Dear Bro. Hales, 11/10/93

Thank you very much for the response I received from you. I feel quite duty bound at the outset to send my deepest and most heart felt apologies for apparently seeming contentious, bitter, or uncharitable.

I have since reread my letter and though I apparently was a bit 'attitudinal', I most certainly did not want to let it get out of hand and am sorry if I were perceived in that way. I to find myself in a quandary. I used to be accused of being too cold, clinical, and emotionless—so now when I express myself passionately I am accused of 'anger, dislike, bitterness, etc.' So I acknowledge I may have treated you inappropriately and am sorry.

As for the content, I cannot apologize as I feel only a purveyor of The Fullness of the Gospel of Jesus Christ as it was revealed to Joseph Smith.
I also apologize for my chicken scratch I call handwriting. I am working on obtaining a computer so I may be more legible, but it is still several months till then. I do have an issue on 'Contention' anyway. I am generally quiet, and soft spoken. Yet, I had an experience which taught me quite a lesson. My bishop called me in not long ago to 'straighten me out' on Gospel Issues. Previously he commanded me saying I "must accept that the Gospel is an eternally changing Gospel and that God is an eternally changing God and if I don't accept that I will find myself out of the Church." So I knew we were not going to see too many things eye to eye. So I opted to remain silent as possible. He was "Heated and Vigorous" to be mild and hit right into me. He began to review "The Points of Doctrinal Purity" to which I could not have been more agreeable. Pounding his desk and threatening me, people outside heard him. I would ask him to go over some scriptures with me and his
Response would be "They mean nothing!" "We have no need of them!" Then he would point to the Manifesto to which I said "If it was a revelation from God why would Wilford Woodruff ordain people to carry plural marriage on secretly in defiance of God, Government and the Church?" To which he pointed his desk and literally screamed "You just being contentious, your full of contention and the Devil!"

When I bore my testimony of Joseph Smith and Brigham Young, he retorted I don't care what prophecy, scripture or revelation come from them they mean nothing to me." I was shocked and appalled by what I heard and when I came but my wife was worried as the color had left my face.

I wrote a letter to the 1st Pres. asking that he at least be corrected on the "Changing God" Doctrine - Guess what? They sustained him and wrote my stake Pres to deal with me. They certainly had grounds.
My point is I learned that when TRUE ETERNAL GOSPEL Principles are Faced off with the Temporal and Temporary Doctrines of Men—Contention is the Equation. There's no escaping it. No matter how pleasant the Delivery of Both. Flint and Steel when Struck Together Equal Sparks. Just as Two True Prophets will not Clash in Teaching or Doctrine, Two True and Eternal Principles will not Clash.

It is my intention and hope that in our discussions should an ‘Air’ of Contention be sensed I will look past the possibility of you being a Contentious Person and examine your Data to see if it ‘Contends’ with the Measures of the Restored Gospel, The Law and the Testament Which The Founders of Mormonism Sealed with their Blood.

As the Prophet Joseph Fielding Smith so adequately said: If I over say anything in Conflict with the Scriptures Let the Scriptures Prevail. Paraphrased: Eternal Truth does not have an
on/off switch, whereby to accept and give it will save you at one time and send you to hell another. But in my opinion you are not an idiot and the last thing I need to do is try to tell you that. I hope I do not need to apologize that I am not disposed to continually shift and change from one Gospel to another.

As for Brigham Young's prophecy on Plural Marriage I can refer you to Millennium Star 15:31, supplement. My simple issue is that when a prophet of the Lord prophesies - the prophecy will prove to become true or false. I believe Brigham was a prophet - and as solid and steady as the Word of the Lord came to Joseph we may apply the words "and I believe not myself."

I maintain that were the Manifesto never to come to pass - the Church and its Mission would have continued unhampered - the Lord promised deliverance - and many scriptures and Latter-day Prophecy endowed that.
deliverance would come only if the Gospel was not changed, altered, or abrogated or perverted. You are unlettered - you know these things.

As for Joseph Smith's prophecy on the Apostacy and the restoration of the Church - surely you have read D&C 101:35-62. That is just one. You cannot be oblivious to the others.

In your list of items with which the Church has done away, I have a question. How is it that they constituted the fullness of the restored Gospel? Those who were known Apostates in Joseph's and Brigham's time are well known to have rallied in opposition against these items, most notably plural marriage - they were Dissenters. Now those who advocate these things are Dissenters. Yet by your own admission in the list the Church Dissented FIRST.

Bruce R. McConkie has stated that plural marriage will again be practiced in the Church prior to the Second Coming presumably.
What will become of all of the plural families, and groups who will happily want Church membership? These people for the most part will not have to change a particle of thought and action as they submit themselves.

Do you honestly believe that during Christ's Millennial Reign Zion will be built up without implementing these things? Do you honestly believe that Joseph Smith's Design for the building up of the Kingdom of God was so far off track that we must be relieved that we need not live by these laws now or in eternity?

I have sat in Church and have heard a great many remarks on the 'mistakes' of Joseph and how Brigham was a president of the Church but no Prophet Seer and Revelator. I squirm, as I believe the bulk of Testimony, Scripture, and evidence points that 'The Mormonism they espoused' was already sharply focused, and unaltered would have brought about the promised
Then they strived for.

As for my accuser of your fear, as a matter of fact your accomplishments have proven fear is not the issue - Choice was the issue and I found it odd you would even try that stance on. My friend, I was talking of his now beseeched me to not discuss Gospel topics. He refuses to research out of fear.

I am also curious about your opinion of Noah as a Monogamist. Am I to understand that he was opposed to plural marriage and called it "gross Iniquity"? Or could it possibly be that there were no women willing and worthy enough to be married at all? Remember his mission was to call people to "The Lord" and not on the boat. I have long believed with no validation Noah started with a great deal of help which fell off later on.
family remained. As for the Righteous Nephiites who were monogamous, in Jacob 2, I do not sustain that as an Anti-Polygamy Statement. Anti-whoredom but all in all it sustains plural marriage in my opinion.

I am curious as to how you interpret the 'Sincere Fundamentalist' statements you sent as "Bitter Criticism." I know several people—faithful and loyal to the Church and brethren—and think I fell out of a tall tree, who you nearly quoted verbatim a truce or two. Why is shining the light of truth on an observation "Bitter Criticism."

Do you find it at all interesting that Mormons can say the very same things about Catholicism and Apostate Christianity?

Why is it that the things which denounce Apostasy in the Ancient Christian Church cannot apply to us?

I truly am glad about your question
as to where the Spirit of the Lord resides. It is a good and very valid question. I truly do believe that the Lord is at the helm of the Church as much as the Leadership will allow. I do not however accept that the Church or its Leadership, or anyone can dictate to God where the Spirit of the Lord will go. I am sorry for the string my use of the word 'priestcraft' carries however what else would you call:
- Ministring for a salary
- Saying God will only allow revelation through 'Channels'
- Changing the Laws and Ordinances of the Gospel
- Compelling others to put those Laws out of their Lives
- Preaching Joseph Smith as a True Prophet and Testator but Commanding men to avoid what he taught and only "Rely upon the Brethren"
The last could go on and I very much think it wise, prudent and fruitful to focus on just one topic at a time so that it can
be more clearly focused on.

The priesthood leadership group/supremacy issue is a tangled mish-mash in my opinion. I do not believe any particular group holds the right to preside in the Church or priesthood. When I prayed continuously as to who to follow, who lead the priesthood of God, etc., I was very flustered. Some I will keep to myself were recognized as holding the Melchizedek priesthood but I was not allowed to follow after them. For reasons I am not comfortable with. I want some more fellowship, etc., but for God's own reasons I am to 'bird myself to none.' I believe it is mostly for priestcraft.

I believe that some people just won't move without 'a group' and someone to lead them. Pretty much these seem to need to be 'commanded in all things.' However, I find it read Sibley's that some people leave the Church's priestcraft and claim in the Peterson Group's priestcraft.

I suppose Brigham Young summed up the
Situation first when he said, "When a man can rely upon God alone - then the Church should stand aside."

As for excommunication I have a lot on my mind. Again - too much to be adequately dealt with in this nearly incoherent letter shotgunning at so many issues. I do however mourn for those who unduly rejoice and savor their excommunication. I know some I feel they are wrong in several instances but hope the Lord can straighten them out. However as you well know there are excom for true sin and excom as a scapegoat to deflect attention from the Church and excom because of personal pique.

As far as Elder Rockers testimony I can't help but view them with a very skeptical eye. For 6 thousand years of someone saw and or heard God and or Christ they plainly said so - evidently though sacred - it was something to talk about. Now since about the Deber
Grant Admin. It is "Too Sacred" to talk about. I don't think so. They use all the words and meanings which one can construe that they saw him but consistently fall short. Then of course there is the flip side where God or Christ or Joseph Smith appears and "heresy of warry," advocate and encourage people to live all of the Gospel Principles as they were revealed to Joseph Smith. Of course, this could never really be of God, for God has changed His Mind. Does God change His Program? Right? It just doesn't work. I remember a booklet put out by Mark C. Peterson called "Has Christ Changed His Mind?" stating He was not a changing God. So here you have Joseph and other men who have seen God and say, so and live all of the Gospel Laws compared to men who counsel to avoid these "sinful" practices and almost say, "We have seen God. At very least, THIS applies when speaking of False Prophets prophecy so very clear."
In my opinion Merely's book does not deal with Fundamentalism as much as it vindicates Post Manifesto Plural Marriage and Divine Concupiscence as Virtuous and how the Church had to close to put up a public front in opposition. My basic summation at this point is at this time the Church is in Apostasy. As cold, cruel, and cross as it sounds - the Church is bound by Covenant to live up to all of the Law, Ordinances, Principles and Precepts taught by Joseph Smith and Expounded by Brigham Young. The Church is indeed "The Bride of Christ," but by willfully conceding to Man made Governments and Voluntarily Forsaking the Conditions of the Covenant She has Become the Mother of Harlots" i.e. Fundamentalists are the offspring - little harlots. To me Fundamentalists are much less to worry about than the other dissident's you mentioned (i.e. Intellectuals and Feminists who believe Joseph was screwed up to start with.)
I know I have not answered all of your points and I will try to do so in further correspondence but I feel I have really dragged on. I feel no need to convert you since we both have a joyful common ground to look forward to. You look forward to the future day when you can have open, public church backing in living all of the Gospel Laws, ordinances, principles, and precepts—so do I, and that day will come. I look forward to seeing you there.

Till next time God Bless you.

P.S. Due to moving soon all of my books and reference materials are packed, finding my sources is rather difficult.
I know I have not performed well in the past, and I'm trying to change. I feel I have really changed, and I feel I need to keep improving. I have been working hard to turn my life around. I don't want to stay in the same place, and I want to keep moving forward. I'm not the same person anymore, and I'm excited to see what the future holds.