p. 132). All work performed for the dead in the temples in Utah is a transgression of the revelation of the Lord through the prophet, forbidding the practice of "baptizing for the dead" by those who are "scattered abroad." The language of the revelation is:

"And after this time, your baptisms for the dead, by those who are scattered abroad, are not acceptable to me, saith the Lord."—D. & C. 124: 35.

"After this time;" after what time?

"For verily I say unto you, that after you have had sufficient time to build a house to me wherein the ordinance of baptizing for the dead belongeth, and for which the same was instituted from before the foundation of the world, your baptisms for your dead can not be acceptable unto me."—D. & C. 124: 33.

Has the "sufficient time" for

the building of the temple at Nauvoo elapsed, years, long years ago? Are the Latter Day Saints in *Utah* "scattered abroad" from Nauvoo? Does over a thousand miles intervene between them and the place where God told them to build a temple for the express purpose of "baptizing for the dead;" promising them, if they would "hearken" to his voice, they should "not be moved out of" their place; not be "scattered abroad," but be able to remain at Nauvoo and erect a temple *there*? Yes, the time has long since passed for the building of a temple at Nauvoo; the Saints in *Utah* were "scattered abroad," and from that very city too. Then, what right have they NOW to "baptize for the dead" IN UTAH, when the revelation distinctly says: "And after this time, your baptisms for the dead, by those who are scattered abroad, are not acceptable unto me, saith the Lord."

Baptizing for the dead in *Utah* is also prohibited by the following:

"For it is ordained that in Zion, and in her stakes, and in Jerusalem, those places

which I have appointed for refuge, shall be the places for your baptisms for your dead."—D. & C. 124: 36.

These revelations teach, as already shown, that Missouri and the country immediately adjoining is "the land of Zion," not Utah. Neither is there a Stake of Zion in all Utah, for the revelation prohibits such:

"Neither shall there be any other place appointed than that which I have appointed, for the work of the gathering of my Saints, until the day cometh when there is found no more room for them."—D. & C. 101: 20-26.

The "day" has not yet come to appoint "other places" as stakes of Zion, for there is *still* ample "room" for Latter Day Saints in and near Missouri. So there can be no "Stake of Zion," which the *Lord* has "appointed" for baptizing the dead. (D. & C. 124: 36). Utah is again barred out.

Oh, ye candidates to be baptized for the dead, before entering these *forbidden waters*, pause—Pause and read the inscription which this revelation emblazons over the baptismal font of every temple in Utah: "SCATTERED

ABROAD, BUT BAPTIZING FOR THE DEAD STILL; IN UTTER DEFIANCE OF THE FIAT OF JEHOVAH FORBIDDING US SO TO DO.”

#### CONTRADICTION. 8.

You claim to be the chosen people of God and your church the only one accepted of him. The revelations of Joseph Smith, in connection with your own history, made by your own hand, rise up against you and denounce the claim as untrue, and frown upon you for making a plea which contradicts the voice of God!

#### Proof.

“But I command you, all ye my Saints, to build a house unto me; and I grant unto you a sufficient time to build a house unto me, and during this time your baptisms shall be acceptable unto me; and if you do not these things at the end of the appointment, ye shall be rejected as a church with your dead, saith the Lord your God.”—D. & C. 124: 31, 32.

Observing the neglect of many of the Saints to comply with the requirements of this revelation, the Twelve became greatly

alarmed lest the threat and calamity of being "rejected" should befall the church. To prevent, if possible, this disaster, December 13, 1841, they published an "epistle" in the *Times and Seasons*, Vol. 3, pp. 625-7, signed by Brigham Young, John Taylor, Wilford Woodruff and six other apostles, from which I quote:

"The building of the temple of the Lord, in the city of Nauvoo, is occupying the first place in the exertions and prayers of many of the Saints at the present time, knowing, as they do, if this building is not completed speedily we 'shall be rejected as a church with our dead,' for the Lord our God hath spoken it; but while many are engaged thus in laboring, and watching, and praying for this all important object, there are more, very many more, who do not thus come up to their privilege and their duty in this thing, and in many instances we are confident their neglect arises from want of proper understanding of the principles upon which this building is founded, and by which it must be completed."

Did the "neglect" of the majority, the "more, very many

www.LatterDayTruth.org

more" of the Saints, prevent the temple being "completed?" Let Pres. B. Young, one of the framers and signers of the above "epistle," answer. In the temple at St. George, January 1, 1877, recorded in *Journal of Discourses*, Vol. 18, p. 304, Brigham said:

"Joseph located the site for the temple block in Jackson county, Missouri, and pointed out the southeast corner of the temple in the year 1831; also laid the corner stone for a temple in Far West, Caldwell county, Missouri. These temples were not built. We built one in Nauvoo. I could pick out several before me now that were there when it was built, and know just how much was finished and what was done. It is true we left brethren there with instructions to finish it, and they got it nearly completed before it was burned; but the Saints did not enjoy it. Now we have a temple which will all be finished in a few days and of which there is enough completed to commence work therein, which has not been done since the days of Adam that we have any knowledge of."

What! No temple sufficiently

completed "from the days of Adam" "to commence work therein" until that at St. George in 1877! Then the church was "rejected" of God, Pres. Young himself being the witness; for, did he not declare, and truthfully, too, in his "epistle" in 1841:

"If this building [Nauvoo temple] is not completed speedily, we shall be rejected as a church with our dead, for the Lord our God has spoken it."

The statement of Joseph the Seer, concerning the building of the Nauvoo temple, to which attention has already been directed, viz., "And if not done in due time we may have to share the same fate that we have heretofore done in Missouri," is proof, in connection with the later history of the church, that the temple was "not done in due time," for the Saints were expelled from Illinois, thus sharing "the same fate" they had "heretofore done in Missouri." If the temple was "not done in due time," what was to befall the church? "Ye shall be rejected as a church with your dead, saith the Lord your God."—D. & C. 124: 32.

The position of the prophet, as

stated above, agrees exactly with Doctrine and Covenants 124: 45:

“And if my people will hearken unto my voice, and unto the voice of my servants whom I have appointed to lead my people, behold, verily I say unto you, they shall not be moved out of their place.”

As this language refers to the building of the temple, as the context shows, it ought now to be apparent to all that the Saints did not “hearken” to the voice of God respecting the building of the house of the Lord at Nauvoo. Had they done so, they would have realized the promise God made them and would not have been “moved out of their place.”

Had the Nauvoo temple been completed and accepted of the Lord, the church would also have realized the following promise:

“Let this house be built unto my name, that I may reveal mine ordinances THEREIN, unto people; for I deign to reveal unto my church things which have been kept hid from before the foundation of the world.”—D. & C. 124: 40, 41.

Were those “ordinances” and “things which have been kept hid from before the foundation of the world,” revealed to the church *in the Nauvoo temple*? If so, where are they “written?” For the church is commanded of God to “do according to that which I have written.”

These evidences prove that the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints was “rejected” of God. The rejection of the church created a demand for a Reorganization of it, by those authorized of God so to do. For it was “never to be destroyed” (Dan. 2: 44), nor were the “keys” to be taken from the earth (D. & C. 27: 13), nor was the “enemy to overcome” (D. & C. 38: 9). “When the enemy shall come in like a flood, the Spirit of the Lord shall lift up a standard against him.” (Isa. 59: 19). The “enemy” did come into the Church of Latter Day Saints “like a flood,” but he did not “overcome.” “The Spirit of the

Lord" raised up "a standard against him." That standard is the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints. None of the revelations of Joseph Smith are repudiated by this organization. It represents the "faith once delivered to the Saints."

"Turn thereunto and live, O "backslidden" Israel!

---



