

A Brief Overview of Doctrinal Differences between Mormon Fundamentalism and The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints

By Brian C. Hales
December 8, 2010

During the late 1930's and early 1940's, small groups of excommunicated members of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints began to coalesce to form a movement now called "Mormon fundamentalism." The main complaint of these "fundamentalists" against The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints involves the practice of polygamy, but other doctrinal issues separate the two bodies. From the 21 volumes of *Truth* magazine (1935-1956), to the more recent publications by Ogden Kraut, such as *95 Theses*, several themes recur attempting to show that Church leaders have deviated from fundamental doctrines and are presently in a state of partial or complete apostasy.

This article will provide a brief overview of eight theological divergences between early fundamentalist teachings and those of their mother church:

1. The need to continue to practice plural marriage
2. The meaning and authority of the 1890 Manifesto
3. The proper method of priesthood conferral
4. The law of consecration
5. Missionary work "without purse or scrip"
6. The Adam-god theory
7. The duties of the "one mighty and strong" mentioned in D&C 85:7
8. The gathering of Israel
9. The priesthood organization established by Joseph Smith

Today, the larger fundamentalist factions such as the Allred group (Apostolic United Brethren), and the FLDS, as well as many smaller splinter groups, may or may not agree with the teachings of their founders Lorin Woolley, J. Leslie Broadbent, John Y. Barlow, and Joseph Musser. However in the 1920s and 1930s, these men established essential doctrines that set them apart from the Church, doctrines that were originally embraced by a majority of the members of the then burgeoning fundamentalist movement.¹

PLURAL MARRIAGE

Mormon fundamentalists believe that Joseph Smith taught that to be exalted, a person must practice plural marriage. It is true that in the early 1840s he secretly taught Church members that it was required and it was publicly pronounced in 1852, eight years after his death.

¹Throughout this article I refer to modern polygamists as "Mormon fundamentalists." The first application of the title was in 1835 by Joseph Musser. (See Joseph White Musser, "The Short Creek Embroglio," *Truth* 1 [October 1935]: 52.) Mark E. Petersen is often credited with creating the label in the early 1940s. (See "Fundamentalism Vindicated," *Truth* 13 [May 1948]: 315). Since "Mormon fundamentalists" have never performed missionary work to baptize new members, which is arguably the most fundamental of all of Joseph Smith's teachings, the title seems to be misapplied.

Believing the commandment could not be removed at any time thereafter, fundamentalists today continue to attempt its practice.

To support their position, fundamentalists observe that section 132 was given in response to Joseph Smith's inquiry "to know and understand wherein I, the Lord, justified my servants Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, as also Moses, David and Solomon, my servants, as touching the principle and doctrine of their having many wives and concubines" (D&C 132:1). Subsequent verses state that "all those who have this *law* revealed unto them must obey the same... and he that receiveth a fulness thereof must and shall abide the *law*, or he shall be damned, saith the Lord God" (vv 3, 6; italics added). By assuming that the "law" refers to is polygamy, fundamentalists conclude that monogamy constitutes disobedience and brings damnation.

In response, Church authors review all 29 references to the "law" as found in D&C 132 and affirm that the word does not refer strictly to plural marriage, but rather to *eternal marriage* which includes the plurality of wives but is not limited to it. They argue that once the Lord restores the knowledge of and the authority to perform eternal marriages, those who understand must participate or they will "remain separately and singly, without exaltation, in their saved condition, to all eternity" (D&C 132:17), which is a form of damnation.

Also, Church believers observe that the revelation on celestial and plural marriage, now section 132 in the Utah Doctrine and Covenants, promises exaltation to a monogamous couple who are sealed by proper authority and live worthily:

And again, verily I say unto you, if **a man marry a wife** by my word, which is my law, and by the new and everlasting covenant, and it is sealed unto them by the Holy Spirit of promise, by him who is anointed, unto whom I have appointed this power and the keys of this priesthood; and it shall be said unto them --- Ye shall come forth in the first resurrection; and if it be after the first resurrection, in the next resurrection; and shall inherit thrones, kingdoms, principalities, and powers, dominions, all heights and depths -- then shall it be written in the Lamb's Book of Life... and they shall pass by the angels, and the gods, which are set there, to their exaltation and glory in all things, as hath been sealed upon their heads which **glory shall be a fullness and a continuation of the seeds forever and ever**. Then **shall they be gods**, because they have no end. (D&C 132:19-20; emphasis added.)

In these verses, there is no apparent demand for plural marriage in order to receive "a continuation of the seeds," which is exaltation in Joseph Smith's teachings.²

Mormon fundamentalists may counter by quoting an 1866 statement from Brigham Young: "The only men who become Gods, even the Sons of God, are those who enter into polygamy. Others attain unto a glory and may even be permitted to come into the presence of the Father and the Son; but they cannot reign as kings in glory."³ Latter-day Saint may claim that extracting this single quote from the entire talk misrepresents Brigham's general teaching.

² See Joseph Smith quoted by William Clayton in George D. Smith, ed. *An Intimate Chronicle: The Journals of William Clayton*. Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1995, 102; Andrew F. Ehat, and Lyndon W. Cook, eds. *The Words of Joseph Smith: The Contemporary Accounts of the Nauvoo Discourses of the Prophet Joseph Smith*. Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University Religious Studies Center, 1980, 247.

³ Brigham Young, August 19, 1866, *Journal of Discourses*, 11:269. In 1875, excommunicated Church member Fanny Stenhouse recalled: "We were told that in the other world Polygamy should be the only order of marriage, and that without it none could be exalted in glory." (Fanny Stenhouse, *"Tell It All": The Story of a Life's Experiences in Mormonism*. Hartford: A. D. Worthington & Co., 1875, 140.)

Earlier in the discourse he provided a more general commandment applicable to all members of the celestial kingdom: “If you desire with all your hearts to obtain the blessings which Abraham obtained, you will be polygamists *at least in your faith*, or you will come short of enjoying the salvation and the glory which Abraham has obtained.”⁴ On September 24, 1871 Brigham Young acknowledged that “a man may embrace the Law of Celestial Marriage in his heart and not take the second wife and be justified before the Lord.”⁵

Modern polygamous authors also frequently cite and 1878 discourse of Apostle Joseph F. Smith:

Some people have supposed that the doctrine of plural marriage was a sort of superfluity, or non-essential, to the salvation or exaltation of mankind. In other words, some of the Saints have said, and believe, that a man with one wife, sealed to him by the authority of the Priesthood for time and eternity, will receive an exaltation as great and glorious, if he is faithful, as he possibly could with more than one. I want here to enter my solemn protest against this idea, for I know it is false.⁶

Church members reply by quoting an earlier portion this very same talk where Joseph F. Smith declared that plural marriage “is a law of the Gospel pertaining to the celestial kingdom, applicable to all gospel dispensations, when commanded and not otherwise, and neither acceptable to God or binding on man unless given by commandment.”⁷ In other words, plural marriage is required “when commanded and not otherwise.” To assume that once commanded, it could never be suspended, contradicts scripture.

For example, Lehi lived at Jerusalem in 600 B.C. where he obeyed the Law of Moses, which permitted polygamy.⁸ However, the prophet Jacob, Lehi's son, taught that God removed that privilege from his father giving him and his followers a “commandment of the Lord... that they should have save it were one wife and concubines they should have none” (Jacob 3:5). The details of when and why this directive was given to Lehi are not detailed in the Book of Mormon, but it makes it clear that for him and his posterity, plural marriage was outlawed and monogamy established as the only accepted marital standard among the Nephites. Decades after Lehi's death, the Nephites engaged in whoredoms causing Jacob to remind his people of that earlier commandment, explaining that marriage practices are issued according to God's will (Jacob 2:30). However, it is clear in the text that the Nephites' later licentiousness had nothing to do with the earlier directive to practice monogamy.⁹

Church apologists assert that God allowed the practice of plural marriage through Moses and later removed it through Lehi. Similarly, the process was repeated in our day as plural

⁴ Brigham Young, August 19, 1866, *Journal of Discourses*, 11:268-269; italics mine.

⁵ Wilford Woodruff Journals

⁶ Joseph F. Smith, July 7, 1878, *Journal of Discourses*, 20:28.

⁷ Joseph F. Smith, July 7, 1878, *Journal of Discourses*, 20:26-27; italics added.

⁸ See Deu. 25:52; Sam. 12:7-8; Ex. 21:10; Mal. 2:11-15; Deu. 21:10-16; 1 Chr. 4:5; Judg. 8:30; 1 Sam. 1:2; 2 Chr. 11:18-23; 2 Chr. 24:3; 1 Chr. 2:46-48; Judg. 19:1;

⁹ Fundamentalist writers sometime confuse this issue asserting an association between the whoredoms in Jacob's time and the commandment given decades earlier to Jacob's father Lehi. See Joseph Musser, *Celestial or Plural Marriage*, 22. See also the editorial "The Book of Mormon and Polygamy" published April 1938, in *Truth* 3:177-83 (also 15:297).

marriage was established through Joseph Smith and completely removed through the Second Manifesto issued by Joseph F. Smith in 1904.

THE 1890 MANIFESTO

While virtually all Mormon fundamentalists believe the 1890 Manifesto issued by Church President Wilford Woodruff was wrong, their reactions to it have been mixed:

1. It constituted man's permission to break God's Law.¹⁰
2. It was a covenant with death and hell; a fulfillment of Isaiah 28:15.¹¹
3. It was a fulfillment of D&C 130:14-17.¹²
4. It came from the "lower regions."¹³ It was a "smoke screen"¹⁴ and inspired by Satan,¹⁵ etc.
5. It was issued because the Church members demanded the Manifesto.¹⁶
6. It was issued because the Saints were planning to obtain Statehood and then legalize polygamy.¹⁷
7. It was given to fool the gentiles while the Church secretly continued the practice of plural marriage.¹⁸
8. It came as a result of the wisdom of men, particularly Wilford Woodruff.¹⁹

¹⁰ *Truth* 6:109.

¹¹ A contributed article to the periodical *Truth* claims that, "President Wilford Woodruff fulfilled the words of Isaiah, (28:15) when he signed the Manifesto: 'Because ye have said, we have made a covenant with death, and with hell we are at agreement.'" (*Truth*, 6:20.) See also *Keys of the Priesthood Illustrated*, p. 222. *Truth*, 1:21[9], 4:42, 5:248, 6:20. Heber Bennion, *Gospel Problems*, Dugway, Utah: Pioneer Press, N.d. (originally published in 1920), pp. 45-46.

¹² *Truth*, 3:78, 8:182. Gilbert A. Fulton, Jr., *Most Holy Principle*, 4 volumes, Salt Lake City, Utah: Gems Publishing Company, 1970-1975, 4:144. Also personal correspondence between one of the authors and a son of Rulon Allred, dated April 1, 1991, pp. 17-18.

¹³ *Keys of the Priesthood Illustrated*, p. 218. *Truth*, 8:260.

¹⁴ *Keys of the Priesthood, Illustrated*, p. 218.

¹⁵ *Truth*, 8:256.

¹⁶ Fundamentalists sometimes compare the issuing of the Manifesto to three distinct historical events. First to Joseph Smith giving Martin Harris the 116 pages (D&C 3, 10). See *Gospel Problems*, p. 43, 49-50; *Most Holy Principle* 4:66; *Truth* 6:19-20. Second, to the Israelites demanding that Samuel give them a king (1 Samuel 8:6-10). See *Most Holy Principle* 4:66; *Truth* 2:130, 6:21. And third, to the Israelites in the desert who rejected the higher law and were given the Law of Moses in its stead (Joseph Smith Translation - Exodus 34:1-2). See *Questions On Plural Marriage* p. 25; *Truth* 18:315, 20:201; *Star of Truth* 3:276; *Marriage - Ballard/Jensen Correspondence* p. 76. The best treatise which implements this approach is by Vance Allred, "Mormon Polygamy and the Manifesto of 1890: A study of Hegemony and Social Conflict," Senior Thesis: Department of History, University of Montana, June 1984. See also Ogden Kraut, *The 1890 Manifesto, 100th Anniversary*, pamphlet, 1990, p. 18; *Questions on Plural Marriage*, 24-25, *Truth* 1:21[8], 2:130, 6:21, 8:202, 260, 18:310, 20:200; *Star of Truth* 3:27; *Marriage - Ballard/Jensen Correspondence* p. 78; *Gospel Problems* p. 43.

¹⁷ *Most Holy Principle* 4:69-70; Joseph Musser, *Celestial or Plural Marriage*, Salt Lake City, Utah: Truth Publishing Company, 1944, p. 89, 148; *Truth* 4:146-147, 6:179, 18:310; *Star of Truth* 3:277; *Marriage - Ballard/Jensen Correspondence* p. 77.

¹⁸ *Truth* 1:21[9], 8:257.

¹⁹ *Truth* 6:108-109, 8:260, 9:142.

Fundamentalist writers have promoted a detailed history of the writing of the document:

Incident to an investigation of the Manifesto, one soon learns that President Woodruff did not write it. It was written by Charles W. Penrose, assisted by Elder Frank J. Cannon and John White. After its preparation, it was submitted to a committee of non-Mormons, Judges Charles S. Zane, C. S. Varian, and O.W. Powers, none of whom were well known for their friendship for the Mormons and their institutions. A change of wording was insisted upon in the Manifesto, and the document was recopied by a clerk named Green... President Woodruff, fully aware of the situation and the designs of the Lord signed the completed document.²⁰

In addition, fundamentalists also quote an account attributing the 1890 Manifesto to Elder Charles W. Penrose alone.²¹ This document, it is claimed, was then reviewed by several anti-Mormons and then submitted to Wilford Woodruff for his signature.²² One confusing entry in the journal of Joseph W. Musser in 1922 recorded that Lorin C. Woolley claimed: "He knew the Manifesto, because he helped to make it."²³ No historical account places Lorin Woolley as a participant or even distant observer.

Church members may be impressed with the many details provided in the various fundamentalist accounts of the history of the Woodruff Manifesto. Specific individuals are named and the particulars of their interactions explained. However, available manuscript documents recount a very different history of the Manifesto that contradict the fundamentalist version in virtually every detail. The historical record confirms that the original draft of the Manifesto was penned by Wilford Woodruff and that no non-Mormons were involved in preparing that document for publication. D. Michael Quinn provided this description:

Cannon described three levels of revision in the Manifesto that occurred on 24 September 1890: First, the First Presidency was engaged in other deliberations that morning and they asked George Reynolds, Charles W. Penrose, and John R. Winder to "take the document and arrange it for publication, to be submitted to us after they had prepared it." Second, when the document this committee prepared was read, President Cannon himself "suggested several emendations, which were adopted." Third, beginning at 2:30, Wilford Woodruff's Manifesto as already revised by Reynolds, Penrose, Winder, and Cannon was read to the meeting of the First Presidency and Apostles Franklin D. Richards, Moses Thatcher, and Marriner W. Merrill (Lorenzo Snow was not able to attend the meeting), and "one or two slight alterations were made in it." As soon as the First Presidency and three apostles approved these final changes, George Reynolds incorporated the revised Manifesto into a telegram the First Presidency sent for publication in national newspapers.²⁴

²⁰ *Most Holy Principle*, 4:67-68, *Truth* 1:20[8].

²¹ *Questions on Plural Marriage*, pp. 23-24; *Truth* 1:20[8], 5:114, 189, 20:204; *Star of Truth* 4:44.

²² *A Leaf In Review* p. 196; *Truth* 1:20[8], 6:182, 8:255; *Star of Truth* 3:278; *Marriage - Ballard/Jensen Correspondence* p. 78.

²³ Journal of Joseph W. Musser, April 9, 1922.

²⁴ George Q. Cannon, Diary, 24 Sept. 1890. In D. Michael Quinn, "L.D.S. Church Authority and New Plural Marriages, 1890-1904," *Dialogue*, 18 (Spring 1985) 44-45.

Fundamentalists may quote Church leaders who believed that the practice of plural marriage would never be suspended. For example, Wilford Woodruff, who while serving as the President of the Council of the Twelve Apostles, stated on December 20, 1888: “The Lord will never give a revelation for us to abandon plural marriage.”²⁵ In reply, Church authors would observe that the personal opinions of priesthood leaders do not constitute binding revelations for God’s followers. Wilford Woodruff made his declaration in a private council meeting, rather than as a general directive to the Church membership. Joseph Smith acknowledged this differentiation saying that “‘A Prophet is not always a Prophet’ only when he is acting as such.”²⁶ He also acknowledged “ I never told you I was perfect—but there is no error in the revelations which I have taught.”²⁷ Imperfect men may share their opinions but only their revelations, given as they fulfill their role as God’s prophet on earth, will contain “no error.”

Less than a year after Wilford Woodruff’s made the comment cited above, he contradicted it by issuing the Manifesto that removed the commandment to be polygamists. He later declared that the Manifesto was a revelation²⁸ and also taught that, “He [God] has told me exactly what to do... the God of heaven commanded me to do what I did do... I wrote what the Lord told me to write... Almighty God commanded me to do what I did... the Son of God felt disposed to have it [the Manifesto] presented to the Church...”²⁹

Mormon fundamentalists continue to practice plural marriage generally believing they are now more obedient than the 1890 Latter-day Saints who supported the Manifesto. An examination of historical sources supports that most Church members in 1890 did not understand what the Manifesto represented, but they sustained it because it came from their president and prophet. It would be inaccurate to portray 1890 polygamists as clamoring for monogamy or unwilling to make additional sacrifices if the Lord had then required them to do so.

PRIESTHOOD CONFERRAL

During the 1920's, Lorin Woolley remembered that President Taylor stated the following to him and others in 1886:

Among other things stated by President Taylor on this occasion was this, "I would be surprised if ten percent of those who claim to hold the Melchizedek priesthood will remain true and faithful to the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ, at the time of the seventh president, and that there would be thousands that think they hold the priesthood at that time, but would not have it properly conferred upon them."³⁰

²⁵ Minutes 419.

²⁶ Scott H. Faulring, ed. *An American Prophet's Record: The Diaries and Journals of Joseph Smith*. Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1989, 299.

²⁷ Andrew F. Ehat, and Lyndon W. Cook, eds. *The Words of Joseph Smith: The Contemporary Accounts of the Nauvoo Discourses of the Prophet Joseph Smith*. Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University Religious Studies Center, 1980, 369.

28. *Millennial Star*, 53:794-796 (1891). *Discourses of Wilford Woodruff*, p. 213-217.

29. *Discourses of Wilford Woodruff*, p. 217-218.

³⁰ 1929 Account.

This reported statement likely refers to a long standing controversy in the Church over the proper wording of the ordinations that transmit priesthood authority from one man to another. During the administration of Joseph F. Smith (1901-1918), the general policy was to first *confer* the priesthood and then *ordain* to the individual offices or callings within that Priesthood. During the presidency of Heber J. Grant (1918-1945), the official policy specified that an *ordination directly to an office in the respective priesthood* was all that was really required and that conferring of the priesthood was a redundant, if not presumptuous, part of the ordinance. George Albert Smith (1945-1951) cautiously removed specificity in the ordinances as a general policy, thereby permitting either form to be used.³¹ When David O. McKay assumed the Presidency in 1951 he reverted to the form followed during Joseph F. Smith's administration, which method is still being followed as the official Church policy.

Early fundamentalist leaders taught that the Joseph F. Smith approach was the only valid method for correctly conferring priesthood authority, rejecting the form used during Heber J. Grant's tenure as Church President. By disallowing such ordinations, Mormon fundamentalists consider all Church males so ordained to be functioning without genuine priesthood authority and that their ordinances to be invalid.

In response, Church researchers show that a variety of wording was employed in ordinations during the nineteenth century. Two methods appear to have been most common, but none were deemed superior so long as the person ordaining held a higher or equal priesthood and that during the ordination, the priesthood and the office bestowed were clearly identified. George Q. Cannon, a member of the First Presidency, wrote the following in 1894:

Ordaining to the Priesthood. We have been asked by several persons whether in ordaining a brother, it is right to confer the Priesthood first and then ordain him to the particular office to which he is called, or to directly ordain him to that office in the Priesthood. That is in ordaining a man an Elder, should the one officiating say: "I confer upon you the Melchizedek Priesthood and ordain you an Elder," or "I ordain you an Elder in the Melchizedek [Priesthood]" or whatever the office conferred may be?

So far as we know, the Lord has revealed no particular form or words to be used in the ceremony of ordination to the Priesthood as he has done in the rite of baptism, neither has he given any direct instructions on the point presented by the inquirers. Certain it is that both forms have been and are being used by those officiated, ordained in either way. Consequently, we are of the opinion that both are acceptable to him, and will be until it pleases him to give the Church further light on the subject, either by direct revelation or by inspiring his servants of the First Presidency of the Church to direct exactly what shall be said.³²

Two years later President Cannon elaborated:

We receive communications from time to time, from theological classes and from others, making inquiries concerning the language to be used in ordaining different officers in the Church. On this and many other points there is a very manifest disposition to be technical and to attach importance of certain phraseology. Of course, no one can object to the exercise of proper care in administering the different ordinances of the Gospel, whether the ordinance of baptism, laying on of hands, administering to the sick, or the ordaining of men to various offices in the Priesthood.

³¹See *Deseret News*, Dec. 27, 1947, also *Truth* 14:12.

³²*Juvenile Instructor*, 29:114.

But while this is right, and there should be no looseness about this, people should not become too critical and technical. The form which is given us by the Lord for the administration of the ordinance of baptism is exceedingly simple and to the point. Undoubtedly the Lord knew better than anyone else whether it was proper and covered the ground or not. It would be very presumptuous in any man to think that he could improve on that which the Lord has given; though there have been times when the President of the Church has suggested language to be used in administering the ordinance of baptism that was appropriate to the then existing circumstances surrounding the candidates. This, of course, he had the right to do, as the man holding the keys. But for the administration of the ordinance of baptism under ordinary circumstances the form prescribed by the Lord in the Book of Doctrine and Covenants is the form that should always be followed. The same may be said concerning the form given by the Lord touching the administration of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. We have, on page 609 in the Book of Mormon [Moroni chapter three], described to us the manner in which John, who was known as John the Baptist, ordained Joseph Smith and Oliver Cowdery. It is simple and to the point, and contains not an unnecessary word. Of course, in all ordinations care should be taken to bestow the authority, and should be done in the name of the Lord Jesus, and, as the Book of Mormon says, by the power of the Holy Ghost which is in the men who ordain.³³

It appears that President Cannon defends the method of ordaining directly to an office but counsels that either method was recognized by the Lord.

Fundamentalists may claim that up to 90% of Church members today have no priesthood because the words used to convey the priesthood to them differ from the pattern used during Joseph F. Smith's tenure as Church President. In response, LDS researchers demonstrate that a variety of wordings were used in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries to perform valid ordinations. Today the terminology has been standardized to avoid confusion, but it does not appear that in past decades, the Lord or His priesthood leaders were as strict as Mormon fundamentalists are today.

LAW OF CONSECRATION

Many fundamentalists today assert that the Lord requires His true followers to practice the law of consecration. Ogden Kraut argued:

Even Mormons have strayed so far from those divine principles that they often say that "United order cannot be lived in our time," or that "it has been revoked" or that those doctrines have been "substituted" by something else. These are expressions of ignorance or confessions of personal weakness. The laws of the Gospel are eternal. Righteous people should attempt to live the Gospel regardless of the time, circumstances or the influences of the world.³⁴

In pursuance of their goal, fundamentalists establish co-ops, united property associations, and even forms of communal living.

The law of consecration was described by Joseph Smith in 1831 (D&C 42:30-42). Two attempts were subsequently made to live it, one in Ohio and another in Missouri, but were

³³ *Juvenile Instructor*, March 15, 1896, vol. 31:174-175, Ed. George Q. Cannon, Editor. Brackets added

³⁴ Ogden Kraut, *The United Order*, Salt Lake City: Pioneer Press, 1983, 8.

unsuccessful. Joseph Smith counseled on June 22, 1834 that attempts to further fulfill the law of consecration lay in the future: "let those commandments which I have given concerning Zion and her law be executed and fulfilled, after her redemption" (D&C 105:34). In other words, let the law of consecration be implemented after Zion is redeemed, which has yet to occur.

Joseph Smith had an opportunity to establish the law of consecration at Nauvoo in the early 1840s, but declined saying: "The law of consecration could not be kept here, and that it was the will of the Lord that we should desist from trying to keep it; and if persisted in, it would produce a perfect defeat of its object, and that he assumed the whole responsibility of not keeping it until proposed by himself."³⁵

In 1874, Brigham Young re-instituted some of the principles of the law of consecration telling the Saints, "Thus saith the Lord unto my servant Brigham, Call ye, call ye, upon the inhabitants of Zion, to organize themselves in the Order of Enoch, in the New and Everlasting Covenant, according to the Order of Heaven, for the furtherance of my kingdom upon the earth, for the perfecting of the Saints, for the salvation of the living and the dead."³⁶ Organizing the Latter-day Saints in the "order of Enoch" included the establishment of united orders. During the next few years, dozens of such orders were created. However, continued success was not realized and those attempts to relive the law of consecration were officially brought to an end in 1881 by President Taylor, who counseled that "Our relations with the world and our own imperfections prevent establishment of this system at the present time, and therefore, as Joseph stated in an early day, it cannot yet be carried out."³⁷

Despite these observations, fundamentalists today may feel inspired or compelled to live the law of consecration. In contrast, Church scholars observe that freelance attempts are not sanctioned by the Lord. Joseph Smith taught it is a "privilege" to live the law, a privilege that cannot be arrogated to oneself. A May 1831 revelation stated: "And thus I grant unto this people a privilege of organizing themselves according to my laws" (D&C 51:15). To usurp this privilege would bring condemnation.

The Prophet also instructed that the process requires God's active participation through his appointed priesthood leaders on earth. The first revelation introducing the law of consecration, now section 42:30-39, mentions the "church" nine times, specifying in four places that a "bishop" must be involved with all the proceedings.³⁸ It appears that it is impossible to establish the law of consecration without a genuine "bishop of the church." Accordingly, sincere desires by Mormon fundamentalists or even Latter-day Saints would not singlehandedly authorize a man to begin to receive properties in the name of the Lord in order to establish the law of consecration. As described by Joseph Smith, participation requires the involvement of bishops and the Church (see D&C 41:9, 42:30-35, 51:1-6, 72:1-19,83:1-6 etc.) and ascribes to teachings that God's house is a house of order (D&C 88:119; 132:8, 18).

MISSIONARY WORK

³⁵ "Minutes of the Iowa High Council," March 6, 1840, reproduced in *History of the Church* 4:93.

³⁶ JD 17:154.

³⁷ John Taylor quoted in *Priesthood and Church Welfare* p. 129.

³⁸ "Church" is mentioned in verses 31, 32 (3times), 33, 34, 35, and 37 (twice). The "bishop" is referenced in 31, 32, 33, and 34.

The position of Mormon fundamentalism regarding missionary work is somewhat paradoxical. It appears that fundamentalist leaders have seldom, if ever, admonished their followers to serve as missionaries to fulfill the revelation: "Go ye into all the world, preach the gospel to every creature, acting in the authority which I have given you, baptizing in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost" (D&C 68:8).

Polygamists leaders from the 1920s onward have claimed to hold the keys of the priesthood, including the keys of the gathering of Israel (D&C 110:11, 35:25).³⁹ yet little or no effort has been expended to gather Israel.

Joseph Smith gave repeated revelations that commanded God's followers to serve as missionaries to baptize all the world. "This revelation unto you, and commandment, is in force from this very hour upon all the world, and the gospel is unto all who have not received it. But, verily I say unto all those to whom the kingdom has been given--from you it must be preached unto them" (D&C 84:75-76).

Therefore, let no man among you, for this commandment is unto all the faithful who are called of God in the church unto the ministry, from this hour take purse or scrip, that goeth forth to proclaim this gospel of the kingdom" (D&C 84:86).

By denying the principle of continuous revelation, Fundamentalists often assert that all missionary work today must be accomplished without purse or scrip. However, with the changing social and economic conditions of the past century, the Lord saw fit to change His directives to His followers just as He did His disciples during the meridian of time. Originally, Jesus Christ taught his Apostles:

These twelve Jesus sent forth, and commanded them, saying, Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not:

Provide neither gold, nor silver, nor brass in your purses,

Nor scrip for your journey, neither two coats, neither shoes, nor yet staves: for the workman is worthy of his meat. (Matt. 10:5, 9-10.)

Later we find, however, when the Lord commanded the Twelve as to their missionary service after his death, he told them to take both purse and scrip:

And he said unto them, When I sent you without purse, and scrip, and shoes, lacked ye any thing? And they said, Nothing.

Then said he unto them, But now, he that hath a purse, let him take it, and likewise his scrip: and he that hath no sword, let him sell his garment, and buy one. (Luke 22:35-36)

In our day the Lord has made similar allowances through His prophet John Taylor:

In relation to these missionary operations which have been alluded to, I should like to see something done, I do not know that it is necessary to talk about it. We used to be in the habit of going without purse or scrip. That is the way I have travelled hundreds and thousands of miles, but then we felt as the disciples of old did. When we returned, if asked if we had lacked anything, we could say verily no. But there was a time afterwards when

³⁹ See *Truth* 2:23; 7:233; *Most Holy Principle* 4:108, 238. Rulon C. Allred in *Gems* 1:3, 5, etc.

Jesus said--"Let him that has a purse take it with him, and let him that has no sword see his coat and buy one." **We do not always remain in status quo.** At that time we were the poorest people in the world, but now we are better off than the generality of mankind, and we are able to help one another, and **there is no necessity for our missionaries to go under the circumstances they have done heretofore;** and since it is the counsel that they shall not, why let us do what we can to help them.... (JD 12:48-49.)

An article in the *Millennial Star* later referred to this new instruction from the Lord's Anointed:

At this time and now about 15 years ago, **the word of the Lord came as of old that from that time forth those who should be called to go on missions should take their purse and scrip with them;** and I well remember President John Taylor, according to President Young's instruction, preaching a powerful sermon on the subject, setting forth his reasons why it would, in the future be necessary for the missionaries to take purse and scrip with them. (*Millennial Star* 49:51.)

The Fundamental doctrine concerning missionary work is demonstrated in the New Testament: *with* or *without* purse and scrip as commanded by the Lord.

ADAM-GOD THEORY

One of the most popular Fundamentalist doctrines involves the notion that Adam, the first man upon the earth, was a god prior to his earthly existence. It is alleged that he was and is superior to Jesus Christ. These ideas contradict the teachings about Adam given in the Standard Works and by modern prophets such as Joseph Smith, Brigham Young and John Taylor. A comparison of the Adam-God theory to truly Fundamental teachings about Adam shows the following:

ADAM and	Fundamental Teachings	Adam-God Theory
His Creation	From the dust ⁴⁰	Resurrected body
His Probation	Needed ⁴¹	Not on this earth
Christ's Atonement	Needed ⁴²	Not required or even applicable
His Death	Yes ⁴³	None

40. See Genesis 2:7, Mormon 9:17, D&C 77:12 and Moses 3:7 and 4:25. Also worth noting are Genesis 3:19, Alma 42:2 and Moses 4:29.

41. See D&C 29:34-43 and Alma 42:4-14.

42. Moses 5:6-9, 6:51-52, 6:64-66.

43. Genesis 5:5, D&C 107:42, 53, D&C 29:42, Moses 3:17 and *Teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith*, p. 38.. See also Abraham 5:13, Moses 4:9, 6:35, Alma 12:23, *Lectures on Faith* 2:10 and *Teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith*, p. 367.

His Resurrection	Through Christ ⁴⁴	Unknown process
------------------	------------------------------	-----------------

As should be obvious from the chart above, the Adam-God theory clearly contradicts the scriptures.

Equally incorrect is the teaching that Adam is superior to our Savior Jesus Christ. Joseph Smith taught this doctrine plainly:

God purposed in himself that there should not be an eternal fulness until every dispensation should be fulfilled and gathered together in one and that all things whatsoever that should be gathered together in one in those dispensations unto the same fulness and eternal glory should be in Christ Jesus, therefore **he set the ordinances to be the same forever and ever and set Adam to watch over them** to reveal them from heaven to man or to send Angels to reveal them. (Hebrew 1:16.) Are they not all ministering spirits sent forth to minister to those who shall be heirs of salvation. **These angels are under the direction of Michael or Adam who acts under the direction of Christ.**⁴⁵

Respecting authority, Joseph Smith noted that "**Christ is the Great High Priest, Adam next**" (*Teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith*, p. 158). Some have suggested that the Prophet was stating that Adam was "next" because he was superior to Jesus, making our Savior second to Adam in the priesthood. However, this is not so, Joseph Smith also identified who was second to Adam:

The Priesthood was first given to Adam: he obtained the First Presidency and held the keys of it, from generation to generation; he obtained it in the creation before the world was formed as in Gen. 1:26-28. He had dominion given him over every living creature. He is Michael, the Archangel, spoken of in the scriptures. **Then to Noah who is Gabriel, he stands next in authority to Adam in the Priesthood.** (*Words of Joseph Smith*, p. 8 and *Teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith*, p. 157.)

These statements plainly show that Christ is the "Great High Priest" and that Adam is "next" and that Noah "stands next in authority to Adam in the Priesthood." It appears that Joseph Smith could not have been any clearer in this teaching.

Brigham Young also taught this Fundamental doctrine:

We believe in God the Father and in Jesus Christ our elder brother. We believe that God is a person of tabernacle, possessing in an infinitely higher degree all the perfections and qualifications of his mortal children. We believe that he made Adam after his own image and likeness. (JD 10:230-231; see also JD 1:238, 4:216 13:308-309, 311-12 etc.)

Regarding the man Adam, the Fundamental teaching is that he was a man who underwent a period of probation and was dependent upon the atonement and resurrection of Jesus Christ for his own salvation. It is also obvious that while he is very important in the priesthood, he is not superior to Jesus Christ.

44. Alma 42:2-6, Helaman 14:15-17, D&C 84: 16 and Abraham 1:3. See also Alma 40:2-3.

45. *The Words of Joseph Smith*, p. 39. *Teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith*, p. 168. Spelling standardized.

THE ONE MIGHTY AND STRONG

On November 27, 1832, Joseph Smith received a revelation that included the following statement:

And it shall come to pass that I, the Lord God, will send **one mighty and strong**, holding the scepter of power in his hand, clothed with light for a covering, whose mouth shall utter words, eternal words; while his bowels shall be a fountain of truth **to set in order the house of God**, and **to arrange by lot the inheritances of the saints** whose names are found, and the names of their fathers, and of their children, enrolled in the book of the law of God. (D&C 85:7.)

Section 85 was added to the Doctrine and Covenants in 1876. Even though the revelation had been published in the *Evening and Morning Star* in January, 1833, references to "one mighty and strong" did not become popular among Church apostates until many years after it was added to the Doctrine and Covenants (in 1876). During the past few decades, it is quite likely the most commonly quoted scripture among Fundamentalists. This is because they have formed their own "laundry lists" of things they believe the "One Mighty and Strong" referred to is going to "set in order." The lists includes:

Church Finances⁴⁶
The Redemption of Israel⁴⁷
Being lead to Independence, Missouri⁴⁸
Polygamists being given leadership callings in the Church⁴⁹
Change terminology used during priesthood ordinations⁵⁰
Law of Consecration⁵¹
Vindication of Modern Polygamists with
their Church Memberships restored⁵²

As one reviews the actual scripture (D&C 85:7), it requires an abundance of misguided faith to believe that this verse could have possibly had the scope Fundamentalists now claim. Fundamentalist interpretations completely disagree with those given by all our Church leaders.⁵³ The mission of the One Mighty and Strong given in D&C 85:7 includes two activities:

46. Joseph Musser Journals June 14, 1922. This teaching is attributed to Lorin C. Woolley. In 1922, polygamists believed the Church was in "Financial Bondage" and "One Mighty and Strong" was to come and rescue the Church financially.

47. *Ibid.* June 10, 1928.

48. *The One Mighty and Strong*, p.15. D&C 103:16 identifies "a man, who shall lead them like as Moses led the children of Israel" for the "redemption of Zion" though Orson Pratt did not believe it was to be Joseph Smith in JD 15:362, 17:303, 21:153.

49. Joseph Musser Journals, March 8, 1933. Personal communication with several FUNDAMENTALISTS.

50. *Truth* 14:12, 12:40-41.

51. *The United Order*, p. 258.

52. Joseph Musser Journals, April 30, 1943.

53. See JD 12:323, 17:305, 21:150-151 for examples from Orson Pratt.

1. "to set in order the house of God"
2. "to arrange by lot the inheritances of the saints..."

Research into the background of this verse shows that the duties of the One Mighty and Strong involve establishing the Church and the Law of Consecration in Jackson County, Missouri. No priesthood leader, including Joseph Smith, Brigham Young, John Taylor etc. has ever taught otherwise.⁵⁴ This is the true Fundamental doctrine. Any further elaboration is pure speculation.

THE GATHERING OF ISRAEL

Fundamentalists may assert that the Church has changed the Lord's command to "gather." They state:

There came a time when perhaps through partial apostasy of the Saints here, or their grudging help to newcomers, the policy of gathering was changed. "Stay where you are", the word went out in Europe and the different states of the Union, "build up the churches where you are and all will be well with you". Or in other words, stay in Babylon, which is falling, and there be tempted to "partake of their sins and receive of her plagues...." (*Truth* 11:431.)

Criticisms such as these are plentiful in Fundamentalist literature and simply reflect an unfamiliarity with the purpose of gathering. In 1843, the Prophet Joseph Smith preached a discourse on the theme "The Purpose of the Gathering of Israel." It is a most instructive discourse and should be prayerfully studied by all. The Prophet said:

This subject was presented to me since I came to the stand. **What was the object of gathering** the Jews, or the people of God in any age of the world?...

The main object was to build unto the Lord a house whereby He could reveal unto His people the ordinances of His house and the glories of His kingdom, and teach the people the way of salvation; for there are certain ordinances and principles that, when they are taught and practiced, must be done in a place or house built for that purpose.

It was the design of the councils of heaven before the world was, that the principles and laws of the priesthood should be predicated upon the gathering of the people in every age of the world. Jesus did everything to gather the people, and they would not be gathered, and He therefore poured out curses upon them. Ordinances instituted in the heavens before the foundation of the world, in the priesthood, for the salvation of men, are not to be altered or changed. All must be saved on the same principles.

It is for the same purpose that God gathers together His people in the last days, to build unto the Lord a house to prepare them for the ordinances and endowments, washings and anointings, etc. (HC 5:423-424. Compare D&C 124:36.)

Hence, the gathering is required so the saints can receive the blessings of the temple. As temples are built in lands outside the United States, the saints are able to receive those sacred blessings without physically gathering to a new location. Concerning temple building, Brigham

54. See *Messages of the First Presidency*, 4:107-120.

Young observed that thousands of temples would someday be built:

To accomplish this work there will have to be **not only one temple but thousands of them**, and thousands and tens of thousands of men and women will go into those temples and officiate for people who have lived as far back as the Lord shall reveal. (JD 3:372. See also 10:254.)

Obviously, these thousands of temples would not be in one location. They would be located throughout the world.

Fundamentalists often claim that the Church, due to apostasy, is no longer accomplishing the gathering of Israel because its missionaries are not teaching new converts to relocate to a specific site in America. The purpose of the gathering is to "gather" the elect into the Stakes of Zion throughout the world so they can receive the ordinances of the House of the Lord from nearby temples. In times past, this required a physical separation because temples were few in number, as were Stakes. However, Stakes have been established throughout the world as contemplated by Joseph Smith (HC 3:390) into which the elect may be gathered. In these last days, the saints will fight the Lord's battles from Stakes which are found "scattered upon all the face of the earth" (see 1 Ne. 14:14).

At a future date, a gathering will take place to Jackson County, Missouri, but for now the Lord has directed us to gather the elect out of Babylon into the Stakes of Zion (wherever they are established) to receive their temple ordinances.

As we review Fundamentalist doctrines, it is perplexing to note that they themselves are not gathering into one central location, but have gathering places in Montana, Arizona, Mexico, Canada and specific sites in Utah. Their criticisms concerning the Church and the gathering appear almost hypocritical. Neither do they follow the Fundamental teachings of Joseph Smith regarding the purpose of "gathering" which is to receive ordinances of salvation in the House of the Lord.

THE PRIESTHOOD

In 1934, Joseph Musser began to teach his followers some very new ideas regarding the Priesthood, its presiding councils and offices. Clearly the Priesthood doctrines presented by Musser constituted *new* teachings, since no Priesthood leader, nor scripture, had ever suggested anything similar. He taught:

There are three major **organizations**, set up in the following order:

(a) **Priesthood; the higher order of which being God's immediate authority, and to which all other organizations, priesthoods and callings are subordinate.**

(b) The Church; which is the vehicle used by **the Priesthood** in its spiritual work, both at home and abroad.

(c) The Kingdom; having to do with the temporal or civil affairs of the peoples of earth.⁵⁵

...there is a Priesthood **organization** greater than that of the Church; and that Priesthood always has, can now and will continue to function aside from and independent of the

55. *A Priesthood Issue*, pp. 15-16. See also *Truth* 17:164. *Priesthood Items*, p. 13. *Supplement to the New and Everlasting Covenant of Marriage*, p. 91.

Church. (*A Priesthood Issue*, p. 25.)

It is impossible to claim that teachings of the alleged external *Priesthood* organization could possibly be Fundamental teachings because prior to the 1930's, no one in or out of the Church (including Joseph Musser), had ever referred to the idea.⁵⁶

In conjunction with his doctrine of the external *Priesthood* organization, Musser taught that the highest Priesthood office was that of HIGH PRIEST APOSTLE⁵⁷ which was supposedly a higher office than the apostleship held by the Twelve. This clearly contradicts the Fundamental doctrine taught by Brigham Young that nothing could exist which is higher in authority:

The keys of the eternal Priesthood, which is after the order of the Son of God, are comprehended by being **an Apostle**. All the Priesthood, all the keys, all the endowments, and everything preparatory to entering into the presence of the Father and of the Son, are in, comprehended of, circumscribed by, or I might say incorporated within the circumference of , the Apostleship. (JD 1:134-135.)

Musser also instructed that his *Priesthood* organization was presided over by a *Council of Seven Friends* or *Priesthood Council*.⁵⁸ This contradicts the Lord's Fundamental instruction on the subject. He plainly taught that the First Presidency presided and held the keys of the kingdom (see D&C 81:1-2, 107:22). In 1857, Heber C. Kimball, First Counselor to President Brigham Young proclaimed:

You have got to render an account of everything you have, for we are all stewards. You Bishops, Seventies, High Priests, Elders, Priests, Teachers, Deacons, and members **where did you get the Priesthood and authority you hold? It came from this very authority, the First Presidency** that sits here in this stand. There was an authority before us, and we got our authority from that, and you got it from us, and this authority is with the First Presidency. Now **do not go off and say that you are independent of that authority**. Where did you get your wives? Who gave them to you? By what authority were they given to you? Where did you get anything? (JD 4:251.)

During the 1920's, Lorin C. Woolley began to claim that in 1886 President John Taylor had secretly ordained him with authority to perform plural marriages. This contradicts the

56. See *The Priesthood of Modern Polygamy, An LDS Perspective*, pp. 177-210, 255-258.

57. See *Supplement to the New and Everlasting Covenant of Marriage* pp. 99-100. FUNDAMENTAList leaders in later years have largely ignored or denied Musser's teaching of a HIGH PRIEST APOSTLE. Rulon Allred refrains from ever using the term (see *Treasures of Knowledge*, 2 vols., Hamilton, Montana: Bitterroot Publishing Company) as does LeRoy S. Johnson (*LeRoy S. Johnson Sermons*). Recently, Rulon Jeffs, leader of FUNDAMENTALists centered in Colorado City, Arizona, completely denied the existence of the office of HIGH PRIEST APOSTLE (see page 61 of deposition given by Rulon Jeffs, May 23, 1989. Copy in possession of the author).

58. *Supplement to the New and Everlasting Covenant of Marriage*, p. 103, 109. Allegedly, this council has several other names which include: The Council of Friends of God, the Quorum of High Priest Apostles, and the Council of the Presidency. A few of the other proposed titles include: "Presidency of the Priesthood" (*A Priesthood Issue*, p. 18), "Presidency of the Council of High Priesthood" and "Presidency of the High Priesthood" (*Supplement to the New and Everlasting Covenant of Marriage*, p. 106), and "Council of the Church before the Presidency of the High Priesthood" (*Ibid.* p. 107). Some FUNDAMENTAList groups simply refer to it as *Priesthood Council* (see *LeRoy Johnson Sermons*).

Fundamental teaching that those in authority will be "known to the church":

Again I say unto you, that it shall not be given to any one to go forth to preach my gospel, or to build up my church, except he be ordained by someone who has authority, and **it is known to the church** that he has authority and has been regularly ordained by the heads of the church. (D&C 42:11.)

Woolley's assertions are confusing concerning the "one man" mentioned in D&C 132. The Fundamental doctrine teaches that it was impossible for John Taylor to give anyone sealing authority to be used indiscriminately after his (John Taylor's) death which occurred in 1877. Fundamentalist theories on priesthood might be commended for their creativity and ingenuity, however, they seem to be lacking a Fundamental quality.

PROCLAIMING THE GOSPEL

Through the Prophet Joseph Smith, the Lord has commanded us to preach the gospel in these latter-days. He has instructed:

Go ye into all the world, preach the gospel to every creature, acting in the authority which I have given you, baptizing in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. (D&C 68:8.)

Behold, I sent you out to testify and warn the people, and it becometh every man who hath been warned to warn his neighbor. (D&C 88:81.)

Dozens of other scriptures are available to show that the Lord expects His saints to proclaim His restored gospel. He has commanded that missionaries be sent out two-by-two (see D&C 42:6, 52:10, 62:5 etc.) and has condemned those who would not "open their mouths" (D&C 60:2).

In 1934, Joseph Musser wrote that the responsibility for missionary work rested upon his *Priesthood* organization, primarily his *Council of Friends*:

Upon them [*Council of Friends*] rested the responsibility of bearing the Gospel message to the world... (*Supplement to the New and Everlasting Covenant of Marriage*, p. 103.)

Notwithstanding, Fundamentalists do little or no missionary work. Their seventies will preach to individuals who seek them out, but they are not sent forth into the world to "preach the gospel to every creature." No missionaries are sent forth "two-by-two." Little or no effort is expended on behalf of fulfilling the Lord's command to "warn" our neighbors.

It appears that the bulk of Fundamentalists expend their energies attempting to live the principle of plural marriage and that little time or motivation is left to fulfill the very plain commandment, which is repeated over and over in the Doctrine and Covenants, to perform missionary work. Even in the nineteenth century, when the saints were being persecuted for polygamy, they still complied with the command to preach the gospel. Missionaries were sent to all the world to teach the gospel. Today, the actions of Fundamentalists show very clearly they feel no need to fulfill this Fundamental commandment.

TEMPLE WORK FOR THE DEAD

Joseph Smith expounded Fundamental principles concerning our need to perform Temple Work for the Dead:

And now as the great purposes of God are hastening to their accomplishment, and the things spoken of in the Prophets are fulfilling, as the kingdom of God is established on the earth, and the ancient order of things restored, the Lord has manifest to us this day and privilege, and **we are commanded to be baptized for our dead**, thus fulfilling the words of Obadiah, when speaking of the glory of the latter-day: "And saviors shall come up on Mount Zion to judge the remnant of Esau, and the kingdom shall be the Lord's." A view of these things reconciles the Scriptures of truth, justifies the ways of God to man, places the human family upon an equal footing, and harmonizes with every principle of righteousness, justice and truth. We will conclude with the words of Peter: "For the time past of our life may suffice us to have wrought the will of the Gentiles." "For, for this cause was the Gospel preached also to them that are dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the Spirit." (April 15, 1842. HC 4:595-599. *Teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith*, p. 223.)

The keys [of sealing authority] are to be delivered, the spirit of Elijah is to come, the Gospel to be established, the Saints of God gathered, Zion built up, and the Saints to come up as saviors on Mount Zion...

But how are they to become saviors on Mount Zion? By building their temples, erecting their baptismal fonts, and going forth and receiving all the ordinances, baptisms, confirmations, washings, anointings, ordinations and sealing powers upon their heads, in behalf of all their progenitors who are dead, and redeem them that they may come forth in the first resurrection and be exalted to thrones of glory with them; and herein is the chain that binds the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the children to the fathers, which fulfills the mission of Elijah. And I would to God that this temple was now done, that we might go into it, and go to work and improve our time, and make use of the seals while they are on earth. (*Ibid.* p. 330.)

This doctrine, [Joseph Smith] said, presented in a clear light, the wisdom and mercy of God, in preparing an ordinance for the salvation of the dead, being baptized by proxy, their names recorded in heaven, and they judged according to the deeds done in the body. This doctrine was the burden of the scriptures. **Those saints who neglect it, in behalf of their deceased relatives, do it at the peril of their own salvation.** (*Words of Joseph Smith*, p. 78.)

These instructions show very clearly that we are *commanded* to perform work for the dead. Nonetheless, Fundamentalists do not build temples and do not perform temple ordinances of the dead.⁵⁹ Again, their preoccupation with the principle of plural marriage allows them to ignore this plain Fundamental commandment.

SUMMARY

59. It is reported that at least one of the FUNDAMENTAList groups have constructed an endowment house in Utah and another outside of Mexico City, Mexico. Endowment work for the dead can only be performed in temples. This is why the Saints were forced to wait until 1877 and the completion of the St. George, Utah, temple to begin that important work, even though the endowment house in Salt Lake City had been in use for many years.

	Fundamental Doctrine	Fundamentalist Doctrine
Plural Marriage	<i>Eternal</i> Marriage required for Exaltation	<i>Plural</i> Marriage required for Exaltation
Priesthood Conferral	Either method: ordain directly to the office or confer pries-thood, then ordain, accepted	Must confer priesthood first, then ordain or it is not valid
Law of Consecration	To be lived when commanded under Church direction	Must be lived now without Church participation
Missionary Work	Will be <i>with</i> or <i>without</i> purse and scrip as commanded by the Lord	Must be <i>without</i> purse or scrip
Adam-God Theory	Christ is the Great High Priest, Adam next, then Noah	Adam is superior to Christ
One Mighty and Strong (D&C 85:7)	To establish the Church and Law of Consecration in Independence, Jackson County, Missouri	<u>Will "set in order"</u> : 1. Practice of plural marriage 2. Church finances 3. The redemption of Israel 4. Being lead to Independence, Missouri 5. Terms used to confer priesthood 6. Law of consecration 7. Vindication of polygamists with Church memberships restored 8. Polygamists given leadership positions in the Church etc.
Gathering of Israel	Gathering is to the Stakes of Zion to receive temple ordinances	Gathering must be to a specific physical location (though they don't say where)

Concerning prophets in these last days, Joseph Smith taught:

False prophets always arise to oppose the true prophets and **they will prophesy so very near the truth** that they will deceive almost the very chosen ones. (*Teachings of the Prophet Joseph*

Smith, p. 365.)

Joseph also instructed:

I will give you one of the keys of the mysteries of the kingdom. It is an eternal principle that has existed with God from all Eternity that **that man who rises up to condemn others, finding fault with the Church, saying that they are out of the way while he himself is righteous, then know assuredly that that man is in the high road to apostasy** and if he does not repent will apostatize as God lives. (*The Words of Joseph Smith*, p. 413.)

All of Fundamentalism's early leaders, Lorin C. Woolley, J. Leslie Broadbent, John Y. Barlow and Joseph W. Musser, were at one time members of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. At some point, each rose up, condemning others, finding fault with the Church, saying that the Church was out of the way while they were righteous. Each one apostatized. Concerning those who are excommunicated from the Church, the Lord has observed:

[W]o unto them who are cut off from my church, for the same are overcome of the world. (D&C 50:8.)

We have plainly observed that Fundamentalist *doctrines* are not truly Fundamental DOCTRINES but appear to be "very near the truth." Fundamentalism is not Fundamental and following it, its leaders or doctrines, will surely destroy one's soul.

Endnotes

Bibliography

- Allred, Rulon C., *Treasures of Knowledge*, 2 vols. Hamilton, Montana: Bitterroot Publishing Co., 1981-1982
- Anderson, J. Max, *Polygamy Story, Fiction and Fact*, Salt Lake City, Utah: Publishers Press, 1979.
- Benson, Ezra Taft, *Teachings of Ezra Taft Benson*, Salt Lake City, Utah: Bookcraft, 1988.
- Clark, James R., *Messages of the First Presidency*, 6 vols., Salt lake City, Utah, Bookcraft, 1965-1975.
- Hales, Brian C. and J. Max Anderson, *The Leaders and Doctrines of Modern Polygamy, An LDS Perspective*, Salt Lake City, Utah, 1993.
- Hales, Brian C. and J. Max Anderson, *The Priesthood of Modern Polygamy, An LDS Perspective*, Salt Lake City, Utah: Northwest Publishing, 1992.
- Johnson, LeRoy S., *LeRoy S. Johnson Sermons*, Hildale, Utah: Twin City Courier Press, 1984.
- Journal of Discourses*, 26 vols. Liverpool, England: F. D. Richards *et al*, 1854-1886. (Abbreviated JD.)
- Kraut, Ogden, *95 Thesis*, Salt Lake City, Utah: Pioneer Press, N.d.
- Kraut, Ogden, *The One Mighty and Strong*, Salt Lake City, Utah: Pioneer Press, 1991.
- Kraut, Ogden, *The United Order*, Salt Lake City, Utah: Pioneer Press, 1983.
- McConkie, Bruce R., *Mormon Doctrine*, Salt Lake City, Utah: Bookcraft, 1966.
- Musser, Joseph W., Journals, Photocopy in possession of the author.
- Musser, Joseph W., *A Priesthood Issue*, N.p. (Truth Publishing), N.d., (1948).
- Musser, Joseph W. (with J. Leslie Broadbent), *Priesthood Items*, N.p., N.d., (1934).
- Musser, Joseph W. (with J. Leslie Broadbent), *Supplement to the New and Everlasting Covenant of Marriage*, N.p., 1934.
- Musser, Joseph W., editor, *Truth*, Salt Lake City, Utah: Truth Publishing, 21 volumes, 1935-1956.
- Smith, Joseph, *History of the Church*, 7 vols., Salt Lake City, Utah: Deseret Book, 1978. (Abbreviated HC.)
- Smith, Joseph, *Lectures on Faith*, (Included with early editions of the Doctrine and Covenants).
- Smith, Joseph, *Teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith*, Joseph Fielding Smith ed., Salt Lake City, Utah: Deseret Book, 1977.
- Smith Joseph, *The Words of Joseph Smith*, Andres F. Ehat and Lyndon W. Cook eds., Provo, Utah: BYU Religious Studies Center, 1980.
- Stewart, George et. al, *Priesthood and Church Welfare*, Salt Lake City, Utah: Deseret Book, 1938.
- Woodruff, Wilford, Journals, Churuch Historical Department
- Woodruff, Wilford, *Discourses of Wilford Woodruff*, G. Homer Durham ed., Salt Lake City, Utah:Bookcraft, 1946.