

IN DEFENSE OF TRUTH

**COURTROOM PROCEEDING TOOK PLACE IN MINNEAPOLIS,
MINNESOTA IN THE YEAR 1963**

1ST PRINTING 1963 U.S.A
BY A. MELVIN McDONALD

2ND PRINTING
B. R. JONES AND L. S. KILLPACT
PUBLISHED BY THE CALIFORNIA SOUTH MISSION

3RD – 14TH PRINTING 1973 - 1979
ALPHA PUBLISHING U.S.A

ALPHA PUBLISHING ALSO PUBLISHES THE DEFINITIVE BOOK ON THE BOOK OF MORMON GEOGRAPHY, "A PROMISED LAND, THE LAND OF PROMISE". A SCRIPTURAL ANALYSIS OF THE BOOK OF MORMON GEOGRAPHY WITH PROPHETIC ANNOUNCEMENTS.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Agnostic	13, 14, 61
Anglican Church	19, 29, 38, 43, 50, 56, 62
Atheist	16, 38-39, 47
Athenasian Creed	6
Baptist Church	20, 28, 45, 50, 55
Catholic Church - Priest	5, 7, 23, 36, 46-47, 52, 68
Christian Science	13, 17, 34, 45
Church of Christ	3-4, 18, 24-27, 33, 35, 38-41, 44, 52, 55 57, 62, 65, 67
Church of England	27, 55, 60
Foxe - List of apostles from "Book of Martyrs"	52-54
Greek Orthodox Church - Father Cook	1-2, 14, 46
Jehovah Witnesses	4, 9-11, 13-14, 16, 51
Judge - Rabi	1, 4, 8, 15, 69
Lutheran Minister	8, 21, 31, 35, 40, 48-49, 66
Methodist Church	2-3, 22, 32, 37, 41, 49-50, 62-63
Pentecostal Church	13, 17, 45, 51, 58, 65
Presbyterian Church	32, 66
Salvation Army	48, 56
Seventh Day Adventist	12-13, 16, 22
United Church of Canada	16, 30-31, 44, 55, 67
Appendix 1	70
Appendix 2	74
Index	75

PREFACE

“In Defense of Truth” is set in a courtroom as a fictitious mock trial of various churches all against two missionaries of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. These ministers all try to prove that the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints is wrong because they do not follow the Bible and that their churches teachings are correct, even though none of them agree with each other. The Bible is the only scripture allowed to be used to prove their cases. The Missionaries then defend the position of the church using only the Bible to prove that they are right and that these other churches do not conform to the teaching in the Bible therefore making them all false.

While A. Melvin McDonald was serving in the Northern States Mission in the early 1960's, he began to collect arguments of detractors of the church. He had previously received tapes of debates between various clergy and his brother Robert McDonald while Robert was serving a mission in the late 1950's in the Southern States Mission. Near the end of Melvin's mission he organized all this information and typed a manuscript entitled, “The Day of Defense”. It is based on the tapes and arguments he encountered while on his mission. A. Melvin McDonald printed a limited number of copies as an aid to missionaries everywhere to answer the all too frequently asked questions that arise while presenting the true gospel. This manuscript was copied and distributed by many missionary.

In 1973, Peter Covino, Jr. ran across a copy of the manuscript. Though it was hard to read with numerous typos, Peter retyped the entire work, edited it, changed and added numerous passages, added appendixes and an index, and designed a cover. He then printed and published it as a book from 1973 to 1979 through his company, Alpha Publishing. It sold all over the world wherever missionaries were serving. Without the efforts of Peter, this book would not have ever been realized. Melvin had long since lost any copies of his original work. Peter sold it at cost. A. Melvin McDonald took over the copyright and published Peter's edition many years later.

In 2008 Peter, reorganized, updated, and rewrote the entire book based on the information in his 1973 edition. It is now published under the title “In Defense of Truth”, published by Alpha Publishing.

You will find The Book of Mormon Challenge in Appendix 1 very useful in teaching the gospel. It is changed slightly for use as a missionary flyer at the web site as a free downloadable.

This book answers, with scripture, references to most of the questions which will arise while teaching the gospel.

Feel free to contact us through our web site listed at the copyright page for any reason, suggestions, or comments.

Prosecutors: A Priest from the Roman Church, Ministers from the Lutheran Church, the Methodist Church, the Church of England, the Presbyterian Church, an Elder from the Church of Christ, two representatives from the Jehovah Witnesses, a representative from the Christian Science Reading Room, a Capitan from the Salvation Army, a Bishop from the Greek Orthodox Church, a Minister from the Baptist Church, an Evangelist from the Pentecostal Movement, representatives from the Church of Canada (a combination of the Methodist, Presbyterian, and Congregational Churches), Seventh Day Adventists, Atheist and an Agnostic.

Defense: Two missionaries (Elders) serving a full time mission for The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, (the Mormons).

Judge: A Jewish Rabbi of the Orthodox Jewish Faith.

PROCEEDINGS

Judge: Gentlemen, we are here today to establish the truth among a confused Christian world. The prosecution has chosen from their council, representatives from some of the major Christian Faiths, to question these two young men of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints of their beliefs. We will remain until the truth is established. The prosecution has maintained that the defendants are spreading false doctrine and bearing false witness, and have desired to promote truth this day and during this trial. In examining my notes, it seems the questions heretofore established are the questions of revelation, the question of the authenticity of the Mormon apostles and prophets, the truthfulness of "The Book of Mormon", and the responsibility of the prosecution to prove the statements false that the defendants are making against their respective churches. Although all of the prosecution has claimed inspired men, none of you have made one claim of "divine revelation" and the appearance of God and His supposed Son, Jesus Christ, to your leaders. I now turn the time over to the prosecution.

Prosecution: (Headed by David Martin, an Atheist, opening statement to the judge) – The prosecution during this trial will establish once and for all the false claims of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. We will prove from the scriptures that Joseph Smith was a false prophet, that Mormon revelation is out of harmony with Holy Scripture, that "The Book of Mormon", "The Doctrine and Covenants", and "The Pearl of Great Price" are not the word of God, as accepted by my colleagues, and the Holy Bible. Each one of my friends has gone into a great degree of study and preparation, and has examined the teachings of their respective religions with those of the Mormon Church. We will expect an answer for each point we bring up, and we in turn will answer all questions directed towards our respective churches. I now turn the time over to Father Cook, a representative of the Greek Orthodox Church.

Father Cook: Gentlemen, I have a question that should close our case immediately, and establish truth. It is well known among our religion and among many of the religions represented here, that the last revelation given to man was given to John on the Isle of Patmos. Now, I refer you to John 16:13, which reads, "Howbeit when he the Spirit of Truth is come, he will guide you into "all truth", for he shall not speak of himself, but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak, and he shall show you things to come." Now, if Christ gave "all truth" to His apostles, how can you possibly claim "More Truth" was given to Joseph Smith, the Prophet?

Missionaries: We would like to express our appreciation for being here this day as representatives of our Church. Christ DID give "all truth" to the apostles through the Holy Spirit, but he did not say he would not give it to anyone else, furthermore did the apostles give "all truth" to man? Matthew 10:1 tells us that Christ chose twelve, and Matthew 20:8 tells us that he gave them great powers. We read in Acts 2 where they received the Holy Spirit, and in Acts 8:13-20

where they gave it to others. However, the “all truth” in John in 16:3 was only given to the apostles, and we only have the writings of approximately five of the seventeen apostles chosen in the New Testament times. Now, sir, five-seventeenths is less than one-third. Christ told the apostles, “Because it is given unto you to know the mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven, but to them it is not given.” (Matthew 13:11) Here Christ plainly gave truth to His apostles that He did not give to the people. Also, Peter did not know all the truth that was revealed only “all truth” that was necessary for his salvation. If you doubt this, you will find that Peter was killed in 66 AD, supposedly in Rome, and you maintain that Peter KNEW everything that was to be revealed to John, recognizing that he had been dead for thirty years, how was this accomplished? If you do believe he knew “all truth”, then the Book of Revelations was not “needful” which you claimed was a requirement of revelations. But if we take into account that the Bible mentions several other books which we do not have including our Book of Mormon then you realize that there is much more truth that can be gained if you really are interested in “all truth” and not just what you have.

Father Cook: I guess he didn't!

Missionaries: Sir, Can I further prove to you that the apostles did not reveal the “all truth” to mankind. If I can prove to you that “all truth” was not given to man, then will you admit that we can still receive truth?

Father Cook: Yes, but I don't believe that there is such a scripture.

Missionaries: I turn you to 2 Cor. 12:2-4 where Paul states he was taken away in a vision. It reads, “I knew a man in Christ above fourteen years ago (whether in body, I cannot tell; or whether out of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth;) such a one caught up to the third heaven. And I knew such a man, (whether in the body or out of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth;) how that he was caught up into paradise AND HEARD UNSPEAKABLE WORDS, WHICH IS NOT LAWFUL FOR A MAN TO UTTER.” I ask you, did Paul and that other man know something that is not recorded in the Bible?

Father Cook: I guess they did. I didn't think of that scripture, but it says “it is not lawful for a man to utter,” so therefore it can not be written.

Missionaries: Yes but that still means “all truth” has not been revealed. The scriptures say “Eternal Life is to have knowledge” so something has to be revealed, which I will explain later must come from the prophets as it says in Amos 3:7.

Methodist Church: Hold on now! Not so quick. I still maintain that it was given. 2 Timothy 3:16-17 tells us that “All Scripture” is given by inspiration of God, so how can you claim that there was more to come?

Missionaries: First, because we just read that there was some that was not yet given; second, where does it say that inspiration can not still be revealed? If it can still be revealed than The Book of Mormon can be part of it. I am surprised that you would really try to use that scripture. Did you ever read the verse before, which answers it for you? It reads “And that from a child thou (Timothy) had known the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation,” so Paul was speaking ostensibly to Timothy. Also, John had not yet received his revelation on the Isle of Patmos, so “All Scripture” could not have been given to all the apostles. The scriptures they had in the time of Timothy were merely Old Testament scriptures, so this merely is the definition of scripture. I am sure that I have made it clear to you. I believe we have then established that “all truth” was given only to some of the apostles (John 16:13), and

was not given to man (2 Cor. 12:2-4; Matthew 13:11). Also, we do not have the entire apostles' writings and by not accepting these principle you limit your knowledge.

Church of Christ: Let's get down to some basic Mormon Beliefs and establish the truth. Mormons teach that God has a body of flesh and bone as does Jesus Christ (D&C 130:20-21). I maintain that this is absurd. John 4:24 points out that "God is a spirit" and nothing more. No place in the Bible does it state that God has a physical body and if your Book of Mormon says otherwise it is also false. In fact, in Gal. 2:9, speaking of Christ, it tells us that "in Him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead BODILY." Genesis 1:26-27 was speaking of a spiritual creation and not a literal one. You will notice that the pagans worshipped a God like to corruptible man in Romans 1:23, of whom Paul said "changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator." I maintain that God having a physical body is blasphemy, He can take any shape or any form, because He is all powerful.

Missionaries: I can see how Paul felt as he stood among the Greeks and read the inscription "TO THE UNKNOWN GOD." Gentlemen, "Whom therefore you ignorantly worship, him declare I unto you?" We do believe that God has a body of flesh and bones as tangible as man's, as does the son. We point to Joseph Smith for the absolute truth here. He saw them both at the same time. But first you would have to know that there can be a living prophet which we surely will get to, but just from the Bible we get to the truth also. John 4:24 points out that God is a spirit, but notice it says, reading on, "and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." Brother Caldwell, do you leave your body home when you go to Church? It says that YOU MUST WORSHIP HIM IN SPIRIT AND IN TRUTH. The context of the scripture informs us that the people of Samaria were not worshipping the Father in truth because in John 4:22, Christ told the women, "ye worship ye know not what." 2 Kings 17:28-34 points out that these people were pagan worshippers, so Christ merely pointed out that God also had a spirit, and was not a pagan God. The scriptures also say "God is love" (1 John 4:8), "God is light" (1 John 1:15), and "God is consuming fire" (Heb. 12:29), so God can be and do many things. To say He is only a spirit is nonsense. Your scripture in Romans 1:20-25 was somewhat facetious proving God without a body. Read it carefully; the people were worshipping birds, four-footed beasts, and creeping things, along with their statue of corruptible man. Christ was trying to explain the reality of a living being, declaring an eternal truth when He told pagan Samaria that God was a spirit, and was not a graven image. Acts 8:13-20 will prove to you that those good people never really received the "word of God" until Philip preached to them. Therefore, if they had not received the word of God, they were living by another word, or gospel. Now you mentioned Gal. 2:9, but here you used a scriptural rail split. Gal. 1:18-19 informs us that Christ was the head of the church, the first born of every creature, and it so pleased the Father that in "Christ" was all fullness of the Godhead to dwell in His mortal tabernacle of flesh. John 1:15 tells us that He gave of this fullness to His followers. This fullness was "the way, the truth, and the life." You will also notice that interpreting the word "bodily" as meaning Christ's physical body is very facetious. For if you accept that literally, then you must accept the next verse literally, which reads, "and ye are complete in him." He was speaking, of course, of the Church as you can tell.

Methodist Church: You may be right, but I am still waiting for the passage where it reads that God has a body of flesh and bone.

Missionaries: Sir, there is no passage in the Bible that states that God has a body of flesh and bones as you are requiring, however it is said in many other ways and in the other scriptures you refuse to acknowledge. First in John 14:7 it says "If ye had known me, ye should have known my Father also: and from henceforth ye know him, and have seen him." At this time Jesus had a real body and has said it is just like the Father. He further state this fact more clear by saying if you have seen me you have seen the Father. Jesus had a body of flesh and bone at

this point in time, therefore so does the Father. Jesus also said that He does nothing that His father hasn't done before him so we also know that the Father is a resurrected being as Jesus did what His Father did before him. It is so plain that anyone who wants to find the truth can see it. Heb. 1:13 tells us that Christ was in the "EXPRESS IMAGE" of His Father, and as Stephen was being stoned, he looked up into heaven and saw God and Christ standing at His right hand. He obviously saw two people who looked the same. Again if we could use all of the Lords teachings we could learn more truth from The Book of Mormon.

Jehovah Witnesses: This is wrong to suppose Christ to have a body as the Father. 1 Peter 4:6 tells us that the Gospel was 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." Therefore Christ did live according to God in the Spirit.

Missionaries: Sir, I disagree with you emphatically, and if you accept the Bible to be the word of God, you cannot maintain that Christ laid down His physical body after His resurrection. We read in Luke 24:36-39 that Christ, after His resurrection, said "Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have." Acts 1:9-11, as Christ bid farewell to His apostles, we read that "This same Jesus which is taken up from you into Heaven." And James 2:26 informs us that "as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also." Now, do you believe that Christ died twice because His spirit had left His body once (Luke 23:46) and entered back into His body three days later, making the first resurrection, and death would have entered His body again if His spirit had separated from it? Paul wrote this was impossibility in Romans 6:9-10 when he said, "knowing that Christ being raised from the dead DIES NO MORE, DEATH HATH NO MORE DOMINION OVER HIM." These scriptures prove very definitively that Christ has His body with him in Heaven today, and that since Christ is in the express image of His Father, then His Father also has a body of flesh and bone as Jesus showed His apostles.

Jehovah Witnesses: Elder, didn't you know that in the scriptures the words spirit and breath are used interchangeably? For instance, in the creation, Jehovah breathed the breath of life, and a few seconds later you see the word spirit used for breath.

Missionaries: I will grant you that in some instances the words might seem to be interchangeable but your group maintains man has no spirit. Isaiah clearly distinguishes between the two in Isa. 42:5, which reads "this saith God the Lord, He that created the heavens and stretched them out; He that spread forth the earth, and which cometh out of it; He that GIVETH BREATH UNTO THE PEOPLE UPON IT, AND SPIRIT TO THEM THAT WALK THEREIN." Zech. 12:1 tells us that the spirit of man "has form." For instance, in the Sermon on the Mount, it would read, "Blessed are the poor in breath, for theirs is the kingdom of Heaven," After that sermon, I believe I would have been at the bottom of the Mount with a basket full of onions for sale. In John 4:24 we would read, "God is a breath and they that worship him must worship him in breath and in truth." I believe we have established that there is a difference, as Isaiah pointed out, between breath and spirit. If you have any more questions on the difference, you could read Job 32:7-8, and 1 Cor. 2:1-15. Now back to the subject of God's body. Christ said, "If you have seen me, you have seen the Father." (John 14:9) So they must both have bodies.

Church of Christ: Hold it now. Christ was alive when He said that. You keep jumping back and forth. His Father was greater than He in all ways, and that would have included perfection. Heb. 5:8-9 informs us that perfection did not come until He had suffered on the cross.

Missionaries: I want to thank you for your logic. I will use it. Christ was then perfect after His resurrection and He had the body of flesh and bones which He has today that He showed to His apostles. Now, if He was going to His Father, which is also perfect (Matthew 5:8, for

father; Heb 5:9 for son), what kind of body would He have? Does Stephen say there was a body of flesh, bone and spirit, or the Father with only a spirit? Now, let's get logical. One or the other has to be perfectly created. One is the express image of the other.

Priest: I am afraid I will have to break in here. One of the weaknesses of the prosecution is that we are not united in our own beliefs. In my own faith we recognize that the concept of the Godhead is that we do not comprehend it and that it was a group effort at best in the first century of the church that came up with its understanding. However, the majority here are in the belief of the Triune God however we individually understand it. Now, after we are through with this point, I am sure that truth will be established once and for all. John 10:30 plainly states "I and my Father are one", and the scriptures in John go on to say and teach this fact. Gentlemen, pay careful attention as I read from the Douay Version of Christ's personal witness concerning Him and His Father. The King James Version is almost identical. The Elders took this scripture out of context, so I will give it in its true light. John 14:5-6 reads "Thomas saith unto him: Lord, we know not whither thou goest; and how can we know the way. Jesus saith to him: I am the way, and the truth, and the life. No man cometh to the Father, but by me. If you had known me, you would without doubt HAVE KNOWN MY FATHER ALSO; and from henceforth you shall know him. And YOU HAVE SEEN HIM. Philip saith to him: Lord, show us the Father, and it is enough for us. Jesus saith to him: Have I been so long a time with you and HAVE YOU NOT KNOWN ME? PHILIP, HE THAT HATH SEEN ME, HATH SEEN THE FATHER; HOW SAYEST THOU THEN, SHEW US THE FATHER?" Judge, from this scripture what do you say?

Judge: I would like to say that your scripture is quite convincing, but you both have used it to prove your views. Elders you may respond.

Priest: Judge, I am not through. We are going to prove Mormon Revelation false and blasphemous. 1 John 5:7-8 in the King James Version reads, "For there are three that bear record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one." Now, we can also use "The Book of Mormon" to support our belief in a Triune God. In Mosiah 15:3-4 of their book it reads that Christ is the "Father and the Son." In several of their scriptures of their book we read of Christ as the "Eternal God." I call your attention also to the testimony of the three witnesses to "The Book of Mormon", who state, "And the honor be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost, which is one God. Amen." I would have said Amen, because they were teaching the doctrine that Joseph Smith declared in their book and denied in "The Doctrine and Covenants". I believe that these missionaries had better go back to their Bibles and look for truth instead of getting all mixed up with this senseless literature of the Mormon Church.

Missionaries: First of all, Joseph Smith did not write the words in "The Book of Mormon" as you have tried to imply, he translated them, an ancient prophet wrote those words. The Lord once told Job "Who is this that darkeneth knowledge by words with knowledge." (Job 38:2) You have done quite a job in fulfilling the Lord's words to Job. I noticed that you made no attempt to explain the account in Acts 7:55-56 when Stephen saw both the Father and the Son. How could Stephen have seen two personages, and yet Christ teach one? It's an easy answer – Christ taught that they were two, and that He was separate from His Father. In John 8:17-18 Christ spoke with the Jews, who accused Christ of being an imposter because He was the only one who bore witness of himself. It is a rule in Jewish law that the mouth of two or three witnesses shall the truth be established. Christ replied, "It is also written in your law that the testimony of TWO MEN is true. I am one that witness of me." Here Christ compared Him and His Father to two men. Christ states in John 10:30 that Him and His Father are one, but in John 17:20-21 He explained what He meant when He said, praying to the Father, "that they may be one, (referring to His disciples), Father, as thou art in me, and I in thee, that they may

be one in us, that the world may believe that thou hast sent me.” I challenge you to take this scripture literally also. Here Christ prayed that His disciples would be one “as He and His Father are one.” They were one, but one in purpose and unity. If He was the Father what need would there have been for him to pray to himself or how could He be two witnesses? He would not have asked the Father to remove this cup because He could have done it himself if were the Father. When Father bore witness that Christ was the Son of God in Matthew 16:15-19, it was Christ that said “Blessed are thou, Simon Barjona; for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in Heaven.” Christ at this time had a body of flesh and blood yet told Peter that flesh and blood had not born that witness, but His Heavenly Father whose body was a resurrected body as Jesus explained. In answer to John 14:5-9, when He declared, “Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also; greater works than these shall he do; because I go unto my Father.” Why would He go unto His Father if He were the Father? This teaching is abominable. This would be so senseless for Christ in the 26th chapter of Matthew to pray to the Father and ask if the “bitter cup” might be removed, if He were the Father. What mockery it would have been in Gethsemane to pray to himself, being the Father. After His resurrection, He told Mary Magdalene not to touch him for “I have not yet ascended to my Father.” (John 20:17) Also Jesus said only His Father in Heaven knows when Jesus will come again. Now, if Jesus really is the Father, why didn’t He know when He was coming again, furthermore, when Christ was baptized a voice from Heaven said, “This is My Beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.” The example of the Father and Son as two separate people is too obvious to even debate. It is complete ignorance to believe anything else in light of these many examples of there being two personages. The creed which was the birth of the triune doctrine was created by a group of uninspired men in the third century, who met at Nice at the command of Constantine, a Pagan worshipper. This creed was later revised to “add to” its understanding by a canonized Saint of Romanist, St. Athanasius, who, I might add, is considered inspired by the prosecution, in general. I would like to put the Creed on trial this afternoon after I have answered these supposed “Book of Mormon” contradictions. If you really wanted to all the truth you would read. It is also a second witness of the divinity of Jesus Christ.

We have established, beyond a doubt, that Christ and God are separate personages, and will now establish what was meant in and by the three witnesses. Did you know that the Bible refers to Christ as the “Everlasting Father” and “The Mighty God”? Isaiah 9:6 reads, “For unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given, and the government shall be upon His shoulders, and His name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, THE MIGHTY GOD, THE EVERLASTIG FATHER, the Prince of Peace.” Now, how was Christ the Mighty God? Col. 1:16-17 tells us that “by him (Christ) were all things created that are in Heaven and that are on earth.” Therefore He is its creator. God was with Christ at the creation, hence “Let *Us* make man in *Our* Image,” (Genesis 1:26-27), and this is pointed out in Eph. 3:9, which also further proves that there are two personages. Now, what the three witnesses had in mind when they said that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost were one God was the same thing Christ had in mind in John 17:20-21, or one in purpose. Christ was the way, the truth, and the life, and “learned all things from His Father.” So you see, it really wasn’t a contradiction, after all, but revealed truth. I now present before you a copy of the Athenasian Creed, accepted by the majority of the prosecution, to prove and produce evidence from the Holy Scriptures that many plain and precious parts of our Lord’s divinity have been destroyed, and that they strip the Godhead of their identity. This is the 2nd creed; it followed the Nicene Creed of 325 A.D. It tried to make the prevailing pagan worship fit the new religion called Christianity.

ATHENASIAN CREED (also referred to as the Apostles’ Creed)

“...the we worship one God in Trinity and Trinity in Unity. Neither confounding the Persons, nor dividing the Substance. For there is one Person of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the

Holy Ghost. But the Godhead of the Father, or the Son and of the Holy Ghost is all One, and Glory equal, the Majesty co-eternal. Such as the Father is, such is the Son, and such is the Holy Ghost. The Father Uncreated, the Son Uncreated and the Holy Ghost Uncreated. The Father Incomprehensible, the Son Incomprehensible and the Holy Ghost Incomprehensible. The Father Eternal, the Son Eternal, and the Holy Ghost Eternal. As also there are not three uncreated, nor Three Incomprehensible, but One uncreated, and One Incomprehensible. So likewise the Father is Almighty, the Son Almighty, and the Holy Ghost Almighty. And yet there are not three Almighty's but One almighty. "So the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God. And yet there are not three Gods, but One God. So likewise the Father is Lord, and the Son Lord, and the Holy Ghost Lord, and yet not Three Lords but one Lord..."

Gentlemen, I would feel safe letting the greatest minds on this earth explain that senseless conglomeration of incomplete sentence structure and rederic of words. It begins by stating that the church worships one God in trinity, but does not divide the substance. Then in the next verse we find three different substances in the Father, Son and Holy Ghost introduced, and near the end of the creed they put our minds at rest again by stating once again that they are undivided. If the creed teaches us anything, it is that the belief of the Church is that God, Christ and the Holy Ghost are incomprehensible. The dictionary defines "Incomprehensible" "that which is not understood." Judging from the explanation in the creed of the Godhead, that is the understatement of the year. I will now judge the creed in the light of the scripture and place before you this creed which is diametrically opposed to the word of God. Bearing in mind that God, to the Prosecution, is "Incomprehensible" let us look at 2 Peter 1, and put the creed on trial. Here, Peter, a servant and apostle of Jesus Christ, in the opening two verses bids the saints God's grace "through THE KNOWLEDGE OF GOD, AND OF JESUS OUR LORD." You will find in a book of antonyms that the opposite of Incomprehensible is knowledge. We go on to read verse 3, "according as His DIVINE POWER HATH GIVEN UNTO US ALL THINGS THAT PERTAIN UNTO LIFE AND GODLINESS, THROUGH THE KNOWLEDGE OF HIM THAT HATH CALLED US TO GLORY AND VIRTUE." It goes on to explain what one must do to obtain this knowledge of his. Found in verses 5, 6, and 7, it states we must have faith, virtue, knowledge, temperance, patience, Godliness, brotherly kindness, and charity. Now, if we have these qualities in our church, verse 8 gives us a wonderful promise – "for if these things (verse 5-7) be in you, and abound, THEY MAKE YOU THAT YE SHALL NEITHER BE BARREN NOR UNFAITHFUL IN THE KONWLEDGE OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST." If these things are in us, we will abound in knowledge. If these qualities are not in us, then we find a creed like the one drawn up, of which verse 9 describes as being "blind and cannot see afar off." John 17:3 tells us that "This is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent," and yet the creed tells me I can't because they are "Incomprehensible". Now, any doctrine out of harmony with the Holy Scripture, according to these educated scholars is false, and the Church is false. I have just proven that the members of Christ's Church abounded in knowledge, and that all of you here are just the reverse in accepting a creed inspired by the devil and robbing the Godhead of their true identity. All of you have accepted that all truth has been revealed yet you accept the lack of knowledge you have in understanding the true nature of God. I have been told by some ministers that the mystery and incomprehensibility is the beauty of the doctrine, and, after reading these past few verses, you see the false nature of your thinking. And, hence, since you do not comprehend the Godhead, you don't know what shape He is in or if there is one, two, or three Gods, or if He has a body or if He does, what it is, and so it is a mystery to you. If nothing else this proves we still need the "all truth" you say we have but you obviously don't. That is why the Lord restored all truth through his prophet Joseph Smith.

Priest: Young man, did you know that Ephesians 6:19 speaks of the "mystery of the Gospel" and that Colossians 4:3 speaks of the Mystery of Christ? So you see it was a mystery.

Missionaries: Again you have shown that there is a need for more “all truth” which obviously means we still need apostles and prophets until we all have a perfect knowledge of these things. But to be direct in responding to this mystery of which you speak, the word mystery is defined as “a spiritual truth which was once hidden, but now is missing in your church, which is why it says in Eph. 4:11-12 that we need living prophets and apostles, and which, without special revelation, would have remained unknown.” (Bible Dictionary). So, sir, I would like to thank you for that argument, because you have just proven that these truths were revealed, and that your church has drawn away from the simple truths as laid out in the word of God, which is why we need a living prophet to reveal and restore the lost knowledge.

Lutheran Minister: Young man, you have done a splendid job in defending your faith by twisting our doctrines. Now, we are going to put you on the defense and are not going to move until you answer this Book of Mormon contradiction. Alma 7:10 it reads that “He (Christ) shall be born of Mary, at Jerusalem which is the land of our forefathers” while the Bible informs us in Luke 2:4-11 that Christ was born at Bethlehem in the City of David. Now, just look on any Bible map and you will happen to see Bethlehem happens to be five miles South of Jerusalem. How can Bethlehem be Jerusalem?

Missionaries: I will show you just how ridiculous your logic is. Would you please turn to 2 Kings 14:20, so we can follow out your contradiction and prove the Bible false. By claiming false, you have just proven without a doubt the Bible is false. It reads, “And they brought him on horses; and He was buried at Jerusalem with His Fathers in the City of David.” Now, if the City of David, according to the New Testament, is Bethlehem, how could He be buried at both Jerusalem and Bethlehem? I will answer your question and show you how ridiculous your contradiction really is. If you had read, you would have learned that Alma’s descendents were from Jerusalem, and Alma knew that Jerusalem was in the Old World. The Lord had to tell Alma where the Son of God was to be born. Of course, Alma had never been to Bethlehem, so the Lord had a small difficulty in attempting to tell Alma where the Son of God was to be born so He told Alma that Christ would be born “at Jerusalem” so Alma could link that up with the land of his forefathers. Now if you would look up the word “at” in the dictionary. The Oxford Dictionary defines the word “at” as a word which expresses exact or *approximate* position.” Therefore, by the wisdom of the Lord, He chose the approximate position where Christ should be born. So in answering your question, is the Bible false?

Judge: It is not! You have made your point well.

Lutheran Minister: I assure you that there are more than one or two contradictions in their book. How any man can accept that book as divinely inspired is beyond me. Upon the crucifixion of Christ we read in Luke 23:44 that “It was about the sixth hour, and there was darkness all over the earth until the ninth hour.” Then we turn to in 3 Nephi 8:20-23, where it reads that darkness covered that land for three days. Now, was it three hours as the Bible stated, or three days as pointed out?

Missionaries: Reverend, you mean to tell me you think that is a contradiction? I see you like the tear down the face of the Bible beyond what it has been already. Mark informs us that He was placed upon the cross at the third hour, (Mark 15:25), although John records it was the sixth hour. That would qualify under your definition and make the Bible false. We also have identical experience in the Bible where darkness prevailed for unusual periods of time in one area, and was light at the same time in other areas. We read in Exodus 10:21 “And the Lord said unto Moses, stretch out thine hand toward heaven, that there may be darkness over Egypt, even darkness which may be felt. And Moses stretched forth his hand towards heaven; and there was a thick darkness in the land of Egypt three days.” You will notice that incident was nothing but a repeat performance of the experience suffered “in the land of Egypt.” In

“The Book of Mormon” 3 Nephi points out (8:19) the corresponding three hours to Luke 23:44 were among the most perilous of the three day ordeal. However, the wisdom of the Lord prevailed as it did in Egypt, and this continent remained for three days in darkness. There is another reason why the American Continent had three days of darkness, but we will point this out later as our discussion progresses. As you can see, however, your Bible would have answered the question for you. The Book of Mormon clears up any confusion, which is why we need this additional volume of scripture to testify of Christ.

Jehovah Witnesses: Elder, I have a question for you that will require detailed explanation. If I am not mistaken, the Latter-day Saints claim that Jesus of the New Testament was Jehovah of the old. Now, if this is the case, I have two scriptures that definitely prove your own theory of the Godhead false. We find in Psalms 110:1-2 “The LORD said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies as thy footstool. The Lord shall send the rod of thy strength out of Zion.” Now, who sat at the right hand of the Lord Jehovah – Acts 7:55-56 tells us it was Christ – and the capital letters in the scripts refers to Jehovah. Now, Acts 3:13 establishes once and for all that Jehovah is the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. It reads: “The God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob, and the God of our fathers hath glorified HIS SON JESUS; whom ye delivered up.” I refer you to Exodus 6:13 which shows that the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob was none other than Jehovah. These two scriptures absolutely prove the Mormon theory of God false.

Missionaries: You are to be commended for your choice of scriptures, because both are excellent questions and will require detailed explanations. We do believe Christ of the New Testament was Jehovah of the old. In answer to Psalms 110:1-2 would you please turn to 1 Cor. 15:24-25 which proves the Lord in capital letters was Christ. It reads, “Then cometh the end, when He shall have delivered up the Kingdom of God, even the Father; when He shall have put down all rules and all authority and power. FOR HE MUST REIGN, TIL HE HATH PUT ALL ENEMIES UNDER HIS FEET.” So, it was Christ that was to put all the enemies under His feet, and since you said the LORD in capital letters referred to Jehovah, and Jehovah was to reign until all enemies were under this feet, then Jehovah, by your own admission, must be Christ. If you ask who the Lord was in small letters, you will find in Acts 3:19-21 that God our Heavenly Father is referred to by the small letters “Lord”. Note that in Isa. 43: 1-15, it refers to the LORD as the redeemer and savior. That would be Christ of the New Testament.

Now, Acts 3:13 will require a more detailed explanation. We must first establish that Jehovah of the Old Testament was Christ of the New using other scriptures. Isa. 12:1-2 informs us that the God of our Salvation, the Lord Jehovah, was Isaiah’s strength and His song, and it also says “HE ALSO IS BECOME MY SALVATION.” Acts 4:12 informs us that, (speaking of Christ), “There is salvation by none other, for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby men may be saved.” Therefore, as we have clearly established, Jehovah was Isaiah’s salvation and Jesus was Peter’s salvation, and since Jesus was the only name given under heaven whereby man could be saved, Jesus was Jehovah. In Zech. 12:10 the Lord Jehovah was speaking, and said “and they shall look upon ME whom they have pierced.” In John 19:37 we find out who it was speaking of, when we read, “They shall look on him whom they have pierced” referring to Christ on the cross. In your own New World translation, we read in Rev. 22:12-13, “Look, I am coming quickly, and the reward I give is with me, to render to each on as his work is. I am the Alpha and the Omega, the first and the last, the beginning and the end.” Verse 16 tells us who was “coming quickly” – Jesus Christ. Therefore as the scriptures pointed out, Christ was the Alpha and the Omega, the first and the last, the beginning and the end. We then turn to Rev. 1:8 in your New World translation, and it reads, “I am the Alpha and the Omega, says Jehovah God, the one who is and who was and who is coming, the Almighty.” Here it proves without any doubt that the Alpha and the Omega was Jehovah, and who, in Chapter 22, was Christ – so by the New World translation of the

scripture, it clearly points out Jehovah was Christ. If you still doubt that Christ was Jehovah, turn to Rev. 1:8 and read carefully until you come to verse 17 and 18, which reads, “Do not be fearful. I am the First and the Last, (the definition of Alpha and Omega), and the living one; and I BECAME DEAD, BUT LOOK: I am living forever and ever, and I have the keys of death and of Hades.” Now, we have established Christ as Jehovah from both translations. We then read, “In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth” (Genesis 1:1), and Paul pointed out in Col. 1:16 that “By him (Christ) were all things created that are in Heaven, and that are in earth.” Now, in Acts 3:3, Peter was faced with a difficult situation, because he had to testify of Christ, and still put over the point that though He was Jehovah it was God the Father that had raised him from the dead. The people understood clearly that men had a spirit, so Peter spoke of their Spiritual Creator – WHO WAS THE CREATOR OF THE SPIRITS OF ABRAHAM, ISAAC, AND JACOB, and, therefore, could be called the “Father of the Spirits” or Christ’s Father. Then He would not confuse them with the creator of all physical bodies, Christ, who as Colossians 1:16; John 1:1-3; Heb.1;1-3 all pointed out “Created all things that are in heaven and that are on earth.” Making this distinction, He easily pointed out that the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob’s spirits, had glorified His son (Whom, with His Father, created our physical bodies, and therefore the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob also) whom they had delivered up and crucified. Heb. 12:9 speaks of the “Father of our Spirits” which is the Father of our Lord, Jesus Christ. So you see, both God and Christ were the “Gods of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob” only God the Father was the creator of spirits, and Christ the Creator of Bodies under the direction and assistance of the Father. If you had “all truth” you would have known this. The only way you can have “all truth” is to accept what the prophet Amos said which is to accept living prophets who are the only people to whom God will give revelation.

Jehovah Witnesses: That is ridiculous, because you will notice that Jehovah breathed into men the “Breath (or Spirit) of life.” Therefore Christ would have been the creator of their spirits, and your argument collapses.

Missionaries: Just because Christ placed the spirit in man doesn’t make him the Creator of that Spirit. And we already established that breath and spirit were not the same thing. Therefore, by reading the scriptures, we can place the correct interpretation when we take the scripture in its context. Notice Eccl. 12:7 when the body dies and returns to the earth, the spirit of man returns to the God who gave it.

Jehovah Witnesses: You know this scripture reaffirms our conviction of only a spiritual resurrection. The LDS plan of salvation teaches that a man’s spirit leaves his body and goes to a spirit world to await resurrection. This is both illogical and absurd. Eccl. 9:5 informs us “that the living know that they shall die, but the DEAD KNOW NOT ANYTHING, NEITHER HAVE THEY ANY MORE REWARD: for the memory of them is forgotten.” We go on to read in Eccl. 9:10 “Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work, nor device, no Knowledge, nor wisdom in the grave, whither thou goest.” How, if there is no more wisdom, knowledge, work or device and the dead know not anything, why do you teach “work in the spirit world” and baptism for the dead? Why is your doctrine so contrarily opposed to the word of God?

Missionaries: I believe that one of the many doctrines that are taught in the Holy Scriptures, the doctrine of the spirit leaving the body is perhaps the clearest of all, along with the Godhead. I maintain that the two scriptures you have just referred to are speaking only of our physical bodies, and we believe that they will “return to the dust” and that in the grave they will not know anything nor have wisdom, because our spirits will not be in the grave with our bodies, but will “have returned unto God who gave it.” (Eccl. 12:7) You see, by such a doctrine, you have created a major problem in your movement. We read in Matthew 17:3 that Moses and

Elias appeared to Christ, Peter, James and John “talking with them” yet Deut. 34:5-6 teaches us that “Moses, the servant of the LORD, died there in the land of Moab, according to the word of the Lord.” This means Moses had been dead for hundreds of years, and “Christ was the first fruits of them that slept, (1 Cor. 15:20), so how did Moses possibly talk with them if He had not yet been resurrected, and he was still in the grave, (spirit and body)? This scripture proves without a doubt that the spirit does leave the body, and can talk, and in this case, communicate with man. Also, this teaches that there has not yet been any resurrection, yet Matthew 27:51-53 informs us that “The veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom; and the earth did quake, and the rocks rent; AND THE GRAVES WERE OPENED; AND MANY BODIES OF THE SAINTS WHICH SLEPT AROSE, and came out of the grave after His (Christ’s) resurrection, and went into the holy city, and appeared unto many.” How clear do you want the scripture to read? 1 Cor. 15:6, along with many other passages, refers to “sleep” as death. Now, if the dead have no reasoning, then Peter should have learned the gospel from the Jehovah Witness, because He taught “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.” Why would the gospel be preached to the dead if they had no reasoning, nor knowledge, nor wisdom? The answer is found in the last seven words of that scripture, because they “live according to God in the spirit.” And since they await a literal and physical resurrection as was experienced in Matthew 27:51-53, they will be resurrected with their bodies “that returned to the dust”. Paul taught this doctrine in ancient time to the Philippians, when he said that Christ would “Change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto His glorious body,” (Phil. 3:21), which was flesh and bones, (Luke 24:36-39). It was my understanding that you gentlemen teach the doctrine that only 144,000 will stand before the throne of God, and that they will be righteous souls. The rest of the righteous will “inherit the earth”. In light of these scriptures you would have a problem explaining your 144,000. However if you really want to understand this you would have to accept living prophets and modern revelation including “The Book of Mormon”.

Jehovah Witnesses: We teach that 144,000 will stand before the throne of God as special witnesses. These 144,000 have already been chosen, and not all can be numbered with them. This is taught in the Book of Revelation. In Rev. 8:4 we read “Hurt not the earth, neither the sea, nor the tress, till we have sealed the servants of our God in their foreheads, and I heard the number of them which were sealed; and there were sealed an hundred and forty and four thousand, of all the tribes of the children of Israel.” We read where they were “married” to the church and therefore in Rev. 14:4 “were not defiled with women, for they were virgins.” It was the 144,000 that stood on Mount Zion with the mark of the Father in their foreheads, (Rev. 14:1), and sung “as it were a new song before the throne and before the four beasts, and the elders, and no man could learn that song but the hundred and forty and four thousand, WHICH WERE REDEEMED FROM THE EARTH.” So you can see they were special servants, redeemed from the earth, and as such were the only ones that were before the throne night and day. It goes on to say that “these follow the Lamb (Christ) whithersoever He goeth. These were redeemed from among men, being the first fruits unto God and to them Lamb. And in their mouth was found no guile; for they are without fault before the Throne of God.” I think these scriptures clearly support our stand.

Missionaries: Thank you for your explanation. I would like to now show you that the 144,000, though they were special, were not the only ones that would live before the throne. Careful examination of the scriptures would reveal this, and I declare that those of the Church of Jesus Christ were the only ones that could stand before the throne, and they were far more numerous than 144,000. You quoted in Rev. 7:1-8 and then skipped to verse 15 and said this had reference to the 144,000. This is absolutely false. Another scriptural rail split. John was taken in a vision, and *after* seeing 144,000 (verse 9) he records “Behold and lo, I beheld a great multitude which no man could number, of all nations, kindreds, tongues and people

which STOOD BEFORE THE THRONE AND BEFORE THE LAMB, CLOTHED WITH WHITE ROBES.” How many is it that can not be numbered? Then in verse 13 one of the “four and twenty Elders” asked “who are these which are arrayed in white robes? and when came they?” John answered and said, “Sir, thou knowest.” The angel then said, speaking of those in white robes, (Which was the multitude which no man could number), “These are they which came out of the great tribulation, and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb. THEREFORE ARE THEY BEFORE THE THRONE OF GOD, AND SERVE HIM DAY AND NIGHT IN HIS TEMPLE: AND HE THAT SITTETH ON THE THRONE SHALL DWELL AMONG THEM.” So the 144,000 would not only stand before the throne, but also the great multitude, representing the twelve tribes. They were members of the “Church of the Firstborn” (Heb. 12:24) as was a requirement of the multitude. If they were not members of the Church, as Hebrews points out, crossed with Revelations, then they had no hope of heaven. Again in modern day revelation and scriptures we could shed even additional light on this subject, if you really wanted to have “all truth”.

Seventh Day Adventist: I have only one question to ask these gentlemen concerning the Sabbath Day. The Lord told Moses “Thou shalt remember the Sabbath Day, to keep it Holy.” For thousands of years, Saturday had been observed by the Jews, but through the Pagan philosophies of the Christian era, this commandment was violated and these young men hold their service on Sunday. Section 68 of their Doctrine and Covenants reads “and the inhabitants of Zion shall also observe the Sabbath Day to keep it holy”. Now, you make the claim that Sunday is the day of worship, yet why does “The Doctrine and Covenants” say to keep the Sabbath day holy, which we all know to be Saturday. Why do you knowingly break this commandment of the Lord?

Missionaries: This is a very good point that you have brought forth, but we can answer to it in the scriptures. We read in the Bible that the “Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath.” The Sabbath was observed under Jewish Law on Saturday so Dr. Gledhill is requesting that I show where the scriptures point out that the Sabbath was done away. We find John in Rev. 1:10 referring to Sunday as “The Lord’s Day” and it was on the Lord’s Day that the disciples gather following His resurrection and it was on the Lord’s Day that our Lord appeared unto them. Once again the following Sunday they met, (John 20:26) and the scriptures affirm that the sacrament was observed on “The Lord’s Day” (Acts 20:7). Collection for the saints was made on the Lord’s Day, (1 Cor. 16:12). If we live by Jewish Law on this commandment, we must live by the entire commandment and, (Gal. 3:24-25), therefore, we don’t need the schoolmaster, because we have come unto Christ.

Seventh Day Adventist: In other words you are denying the ten commandments?

Missionaries: Not denying them, just saying that Christ summed the ten up into two commandments, love the Lord and love your brother. On these two laws, said Christ, hung all the law and the prophets. Heb. 8:1-13 tells us that the “Old covenant was superseded by the new”. Col. 2:16 tells us “let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of THE SABBATH DAYS.” Now, if you live by the Sabbath, you should live by the entire law. We read where in Exodus 31:14-17 that a man was to be put to death for not keeping the Sabbath day holy. Exodus 35:3 informs us that those abiding by the Old Testament Sabbath should not “kindle fire” on this holy day. All food, according to Mosaic Law, was to be prepared in the evening before the Sabbath. Now, if the old law was to remain binding, why in Acts 15:29 were not the gentile converts taught this fact after the council at Jerusalem? Also, if you are going to live by the old law, since you keep the Sabbath Day on Saturday, you will read where Jews observed the 7th month of every year, and also every seventh year. In this year the self sown produce of the arable lands was to be left for the poor and the beasts of the field. All release of debts among the Israelites were made, You will see

that these things were done away, and if you wish to continue by the old Sabbath, then why don't you observe it like the Jews and keep it Holy? Why don't you put violators to death? Why do you kindle fire on the Sabbath? Why don't you live the sabbatical year, and also the year of Jubilee? I believe that this proves that the law was given to a certain people at a certain time, and New Testament scriptures show a revision of the law of the Old Testament.

Seventh Day Adventist: Then why in "The Doctrine and Covenants" is the command to "keep the Sabbath Day holy?"

Missionaries: This is what I have pointed out to you. The Jewish Sabbath was observed on Saturday under Mosaic law, but the resurrection of the Lord brought about the change to the first day of the week, which is the Christian Sabbath.

Seventh Day Adventist: Then since you admit that you live by the Sabbath Day, why don't you observe Jubilee, or the sabbatical year, or kill violators of the Sabbath?

Missionaries: Because with the resurrection the law was changed along with the higher priesthood and a new and better covenant being given, there was also of necessity a change of the law. (Heb. 7:12). That was the old law, which was fulfilled, and do you kill violators or observe Jubilee? Of course not and for the same reason. If you consider that the Doctrine and Covenants is all new revelation from the prophet Joseph Smith you will realize that there are several verses which reinforce the first day of the week as the new Sabbath as established in the New Testament.

Agnostic: Gentlemen, I believe that we are troubling ourselves with concepts only common to our individual beliefs, such as the Sabbath Day, the 144,000 and the spiritual or physical resurrection. Our purpose today is to establish the claim of Mormon apostles and prophets by the scriptures, and to see these gentlemen prove their stand. At this point, they have well established that their revelation is harmonious but as we know, revelation must also be needful and progressive. Even if they could support this stand on revelation they still have to establish that Mormon apostles and prophets fill the qualifications as laid out in the Word of God. I firmly believe that they nor any modern day religion can establish this from the scriptures. The claim of Joseph Smith being a prophet of God is not a new claim, but an old one. Other religions have claimed prophets of God and have likewise founded their beliefs. This has been going on for the past couple of centuries, in fact, the prosecution today has four such religions who claim to have been founded by prophets or prophetesses of God. We find the Christian Science movement makes such a claim, and we read in the Book of their founder, Mary Baker Eddy, entitled "Science and Health, the key to the scriptures" on page 107 that she was inspired by God. We find that in the Pentecostal Church manual, 1956 edition, that in 1914 they had the "Revelation of the name of the Lord Jesus." The Jehovah Witnesses claim Pastor Russell was a Prophet of God in the Book "Study to the Scriptures", volume 7 and page 377. Then we have the Instructor which claims that Ellen C. White was a prophetess of God and divinely inspired. All four of our representatives here today would testify with all their hearts that theirs was the true way. All claim to be inspired – all claim to be founded on prophets or prophetesses of God. Now, using the Holy Bible, I challenge you to PROVE to me why Joseph Smith was inspired and a prophet of God and that the others are not. For every passage you use to show that Joseph Smith was inspired and a prophet, I will use the very same argument to show that the others were inspired and prophets of God. Will you do that? Can you do that?

Missionaries: I am thankful to the Lord for my chance to defend the principles of truth this day. I bear witness to you gentlemen that Joseph Smith was a Prophet of God, that he was inspired, and

that he saw the Father and the Son in the year of 1820, and that through this great prophet the Church of Jesus Christ was established once again in these, the later days.

Agnostic: Young man, we do not doubt your sincere belief that Joseph Smith was a prophet. We know you hold this belief near to your heart, but so do the Jehovah Witnesses, Seventh Day Adventists, Pentecostals, and the Christian Scientists. And you all say you know it is true. I bear you my witness that Joseph Smith was a false prophet, that he was not inspired, and that he did not see the Father and the Son in the year of 1820. Now, can you, using only the Bible and no other volume of scripture, prove to me that he did?

Missionaries: Christ once stated in Matthew 12:36-37 that idle words were of such importance that on judgment day “by thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned.” I testify that those words will condemn you at that day. The scriptures very clearly define the qualifications of the Prophet of God. Moses, while in vision, was commanded by the Lord to “hear now my words. If there be a prophet among you, I the Lord will make myself known unto him in a vision, and will speak unto him in a dream.” (Numbers 12:6) In other words, a prophet must receive visions from God, and have inspired dreams. This eliminates the other four right now, because they have not made this claim – but let’s read what the Prophet Joseph said as recorded in the history of Joseph Smith 1:16-18 and also in the pamphlet on “Joseph Smith’s Own Story” on Page 3, paragraph 4 and 5. It reads, “just at this moment of great alarm, I saw a pillar of light exactly over my head, above the brightness of the sun, which descended gradually until it fell upon me. It no sooner appeared what I found myself delivered from the enemy which held me bound, When it rested upon me, I saw two personages, whose brightness and glory defy all description, standing above me in the air. One of them spake unto me, calling me by name and said, pointing to the other – *“This is my beloved Son. Hear Him.”* So, sir, this eliminates the other four and places Joseph Smith as a Prophet of God. But there is more! Let’s read in the Bible.

In Deut. 18:21-22 we find where Moses stated another qualification on how to recognize a prophet. It tells us if a prophet speaks in the name of the Lord and the thing follow not, he is a false prophet – but that if he speaks in the name of the Lord, and it follows, he is a prophet of God. Gentlemen, this was a divine qualification. I refer you to the revelation and prophecy of war, given through Joseph Smith the Prophet on December 25, 1832 and found in Section 87 of “The Doctrine and Covenants”, and I challenge you for an explanation of it if this is not it. In verse 1 the prophet prophesied in the name of the Lord and stated that “Beginning at South Carolina” a war would start that would “eventually terminate in the death and misery of many souls.” Twenty-nine years before the beginning of its fulfillment, he states that it would begin in South Carolina, and many would be killed. This, of course, was the Civil War, and the first shot was fired at Fort Sumter, South Carolina. The military services today employ the same tactics that were introduced during this war, which we call modern warfare. There have been two kinds of warfare since the beginning of time, Ancient and Modern, the latter of which is by fact the most destructive of the two, ancient warfare made world war impossible, but modern warfare makes it easy, so verse 3 looks ahead towards the first world war, and states war would eventually be poured out on all nations “beginning at this place.” In verse 3 it states that the North would be divided against the South, and the prophet foresaw and prophesied that the South would call upon the nation of “Great Britain” for assistance. This prophecy has parts that have not yet been fulfilled, but will at future dates right up to the end of time. As you will notice, the prophecy was made in the name of the Lord and it came to pass. According to the Bible and Moses, this is the sign of a true prophet. There are numerous other prophetic announcements in our scriptures if you want to know “all truth”.

Father Cook: Paul taught that in the mouth of two or three witnesses, every word would be established. What other prophecies has he made that have been fulfilled? Also, since the prophecy was on war it could have been under the influence of the devil. War is of the devil.

Missionaries: Nostradamus only prophesied war and destruction. Mohammad taught murder everyone. These are prophets of the devil. Our prophets, like unto Jesus, prophecy all things in all categories while teaching and revealing truth and peace and destruction. Time does not permit me to list the numerous prophecies that have come to pass which Joseph spoke. The Lord said in Mathew 7:16-20 that by their fruits ye shall know them, meaning if they have done good things and good things have come from their teachings, they are a prophet of God. I have a very long list here of the many good works, "fruit" that Joseph brought forth. Here it is. (See appendix 1) But to be specific as to the war prophecy, read the prophecy. Joseph Smith spoke in the name of the Lord, and when a man spoke in the Lord's name, the test was on, and if it was fulfilled, he would be a prophet. War is of the devil, but that doesn't make prophecy false. Christ prophesied of "wars and rumors of war" in Matthew 24, and John the Revelator saw great destruction as recorded in the Book of Revelations. It would be blasphemy to assume these prophecies were made under the influence of the devil. Gentlemen, you will have to admit partial fulfillment, and once again, we have eliminated the other four churches in question.

For the sakes of a "second witness" I will point out a fantastic prophecy made by the prophet in 1842, (as recorded in Documented History of the Church, Volume 5, Page 85). The Saints at the time the prophecy was made were living in Nauvoo, Illinois, a beautiful town which they had settled and built up from the swap land. It was a Mormon Community, and had a militia second only in power to the Army of the United States. Its soldiers were well trained in the methods of war and self defense. At the time of their greatest prosperity, Joseph speaking in the name of the Lord, prophesied that the saints would continue to suffer much affliction, and would be driven to the Rocky Mountains, many would apostatize, others would be put to death by our persecutors or lose their lives in consequence of exposure or disease. And then to fulfill this great and dynamic prophecy he states "and some of you will live to go and assist in making settlements and build cities, and see saints become a mighty people in the midst of the Rocky Mountains." At the time the prophecy was made that territory was out of the confines of the United States, and the West a savage country. At the time the prophecy was made, the 27th Congress was in its 3rd season, and Senator George H. McDuffie of South Carolina made a statement concerning the Rocky Mountain Territory, which states "Who are to go there, along the line of military posts, and takes possession of the only part of the territory fit to occupy, that part upon the seacoast, a strip less than one hundred miles in width. Why, sir, of what use will this be for agricultural purposes? I would not for that purpose give a pinch of snuff for the whole territory. I wish to God we did not own it." History bears us witness what happened in the West. The prophecy of Joseph Smith was fulfilled to the letter. The Saints were driven from Nauvoo, their temple was destroyed and desecrated and many were killed. They made the longest exodus ever recorded on this continent, and completed their casualty-filled journey in a valley surrounded by the Rocky Mountains with no sign of life in the entire valley except a single tree. Gentlemen, I know that Joseph Smith was a prophet of God and have not begun to scratch the surface of the real proof of His divinity such as how came forth.

Judge: The Prophecies are very impressive. Did you want to continue in this vain?

Missionaries: Yes. Amos 3:7 tells us that the Lord God will do nothing without revealing it first to his servants, the prophets. Which churches among us say they receive continual revelation through their living prophets? None of you! This means that the churches represented here, since they don't claim to have living prophets, have a Lord that is "doing nothing" in them, is revealing nothing to them and therefore are not God's true church by your own definitions.

Now, from the dream of Nebuchadnezzar as interpreted by Daniel, we find in Dan. 2:44 that the God of Heaven would set up a kingdom that would never be destroyed, and would not be

left to another people, but that it would break into pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and would stand forever. Since we know that the kingdom that was set up at the time of Christ was destroyed, that would mean that another kingdom of the Lords' would have to be established at the restitution of all things as spoken by the mouths of the prophets as the scriptures inform us. That kingdom could not be established without a prophet, since the Lord does not work, as Amos records, unless it is through his servants, the Holy Prophets and we have already and yet will continue to establish for this group, that the prophets and apostles must be living and not dead in order for the kingdom of God to be established or more perfectly put, restored once again. Dead prophets can not restore new revelation, which is why we need living prophets and apostles.

United Church of Canada: You are trying to tell us that the Kingdom that Daniel saw was the Mormon Church? Scriptures bear record that it was the kingdom set up by our Lord 2000 years ago.

Missionaries: It could not have been. You will notice that the kingdom that Daniel saw "Shall not be left to other people." And we read in Matthew 21:43 where Christ and "The Kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof." So the kingdom Christ organized was left and given to another people. Or as it says in Acts 3:19-21, there will be a restitution of all things or in the many other scriptures which say there will be a falling away and restitution and also that after Christ leaves there will be grievous wolves destroying the church. But this topic about the falling away of the true church and its eventual restoration will surely come up later. To continue on my defense for the prophet, Matthew 7:15-20 tells us that a true and a false prophet can be recognized "by their fruits". The fruits of Mormonism are many. We have, and inspired book of scripture that serves as a second witness for Christ; we have numerous prophecies that have given us guidance, we have the Word of Wisdom – a perfect health code given us by the Lord. The Mormon people are the most educated on the earth, having more college graduates and men on honor rolls in science per capita than any other church. Joseph Smith, through the Lord, introduced fruit upon fruit that is good, more than time will permit us to enumerate. Matthew 7:18 states, (comparing prophets to trees), "A good tree (prophet) cannot bring forth evil fruit. NEITHER CAN A CORRUPT TREE (FALSE PROPHET) BRING FORTH GOOD FRUIT." The prophet brought forth good fruit, so he had to be a true prophet. If you read "The Book of Mormon" you can't help but realize that no man could have written this and therefore it must be a true record. And that if it is a true record then Joseph Smith must have been a prophet of God.

Atheist: I will use your same argument concerning fruits and prove the other four prophets and prophetesses, because they have brought forth good fruit.

Missionaries: I will accept your challenge. Sir, what did Pastor Russell give the world in the cause of truth, and what fruits can you show for the Jehovah Witnesses?

Jehovah Witnesses: The correct interpretation of the scriptures, a greater understanding of Jehovah, and an organization that can be matched by none other in the world.

Missionaries: Dr. Gledhill, what did Mrs. White give the world that we didn't have before? What new fruits did she bring to mankind?

Seventh Day Adventist: A correct interpretation of the scripture, especially concerning the Sabbath Day, which has been dishonored by man. Also the correct plan of life has been explained by Mrs. White, and the only way whereby man can find his way back to God.

Missionaries: Sir, what has Mary Baker Eddy given us in her teachings and doctrines and what new fruits has she given to mankind?

Christian Science: Mary Baker Eddy has made a valuable contribution to the Christian world in the book "Science and Health, the Key to the Scriptures" and by doing this has given to man the true and correct interpretation of the Holy Scriptures and the fruits of healing.

Missionaries: Evangelist Krause, what has Pentecostalism given to us in the way of good fruits and truth by their revelation of the Lord?

Pentecostal Church: Within the Pentecostal doctrine we have the true baptism of the Holy Spirit, the gifts of the church of Pentecost, the correct interpretation of the Holy Scriptures. We have also the same missionary fervor as was demonstrated in the book of Acts.

Missionaries: Gentlemen, I appreciate your fervor and your convictions. Our purpose is to establish truth. Now, there are some striking differences that I will bring forth between the Mormon Church and the fruits of the other four. To begin with, in accepting the fact that God has inspired one of the five churches, four of our churches have to be wrong and the fifth right. This is why the divine qualifications play such an important part in our examination. We have presented the qualifications of a Prophet of God, of which these gentlemen could not do. I would like to call your attention to the names of their churches; Seventh - day Adventist, Christian Science, Jehovah Witness, and Pentecostal. You will notice that each is founded and named after an important principle already established in the Holy Scriptures. For Mrs. Eddy, it was healing by faith even though the scriptures state it is to be done by the laying on of hands. For Mrs. White, it was the 7th day for which we have shown is Sunday and not Saturday. For Pastor Russell, it was the name Jehovah instead of LORD which we have shown is incorrect. For the Pentecostals it was a day, found in Acts 2. I want you to notice, then, that none of the four brought forth any principle that was not in the Bible 2000 years ago. Mrs. Eddy's words were summed up by Christ in eight words "All things are possible in him that believeth". Her book, "Science and Health" deals with this point that Christ had established almost 19 centuries ago. In doing so, she denied the need for modern science and the medical profession. Mrs. White was supposedly inspired to speak on the Sabbath Day, a teaching almost as old as the existence of the Jewish Nation, and one that was involved in the creation. Pastor Russell picked up a Bible, and after a little study found out that the translators had taken the name LORD and replaced it for Jehovah, so he was prompted to start a religion. Then came the Pentecostal Church, founded on scriptures, and an unusual amount of enthusiasm. Their doctrine is nothing new, like the other three adherents to truth, but it is a doctrine that had been borrowed from one small section in one book in the entire New Testament. None of them have fulfilled the requirements of the restoration as listed in the Bible. Their prophets do not fulfill the divine qualifications in fact, based upon what we have outlined previously about the qualifications of a prophet, none of them have a prophet; none of them have received revelation from the mouth of God or restored a single thing that was not already in play. Pastor Russell made a dramatic prophecy concerning Christ's second coming of a "Spiritual" second coming. Christ said you would know a prophet by their fruits, and they have brought forth no new fruits, but merely their own interpretations of existing doctrine that has been taught for 2000 years. Of course, their own interpretations have been added to these doctrines. I want to point out that followers of these religions are sincere, god-fearing people but people were not the fruits of the scriptures as taught by Christ, but "New Truth." The doctrines of these churches I believe are treacherous, and this I will illustrate.

The gospel of Jesus Christ was complete and full, and as the scriptures read, "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." (Matthew 4:4) Christ taught the Scribes and Pharisees a bitter lesson in the 23rd chapter of Matthew that describes in perfection these four groups. He said, "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For ye pay tithe of mint and anise and cumin, and have OMITTED THE

WEIGHTIER MATTERS OF THE LAW, JUDGEMENT, MERCY, AND FAITH: these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone. YE BLIND GUIDES, WHICH STRAIN AT A GNAT, AND SWALLOW A CAMEL.” What did Mrs. White strain at – the 7th day, as I have illustrated, this was a law for a certain group of people at a certain given time on the earth. What did Mrs. Eddy strain at? the doctrine of healing. Mrs. Eddy most likely forgot that this was only one of the many gifts of the spirit as promised by our Lord. (1 Cor. 12:8-10) The foundations of this group deals with healing, and their doctrine is centered on that one principle. Not only is there more but the Lord has taught us the correct way to perform these gifts of the spirit. They do not follow them.

Mr. Russell loved trivialities, so he chose to really strain at gnats and put the name Jehovah down instead of LORD, but as we have proven this day, Jehovah was one of the many names for our Lord. We have another group floating around called the “Great I Am’s” which was another name of Jehovah’s. (Ex. 6:3 compare with Ex. 3:14) From this initial inspiration, other doctrines sprang forth merely by interpretations of Daniels’ explanation of Nebuchadnezzar’s dream, or the book of Revelations. They forgot Peter’s words that “No prophecy of the scriptures is of any private interpretation, for the prophecy came not by the will of man, but holy men of God spoke as they were moved upon by the Holy Ghost.” (2 Pet. 1:20-21) You will notice in verse 19 Peter explains that he has the power to interpret the scriptures, and in verses 17 and 18 he tells us why, because he had seen a vision and heard the voice of the Father. Pastor Russell had neither of these experiences. Then the Pentecostal movement claimed the “testimony of the Lord Jesus” in 1914, and to this day I don’t think anyone knows how it came. Once again, a religion started on one passage of scripture or in this instance, on the proceedings of one day 2000 years ago. None of the four brought forth new truth, new scripture, and none of the four, therefore, could meet the qualifications of revelation. It is not progressive; in fact, it is not regressive. It is not needful because we have had it for 2000 years. This is what all the religions of the world do. They take one or more existing doctrines, apply their interpretation and call it a “new church”. It is not harmonious, because there is no revelation. None of these founders sealed their testimonies with their blood, (Heb. 9:16-17), and the Spirit of Prophecy which is the Testimony of Jesus could not be found in their churches today. (Rev. 19:10) Did you know that Communism is merely a distortion of evil men placed on a volume of scriptures and doctrine taught by the apostles? In Acts 4:32-35 and pretty well the entire 5th chapter of Acts we have the God given principal of “United Order” and “Common Distribution” taught by our Lord’s apostles. We have over one-third of the world held under wicked rule today only because men of evil designs have perverted it. This shows the tragedy of a doctrine motivated by false prophets.

Church of Christ: You stated the claim that Joseph Smith was a prophet because he brought forth fruit and his prophecies were fulfilled and you used Deut.18:21-11 in support of this. I quote from “The Doctrine and Covenants”, a prophecy that has not been fulfilled. It reads in Section 111 that, (1) the Lord had much treasure for the saints in Salem, (2) in due time the Lord would give the city into the hands of the saints, (3) meet prominent people in Salem, and it shall be given to you, (4) they (the saints) would have the power over it and the gold, silver and other wealth would give them power to pay off the debts of the church, (5) the Lord told them to inquire about the cities ancient inhabitants because there was more than one treasure in that city for them. This prophecy was not fulfilled – the saints never did get the treasure of the city, they never did receive the city in their hands, they never got the gold and silver promised, and learning about the ancient inhabitants didn’t do them a bit of good. They didn’t get a single treasure out of the whole city. Therefore, Joseph Smith’s revelation was false and therefore the Mormon Church is false.

Missionaries: You keep trying to show our church false if you can find but one item inconsistent or not true, yet we have shown you that all of you have several items incongruent with the scriptures

therefore proving all of your churches are false while showing there are no inconsistencies. However we can prove your new points also incorrect. Your interpretation is quite a fantastic one, but so far off track that I could hardly recognize you were reading from the 111th section. The prophet with three elders of the church had gone to Salem for a month of missionary work. The Lord then told them that He had treasure for them in the city, which would be gathered out for the benefit of Zion – and that treasure was converts who were baptized into the church that they brought in during their stay in Salem. They were told to meet prominent people, not for the purpose of gaining wealth, but for the sake of missionary work and to build an influence in the town. The Lord then told them that “in due time of the Lord” they would have power over the city and its wealth in riches – but notice the Lord didn’t say when. The prophet knew it would be fulfilled when the saints were to settle and gather once again in Zion, (Independence, Missouri), during the Savior’s reign on the earth at His second coming. He knew and never meant to convey that it was to be immediately because there was severe persecution being given at the time to the Baptist and Quakers, and had only recently destroyed through mob violence a Convent near Charleston, and that is why he stated through the Lord that it would be in “the Lord’s due time.” The saints did get their debts paid off in reference to verse 5, and paid \$14,000 soon afterwards for the Kirtland Temple. The Lord then told the prophet that there was more than one treasure for the saints in that city, (converts and at a future date power over the city and its wealth), and told, (God to the prophet), him to learn the city’s history. History is a valuable tool to a missionary, but the revelation was more specifically pointed towards the ancestors of Joseph Smith, who had first settled near Salem upon arriving in America. Therefore, the prophecy in parts has been fulfilled, and the other parts await fulfillment. Just because the Lord makes a prophecy through a prophet does not mean that fulfillment must immediately follow.

None of your prophets have given us anything. Isaiah prophesied that Christ would be born of a virgin, (Isa. 7:14), and if I were living in the time of Macabees around 100 B.C. and I accused Isaiah of being a false prophet because it had not come to pass; it would only be a demonstration of my own ignorance and not make the prophecy any less valid and exact. Likewise if you were living in 1858 and called Joseph Smith a false prophet because the North and South had not fought nor divided, and that no war had come beginning at South Carolina, and great bloodshed had not come upon the face of the land, it would have been an indication of your own ignorance and lack of foresight and spiritual knowledge, and not made Joseph Smith any less a prophet of the living God. In the same light, because parts of this prophecy have not been fulfilled does not make Joseph Smith any less a prophet of God, after all many others have been fulfilled.

Anglican Church: I believe a little earlier you just destroyed any case you might have had. It came through your selection of scriptures to which Heb. 9:16-27 teaches that Christ was the testator of the New Covenant or New Testament, and “The Doctrine and Covenants” 135:5 teaches that Smith and his brother are the “Testators” of the new Covenant. Also, Eph. 1:22-23 names Christ as the head of the Church, but Mormon revelation in “The Doctrine and Covenants” 28:6 names Smith as the head of the Church. Do you notice, gentlemen, what I am pointing out? Smith to Mormons is what Christ is to Christians. To good thinking Christians, Christ was the Testator, (Heb. 9:16-17), and the head of the church as it says in Eph. 1:22-23, while to Latter-day Saints, Smith is both testator and the head of your church. Would you please tell me if Christ is the head of your church and the testator, or if Smith is the head of your church and the testator as Mormon revelation points out?

Missionaries: Sir, I could answer both are the heads of the Church and Testators, and still be right. Do you not have a leader of your church? Is he or she not the president and or head? The Pope is not called president but he is still the head of the church, is he not? You will notice that Eph. 2:20 places Christ as the Cornerstone of the Church, and the apostles at the

foundation. This was the ruling of the Church, with Christ at the head. When Christ was taken to heaven after His resurrection He led the church by revelation, but this left the twelve as the earthly heads of the church. Christ had told Peter in Matthew 16:19 that he has the KEYS OF THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN, and the power to bind on earth what would be bound in heaven. This power was also given to the other eleven. (Matthew 18:18) You will notice that the saints considered this foundation as the “head” of their temporal affairs, (Acts 6:1-6; 1 Cor. 16:2), along with being their spiritual guides to Christ. This is why their epistles were so enthusiastically accepted. All revelation came from Christ, was given through the apostles and prophets, and given to the people. In the D&C 28:6, the Lord revealed “the earthly head” of the church, because by evil purposes wicked people had deceived many of the saints by claiming false revelation. We can find almost identical experiences in the Bible. Suppose Simon the Sorcerer in Acts 8 had claimed revelation. How were the people to know whether he was a true or a false prophet, if the Lord had not already designated the leaders they were to follow?

Now, concerning the Testators – Christ built the church and organized as mentioned “on a foundation of apostles and prophets” and brought a new covenant and testament to the people. He was Lord and Christ, and founder of the eternal principles of truth. With His death, and the death of His chosen twelve apostles and their immediate successors, havoc filled the church. Destruction and corruption destroyed the plain and simple truths He had given the people. We will establish, I am sure, how this destruction took place later in this discussion. It was in the dispensation of the fullness of times that the Lord restored His Church and the plain and precious parts of the gospel. He announced the creeds as abominable, and the existing churches as false. Joseph Smith was given power and authority from the Father and the Son, from Peter, James and John, from John the Baptist, from Elijah and many other leaders of ages past to organize the church in its perfection. Through the guidance of Christ, He chose twelve apostles, and set up an identical organization with the church of ancient times. With the “New and Everlasting Covenant” once again established on the earth, new truth given, in “The Doctrine and Covenants”, and “The Pearl of Great Price”, the Lord required his blood as a testimony against those who denied these revelations. Since “all truth” had been restored through the prophet, he gave his testimony, and was martyred with his brother. He was never recognized above Christ, or even near Christ, but just as an inspired prophet of our Lord. This is why he could be a testator; because it was his blood that sealed a testimony of the restoration of the Church. Christ was a testator, and the testator of the early day of the Church. Today the earthly head of the Church is the prophet in charge of the church leadership because all revelations from God comes through him – yet the head of the entire body, the founder of truth, the cornerstone, and Savior of mankind is Jesus Christ, the founder of this church. The head of the church is just the leader on earth. Because of the law he must also be a president. By the way, Jesus is the founder of this church, the founder of all the other churches is a man or woman. None of them have made any claim as to having the Father or the Son visit them and restore that which had been taken, as the scriptures have prophesied.

Baptist Church: You made the statement that you had the same organization as the Primitive Church, namely apostles and prophets. We read where Christ chose twelve apostles and they were prophets, yet Mormonism today had twelve apostles and three prophets. A few years ago they had twelve apostles and four prophets. You seem to fluctuate yearly. Also, the head of your church is called President. Please establish for me chapter and verse where Peter, James and John, whom Mormon revelation calls the first presidency of the primitive church, were called "Presidents" or where the term is found in the Bible. Also, explain to me why you have a different number of apostles and prophets than had the Primitive Church. This points serious fallacies in Mormon Doctrines, and effects the entire organization of the Latter-day Saint's Church.

Missionaries: We teach in our sixth article of faith that we believe in having the same organization as the Primitive Church; namely apostles, prophets, etc. Gentlemen, you try to override the offices by numbers. We learn in Eph. 2:20 that the church was founded on apostles and that they were to remain "till we all come in a unity of the faith". (Eph. 4:11-13) We learn in Matt. 10:1-5 that the quorum of apostles numbered at twelve, of which the church today has numbered in its quorum. However, the church in Eph. 2:20 was founded on apostles and prophets and nowhere in Holy Scriptures can you find that you could only have a limited number of prophets or apostles. Acts 11:27-28 informs us that prophets existed after the time of Christ, and had great authority of the Holy Ghost concerning the future of Paul of Tarsus of which Paul accepted and believed. Prophets is plural and no number is listed. This proves that the church did have twelve apostles and an unlimited number of prophets. The Church today has twelve apostles and a first presidency. The presidency usually has a president and two counselors but there is no scripture that says there can only be two counselors or only 12 apostles. The Presidency are all prophets and apostles but because they are the leaders they are called presidents. All the apostles and presidency are prophets, seers, and revelators. The Bible also refers to them as Elders. There is nothing in Holy Scripture that informs us this is out of harmony with Christ's word. Your concern over how many individuals serve in these God-given assignments has confused you with the importance of their offices of which you have none. Keep in mind that the Bible says they are needed and we are the only church that claims to have them.

As for the term "President" it is not found in the New Testament, neither is Pope yet there is one of them now and in times past there were several living at one time, of course they were killed off by each other and had wives and mistresses but that is not the topic, but through your own misunderstanding, you place improper emphasis on the term President instead of having prophets and apostles. The word President is derived from the word "Preside" or one who presides. It is merely added to the prophet's name to indicate he is the "Presiding" officer of the church. In our missions, we have mission presidents who are called presidents because they "preside" over our missions and our missionaries. There is no specification as to how many prophets you can have in the church. There may be many prophets and apostles but only twelve apostles make up a quorum. When there are more they are just on special assignments and not part of the governing body. Therefore, we have the same offices as the primitive church, and where numbers are mentioned as a requirement in the New Testament, (such as apostles and Seventies), we fulfill the qualifications. But does any of the prosecution fulfill the qualifications? Which one of you have the office of the Seventy in your church? We already know you do not have apostles or prophets. The Bible shows a record of having as part of the church government prophets, apostles, evangelists, seventy bishops, pastors, High Priests, elders, priests, teachers, and deacons. Nowhere in the Bible does it state that only a few of these are necessary or they are only needed during biblical times. As a matter of fact if you have only some of these offices in your church you are admitting you do not have the true church. They are all needed or none needed, for by whatever qualification you use to say some are needed they are all needed and conversely. For example, if you say we need not apostles and seventy and prophets because they are in the Bible, I say so are elders and bishops, deacons and teachers. It is all or none, you don't get to pick and choose, so we need all of them or none of them. If we need them then the Mormon Church is the only church that follows the pattern outlined in the Bible.

Lutheran Minister: Hold on. The scriptures say that "Christ placed some in the Church FIRST, APOSTLES, SECONDARY PROPHETS, ETC." In the Mormon Church it is the reverse, first prophets, secondary apostles.

Missionaries: You will notice that Christ, a prophet, (Acts 3:22) placed the apostles first in the church when he organized it almost two thousand years ago. Joseph Smith (A Prophet) also placed apostles first in the church when it was organized in 1830. It was the prophet that ordained these, the apostles, under God's commission. After the church was organized, (Acts 1) and Christ was ascended, the apostles and prophets chose the new apostles which is done the same way today, under the Lord's guidance. If you knew anything about Mormon revelation, you would be surprised that in "The Doctrine and Covenants" 107:23-24 the apostles are equal in power and authority to the First Presidency. The main difference is that the Lord's revelations go through the Lord's chosen prophet. This is in harmony with Holy Scripture. (Amos 3:7) That the original church could have had a first presidency is strongly indicated by Paul's words to Galatians 2:9 when he said, "James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars." This scripture seems important, when we stop and think it was Peter, James and John that went with Christ to the Mount of Transfiguration in Matt. 17:1-5 and the Garden of Gethsemane on the Mount of Olives. (Matt. 26:29-30) Also, it was only Peter, James, and John that were allowed with the parents into the room when the daughter of Jairus was raised from the dead. It is because of living prophets and the restoration of "all truth" that we understand this principle of the gospel.

Methodist Church: Judge I think I have a contradiction that even the Mormon apostles could not answer. In Matt. 26:26-29 our Lord instituted His holy sacrament of which 1 Cor. 11:26 shows was a commandment given to the church. The Commandment teaches that members of the church were to partake of the "Bread and Wine" in remembrance of our Lord. The Latter-day Saints in their sacraments use Bread and Water, which is contrary to Holy Scripture, and which, I might point out, is also contrary to 3 Nephi 18:1-10 in their Book of Mormon, where Christ commanded the people to partake of the Bread and Wine.

Missionaries: Sir, careful reading of the scriptures would prove to you how badly you misinterpreted the scriptures. In Matt. 26:26-29 the command was not to partake of the Bread and Wine, but of the Bread and Cup. No where in the Holy Scripture can you find wine as a commandment with the bread. The cup represents "the bitter cup" of Matt. 26:39 that Christ was to take. Notice Matt. 26:27; Mark 14:23; Luke 2:20, and 1 Cor. 11:25-26 all command CUP. True, wine was in one instance placed on one cup, but the command was to drink of the cup. Anyway, wine is part water, how are you going to distinguish? Furthermore, with living prophets to receive new revelation, water was substituted in order to avoid stimulating a taste for over indulgence. Remember, we have living prophets to reveal new truth and revelation.

Seventh Day Adventist: Judge, an interesting belief of the Latter-day Saints is their belief concerning their dead. However, it is given contrary to Holy Scripture. Titus 3:9 completely destroys the entire "work of the dead" program of the Mormon Church. It reads "But avoid foolish questions, and GENEALOGIES, and contentions, and striving about the law; for THEY ARE UNPROFITABLE AND VAIN." The same advice was given to Timothy in 1 Tim. 1:4, yet this belief in Genealogy work fills an important part of Mormon Doctrine.

Missionaries: This is one of the most ridiculous controversies I have heard on my mission. Undoubtedly you have never read Matthew 1 or Luke 3 where in detail the genealogy of Jesus Christ is given. This was to prove HIS MESSIAHSHIP. The genealogy of many are given throughout the scriptures. When was the last time you read the Old Testament? And why? Because it was the method used to determine if a person had the right to the Priesthood. This was considered a vital way of recognizing the promised Messiah, because He would come through the seed of David, and from the house of Judah. The Cambridge Bible Society also has an excellent answer to these two scriptures. They wrote in their Bible Dictionary, "1 Tim 1:4 and Titus 3:9 refers to fables and endless genealogies, and is referred to legendary stories of the heroes and patriarchs of early Hebrew history, such stories being at the time very

popular among the Jews, but foreign to the gospel, and likely to call attention away from the essential doctrines of the Christian faith." In other words, gentlemen, these genealogical lines and legendary heroes were of Jesus Christ because great fables and tall stories would come from them. Also, some of the people tried to make it seem as if they were greater than others because of their "Royal Blood." The genealogy which we do is not for that reason, as you will probably find out later, when we explain the plan of salvation to you.

Priest: I think it would be appropriate at this time to bring out an interesting difference between our religion and the great majority represented here and that of the Latter-day Saints. In the year 1833, Joseph Smith the Prophet claimed to have a revelation which Mormons know as the Word of Wisdom. As an interpretation of this supposed revelation, Mormons now abstain from alcohol, tobacco, coffee, and tea. I would appreciate these Elders this day, to show me in the scriptures where these things were prohibited to the followers of Christ in the Bible. These things were given to be taken with care and not in large quantities. Before you answer my question, I would like to point out three passages in the scriptures that will add light on the subject. Paul, writing to Timothy, states, (1 Tim. 5:23) "Drink no longer water, but use a little wine for thy stomach's sake and thine often infirmities." In Matt. 15:11 we find another interesting scripture from the words of Christ. Speaking to those hypocrites whom we know as scribes and Pharisees, He stated "Not that which goeth into the mouth defileth a man; but that which cometh out of the mouth, that defileth man." Then we read in Genesis 9:20-21 where the great Prophet Noah, whom Gen. 6:9 says "Was a just man and perfect in his generations, and Noah walked with God" becoming drunk with wine, Gen. 9:20-21 reads "And Noah began to be an husbandman, and he planted vineyards; and he drank of his wine, AND WAS DRUNKEN; and he was uncovered within his tent." Gentlemen, in the light of these scriptures, would you please point scripture upon scripture where these things, not taken in excess, are forbidden.

Missionaries: Judge and gentlemen I have a great and abiding testimony of the Word of Wisdom. By living its principals I know that I have received great blessings from the Lord. As this trial began you stated that there were three qualifications for revelation (needful, progressive, and harmonious). The Word of Wisdom fulfilled all three of these requirements. It was needful because coffee, tobacco and tea were not in existence in biblical times, and in 1833 was not known to be harmful to the body. It is progressive, because it shows that God gave great commandments to assist the people in maintaining their health and keeping their bodies as "the temple of God." We will now establish that it was harmonious with Holy Scripture. 1 Tim. 5:23 speaks of using wine instead of water for our stomach's sakes. I have here a Diagloat, (Original Greek Text), of the Hebrew Scriptures, which gives us an interesting insight of the term "wine." You will notice that in Romans 14:21, wine is absolutely forbidden, and 1 Tim. 5:23 is recommended, and yet it is the same Apostle writing both epistles. That would be contradictory, if it were not for the fact that translators made in the translation the term "wine" to mean everything from grape juice to fermented wine. The wine used in the Lord's Supper was nothing more than grape juice, or as the scriptures stated it "fruit of the vine". This is all that 1 Tim. 5:23 is pointing out, that grape juice can be used instead of water. I have here the original Greek scripture if you would like to check this out. Proverbs 20:1 states "Wine is a mocker, strong drink is raging, and whosoever is deceived thereby is not wise." Incidentally, this same translation is put out by the Vatican Manuscript.

We then refer to Matt. 15:11 which was a beautiful case of a scriptural rail split. I don't know if you were trying to pull the wool over our eyes or not, but failed. You should have read the entire 15th chapter instead of just one verse from it. Jewish custom taught that man was supposed to cleanse his hands before eating or he was unclean. Christ, to show this doctrine man made, partook of the food without washing his hands. They became very excited, so He told them that the food He took in did not defileth him, but the thoughts which came from men

defileth them. Read verse 20 carefully, and you will find that point clearly defined. Now, sir, the question on Noah's drunkenness is an interesting one. It is true that Noah was intoxicated, and that it was fermented wine that he did use, however, in the light of other teachings, such as Proverbs 20:1, Noah must have repented. The Lord tells us He will forgive and forget our past mistakes if we do repent. If Noah had continued to drink, I refer you to his fate, which scripture is also my favorite word of wisdom scripture. Found in Galatians 5:19-21, it reads, "Now the works of the flesh are made manifest, which are these: Adultery, Fornication, Uncleaness, Lasciviousness, Idolatry, Witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, DRUNKENNESS, revellings, AND SUCH LIKE, of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past, that they which do such things SHALL NOT INHERIT THE KINGDOM OF GOD." Notice, sir, that drunkenness was included on the list of those who could not enter the kingdom of God, and the words "of such like" mean things that pertain to them. This would include light drinking, which leads to heavy drinking. Now, if you assume that Noah continued to drink, then we must assume he was a drunkard and realized that he could not have entered the Kingdom of God, which is blasphemous. From Genesis 6:9 we realize that he must have repented, and was therefore forgiven. Or would you have us believe that Jesus does one thing but teaches another?

Church of Christ: Gentlemen, I maintain that the Elders of the Mormon Church are not elders. Titus 1:5-6 proves that an Elder has to be married. The husbands of one wife, and have faithful children. Timothy, writing to Titus, said, "For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting and ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee; if any be blameless, the husband of one wife, having faithful children not accused of riot or unruly." Since the two young men represented here are not married, they cannot be elders.

Missionaries: Sir, I challenge your interpretation of that scripture, and will show you and prove that you do not have Elders in the Church of Christ and that we do. In answer to Titus 1:5-6 our friend did not ever bother to go on and read verse 7. This proves plainly that this passage was talking about presiding elders, or bishops. I refer you to the first four words in verse 6, and the first six in verse 7. Notice that the Elder (verse 5) had to be blameless (verse 6) to be a Bishop (verse 7) which was blameless. 1 Tim. 3:2 reaffirms this claim. Sir, was Paul the Apostle married? How many bishops are married? Based on this chapter alone the Catholic Church is false because their Bishops are not married nor are their elders.

Church of Christ: Absolutely not! 1 Cor. 7 is a direct indication that Paul was single. He was not an elder, either.

Missionaries: By your own admission, Paul was single. We read in 1 Tim. 4:14 Paul's advise to his former companion in the ministry, Timothy. He tells him not to neglect the gift that is in him, which was given him by prophecy, by the laying on of hands of the Presbytery. Any Bible dictionary will tell you that Elder and Presbytery are the same. We read in 2 Tim. 1:16 where Paul tells Timothy "Wherefore I put thee in remembrance that thou stir up the gift of God, which is in thee by THE PUTTING ON OF MY HANDS." There it is in black and white. The Presbytery gave Timothy this gift of God, and Paul was one of the Presbytery or Elders, and since Paul was not married, by your own admission, Elders can be single. If you question this scripture, look at the little Bible aids of reference and you will find that 2 Tim. 1:6 refers you to 1 Tim. 4:14. These scriptures answer your question, and prove that Titus 1:5-6 was referring to presiding elders, or bishops. It also establishes that elders can be single or married but bishops must be married. Now, sir, I promised you that I would prove you do not have elders in the Church of Christ. I refer you to James 5:15 which reads "is any sick among you. Let him call for the Elders of the Church and let them pray over him, ANNOINTING HIM WITH OIL IN THE NAME OF THE LORD. AND THE PRAYER OF FAITH WILL SAVE THE SICK, AND THE LORD WILL RAISE HIM UP, AND IF HE HATH COM ITTED SIN, THEY SHALL BE

FORGIVEN HIM." First of all, your elders do not anoint sick. Second, you do not have the spiritual gifts in your church, and neither do these associates of yours from the other denominations. It was Alexander Campbell, founder of the Church of Christ, that stated, "Where the Bible speaks, we speak, where the Bible is silent, we are silent." I ask you why don't you have elders in your church that can heal the sick? Before you answer the question, I might point out by way of interest that Mark 6:12-13 establishes that the apostles were also Elders. We read, "And they cast out many devils, and anointed with oil many that were sick and healed them." We go on to read in John 20:23, "Whosoever sins ye remit they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained." Compared with James 5:14 we find identical qualifications in the elders and apostles, 1: Anointing the sick, and 2: Remitting sins through inspiration of the Lord. How do you answer James 5:1-7?

Church of Christ: Our elders do not heal the sick, because when the perfect work of God came in, the miracles ceased.

Missionaries: Please show me in writing where the scriptures say they were to cease? No I guess you can't which is why what you have just said is ridiculous! Jesus clearly taught that greater works would be done by the apostles after He left them. There are NO scriptures to support your stand, and in view of Mark 16:17-18, the spiritual gifts were TO FOLLOW. Since you don't have them you don't even resemble in the least the original Church of Christ, of which you can't trace your authority within 1800 years. I am sure we will discuss the authority later in our discussion.

Church of Christ: I can't stay off this subject any longer. These leaders of the blind teach today that they have inspired and divinely directed apostles and prophets. They use as their scriptural support Eph. 2:19-20. They do not meet the qualifications of the apostleship, nor the qualifications as laid out in the word. First of all, it is ridiculous to assume that the Lord will build on His already established foundation. 1 Cor. 3:10-11 tells us that Christ was the foundation and He is in heaven. Now, why can't the apostles be the foundation, and also be in heaven? I support the stand that we keep the apostles and prophets Christ put in His Church, and not replace them with false apostles and prophets of any modern day religion. Would you answer that? If Christ can be the foundation and be in heaven why can't the apostles also, as the foundation, be in heaven? Question two, 1 Cor. 4:9 is a prophecy by Paul where he says and states that he thinks "that God hath set forth us the apostles last, as it were appointed to death." Now, if the apostles, secondarily prophets and so on, then in verse 31 it states, "But covet earnestly the best gifts: And YET SHEW I UNTO YOU A MORE EXCELLENT WAY." Clearly they were to be shown a better way. 1 Cor. 13:9-10 tells us "For we know in part, and we prophesy in part, but that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away." When the perfect word of God was ushered in after the revelation of John, then came the fulfillment to the scripture, that which was in part, (Prophecy, healing, etc.) were to be done away and the heavens were closed. Therefore, as James 1:25 proves, the people lived under the "perfect law of liberty" or "that which is perfect" as 1 Cor. 13:9-10 teaches. Now, would you be so kind as to answer these questions for me?

Missionaries: I would love to answer them. You quoted Eph. 2:19-20 but failed to go on and quote Eph. 4:11 which tells us that He gave us apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, teachers, etc. From verse 12 we learn why we need these people and in verse 13 we learn for how long these offices of priesthood should continue among us, "till we all come in a unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man." Romans 16:17-18 and 1 Cor. 1:10-11 shows that they were not even close in the original Church of Jesus Christ to that Unity of Faith. Now, I ask you this question about what it just said in Eph. 4:11-13 which states "And He gave some apostles and some prophets, and some evangelists, and pastors, and some teachers." These offices in the priesthood He gave for the perfecting of the saints,

for the work of the ministry, and for the edifying of the body of Christ. Now, you have just created a problem in the Church of Christ and all of the rest of the Christian churches. You will find in the Church of Christ, pastors and evangelists and possible teachers, but you have omitted apostles, prophets and all the other offices in the scriptures. Notice they *all* were to continue till we come in a Unity of the Faith. Now, if the Church of Christ is at a unity of the faith, you don't need pastors, evangelists, and teachers, and therefore you have talked yourself out of a job. If you aren't at a unity of the faith however, you need apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers. The same argument holds true for every Christian Church on earth. Are the people of this earth at Unity of the Faith, or not a Unity of the Faith? If we are not, which is obvious from this discussion, then who has these priesthood offices running their church?

Church of Christ: That scripture merely referred to inspired apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers. All five are gone, but the church today has uninspired pastors, evangelists, and teachers. Also by unity of the Faith the Lord never meant the saints believing the same thing and being united. In Luke 18:8 the Lord doubted whether He would find faith on the earth when He said, "Nevertheless when the Son of man cometh shall He find faith on the earth?" He knew his disciples could never attain "Unity" as you have described it.

Missionaries: I agree with you, your leaders are uninspired. You know, sir, it's a shame you weren't living back in the time of Paul to teach him. Why, then, did this great apostle write the Corinthian saints and tell them, "Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of the Lord Jesus Christ THAT YE ALL SPEAK THE SAME THING, AND THAT THERE BE NO DIVISION AMONG YOU: BUT THAT YE BE PERFECTLY JOINED TOGETHER IN THE SAME MIND AND IN THE SAME JUDGMENT." (1 Cor. 1:10) That is Unity of the Faith, to be perfectly united in one mind and judgment, and that is why apostles and prophets were placed in the Church. You never have attained it, and you never will. Incidentally, if you try and tell me that Christ's Church did attain a unity of the faith, you had better read those scriptures over closely that I gave you, (1 Cor. 1:10-14; Romans 16:17-18), because they prove that it never was.

Church of Christ: I notice you have evaded the rest of the questions I asked you. Can you answer those points?

Missionaries: I see how you have recognized the weakness of your argument on the scriptures we have shown you and since you have conceded I will answer your next point. You asked me why Christ as the Foundation could live in heaven and the apostles as the foundation not live in heaven also. How ridiculous can you become? In 1 Cor. 3:10 you will notice that it reads "According to the grace of God, which is given unto me, as a wise master-builder, I have laid the foundation and another buildeth thereon." The "I" in verse 10 was Paul, therefore proving that Christ could not have been the foundation of the church because Paul was not even a member of the church, but a Pharisee for years after the death of Christ. How ridiculous can you get? Paul laying the foundation of the church. Ephesians answered it correctly and place the apostles at that position. Since Paul laid the foundation, it could not have been the church but Christ was the foundation of TRUTH. That was the foundation that no man can lay. John 14:6 says, "I am the way, the truth, and the life." You mentioned in 1 Cor. 4:9 where Paul gave his opinion concerning the future of the apostles. His opinion was that these apostles were sent forth first yet He still taught that they were to "remain until the saints came to a unity of the faith." Paul was right in a sense, because they were the last apostles sent forth in his dispensation, proving the destruction of the Church. That is why He prophesied that "Grievous wolves would enter in among us and destroy the flock." (Acts 20:29-30) He knew that sacred crop of apostles would die, and of that generation they were sent forth last but still they were to remain forever. Since we are not of a Unity of Faith today, we do have a need for living apostles and prophets. Nowhere in the Bible does it state that only a few of these are

necessary or they are only needed during biblical times. You then got carried away on a tangent of 1 Cor. 12:13 about the "more excellent way." You said the "more excellent way" was to do away with prophecy and healing, and inspired men of God were to cease. Why do you twist the scriptures? You will notice in verse 31 that Paul was to show the more excellent way and if it was the Bible, Paul had to live until the second century for its compilation, then bring it in. It couldn't have been the Bible, because Paul never mentioned this "perfect law", (11 Cor. 3:17) in any of his writings. Even if he had spoken of that "perfect law" 11 Cor. 3:17 tells us, "Where the spirit of the Lord is, there is Liberty." Therefore, the day of Pentecost would have been the fulfillment of that scripture because the Lord's spirit was there in rich abundance and the people were very united. Now since Paul was to show the more excellent way, and he was killed in 66 A.D. and using your own statement that revelation was to cease, (1 Cor. 13:10) it stands to reason that the Church of Christ does not accept the "Book of Revelations". By your admission, that inspired document of revelations would be a fraud. The "More excellent way" of 1 Cor. 12:28-31 was eternal life. Therefore, the gift of healing would be "done away" because there would be no sickness. That is progressive; your concept is retrogressive. Paul went on to tell of that wonderful day they would have that "excellent way" when he spoke on life hereafter in 1 Cor. 15:40-42 where we would have perfect charity and love for one another. By the way, Paul was not one of the original apostles but came after Christ was resurrected which is another evidence of apostolic succession and proof of the need of continual revelation. Again the LDS church is the only church to claim to have this.

Church of England: You mentioned that Mormon apostles filled the qualifications as recorded in Christ's word. Acts 1:22 states that "must one be ordained with us a witness of His resurrection." The apostles were then chosen as witnesses of the Lord's resurrection and this meant that to be an apostle a man had to see the Lord. Gentlemen, I affirm that Mormon apostles and prophets have never seen the Lord.

Missionaries: You cannot find that last statement recorded in any of our writings. Not only have the Mormon apostles seen the Lord as required of all apostles but many of our church members have seen him. But the apostles are called as special witnesses to testify to the world of His divinity. Also, your definition was somewhat feeble if I might say so. 1 Cor. 15:16 informs us that Paul was an apostle "born out of due season." Apparently this was not a requirement of Paul to see the Lord although he did see him on the road to Damascus. By your claim, you have one great problem. Since you of the prosecution have so dramatically defended the Holy Bible as containing "all truth", would you be so kind, since seeing the Lord is a qualification, tell us where it is recorded that the apostles (Acts 14:14) ever saw the Lord. Now, we will use your logic - "Where the Bible speaks, we speak." Unless you can show me where ALL the apostles saw the Lord, you can't state that as a qualification. I maintain a man can be a "witness" of the Lord's resurrection without seeing the Lord. The Holy Ghost was to "guide men into "all truth", and therefore has the power to bear such a strong witness. Christ said "whosoever speaketh a word against the Holy Ghost it shall not be forgiven him neither in this world, neither in the world to come." (Matt.12:32) The Holy Ghost has such power that man can prophecy in His name and it will come to pass. (Acts 21:10-13) Notice Agigua did not see the Holy Ghost in Acts 21:10-13 but he bore witness that what he said was by the power of the Holy Ghost.

The apostles had many qualifications. They were to guide the church to a unity of the faith, (Eph. 4:13), help perfect the saints, (Eph. 4:13), lead people to a perfect knowledge of the Son of God, (Eph. 4:13) which, judging from your creeds, is diametrically opposed to a perfect knowledge. After reading the Nicene and Athenasian Creeds it is abundantly obvious that there is a need for living apostles and prophets to guide us in these latter-days. They were to serve as missionaries "sent forth" (Matt. 10:1) and take the gospel to all nations. (Matt. 28:10-18) I have writings to support each of these qualifications and I have met these men and know

and bear witness to you that they are apostles of the living God. Mormon apostles travel millions of miles yearly to all nations; they serve as a great inspiration to the saints and testify to the world that they are witnesses of the Living Christ. They heal the sick, they have raised the dead, and perform the mighty works of God and they are truly witnesses of the Lord's resurrection. Gentlemen, they fill each one of the qualifications of the Holy Scriptures as we have proven and you have proven you have nothing that resembles the teachings in the Bible.

Baptist Church: Let's check the writings of these supposed "inspired" men to examine them. I have before me an article by Mr. Lorenzo Snow, a Mormon Prophet, where he states, "As man is, God once was, as God is man may become." How blasphemous can you become? In other words, the Latter-day Saints teach that God was once a man, and that we can become Gods. Yet "The Book of Mormon" states in Moroni 8:18, "For I know that God is not a partial God, neither a changeable being, but he is unchangeable from all eternity to all eternity." Look at it, Judge, what a joke! Here "Prophet" Lorenzo Snow says God was once a man like you and I, and "Prophet" Moroni says he was and has been "unchangeable" from eternity to eternity. It's your baby, Elders. Answer it.

Missionaries: You must be running out of questions, because they are getting weaker and weaker with each question. I believe both of these statements, and still they don't contradict. Lorenzo Snow uttered a teaching taught by Joseph Smith, the Prophet, and it was Joseph that beheld in the great plan of salvation the beginning of God and how He became God. He was once man, and became a God. When He became God, He created you and me, and that was the beginning of us in eternity. In other words, Moroni 8:18 speaks of eternity on our own understanding, while Lorenzo Snow stated a truth that existed before we were even thought of. You see, because of your lack of understanding of eternity you failed to see that they referred to two different periods of time--one before we were created, and the other since our creation. This whole concept of man becoming a God is very simple and plain to understand but only if you have the Holy Ghost to help you understand it, and you have all clearly demonstrated that not only do you not have it but by your own admission of not having the authority through the priesthood, you can not get it. However because of our time restraints, I will have to forgo the detailed analysis of this spiritual topic which we refer to as the Plan of Salvation.

Baptist Church: That answer sounds reasonable, but can you find me one single solitary proof from the Holy Bible that God was once a man?

Missionaries: Yes, I can. And when I do that, that means you concede too. In John 8:17-18 Christ compared Him and His father to "two men". Both "men" bore witness to this divinity. I am sure we will agree to Christ's human aspects while in the flesh. He was a human being like you and I, only He had God ship within him. We read in John 5:19 "The Son can do nothing of himself, but what He seeth the Father do; for what things so ever He doeth, these ALSO DOETH THE SON LIKEWISE." We read also in the scripture "As the Father hath power to himself, even so hath the Son power." (John 5:26) The answer is so obvious. What was Jesus going to do? (John 5:26) John 10:17-18 tells us "therefore doth my Father Love me, because I lay down my life, that I might take it again, No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself, I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again." This is why the prophet taught these truths. Christ said He could do nothing of himself but what He had seen His Father do, and here we read where He was to take His body and lay it down and take it up again. There's your answer from the Bible. It's for you to accept or reject, but it is true, and it is from the mouth of Christ. Notice it was the same identical power of the Father. Therefore the only conclusion you can get from this is that our Father in heaven is a resurrected being which means He would appear as Jesus did after He was resurrected and appeared to the apostles.

Baptist Church: Those are absurd and damnable teachings. It is a doctrine of the devil.

Missionaries: Did you know that you just spoke the same thing that the Jews said to Christ after He made that statement. It only goes to prove you would have made an ideal Pharisee if you were living in the time of Christ. I have done nothing but quote the Bible and use Christ's own words with an inspired prophet's declaration. It is so simple and in black and white before you.

Pentecostal Evangelist: Elders I find your answers most fascinating I would now like to ask you a sincere question. How do you baptize?

Missionaries: By immersion and in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, as was taught in Matthew 28:19-20. In the Hellenistic Greek which most of the Bible was probably written, the word for baptize meant immersed. The literature of the day refers to ships that sunk as being baptized. So that is how it is done and how Jesus was baptized.

Pentecostal Evangelist: Gentlemen, you have run into a real conflict. Matt. 28:19-20 gives the command, but we learn from the book of Acts and throughout the rest of the scriptures that all people were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. I refer you to Acts 2:38; Acts 8:15; Acts 19:1-5, and so-on. This was not the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, but that of the Lord Jesus. How can you answer that? Why weren't people baptized in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost?

Missionaries: That is an excellent question. We accept literally the command of Matt. 28:19-20 given by Christ to His apostles. Then we find in the book of Acts a problem arising. As Paul, Peter and other of the Lord's disciples went about bringing converts into the church, small segments broke off. In 1 Cor. 1:10-15 we learn PAUL was very displeased because "it hath been declared unto me of you, my brethren, that there be divisions among you." He went on to say, "Some say, I noticed people were forming little segments, and saying they were disciples of Paul, or Cephas, or one of the others." Paul went on to say, "Were any of you baptized in the name of Paul," after they had declared "I am of Paul or I of Apollos, or I of Cephas, or I of Christ and Gaius," and Paul then declared, "I thank God I baptized none of you, but Crispus and Gaius, least any should say that I baptized in mine own name." There's your answer. Notice that false cults were baptizing "In the name of Paul" or "in the name of Appollos." What's more, your example in Acts 19:1-5 shows they "Baptized unto John's baptism" which undoubtedly referred to their being baptized in the name of John causing Paul to rebaptize them into the "Church of the Lord Jesus". This is what the scriptures pointed out; it was to clarify unto "whose baptism" these people were baptized. It denoted the church, which would be that of our Lord Jesus Christ but the command was the same, that they should baptize in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

Anglican Church: As I studied your faith, I learned in your belief of marriage in Heaven. This doctrine can be directly applied to the teaching of Smith and the ideas of sex of the Mormon Church. Matt. 22:23-30 tells us that Christ's answer to the Sadducees concerning marriage in the resurrection "that they neither marry nor are given in marriage but are as the angels in heaven." Why, then, if we neither are married nor given in marriage in heaven, according to the words of Christ, do you teach believe and proselyte this false dogma of "eternal marriage". This is noticeably in complete disagreement with the Word of God.

Missionaries: Sir, Christ always answered people according to their knowledge. For instance, He would use parables to teach the farmer, the shepherd, and the common laborer. Here Christ had been confronted by a Sadducee who verse 23 points out "TEMPTED HIM" and "WHICH BELIEVED NOT IN A RESURRECTION." Therefore, Christ had a heckler before him asking questions on something he didn't believe in, and trying to confuse the Lord. The Lord saw

here a good teaching point, so He listened patiently as the Sadducees explained their case. It consisted of Jewish law, which commanded a woman to live with the brother of her deceased husband. In this particular case, the woman's first husband died, so she went to the next in line and he died and this went down to the seventh. After he had died, she died. Now, the question was "who shall she marry in the resurrection"? Christ said, "She will not marry in the resurrection, for in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage." He taught that it was an earthly ordinance, and must be performed before the resurrection. He then said "Ye greatly err, not knowing the scriptures or the power of God." But God's power He gave to the apostles "To bind on earth what would be bound in heaven." This same question was asked by a Pharisee in Matt. 19:4-6 and so He answered the Pharisee, WHO BELIEVED IN A RESURRECTION, a little differently. He said, "WHATSOEVER GOD HAS JOINED TOGETHER, LET NO MAN PUT ASUNDER." So here we learn that Peter is given the power to bind on earth and in heaven so if they marry a person for all time and eternity, it will be so, unlike all of the other churches which issue a bill of divorcement with each marriage when they say "until death do you part. Since God joined man and woman together, how clear it is put to us in Eccl. 3:14 which reads, "I know that whatsoever God doeth it will be forever." They understood it. That's why in 1 Cor. 11:11 we read, "Neither is the man without the woman, neither the woman without man, in the Lord." That's why in 1 Peter 3:7, Peter assured the people that man and woman would "be together of the grace of life, that their prayers be not hindered." The apostles today bind on earth that which will be bound in heaven and they understand the power of God. It shall be forever as Ecclesiastes pointed out crossed with Matthew 19:4-6; and man is not without woman in the Lord. Therefore, Christ answered the Sadducees according to their knowledge and His answer was an often misinterpreted one, but still universal truth. Therefore if an apostle like Peter or our living apostles today bind on earth and in heaven how can it not be bound in heaven? This is one of the purposes of our temples.

United Church of Canada: While we are on the subject of marriage, Judge, I think it would be interesting to disclose a little Mormon history. We find in the past three religions that have been founded on sex. We learn of the Oneida Perfectionists that have been founded on sex, believing that every woman was every man's wife, in other words, they formed a free love colony. Then we had Mother Ann Lee and her Shakers, who taught that Ann Lee was none other than Jesus Christ manifest as a woman. Ann Lee, the majority of her life, walked the street as a "call girl". Then the Latter-day Saints, who taught and practiced polygamy or the giving of many wives to one man. In the "Twenty-Seventh Wife" some of the horrors that actually went on under these evil conditions were described by Mrs. Brigham Young. Now, let's examine this practice from the standpoint of the Holy Scriptures. In Matt. 19:1-9 we learn that "Man shall cleave to his wife, and they shall be one flesh," and the Savior went on to point out that it was through "hardness of their hearts" that divorces were given. He then taught if a man were to marry another while his wife lived it was adultery. We then read from in Jacob 2:23-24 which states "For behold thus saith the Lord: This people begin to WAX IN INIQUITY, they understand not the scriptures for they seek to excuse themselves in committing whoredoms, because of the things which were written concerning David and Solomon, his son. Behold, David and Solomon truly had many wives and concubines, which thing was ABOMINABLE BEFORE ME, SAITH THE LORD." Even your Book of Mormon powerfully condemns polygamy. The Lord in that same Book of Jacob went on to say that a man must cling to one woman, and have no concubines. He said that whoredoms were an abomination before him, and the land would be cursed for their sakes by its practice. Therefore, Judge, we have presented a case before you of a people who disobeyed God's moral law and through a prophet's command went against the writings of the Bible and to satisfy the lusts of their flesh. What was it you said, elders, by their fruits ye shall know them?

Missionaries: Gentlemen I maintain that polygamy is a principal of God when He thus commands it. I challenge the representative of the United Church to dispute the points I will bring up. Paul

said, "to the pure all things are pure, but unto them that are defiled and unbelieving is nothing pure." I believe you, sir demonstrated which category you fit under this afternoon. He first quoted "The Twenty-Seventh Wife" written by a wife of Brigham Young, I would imagine that the defense could build a stronger case than that by reading anti-Mormon trash. If you wanted to learn of Christ as He was stumbling towards the cross, would you go to the apostle John or would you go to a Roman soldier? You have used the very same logic. It would seem to me that intelligent people would go to the unbiased sources. This woman was a liar and a false witness, because Brigham Young had eighteen other wives to bear witness of his tender love and affection to them and their families. Incidentally she was the nineteenth wife, not the twenty-seventh as she stated. The truth is available from the official government documents available for anyone to investigate which should prove that the book is a worthless bunch of lies. You used Matt. 19:1-9 and your hasty interpretation completely destroyed your correct interpretation of the scripture. The Pharisees were not talking about polygamy, but were talking about divorcees. Christ told them that a man and his wife were one flesh and that they were not to be put away for the cause of divorce. Those that practiced polygamy were not married before, (among the women), nor divorced and neither had husbands that were still living, so they wouldn't have even figured in the explanation the Savior was giving about divorce. There is absolutely no part or parcel dealing with polygamy in either scripture merely divorce. Then you have pulled a beautiful scripture rail split, in Jacob. You got all the way to verse 29 in Jacob 2 but then stopped. Why didn't you read on to verse 30 like an honest individual seeking truth. It would have answered your question for you. It reads "For if I will saith the Lord of Hosts raise up seed unto me, I will command my people; otherwise, they shall hearken unto these things." Notice He said "Unless I build up a seed, you shall hearken to verses 22-24." United Church of Canada: The Lord there said that those people were excusing their deeds because of what they read of David and Solomon and their deeds. The Lord said that they had been "Abominable before him." You can't dispute it.

Have you read the Old Testament, sir? Have you now? You must ask WHY it was abominable. Apparently David and Solomon did something to make it that way since polygamy had been practiced by many others in the Old Testament without the Lord condemning it. Christ in Matt. 5:48 said that "God was perfect." We then read 2 Samuel 12:8 where Nathan the Prophet speaking in the name of the Lord, said "Thus saith the Lord God, speaking to David, I gave thee thy master's house, and thy master's WIVES." It was none other than the God of Israel, the God of our fathers that gave David his wives. According to your own words, you have this day accused God of wickedness by your hasty interpretation of the Bible. If you had read the Old Testament, you would have found out why polygamy was abominable before the Lord's eyes. 2 Sam. 12:9 reads "Wherefore hast thou (David) despised the commandments of the LORD,...thou hast killed Uriah the Hittite with the sword, and hast taken his wife to be thy wife, and hast slain him with the sword of the Children of Ammon." It is pointed out again in 1 Kings 15:5 that "David did that which was right in the eyes of the Lord, and turned not aside from anything that He commanded him all the days of his life, SAVE ONLY IN THE MATTER OF URIAH THE HITTITE." That is why it was abominable, David had left those wives that God had given him, and committed adultery. The reason it was wicked with Solomon is answered in 1 Kings 11:1-11 and particularly in verses 9-11. As it points out Solomon turned his heart from the "God of Israel" and loved MANY STRANGE WOMEN of which the Lord said it had been wicked. The Son of God came from this same polygamous seed of David; and proudly I say to you as you facetiously asked me, "by their fruits I do know them". I look at Jesus Christ, David, Abraham and the greatest men of all time and say "By their fruits ye shall know them." God sanctioned it, gave these prophets their wives, and called it righteous. He made provision for its practice in, and I know that it is a righteous commandment, and was given to the prophet by the Lord.

Lutheran Minister: I have two questions to ask you that point some pretty big holes in the Joseph Smith pamphlet. We read where his own story was not printed until May 2, 1838, over fifteen years since the Angel Moroni had appeared to him, and over eighteen years since God and Christ were to have appeared to him. Why did he wait so long to write his story, and how do you know he didn't add a lot of it? Secondly, within the pamphlet on Page 9 we read of the Angel Moroni's visit to Joseph Smith, and the angel referring to Joel 2:28-31 said "It has not been fulfilled." Yet we turn to Acts 2:17-18 and find Peter declaring "But this is that which was spoken by the Prophet Joel" referring to Joel 2:28-31 and announcing its fulfillment. Why did Moroni say that Joel's prophecy was not fulfilled, when Peter said that it was? How could Joseph Smith accurately quote the Savior and these other messengers in his pamphlet up to twenty years since many of these experiences had occurred to him?

Missionaries: These are very interesting questions. Joseph Smith wrote the pamphlet of his own story to publish to the world the true account of his vision in 1820. Many false rumors and reports were getting around, and so it was published to clear up any confusion and also as a missionary aid. You seemed concerned that Joseph Smith correctly quoted these great Heavenly Messengers with as long as eighteen years separating his vision with his writing, and yet you think nothing of the Book of John, which records many word for word conversations with the Savior and some of his most dramatic utterances, of which historians believe came around the year 100. That's a seventy year split yet you have no trouble believing that! The answer is simple. Joseph Smith had the Holy Ghost to guide him into "all truth", as did John, and it had as he recorded left a powerful imprint on his brain. Also, he kept a daily journal which could have assisted him a great deal in compiling the pamphlet. In answer to Joel's prophecy, Peter never did declare it was fulfilled. He merely said Joel's Prophecy referred to this day.

Prophecy, as a rule, has partial fulfillment the majority of the time. For example, we have the Jewish people who declared at the crucifixion that "his blood be upon us, and upon our children". It was fulfilled in 70 AD, throughout the dark ages, and again in the reign of Adolph Hitler. We have another case where Christ said in Matt. 24:14 that "this gospel of the Kingdom shall be preached in all the world as a witness unto all nations, and then shall the end come." From the holy scriptures Paul states that "the gospel was preached unto every creature under heaven" where Paul was called to preach the gospel. According to Christ, the end should have come but it was only a partial fulfillment. We could cite countless cases. That Joel's prophecy was only partially fulfilled on Pentecost is pointed out in the last half of the prophecy, which you seem to have forgotten to read, "And I will shew wonders in heaven above, and signs in the earth beneath, blood, and fire and vapor of smokes the sun shall be turned to darkness, and the moon into blood, before that great and terrible day of the Lord come." I believe you can see that this was not fulfilled, and therefore Moroni could correctly say that "This was not yet fulfilled". In some cases prophecy is fulfilled more than once.

Presbyterian Church: Sir, before I came to these courtroom proceedings, I had several of these young men come from their church over to our home, so I could learn more of their claims. As they gave me their first in a series of six discussions, they used Matt. 17:11-13 to prove that John the Baptist must come and as they said "Restore all things" which included the church, priesthood, apostles, and prophets. I am sure these young men use the same scripture, and I maintain it was seriously misinterpreted. I refer you to Matt. 11:13-14 speaking of John and if you will receive it, "THIS IS ELIAS WHICH WAS FOR TO COME". Here the scripture points out that this John was the "Elias which was for to come." That is why Christ said "Elias has come already." Therefore, the scriptures do not say John would come again, and the Mormon claim that John the Baptist returned in 1829 is false.

Missionaries: Sir, you should have read just a little more carefully before bringing up this last question. Christ speaking of John did say, "And if ye will receive it this is Elias, which was for to come." However, did THEY RECEIYE IT? Christ went on to point out that they did not receive it. In verse 18, of Matt. 11 He said some had said "John was a devil," because He neither ate nor drank and in verse 19 He said, "The son of Man came eating and drinking, and they say behold a man gluttonous, and a winebibber." As you can see, they did not receive John. In the 14th chapter of Matthew, we learn that John was beheaded by Herod the tetrarch, so they did not receive him. That is why in the 17th chapter of Matt. our Lord said, "Elias must truly first come and restore all things, but Elias has come already, AND THEY KNEW HIM NOT, but have killed him." That is why the disciples knew He spoke of John the Baptist. So, as the scriptures point out, if they had received it, this was Elias which was for to come, but since they did not receive it, Elias has to truly first come and restore all things. The LDS church is the only church to make the claim that Elias did come and restore all things.

Church of Christ: Elders, may I ask you a question? What does you Book of Mormon actually contain? It does not contain the "Missing Books", the "plain and precious parts", nor any doctrine that the Bible does not contain. There is nothing new found in it al all. It does not teach a thing about Baptism for the dead or the Mormon concept of the three heavens, and if sanctification was taught in the Bible and the people were sanctified by the word in the Bible, what need have we of a Book of Mormon? What does the book really teach us that the Bible doesn't?

Missionaries: Sir, I will answer your questions using the words of the recognized founder of the Church of Christ, whom your church denies, "founded the Church but recognized as one of its chief promoters" Alexander Campbell. Speaking of "The Book of Mormon", Campbell said "It decides all the great controversies: Infant baptism, the trinity regeneration, repentance, justification, the fall of man, the atonement, transubstantiation, fasting, penance, Church government, the call to the ministry, the general resurrection, eternal punishment, who may baptize, and even the questions of free masonry, republican government and the rights of man." In other words, sir its purpose is to clear up the confusion of the Bible, which is quite obvious, since the prosecution cannot agree on many things themselves. also testifies to the world that Christ is the Son of God. It is "Another Testament" for Christ, and the only book on earth that testifies that God is just and that He will reveal his words to all people through his living prophets as Amos says.

You know, as I have sat before you this day representing my church, I have marveled at your questions. You remind me so much of Christ's statement to the Pharisees who He said "Ye strain at the gnat, but swallow a camel." You have testified this day that "The Book of Mormon" is false, and your reasons have been "because it contradicts the Bible", yet everything you have said so far has been proven false. It might be because one or two words appear to you to be out of place which you feel should be in there. Lord Bacon once said, "Read not to contradict and confuse, not to believe and take for granted...but to weigh and consider." I wager to say that 90% of you have never read the book from cover to cover, and that none of you have read it, praying to God to find out if it is true. You have run across the little pamphlets that attempt to "expose" the book and each time, the book withstood the test. You say the book is false because Alma 7:10 referred to Christ as being born "at" Jerusalem where the Bible had "in" Bethlehem, yet you think nothing of the contradiction that actually appears in the account of Paul's vision in Acts 9:7 compared with Acts 22:9- where one account said "They that were with me saw indeed the light but they heard not the voice of him that spoke." with the other which reads "And the men which journeyed with him stood speechless, Hearing a voice, but seeing no man." One says they saw the light, and the other said they didn't.

You think nothing of the contradictions that deal with the crucifixion, where all four writers had different inscriptions about Christ on the cross, nor do you seek to answer why Luke 23:44 refers to three hours of darkness coming between the sixth and the ninth hour while Christ was on the cross, compared with Mark's account that at the third hour they crucified him. John 19:14 informs us that Pilate was still trying to free Christ at about the sixth hour, yet Mark tells us He had been on the cross for three hours. We read in Matt. 27:9-10 where Matthew quotes Jeremiah with the prophecy of the thirty pieces of silver, and yet the Old Testament proves that it was not Jeremiah that made the prophecy but Zechariah. You think nothing of the great martyr Stephen and his testimony in Acts 7:22 where he stated "Moses was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, and was mighty in words and in deeds." Yet Moses said in Exodus 4:10 "O my Lord, I am not eloquent but I am slow of speech and of a slow tongue", so the Lord had him take Aaron as his spokesman. This means Stephen, being filled with the Holy Ghost, (which guides us into "all truth") was mistaken or else the translators were mistaken. And then there is Gen. 6:6 where it says that the Lord repented. Now if He is perfect how can He sin and need to repent? Obviously it is a wrong translation which Joseph Smith corrected by informing us that it repented Noah and not the Lord.

People attack because it supposedly contains grammatical errors, and yet we have found the greatest grammatical errors and contradictions in the English language still present in the King James Version of the Holy Scriptures. Jesus, speaking to Peter, said "Whom do men say that I the Son of Man am?" (Matt. 1:13) In this sentence the verb "am" is a "be" verb making the sentence intransitive, and an intransitive sentence never takes an object. A sentence like that would rate a D on any college term paper. People attack because in 2 Nephi 29 it states that if you accept only the Bible you are a fool, yet those that criticize close their eyes on Matt. 4:4 which tells us we must live by EVERY WORD that proceeds out of the mouth of God. If I were to believe only the first five books of the New Testament, that would make me a fool. The same holds true in the case of "The Book of Mormon". If you only accept the Bible, you are cutting God's word in half and not living by "every word" and therefore you are a fool. You see, gentlemen, what I am pointing out is that for every point with which you attack, we can turn around and find the same mistakes in the Bible. We make the fantastic claim that there are no contradictions in "The Book of Mormon" and no one has ever found any, yet I have pointed out at least ten, so far, in the Bible and there are numerous others. Does that make the Bible false? In the Bible, Christ, no less than ten times, quotes ancient prophets incorrectly. Do you think someone made a mistake in translating or is the Bible false?

Here was a young man who in eighty days translated from an unknown language a 300,000 word, 552 page volume about Ancient America without the assistance of any outside information, and with only three years of formal education, and you want a grammatically perfect copy and yet it took 54 Scholars from Oxford, Cambridge and Westminster four years to write and translate the Authorized King James Version of the Bible from known languages, and we still have these grammar errors in it. Which is more impressive? Which would have had to have been inspired? People have criticized it because of its poor English, which has been updated for current punctuation from 1830's punctuation, yet they ignore the poor English of Lev. 11:21; Gen. 43:25; Gen. 18:2; Gen. 42:2; 2 Kings 19:35; John 4:2; and dozens more. They find places in "The Book of Mormon" that were poorly punctuated, and yet they ignore the punctuation errors that still stand in our Bible found in Luke 23:32 and Acts 19:12. We find errors in the Lord's Prayer where Christ said "Lead us not into temptation" yet James said "God is neither tempted, NEITHER TEMPTETH HE ANY MAN." Of course we understand this prayer to be an example to follow it's content and not to be repeated or as the Bible states it, "vain repetitions". is a testimony of Jesus Christ translated by a humble servant. It is the second witness to establish the truth of all things. Gentlemen, it is true, and God is my witness and it has been shown unto you today.

Christian Science: It is a surprise to me that you try to destroy the face of the Bible. However, to go on with our discussion, you teach that God and Christ have bodies of flesh and blood yet we read where "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God." How can they live in their own kingdoms then with flesh and blood? (1 Cor. 15:50)

Missionaries: Flesh and blood cannot enter the kingdom of God, and we have not made the statement this day that it could, but we have shown that flesh and bone can, does, and will inherit the Kingdom of God. So you and these other gentlemen can understand, let's examine once again the scriptures. Luke 24:36-39 teaches Christ with a resurrected body of flesh and bones and we have said nothing to the contrary.

Church of Christ: Yes, but it materialized. How could He have appeared in the upper chambers with a body when the doors and windows were locked?

Missionaries: I could care less how He did it, but the scriptures say that He was able to do it. You are so materialistic I can hardly believe it. You wonder how Christ got into the upper chambers without coming through a door or window with a tangible body. How did Christ walk on the water with a body when He was a mortal being? How did He ascend into heaven with a body when the laws of nature and gravity tell us He couldn't? How did He get out of the tomb when it took the angel to roll away the stone and yet Christ was not to be found? How did Christ vanish out of the sight of the two men who were on their way to Emmaus after His resurrection? The answer is simple, Christ was now governed by higher laws. He had control over the elements. He was not a vain man like you and I, but was the Son of God. This same Christ who taught that by faith we could move mountains surely had the power to enter a room with a body of flesh and bones as the scriptures teach us. For your information, Lev. 17:11 informs us that "the life of the flesh is the blood" and later in verse 14 reads, "For it is the life of all flesh; the blood of it is for life thereof." Christ did not have blood in His body at the resurrection. If you recall, a spear was driven in His side and blood and water poured from His wound. Therefore, flesh and blood will not inherit the Kingdom of God, but Flesh and Bone will as He said He was and the scriptures testified.

Lutheran Minister: Gentlemen, I have before me a discourse written by the second Mormon Prophet, Brigham Young. Commonly known as the Adam-God discourse. It reads, "NOW HEAR IT, O INHABITANTS OF THE EARTH, JEWS AND GENTILES, SAINT AND SINNER: WHEN OUR FATHER ADAM CAME INTO THE GARDEN OF EDEN, HE CAME IN IT WITH A CELESTIAL BODY AND BROUGHT EVE, ONE OF HIS WIVES, WITH HIM. He helped to make and organize this world. HE IS MICHAEL, THE ARCHANGLE, THE ANCIENT OF DAYS, ABOUT WHOM HOLY MEN HAVE WRITTEN AND SPOKEN. HE IS OUR FATHER AND OUR GOD, AND THE ONLY GOD WITH WHOM WE HAVE TO DO." Therefore, we learn that the Mormons worship Adam as God and as such it would have been Adam, (as other parts of the discourse indicate), who would have been the Father of our Lord, Jesus Christ. I have never in my life seen such a deplorable doctrine, and it came from the mouth of one of your Mormon Prophets.

Missionaries: Gentlemen, for a moment I am going to put the writings of the apostle Paul on trial and give Paul the same chance that this minister has given Brigham Young. It's a little trick called "sentence separation" or "scriptural rail split", and by using this method, you can take a couple of simple truths by an inspired man out of context and put them together and make a malicious falsehood. Paul said in 1 Cor. 7:1, "It is good for a man not to touch a woman." We could go on and find what Paul was talking about, but we shall not because that would require an honest approach. We are taking this minister's same approach of Brigham Young. Remembering that Paul had told the men "not to touch a woman" we read in Gen. 1:25 that God commands men to "multiply and replenish the earth." Now, who are you going to believe,

Paul or God? How can you have children without touching a woman? Here Paul is fighting against God, and is anti-Christ. You see how easy it is. This Lutheran Minister has tried the same thing on Brigham Young. I have read the discourses a hundred times, and that is not what it says. You don't establish truth on a lie or on a scriptural rail split or miss quote. Now, for your benefit we will examine what President Young meant and maybe put together what this "good" minister has torn apart. Of course, we will use the Bible to support the points that we bring up. We read in the discourse where Adam was subordinate to the supreme creator which was proven because it said, He "helped to make and organize this earth." We learn from the same discourse which Reverend Haliday was kind enough to omit, that Brigham Young taught that there were three that created the earth, Elohim, Jehovah, and Michael, and notice Michael's name was listed third.

That Adam was a God is a fact from holy scriptures, and that there were more than one in the creation is also supported by scriptures. God said, "Let *us* make man in *our* own image" indicating plurality of personalities in the creation. In Gen. 3:5 we learn that Adam and Eve had become "as God", knowing good from evil." In John 10:34-35 we read, "Is it not written in your law, I said ye are gods?" If He called them gods, unto whom the word of God came, the scripture cannot be broken. Now, that we have also established that Adam was a God, and we have proven from the discourse he was a subordinate to the supreme creator, and third in the creation, we now examine why he "is the only God with whom we have to do." God, by His almighty powers, has created other worlds, worlds without number. Even science is convinced there is life on other planets in the Universe. Adam was the father of the human race, the first physical father, and therefore President Young pointed out this fact ("Adam is our father and our God.") Other of God's creations would have men such as Adam, who became as Gods, (as Christ mentioned), and in the sense we have mentioned, be "fathers" over their worlds. As our physical father, of whom every living creature can trace back to Adam, he is in the sense "the only God with whom we all have to do." Adam worshipped God Almighty, and we worship God Almighty.

Our first Article of Faith states that "We believe in God the Eternal Father, and in His Son Jesus Christ, and in the Holy Ghost." James 1:17 tells us that God cannot be tempted, and yet, gentlemen, this minister did not read the discourse. It was Brigham Young's way of telling the story of the creation only he used an unusual approach. Adam is the father of the human race, he is a God, and if Adam had not lived and brought forth seed, we would not be here today. He is the only man that ever lived whom we can trace our genealogy directly to and therefore is "the only God with whom we have to do." We still believe that salvation comes by Jesus Christ (Acts 4:12) that we must worship God Almighty, and His Son, (Matt. 6:9-13), and we do respect and love Adam for what he was, the father of the human race. By your accusation of Brigham Young's teachings, Reverend, we might say that you have borne false witness against your neighbor. A man of your education and your experience in studying Mormonism should have known that we don't believe or teach that absurdity.

Priest: I understand that it is the teachings of the Mormon Church that to enter the highest degree of the first heaven or Celestial Kingdom in your church, you must be married in a Mormon Temple. How do you account for the fact that Christ was not married and that undoubtedly many of the other apostles were not married? Also, how do you account for 1 Cor. 7 and Matt.19:12 in the Holy Scriptures?

Missionaries: The first and perhaps one of the greatest commandments ever given to man was to "multiply and replenish the earth." (Gen. 1:28) It was the creator that said "It is not good that man should be alone; I will make an help meet for him." (Gen. 2:18) Therefore God taught "Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife; and they shall be one flesh." Christ later uttered to the Pharisees who were trying to tempt him

about the marriage vow, "Whatsoever God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." It was in this utterance that the Pharisees replied "But Moses commanded to give a writing of divorcement, and to put her away." Christ then went on to the point that in the beginning it was not so and that any man that should put away his wife, save it be for the cause of fornication, was committing adultery. His disciples were disturbed, and said "If the case of the man be so with this wife, it is good not to marry." Christ then pointed out the case of eunuchs made of men, (a pagan philosophy that undoubtedly affected Christian Converts physically disabled by their ceremonies) and then He pointed out that some were made eunuchs for the kingdom of Heaven's sake and said "He that is able to receive it, let him receive it." In the light of other scriptures, this appears confusing to many, but what the Lord meant was that if a man were to marry and do so with any reservation or lack of assurance of love towards his wife, that it would be better for him not to marry, because if he were to put away his wife and marry another, he would be committing adultery. Then the Lord thereby pointed out that it was "for the Kingdom of Heaven's" sake that they had not done it, and saved them from greater condemnation.

Many eminent scholars believe that Paul of Tarsus was married and either divorced or a widower. Paul, if he had been married and either divorced or not before he became a Christian, knew and taught the principal of marriage so strongly that He said "Neither is man without the woman, neither woman without the man in the Lord." (1 Corinthians 11:11) The wickedness of sexual sin was prevalent at the time of our Lord and His apostles, as countless of the scriptures point out, so Paul felt it best, due to this wickedness, to "speak by permission and not by commandment," that all was given to unmarried and widows with the caution that they could remarry but again uttered the fearful warning which Christ himself taught "Let not the wife depart from her husband." Paul, in convincing the Corinthian saints that He was an apostle, said "Have we not power to lead about a sister, a WIFE, as well as other apostles." (1 Cor. 9:5) Here the possibility of Paul having once been married and possibly now a widower is possible, especially considering the statement in Acts 26:5 before Agrippa "after the most straightest sect of our religion I live a Pharisee." The straightest sect was that of Sanhedrin, or ruling body of the day, of which its members, to be members, were commanded to be married at a young age. He was taught "at the foot of Gemalial, and taught according to the perfect law of the fathers, and was zealous towards God." (Acts 22:3)

We still have the commands of marriage by the God of Israel, and Paul's statement along with Christ's on the eternal principal of marriage. Many indications point out the possibility that Christ was once married; John wrote "There are also MANY OTHER THINGS WHICH JESUS DID, the which, if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the Books, that should be written." (John 21:25) I might point out also that we believe that during Christ's reign upon the earth, the thousand years of righteousness, marriages will be performed and many of those who have not lived with the opportunity of marriage that were righteous, will have the opportunity at that time. This is pointed out in Isaiah 65:2 where it states, "They shall not labor in vain, nor bring forth for trouble, for they are the seed of the blessed of the Lord, and their OFFSPRING WITH THEM." It will be so much like our existence in many respects, as it is now, "That they shall build houses and inhabit them".

Methodist Church: Isn't it true that you believe that men have many wives in the hereafter? I noticed that in Brigham Young's "Adam-God" discourse, he mentioned Adam brought Eve "one of his wives", with him? Do you believe in the plurality of wives in the hereafter?

Missionaries: As we pointed out earlier, the greatest prophets of all times have practiced the God given principal of plural marriage. Since "Man is not without the woman, neither woman without the man in the Lord," and since the great prophets of old had these wives, we believe

that they will have them in the eternities. For the sake of time, we can refer you again to the scripture in 2 Samuel 12:8 where "God gave David his wives" and the statement in Eccl. 3:14, "Whatsoever God doeth, IT WILL BE FOREVER." God made woman from the man, and said "It is good that a man not be alone."

Anglican Church: You mean to tell us God has a wife?

Missionaries: Paul, in speaking to the men of Athens, said "For in him we live, and move, and have our being; as certain also of your poets have said, FOR WE ARE ALSO HIS OFFSPRING. FORASMUCH THEN AS WE ARE THE OFFSPRING OF GOD, we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold." (Acts 17:28-29) Paul apparently said we were God's offspring. I don't see how you can have offspring without a mother. Also, if Christ were God's son, there must be a mother there. (Refer also to Eph. 3:14-15)

Church of Christ: Since you teach that whatsoever God does will be forever why doesn't He still give "many wives" and have polygamy exist?

Missionaries: I think God could answer that question better than I could. The Lord said in Isaiah 55:8-9, "For my ways are not your ways, neither are my thoughts your thoughts saith the Lord." His ways are greater and higher than our ways, but I believe what the scriptures say, that God joined man and woman together, and that it would be forever. If you doubt the Lord's ways, you had better take it to him. In answer to plural wives in the hereafter, I can't see a just God causing a good sister to lose her highest exaltation because she was the second wife to David, the 300th wife to Solomon or the 7th wife of Brigham Young.

Atheist: If I am not mistaken, the Latter-day Saints in Matthew 17:11 teach that John the Baptist was the "Elias" which was fore to come, and that Malachi 4:5-6 referred to "Elijah the Prophet." Yet, we find upon examination of the original writings, the words Elias and Elijah to be interchangeable. Malachi 4:5-6 said, "Elias (Elijah) would come before the great and dreadful day of the Lord and turn the hearts of the fathers to the children." Latter-day Saints claim a fulfillment to that prophecy in 1836, yet Luke 1:17 tells us of John, (the same Elijah of Malachi 4:5-6). "And He shall go before him in the SPIRIT AND POWER OF ELIAS TO TURN THE HEARTS OF THE FATHERS TO THE CHILDREN. Therefore, Elijah of Malachi 4:5-6 was none other than John the Baptist of Matthew 17:11 and Luke 1:17. Can you prove this statement incorrect?

Missionaries: Yes, quite easily. You are correct about your knowledge about the interchanging of the words, but it has one weakness. We had a great prophet named "Elijah" in 2 Kings 2:11 that was taken by a whirlwind into heaven and John never claimed to be that Elijah. Now, concerning the prophecy of Malachi 4:5-6 you will notice that Elijah was also to turn the hearts of the children to their fathers of which holy scriptures say never happened by the work of John. Therefore that is a prophecy which had not come to pass in the times of the New Testament but will have to be fulfilled in some time after the Bible times. Do any of you claim to have had this happen in your churches? It has in ours. That John in John 1:21 which reads "and they asked him, what then? Art thou Elias? And He saith, I am not, Art thou that Prophet? And He answered, No." That should answer it for you quite easily. John's mission was to prepare the way for the Lord and he did go forth in the spirit and power of Elias but not that Elias.

Atheists: I'll tell you what, show me Joseph Smith's name in the Bible and I will join the Mormon Church. Can you do it?

Missionaries: I'll tell you what I will do. We read of about a 400 year difference between the Old and New Testament, while there is an 1800 year difference between Joseph Smith and the Bible. If you can show me where Christ's name (Jesus Christ) is found any place in the Old Testament, I will become an Atheist. Will you do that?

Atheist: No, I can't but how do you know he is a prophet?

Missionaries: We have explained all about his fruits earlier but he also fulfilled the scriptures of apostasy and those scriptures of restoration and all the other scriptures we have brought up. Paul said "Be not carried about with divers and strange doctrines." (Hebrews 13:9) That there were to be no prophets nor revelations is taught *no place* in the scriptures. Christ through His servant Paul taught "And the eye cannot say unto the hand, I have no need of thee, nor the head to the feet, I have no need of you." This he said comparing the offices of the church to a human body. (1 Corinthians 12:1-31) To say we have no need of apostles and prophets is a diverse and strange doctrine and was taught never by the Savior or any of His apostles.

Atheist: Thus far you have shown that your Latter-day Scripture could be harmonious, but you have not as yet proven a need for them. Can you, from the scriptures, prove a need for latter-day revelation?

Missionaries: I have done that already but I will expound more. We read in 2 Peter 3:15-16 that Peter had reference to Paul's writings, and said, "And account that the long suffering of our Lord is salvation: even as our beloved brother Paul also according to the wisdom given unto him hath written unto you; as also in all his epistles, speaking in them of these things; IN WHICH ARE SOME THINGS HARD TO BE UNDERSTOOD, which they that are unlearned and unstable, wrest, and they do also the other scriptures, unto their own destruction." That includes 14 epistles or about 53% of our New Testament Books. Christ said "When any one heareth the Word of the Kingdom and understandeth it not, then cometh the wicked one, and catcheth away that which was sown in his heart." (Matt. 13:19) Here we have 53% of the New Testament and a mass of people that will not understand the things that are spoken pertaining to the salvation by Paul. That sounds like a real need to me. Also, the fact that none of you agree with each other shows we obviously still need enlightenment.

Church of Christ: Very few will ever know this scripture. You really exaggerate your points. We read in Eph. 3:4, "Whereby, when ye read, ye may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ." So all you have to do is read to understand.

Missionaries: That would have been a good answer, except you have two problems. 1 Ephesians 3:4 mentioned that the mystery would be revealed when you read, and the mystery was answered in Romans 16:24 and Eph. 1:9-11. That mystery was that through the blood of Christ that we have our inheritance. It had been a mystery since the beginning of the world, with the Jewish nations sacrificing animals to the "God of Israel" because it was commanded to them and yet they really didn't know why. Paul in Heb. 10:10-12 pointed out that "every priest standeth daily ministering at the altar, offering often times the same sacrifice for sins, but this man, (Christ), after He had offered one sacrifice for sin forever, sat down on the right hand of God." Therefore the mystery which means revealed truth was that we would be adopted "by obedience" as the sons of God by the precious blood of Christ who died for our sins. All Paul pointed out in Eph. 3:4 was to read Eph. 1 and they would know the mystery, but Peter's concern was not the mystery, but on salvation that many of the saints were confused. That is our second problem. Peter was talking about salvation, not the mystery of the adoption. History bears record that Ephesians was written before 2 Peter, and if all you had to do was read Paul's writings (since you agreed that all their writings were harmonious), Peter would have never mentioned that they were hard to be understood because Ephesians 3:4 would

have pointed out that all you had to do was read them. That is why they needed the "Gift of the Holy Ghost." It was to guide them into salvation. Therefore, as we have established from the scriptures, there is a need for revelation and living apostles so we may obtain the Holy Ghost which is only available if there are living apostles and prophets as the scriptures have shown.

Church of Christ: I don't think I can accept that answer.

Missionaries: It comes as no surprise to me, especially since you say that the Holy Ghost in Acts 8:14-20 is not given in your church and since it is the Holy Ghost which is to reveal truth, you haven't been able to accept hardly any of the truth taught in the scriptures, so I will prove it further. We have in Deut. 18:21-22 a scripture that informs us that when a man speaks in the name of the Lord and it follows, he is a prophet. I refer you to Matthew 12:40 and the statement of Christ where He prophesied His death and resurrection, "for as Jonas was three days and three nights in the belly of the whale, so shall the son of Man be three days and three nights in the belly of the earth." Matthew 27:62 with Matthew 28:1 proves that the crucifixion was on Friday (Good Friday) and on this fateful Friday, Mark informs us that He was placed upon the cross at the third hour, (Mark 15:25), although John records it was the sixth hour. We will accept Mark's account that it was the third hour (9 AM) and was upon the cross alive for six hours until the ninth hour (3 PM) where Matt. 27:46-51 and Luke 23:44-46 record that He "gave up the spirit" and died. This would, of course, make Friday the first day. Then Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus gained permission to remove Christ's body from the cross, and laced it in a large tomb. We know that it was placed (Christ's body) in the tomb before sunset, because Jewish law demanded that nothing remain on a cross over the Sabbath. Therefore Christ's entry in the tomb could be accurately estimated at the eleventh hour (5 PM) making the first day. Friday night would have been the first night, and then the Saturday would be the second day, and Saturday evening would be the second night, and lo and behold, we find that Christ was resurrected sometime on the dawn of Sunday morning. (John 20:1; Luke 24:1; Mark 16:2; Matt. 28:1-2) making it the third day. This would mean He was in the "belly of the earth" Friday, Saturday, and Sunday during the days, but on the examination of His time spent there on nights, it would have been only Friday and Saturday nights thereby making three days and two nights "in the heart of the earth." This would make Christ's statement in Matthew 12:40 incorrect. Therefore, we would need revelation to answer this prophecy, or according to Deuteronomy, Christ would be a false prophet. Can you prove me wrong?

Lutheran Minister: 99% of them won't think of this answer – but if they should make a lucky stab, it is easily answered. How about the three hours of darkness, that would technically be a night, therefore making the crucifixion of Friday from the sixth to the ninth hours the first night, from the ninth to the twelfth hours the first day, Friday night, the second night, Saturday the second, Saturday night the third night and Sunday (the day of His resurrection), the third day. That would make three days and three nights. (Three hours of darkness supported by Luke 23:44 and numerous passages).

Missionaries: Let's examine the prophecy. It said Christ would be in the heart of the earth or tomb three days and three nights and this was to be the only sign to the Pharisees. Matthew records that at the ninth hour or very close to it Christ asked for God's spirit to be with him, and in great agony stated "My God, my God, why has thou forsaken me?" We read where shortly afterwards He died at the ninth hour, when DARKNESS HAD CEASED. Mark records that it was at the ninth hour Christ made the declaration to God and asked why He has been forsaken and thereby death was placed at the time darkness was to have left the earth. The prophecy called for Christ "being" in the heart of the earth and so three hours of darkness could not have possibly accounted for the first night because He was still upon the cross. Since it was Jewish law that no one hang on a cross over the Passover, and the nightfall

which marked the beginning of the Sabbath of the Passover was beginning to approach (which would have been the 12th hour or 6 PM), the apostle John records that guards went to Pilate and requested permission to break the legs of the three that hung on the crosses (the two thieves and Christ) because this would cause suffocation in a short time causing death, of which permission was granted. However, when they arrived at the foot of the crosses, as John records, they discovered Christ was already dead (placing him on the cross considerably after the 9th hour). Then to insure death one of the guards placed a spear in His side which fulfilled the Old Testament prophecy that not a bone of His body would be broken. This was another of the many proofs that He was their Messiah. Therefore, from the time Christ was taken from the cross and placed in the tomb, it can easily be estimated between the ninth and twelfth hours, (very near the 12th). The reason He was placed in the tomb was because it was so near the Sabbath. You see, gentlemen, your argument does not hold up. Christ was never in the heart of the earth during that three hours, but on the cross. He was in the heart of the earth, according to the Bible, but for but three days and two nights and so we have proven a real need for revelation. And where will you find a church that claims to have this revelation?

Church of Christ: Does Mormon revelation contain the answer?

Missionaries: Yes, gentlemen we do. As we began this trial you used the scripture Luke 23:44 crossed with 3 Nephi 8:22-56 to establish a supposed contradiction between the Bible and "The Book of Mormon". Gentlemen, there is your answer right there. It is a volume of scripture that bears record that Jesus is the Christ, and still establishes His claim as Lord and Christ, and a prophet, (Acts 3:22) of which the Bible cannot do, according to Matthew 12:40. That is one reason why the three days of darkness on this continent. It was a sign that was prophesied to the people of America, the death of our Lord, and was to bear witness that Jesus was Christ. Another answer for the three days and nights is only accepted by a few scholars. The months in the Old Testament were lunar, every new moon was a new month, 13 months of 28 days each, totaling 364 days. Then once a year was a double Sabbath during the Passover, to make up the missing day. Note that the body of Christ was to be removed because it was the "preparation of the Sabbath", (Luke 23:54) or the Passover which occurs on the double Sabbath, which was "on high day". (John 19:31) So that Friday night was night one and day one is Saturday; then Saturday night is night two and Sunday, the first of two Sabbaths, is day two and that Sunday night is night three; and the last Sunday morning is day three "and He rose on the third day". Now, look at Psalms 81:3; Isa. 66:23; Col.2:16; or a number of other scriptures that make reference to the moon for the way of telling months. Or look up month in the Bible dictionary and you will see moon is its reference. So we have proven to you a need for revelation. Also every 50 years was the Jubilee year where there were three Sabbaths. It is truly the word of God.

Methodist Church: Sir, I have evidence here to prove a fraud. "The Book of Mormon" was to have covered a period of history from 600 B.C. to 421 A.D. and was to have been buried until 1823 and delivered to Joseph Smith, the Prophet, by the angel Moroni. In 1611 we had 54 great scholars translate a book we revere and hold sacred which we know as the King James version of the Holy Bible. Until the time of Joseph Smith, it (the Bible) had been in publication for 212 years while "The Book of Mormon" was supposedly to have been completed for 1190 years before this King James Version of the Bible and yet we have definite proof that there is a fraud between the two and it's not the Bible. We find 400 years before the birth of Christ in 2 Nephi a verse that was quoted verbatim in Galatians 3:28, (Compare Galatians 3:28 with 2 Nephi 26:33). We go on to find that the sermon on the mount in 3 Nephi 12 is none other than Matthew's version from the King James version and word for word. We have Matthew 6:5 and Luke 18:11 almost identical with Alma 38:13-18. Also remarkable copies of the King James version are found in comparing Alma 10:2 with Daniel 5; Alma 19:5 compared with John 11:39; Mosiah 20 with Judges 21; Ether 8:10 compared with Matthew 14:6; 2 Nephi 9:9, with 2 Cor.

11:14; and Alma 18:13 with John 20:16. To top it off, we have Joseph Smith quoting in 2 Nephi 1:14 none other than William Shakespeare – it reads: "Whose limbs ye must soon lay down in the cold and silent grave, from whence no traveler can return." Now, I ask you, gentlemen, is this a fraud or is this a fraud? While I am at it, we might turn to 2 Nephi 29:3, and the quotation from the great Nephi "Many of the Gentiles shall say, a Bible! A Bible! We have got a Bible, and there cannot be any more Bible." That's pretty good, Nephi, since the name for the Bible was not even coined until the second century when the word "Bible" was given to the Book. I maintain this proves without a doubt that the book is fraudulent!

Missionaries: I am surely glad that I am not in your church, because your last brilliant discourse completely destroyed the face of your only book of scripture, the Holy Bible. I have never seen such an onslaught of the only inspired book you can claim in my entire life. I see for your sake and for the sake of the prosecution that we will have to give you a lesson in translation this afternoon. I have never seen such an inconsistent approach by any group of men in my entire life. One minute you are telling me it is false because it contradicts the Bible and the very next minute you are telling me it's false because it corresponds with the teachings of the Bible. Did you know that when our good friends translated the Holy Bible they didn't just sit down and roll off the words but they had to deal with strange markings, symbols, pictures, and translate many different styles and types of writing. It took years of preparation, study and examination. The 54 scholars of King James even had difficulty in trying to word the translation so that they would agree. That was probably more difficult than the translation and you will notice that all words in italics were words that all of the scholars could not agree upon, but won the majority vote to be placed in the Bible. Now these had to convey as best they could the meaning that the inspired writers attempted to place in their writings, and in doing this had to convert it from other languages. Oftentimes, they would come across two identical ideas put over by writers, so they would word for word have different gospel writers agree. (Compare Matthew 22:23-30 and Luke 20:27-35) Undoubtedly all four writers wrote different reactions to Christ's blessing of the little children, yet all the writers in the King James version record almost word for word the same event. By doing this, the translators would not have to create new sentences, but merely put over the idea that the original writers were teaching the same idea. In your attack on "The Book of Mormon", you said it was false because it "resembled" the Bible and I might add that they were *not* word for word. By this accusation, you presented an astounding case against the Bible. By the same accusation, you also robbed many of the prophets of their identity in their writings.

We have Micah, who lived hundreds of years after Isaiah, prophesying word for word in Micah 4:1-3 what Isaiah had prophesied in Isaiah 2:2-4. Thereby, according to your line of logic, Micah copied Isaiah's writings. You see, however, a tremendous problem arises from this logic. Isaiah, when he made the prophecy, the verse that preceded the prophecy and verses that followed it were quite irrelevant to the prophecy; but such was not the case with Micah. The entire third chapter and a large section of the fourth dealt with Micah 4:1-3, and so your accusation against it actually destroys the entire third and fourth chapters of Micah, because we find the same situation in his writings. That is not even progressive revelation, but retrogressive. Now, we will continue to follow your accusation out.

Since is false because their writers "resembles" writers in the Bible, we find that Isaiah copies word for word a prophecy made in 2 Kings 19:35, but by doing so, copied also the grammatical errors as well. Isaiah really blundered yet they are word for word. (Cross Isaiah 37:36 with 2 Kings 19:35) What I'm pointing out is that the writers could speak and prophecy of certain events and when the translators got their writings and saw that two writers were referring to the same event, they merely copied down almost word for word the writings of the two writers. To your understanding of translators, Isaiah would have swallowed the prophecy in 2 Kings hook, line, and sinker, with errors and all. The gold plates did not contain English sentences,

but was written in an unknown language called Reformed Egyptian, and the words reeled off in English when he looked through the Urim and Thummim, and with three years of formal education, that could have only been accomplished by direct revelation. That is why the original had so many punctuation and spelling errors. That is why, when he saw from the inscription that Christ taught the people on the American continent the same teachings as were taught in the Sermon on the Mount, the prophet found that Matthew's account from the Bible was very exact and correct, so he took Matthew's on this continent. It was done for the benefit of the reader. It would not make it false, because another could put it in better words than he could. You might also compare Sermons, (Matthew's with) and you will find that in parts they are quite different indeed. It doesn't prove something fraudulent if you have similar events happen on two different continents. It would only seem logical that Christ would teach the same principles to all people for "he is the same yesterday, today and tomorrow".

History bears record that men at different places can do the same things, and still not be fraudulent. Many of our discoveries in the field of science were discovered almost simultaneously, yet that didn't mean that one of the scientists copied the other. In 2 Nephi 1:14, Lehi could have uttered these words, or Joseph Smith could have learned them from studies in Shakespeare, and put them down because they identified what the writer was trying to put forth. The reason it is non-contradictory was not because of its grammar, but because of its precepts and its doctrine. The Urim and Thummim gave Joseph the correct interpretation of the figures on the plates, so he would be infallible in interpretation, while the scholars were extremely fallible. Hence, our many "contradictions" within the Bible and none in our book. You mentioned that the word "Bible" was used around 600 years before it was coined. Did you know that in Job 31:35 we have the quotation, "Oh, that one would hear me!" Behold, my desire is, that the Almighty would answer me, and that mine adversary had written a book." According to your logic the word "book", placed in the translation as the words of Job, could not have been stated as such as the word "book" had not been coined until hundreds of years later. There was no such things as a "book", in those days. (See "Apology for "The Book of Mormon"" - McGavin) What the writers of the King James Version did was to decipher the meaning and place the word "book" in the translation so the readers would know what Job was referring to in his writings. Joseph Smith was alive 2,400 years later and knew that what Nephi had seen was the Bible, so he placed the word "Bible" in "The Book of Mormon" so the reader would understand what Nephi had reference to. He did nothing more in either accusation than did the authors of our own King James Bible. I suggest, sir, that you give book a constructive analysis, looking at its teachings instead of blindly swatting at something of which you know nothing.

Anglican Church: If I am not mistaken, it is the belief of the Mormon Church that paid ministry is unscriptural. Of course, this is not supported by God's Holy Scriptures. Paul said, "Even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel," (1 Cor. 9:14), because the laborer is worthy of his hire." (Luke 1:7) Can you refute the words of the Savior?

Missionaries: No, I cannot refute the words of the Savior, but I surely can refute your interpretation of them. You do not qualify under the requirements as laid forth in the preceding verses concerning paid ministry. So, therefore, you don't qualify to receive "hire" for your labors. Christ said, "The Laborer is worthy of his hire," but the laborer was to carry neither purse nor script, nor shoes; and salute no man by the way. (Luke 10:4) He was to enter the homes and "heal the sick that are therein, and say unto them, the Kingdom of God is come nigh unto you." (Luke 10:9) Thirdly, the recompense was not in money and material goods, but those that were to be worthy to receive of their goods, were to remain "eating and drinking such things as they give," not passing collection plates at Sunday sermons and receiving a portion of all that was given by your membership. The apostles worked for their food and yet they did five times

as much preaching as all of you combined. Paul was a tent maker. (Acts 18:3) Peter, James, John, Andrew and others of the apostles were fishermen, Matthew was a tax collector, and so forth. Paul said only a few verses later in the scripture you quoted in 1 Cor. 9:18, "What is my reward then? Verily that, when I preach the gospel, I may make the gospel of Christ WITHOUT CHARGE, that I abuse not my power in the gospel." Gentlemen, your plates go around every Sunday for your sermon and so you have taken Christ's words to His missionaries that were to go and preach the word without purse or script and have applied them to yourselves. I may point out in Matt. 10:8, it describes the power Christ gave to His apostles, and Paul said, preaching without charge was the correct way and method not to abuse these God given powers. You preach for charge, and it's interesting to note that not one of these powers are found within your churches. (2 Cor. 12:16-18; 1 Tim. 3:3; 1 Peter 5:1-3)

United Church of Canada: You mean to tell me that you have healing in your Church? That is absurd! And I am sure that the dead have been raised in your church, also.

Missionaries: I have already said that. It wouldn't do you any good if I told you of the personal experiences that I know to be true. You don't have the faith to believe in the works or leaders of Christ, anyway. He has sent apostles and prophets, and has given such great signs that they are unmistakable. Christ told His apostles, "Verily, I say unto thee, the works that I do shall you do also, and Greater works than these shall ye do, because I go unto my Father." (John 14:12) I will testify that Mormon apostles and prophets have the same spiritual gifts today, and that they are in the church. Many of the priesthood holders of the church perform many miracles every day. We do not broadcast them or cast our pearls in front of swine.

Church of Christ: James 5:14 tells us that the Elders were to heal the sick. YOU'RE an elder, can you heal the sick?

Missionaries: Yes, through the power of the Lord, I have healed the sick when it was His will, and there have been apostles in our church who have raised the dead. It is so common place we do not mention it to often except in special spiritual settings. The church does not make a record of all the healings by its many priesthood holders.

Church of Christ: I don't believe it. I'll tell you what. I have a friend over at St. Luke's Hospital that is a member of our congregation. Let's go over right now, and if you heal her, then I will believe that your elders have this power.

Missionaries: I can't believe what I have just heard, you're asking for a sign. In the New Testament we read that the first request for a sign was given by none other than Satan to Christ, so I'll give you the same answer Christ gave to Satan, "Get thee behind me, Satan!" (Matt. 4:10) Christ could not perform the mighty works of God in His home town of Nazareth because of the great disbelief of the people of that town and it would be solemn mockery to show you a sign through your disbelief. The Pharisees asked for a sign, in Matt. 12:38, just like you have done, and said, "Master, we seeketh after a sign." To perform God's work requires faith, and I could put your combined faith in healing in the end of a thimble.

Church of Christ: That's a pretty slick way to slide out of it, saying you can work miracles, and then not show us any because we're sign-seekers.

Missionaries: You should have been a Pharisee. I have many books that speak of miracles performed by our leaders and our membership, and I have the testimonies of the people who have been healed by the Priesthood, but you would disregard them anyway. Gentlemen, you are of little faith. `Your churches do not even resemble the original church. Paul said, "Our

gospel came not unto you in word only, but also in power, and in the Holy Ghost, and in much assurance, as ye know what manner of men we were for your sake." (1 Thess. 1:5) Yet, he told the Galatians (1:6-8) that even if an angel of heaven were to preach another gospel they were to be accursed. Yet your gospel comes in word only, and yet each one of you have different gospel interpretations. I have never seen so many gospels in a room in my life, and yours does not come in power and in the Holy Ghost, and in the assurance.

Pentecostal Church: Our gospel comes with all of these signs, tongues, healings, miracles and works.

Missionaries: In the Scriptures, we read where Satan would have great powers in the last days even to deceive the very elect. We read where Simon the Sorcerer performed great miracles and wonders yet Philip, through God's power performed greater miracles. Your idea of the gift of tongues is nothing more than a lot of babble. There is a purpose for all the gifts and standing in church speaking non sense is some unknown language serves no one. The reason and purpose for the gift of tongues is to communicate with someone of a different language and also not to be deceived when a translator is translating for you. Such was the case when the Prophet David O. McKay was in Germany and his translator made a mistake. The Prophet corrected him before he would continue. You could always recognize the true from the false by their line of authority. You could trace it directly to the apostles and prophets, whom Christ placed in the Church, "till we come in a Unity of the Faith," and as its "Foundation." Before Pharaoh, the magicians performed miracles yet Moses, by God's power, performed greater miracles. Though you place yourselves as the Church of Pentecost, you can't come within 1800 years in your line of authority. I have heard the same claims of "great signs" from the Church of God, the Christian Science, the Holiness Church, Foursquare Gospel Church, Pentecostal Fire-baptize Holiness Church, the negro Church of God in Christ, and the Church of the Living God-the Pillar of Ground and Truth, which I might add, teaches that Christ was a Negro and made a claim that the Jewish race were Negro. (Scriptures they use Roman 1:3 proves Christ came from the Seed of David, whom Psalms 119:83 infers, "become like a bottle in the smoke." Also, Job was a Negro Job 30:30 Jeremiah was a negro, Jer. 8:21 Moses' wife was black, Jer. 13:23). These, gentlemen, speak in tongues, heal, and claim to be the Divine Church. All claim the others false, yet all have the same signs. That is why the Lord had a definite organization to recognize the true church, and as we have proven earlier, the Lord worked through all the offices of His Priesthood.

Baptist Church: I learn from Mormon writings that we shall be judged by our works, yet Ephesians 2:8-9 reads, "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works, least any man should boast." Acts 16:31 tells us that Paul told the Phillipian jailer, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house." Romans 1:16-17 tells us that the gospel of Christ is, "The power of God unto salvation, to everyone that believeth." In light of these passages, why do you teach works?

Missionaries: This is why, my friends, that Peter said Paul's writings concerning salvation were hard to be understood. I am sure this is why Luther wrote in Philip Melanethon, (Christian Apologies Vol. 2, Page 417), and said, "We must sin as long as we are in the flesh...Sin cannot separate us from God, even if we were to commit a thousand adulteries and as many homicides." We read, however, in 1 John 2:4, "He that saith, I know him and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him." I think this doctrine of saved by grace is one of the most misunderstood doctrines in the world today. Rev. 20:12-13 speaking of judgment day informs us that all were judged, "according to their works." Matt. 16:27 informs us of Christ's declaration that, "the Son of Man shall come in the glory of His Father with His angels; and then He shall reward every man according to his works." Paul said in Phil. 2:12, "Work out your own salvation through fear and trembling." We are saved by grace, after we

do all we can. The Jews were firm believers in the "works of the law" and so these great apostles would often write and tell them that these works would not save them. We are all going to be saved, by the grace of Christ, but be rewarded for our works done in the flesh. Christ did provide three main works to show that it was by His grace we should be saved therefore, erased our boasting. These three we could not have done for ourselves, and are thereby saved by His grace.

1. He created the earth upon which we are privileged to live. (Col. 1:16-17)
2. He atoned for the transgression of our first parents who had brought death into the world, thus bringing resurrection from the grave, or reuniting the body and spirit. (1 Cor. 15:22; James 2:26)
3. By giving us the everlasting gospel, "he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him." (Heb. 5:9)

These things we could not do for ourselves, and therefore it was His grace that made it possible. However, as Heb. 5:9 teaches, He was the author "unto all them that obey him". If you replace the word "grace" with "the plan of salvation" or "resurrection" all the scriptures with the word grace in them would make more sense. More simple put, the grace of God is that we are saved from the grave because everyone will be resurrected no matter what they have done. This resurrection is a free gift and hence we are saved by grace from eternal death by being resurrected without any effort on our own. Eternal salvation however, which is to be with our Father in heaven for all eternity must be earned and that can only be demonstrated by us through our works to prove we are worthy to be in His presents.

Priest: I read in "The Book of Mormon", (Moroni 8:9), where you teach it is solemn mockery to baptize little children yet we read in Psalms 51:5, "Behold I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me." This, with Christ's own words, "Unless a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God," goes to show that it is a wicked teaching and an absurdity to damn innocent children by not baptizing them.

Missionaries: Innocent little children are not damned because they miss the ceremony of sprinkling. When David spoke those words, he had been recently chastened by Nathan the Prophet, who had prophesied the death of his child that was to be born of Bathsheba, of whom he had committed adultery. In this moment of great sorrow and anguish, he spoke bitterly of himself and his sins even to the point where he was "shapen in iniquity" and "conceived in sin." Paul wrote in 1 Corinthians: "What? Know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost, which is in you, which we have of God, and ye are not your own? For ye are bought with a price, wherefore glorify God, in your body, and in your spirit, WHICH ARE GODS." In other words, the scripture tells us that our very bodies are "Gods" and Father Cook is affirming that these innocent babies right from His presence, which are God's children "are sinful." Paul taught "Where there is no law, they have no transgressions." (Romans 4:15) Since little children have no law, they have *no transgressions*. The only sin they have is that which they inherited from Adam, which Paul stated, "wherefore, as by one man, sin entered into the world, and DEATH BY SIN; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned...even so by righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life, For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." (Romans 5:12, 18-19) Therefore, Paul taught that physical death was the only sin inherited from Adam, and that Christ paid for that sin so "all would be made alive." (1 Cor. 15:22) Yet, baptism and the Holy Ghost are necessary, so Peter taught, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost, and the promise is unto you, and TO YOUR CHILDREN." (Acts 2:37-39) Which children? The ones that are able to repent, as Acts 2:38 points out. Whenever baptism was taught, it followed belief or repentance. Hence, Christ said, "He that

believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned." (Mark 16:16) That is why we don't baptize little children, and why it is not abominable. Baptism is for remission of sins (Acts 2:38) and not for remission of Adam's sin, because the precious blood of Christ has paid for it. (Romans 5:12-19; 1 Cor. 15:21-22) Therefore, Christ taught when He took little children in His arms that "of such were the Kingdom of Heaven". This is another doctrine which "The Book of Mormon" clarifies.

Priest: The Latter-day Saints teach that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not meant as Christ said it: "Take; eat; this is my body," and "Take, drink, this is my blood." Therefore, they have interpreted Christ's precious words to be those of little meaning and only take the bread and water in remembrance of him. I ask you and challenge you by every fiber of my being to explain why Christ said something that He did not mean. Will you accept this challenge?

Missionaries: Absolutely, since you concede to the previous answer. We maintain that He did not mean it literally. To Romans, they consider the sacrament or Holy Communion as the "miracle of the 'Transubstantiation'" or the transforming literally of the biscuit and wine into the actual and living "blood and body of Jesus Christ." You will notice that all of Christ's miracles were followed by evidences; such as the blind seeing, the lame walking, and the dead living once again, but under their front of mystery, this is another "mysterious miracle" which produces no evidence whatsoever. Before we examine the scriptures, since you take the scripture literally, you must take all other related scriptures literally. John 6:35 says that Jesus said, "I am the bread of life." Since you so strongly claim that Christ literally meant the bread at His last supper "WAS" His body, then you must claim that His body "WAS REALLY BREAD." Your claim that Christ meant literally what He spoke those last hours is blasphemous. First, when He partook of the bread and wine in the upper chambers at the Last Supper, it would be your interpretation that they ate and drank His body and blood before His crucifixion. That sounds more like cannibalism than Christian Doctrine. As we examine the scripture found in Matt: 26:26-29, we read, "And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and broke it, and gave it to His disciples, and said, "Take, eat, this is my body." And He took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, "Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins. But I say unto you, I WILL NOT DRINK HENCHFORTH OF THIS FRUIT OF THE VINE UNTIL THAT DAY WHEN I DRINK IT NEW WITH YOU IN MY FATHER'S KINGDOM." Notice, after they had partaken of the Lord's Sacrament, He said He would not drink of the "fruit of the vine, (not flesh and blood) until that day He would drink with them in His Father's Kingdom. Paul clarified the true teaching of the sacrament in 1 Cor. 11:26 when he said, "For as often as ye eat this bread (not His body) and drink this cup (not blood) ye shall show THE LORD'S DEATH TILL HE COMES!" That is why we know it is not literal and why there is no mysterious conversion in the sacrament. Paul taught in Hebrews 10:10-12, "By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Christ ONCE FOR ALL... but this man, after HE HAD OFFERED ONE SACRIFICE FOR SIN FOREVER, sat down on the right hand of God." The great sacrifice has been offered, and we now partake of the bread and cup in remembrance of this great sacrifice and as a renewal of our baptismal commitments. Again we get a clarification on this subject from "The Book of Mormon". We learn that the bread represents the resurrection and the wine or water represent the atonement. Hence further truth missing from the Bible.

Atheist: How seriously do you and your people accept the Old Testament as it stands today? I have reference to the creation and story of Adam and Eve, along with some of those fantastic stories like Jonah and the whale, and Job with all His suffering.

Missionaries: Yes, sir, we accept them literally. We read in the scriptures where the Holy Ghost led the apostles to the truth and with God all things are possible. For instance, we read in 2 Peter 2:16 that Peter, an apostle of the Lord, believed the account in Numbers 22:28 where an ass

spoke to Balaam. He believed it and He taught it. We find where Christ believed in the story of Jonah and the whale, (Jonah 1:17; Matt. 12:40), and that Paul, who learned the gospel of Jesus Christ, believed in the account of Adam and Eve as recorded in 1 Tim. 2:13-15. If I profess to the Christian disciples and to its faith, I must firmly believe on their teachings. They were chosen by the Lord, and taught by him. It is a shame that many of these ministers represented here do not accept the account of Adam and Eve and the forbidden fruit anymore and yet teach that God's apostles were inspired.

Salvation Army: I understand that it is one of your first four principles of the gospel that baptism should be performed and that a man cannot live again with God unless he is baptized. Why does a little ceremony like baptism remain necessary in the Latter-day church?

Missionaries: Christ, speaking to a group of Pharisees and lawyers, said on one occasion, "And all the people that heard him, and the publicans justified God, being baptized with the baptism of John but the Pharisees and lawyers rejected the council of God against themselves, not being baptized of him. (Luke 7:29-30) We then learn it was the council of God to be baptized, and as Christ said in the Sermon on the Mount, "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, but He that doeth the will of my Father, which is in heaven." (Matt.7:21) That means doing the will of the Father, and His council is to be baptized. We read in 1 Peter 1:22-25 that the word of the Lord was to endure forever, and the word by which the gospel was preached unto them (v.25) was to purify the souls of the saints, they were to be born again (baptized) and follow the word of the Lord forever. Galatians 3:27 tells us, "For as many of you as has been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." It goes on to say, "And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." It is by baptism that we receive the "adoption of sons" and become the sons of Abraham and of God. Peter taught baptism preceded salvation. (Acts 2:38) Paul taught baptism just as emphatically in Romans 6:3-5. Baptism is not just a ceremony, but is a vow and a covenant we make with the Lord that we will serve him and keep His commandments. By it we receive forgiveness of sins, and complete remission.

Lutheran Minister: But as long as we are in the flesh we will sin. Sin cannot separate us from God. Christ died for our sins, and I shall live again with Him.

Missionaries: You should have taught Paul that principal, because he said in Hebrews 10:26, "For if we sin willfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins." In other words, sir, Christ's death is of no value to you.

Lutheran Minister: Well, maybe we can prevent sins, but I would like to ask you in all sincerity, why you go around and try to change people to your church. All we need to do is to serve Christ, and it doesn't matter which church you belong?

Missionaries: I will have to seriously disagree with you. Paul taught we should be "of the same mind and the same judgment" and that there should be no divisions among us. (1 Cor. 1:10-14) Peter taught the same principal, when he said in 1 Peter 3:8, "Finally be ye all of one mind." Paul taught, "One Lord, One Faith, One Baptism" and we say the same.

Lutheran Minister: In other words, all the good we are doing in the world then is wrong and the Mormons will be the only ones to go to heaven. Is that what you are trying to say?

Missionaries: I don't for a moment doubt the sincerity of your ministers today, but I think Paul could have answered that question better than I could. I hope you will memorize this passage, because it is good advice. In Romans 10:1-3 he said, "BRETHREN, MY HEARTS DESIRE AND PRAYER TO GOD FOR ISRAEL IS, THAT THEY MIGHT BE SAVED, FOR I BEAR

THEM RECORD THAT THEY HAVE A ZEAL OF GOD, BUT NOT ACCORDING TO KNOWLEDGE. FOR THEY BEING IGNORANT OF GOD'S RIGHTEOUSNESS, AND GOING ABOUT TO ESTABLISH THEIR OWN RIGHTEOUSNESS, HAVE NOT SUBMITTED THEMSELVES UNTO THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF GOD." As we have established here today, you have left the doctrines of Christ by your creed and interpretations. Paul wrote and told Timothy to, "Hold fast the form of sound words, which thou hast heard of me" (2 Tim. 1:13), and with this same breath he wrote to the Ephesians and said that in his prayers that he, "ceased not to give thanks for you making mention of you in my prayers that THE GOD OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST, THE FATHER OF GLORY, MAY GIVE UNTO YOU THE SPIRIT OF WISDOM AND REVELATION IN THE KNOWLEDGE OF HIM." (Ephesians 1:15-17) What Paul prayed for, you deny. Joseph Smith received from God a revelation of the "Knowledge" of Him, and you accept "divers and strange" doctrines. Indeed you have already admitted that you do not have all the fullness of the gospel which is what the Lord understood when He says in 2 Tim. 3:5 that you have "a form of Godliness but denying the power thereof."

Lutheran Minister: You make in your church such trivialities as baptism by immersion and bread and water in your sacrament to be so deathly important. Why does it matter which way you are baptized, or how you go about serving the Lord?

Missionaries: The Greek word for baptism, which is where it is from, means to immerse or to be buried. All the baptisms in the Holy Scriptures were done by immersions, and Paul thought it was so important that the people not change these ordinances, that he wrote, "Now, I praise you brethren, that you remember me in all things and KEEP THE ORDINANCES, as I delivered them to you." (1 Cor. 11:1-2) In other words, Paul did not want the Bishop of Carthage in the 3rd century to initiate new rules for baptizing because the form was to be by immersion. To understand the meaning and true applications of authorized baptism you will need to read "The Book of Mormon".

Methodist Church: If your church is true, why are there so few members in it?

Missionaries: Because Christ said, "Strait is the gate, and narrow is the way that leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it." (Matt. 7:1) However, we are the fastest growing church in the world today and the 3rd largest Christian church so based on your statement your church must not be true.

Methodist Church: I would like to ask you some questions about Joseph Smith. If he was a prophet, why did his wife and son leave the Mormon Church and join the Reorganized Church whose headquarters are in Missouri? Also, if your church is true, why did the three witnesses leave the Mormon Church and hold bitterness against Smith, along with several of the eight witnesses? If it were God's church there would only be love and harmony in it – and at least his own family would have stayed in the church.

Missionaries: Your questions surprise me. Christ said, "Suppose ye that I came to give peace on earth? I tell you, nay, but rather division. For from henceforth there shall be five in one house divided, three against two, and two against three. The father shall be divided against the son, and the mother against the daughter, and the daughter shall be against the mother, and the son against the father." (Luke 12:51-54) So the Gospel would divide homes, and this was true even in the home of the prophet. However you are wrong about his wife. She remained true to the church and did not join the reorganized church. However she did remain in Missouri to stay where her husband was buried. Your statement against the three witnesses being out of harmony with the prophet, and then stating this as a qualification of identifying a false church, made the original church false, is not accurate. All churches lose members from time to time for any number of reasons. How is that a qualification for truth? Even though they left the

church they never denied seeing the angel or the original gold plates, which is the crux of the matter. We read in Acts 15:37-41 where the feelings of Paul and Barabbas were so strong, "and the contention was so sharp between them, they departed asunder one from the other; and so Barabbas took Mark, and sailed to Cyprus, and Paul chose Silas and departed." Also in Gal. 2:11 we read, "But when Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed."

Anglican Church: Speaking of the three witnesses, I have before me a pamphlet entitles, "An Address to all Believers in Christ" by Mr. David Whitmer, one of the three witnesses. In this pamphlet, he describes the solemn mockery of the Latter-day Saint Church, and his contempt against it's leaders. His closing words are, "Oh foolish Latter-day Saints" and his final plea is for them to return to Christ. I'll bet you didn't know that David Whitmer denied your church and wrote against it, did you?

Missionaries: He never denied seeing the angel or the gold plates from which it was translated. The fact that he was disgruntled over not being chosen for a high position in the church and therefore left it and disagreed with some of its practices again does not disprove the truth of the restoration of the gospel. He was a man embittered and left the church, but your proposal here today is not to investigate his feelings about the Church but as a prosecution, to show me where it is shown to be false or that there is a false witness about the plates. I really don't care about that pamphlet, and yes, I have heard of it. To show what kind of faith this man did have, just before his death he had printed in the New York Times and the London Times the following statement, "I wish now, standing in the very sunset of life and in the face of God, once and for all to make this public statement; I have never at any time denied the testimony or any part thereof. I have always adhered to that testimony. I do again affirm the truth of all my statements as when made and published. It was no delusion. In the spirit of Christ, I submit these statements to the world, God being my judge, as to the sincerity of my motives." Many of the town's most noted citizens signed a certificate saying that he was a man of the highest integrity. Therefore, gentlemen, the testimony of David Whitmer still stands as a witness to the entire world that "The Book of Mormon" is true.

Methodist Church: I understand in your church you have tithing, fast offering, fast days, and not all your apostles appoint officers in your church. Can you produce for me in the New Testament where these practices were found in the early church?

Missionaries: I certainly will. For tithing, read Matt. 23:23 and you will find that Christ taught the principal. For membership appointing leaders, (and not apostles appointing them), read Acts 6, where the seven were chosen by the congregation, and for fast offerings try 1 Cor. 16:2. These were all doctrines of the early church. There are so many scriptures on this subject that it would waste our time to show them to you.

Baptist Church: I have a question, which comes first, the Priesthood or baptism in the Mormon Church? You see, I challenge you to show me a passage or verse where the apostles were baptized into the church. Also a passage or verse to show me who did it, since John 4:2 informs us that Christ did not baptize. Also, can a man hold the Priesthood without being baptized?

Missionaries: The cases are few and far between but a man can hold the Priesthood without being baptized. Joseph Smith received the Priesthood from John the Baptist, and then baptized Oliver Cowdery, and the same was true in reverse. Our Lord, in Matt. 10:1-3 gave the apostles His power and authority, (also Luke 9:11) and I guess due to your own lack of knowledge you did not read in Matt. 20:21-23 where Christ promised James and John that they were to be baptized. You have also forgotten that it was the "council" and "will" of God for

them to be baptized, "of the baptism of John." (Luke 7:29-30) Also, the baptism could have been performed by anyone who had the Levitical or Aaronic Priesthood which Priesthood the Jews held. The fact that we do not have records on everything that was ever done with the apostles does not mean it was not done. The teachings are there and therefore it was done but there exists no written record of it today.

Pentecostal Church: I understand you can also dance in the Mormon Church. Wouldn't you say that is breaking the laws of God? You had better not use the Old Testament to point out dancing there, because it was a religious ceremony. Why do you dance in your church?

Missionaries: Christ apparently approved of dancing, because in His parable of the "Prodigal Son" when he said, "Now his elder son was in the fields and he came and drew nigh to the house, and HE HEARD MUSIC AND DANCING" (Luke 15:25) We believe dancing then is proper under wholesome circumstances that are properly chaperoned.

Pentecostal Church: The scriptures tell us that the "law and the Prophets" were until John, since that time the Kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it." (Luke 16:16) What's more, we read in Matt. 21:37, in Christ's parable of the husbandmen, that He compares himself to the son that "Last of all He sent unto them His son, saying, they will reverence my son. But when the husbandmen saw the son, they said among themselves, this is the heir; come, let us kill him, and let us seize on his inheritance. And they caught him, and cast him out of the vineyard, and slew him." (Matt. 21:37-39) we find, therefore, that Christ was the last prophet sent to the world, and John was the last prophet sent to the Jews. How do you explain that?

Missionaries: That's quite an interpretation you got out of those scriptures. Luke tells us the "Law and Prophets were until John," and since Acts 3:22 tells us that Christ was a prophet and He came after John, undoubtedly it referred to the law in Luke 16, and Christ did away with that law. That Christ was the last prophet to the world confirms your ignorance. Now going on to read that He was merely the last prophet sent to the Jews we read in Matt. 21:43, and Acts 11:27 where it tells us after the death of Christ there were prophets at Jerusalem; Acts 15:32 tells us Judas and Silas were prophets, and Acts 21:10 tells us Agabus was a prophet, and you forgot that Christ chose those apostles, which were also prophets. The scriptures prove that Eph. 4:11 meant by saying until we come to the Unity, etc., that there were prophets and apostles after Christ died and that there were always to be living prophets and apostles. Is there any other church on earth that you know of that even claims to have these priesthood offices as their leadership?

Jehovah Witnesses: If I am not mistaken, you salute flags, and join the Military services, which purpose is to kill. You vote in elections, and support earthly governments instead of God's Kingdom. Why do you do this in the light before the eyes of the world, and then hypocritically declare, "Thou shalt not kill" and "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image?"

Missionaries: The answer is simple Christ taught the multitude in Matt. 23:2-3 that, "The Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' seat: All therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do: but do not ye after their works: (Religious) for they say, and do not. " Paul taught, "I exhort therefore, that, first of all, supplications, prayers intercessions, and giving of thanks be made for all men, FOR KINGS, AND FOR ALL THAT ARE IN AUTHORITY: that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty. For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Savior." (1 Tim. 2:1-3) Paul taught in 2 Cor. 3:17 that, "Where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." We have liberty in the land of America, and I would fight and die to preserve that liberty that has been God-given and support our leaders. Also Christ paid tax and thereby observed the Law of the Land as 1 Tim. 2:1-3 explains. By the way we do not join the service

to kill but to protect freedom. How many times did the Lord command to kill in the Old Testament for the preservation of there race?

Priest: Gentlemen, we have been in here now quite a long time, and have not heard or seen these gentlemen point out to us where the Church of our Lord was to have fallen away. In Matt. 28:19-20 the Lord promised to be with His Church "always, even unto the end of the world," In Eph. 3:21-23 we read, "Unto him be glory in the church of Christ Jesus throughout all ages." It is absurd to suppose and imagine that the Lord would come to the earth and bring His church, only to have it fall away. We have the Papacy that can be traced right to Saint Peter and the Church of Rome. We have the traditions and writings of the Apostolic Fathers for the past 1800 years. These men of the world have their Bibles today, courtesy of those valiant monks who preserved the sacred writings of the apostles. Paul said in Hebrews 12:28, "Wherefore we receiving a kingdom which cannot be moved, let us have grace." In Hebrews 13:5 the Lord said, "I will never leave thee, nor forsake thee." Christ said to Peter, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." The apostles gave their authority to the bishops and the church today has the four marks: One - in doctrine, authority, worship, Holy perfect observance of its teachings leads inevitable to sanctity; Two "The Book of Mormon" is unchanging in its essential teachings and preaches the same gospel and administers the same sacraments to men of all times in all places; and Three - Apostolic, it traces its ancestry back to the apostles and, like them, carries the message of Christ to all, regardless of race, nationality station, or class. Could anyone possibly imagine Christ putting His Church on the earth and then letting it be destroyed?

Missionaries: In the first place, we have already proven that you do not teach any of the doctrines recorded in the Bible. The scriptures and the conditions that we live under in this present day prove that there was truly an apostasy from the divine church. Amos, along with many of the great prophets of the Old Testament foresaw this apostasy when he said there would be a "famine over the land, and not a famine of bread or a thirst for water, but of hearing the word of the Lord! Isaiah foresaw that the Church of Jesus would break the EVERLASTING COVENANT in Isa. 24:5, established by Christ. (Heb.13:20) The law of Moses was never referred to as the everlasting covenant, so it had to be Christ's Church. Micah saw the day when the sun would go over the prophets; there would be no more visions, inspirations, or guidance from on high and then gave the reassuring hope that "in the last days" God's church would be set up "in the tops of the mountains." And in reference to mountain tops, there are better than a dozen scriptures that tell us that the church would be established in the mountain tops including that the church would establish a choir there, ever heard of the Mormon Tabernacle Choir? The Mormons are also the only church today which have their headquarters in the mountain tops. By these scriptures alone we prove who we are and where the true church is. (Micah 3:5-7, 11; Micah 4:1-3). Daniel foresaw a kingdom "which would never be destroyed, nor given to another people", yet Christ's kingdom was "given to another people", (Matt. 21:43), and later destroyed and taken from the earth. There were two causes of the apostasy, internal and external. The external came at the death of the Lord's chosen twelve apostles. Foxe, in his "Book of Martyrs", records the fate of this chosen group, and I have added other leaders along with the apostles. Here are copies of this list; you may keep it. The number by the names mean that they were referred to in the Bible as apostles.

	PERSON	METHOD OF DEATH	YEAR AD	LOCATION
1.	Judas Iscariot	suicide - hanging	34	Jerusalem
2.	James the Great (brother of John Son of Zebedee)	beheaded	36	Rome
3.	Thomas (doubting)	run through with a lance	52	Calamina- East India

4.	Philip	scourged, imprisoned stoned, crucified,	52	Phyrgia
5.	Bartholomew	dragged, flailed alive crucified, beheaded	52	Albinopolis, Armenia
6.	Simeon Peter	crucified upside down	56	Rome
7.	Matthew (Called Levi, son of Alphaems)	run through with a lance	60	Madabah, Ethiopia
8.	James, the Less, son of Alphaeus	thrown from the pinnacles, beaten, stoned, brains dashed out with a fullers club	60	?
9.	Paul	Beheaded	66	Rome
10.	Mathias	Stoned, beheaded	70	Ethiopia
11.	Thaddeus (brother of James; could be Jude)	shot with arrows	72-76	Edessa
12.	Barabbas	Stoned to death	73	?
	Timothy	beaten with clubs	73	?
	Luke	Hanged on an olive tree	73	Greece
13.	Barnabus	stoned to death	73	Salancan
	Mark	Dragged to pieces, burned to death	74	Egypt
14.	Simon (Zelotes)	crucified	74	Brittan
15.	Andrew (brother of Peter)	Burned to death	74	Patrae
16.	John the beloved (brother of James the Great)	Banished to the Isle of Patmos until A.D.82	no record	no record
	Matthew	slain with a battle ax	?	India
17.	James (brother of Jesus)	Stoned, beaten with a fuller's club	?	?
18.	Judas (brother of Jesus; could be Jude)	?	?	Edessa
	Philip, the evangelist	?	?	?

*Judas, Silas, Agabus; Acts 11:27; 13:1; 15:32; 21:10; etc...listed as Prophets

Now that list contains 17 apostles, who are also prophets, and the apostles who came after the original 12 got their authority from the living apostles. Notice in Acts 8 that the authority and power to act for the Lord in the ordinances of the gospel had to get it from someone who had it, namely the apostles. Just reading the Bible does not give you the authority to act in the name of the Lord. This points out apostolic succession and an end to it by force, not choice. You will notice that Timothy, whom the s claim sometimes as the one who gave them their authority, not Peter, was not an apostle, and died without passing his authority to anyone. With the death of the apostles and other noted leaders, who were the foundation of the Church, and held the authority to pass on their authority, the Church began its great collapse. However, this was not accomplished until internal apostasy had begun. Paul fearing this, said, "For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock." What does NOT sparing the flock mean to you? "Also, of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them." (Acts 20:29-30) He told the saints in Thessalonica that before Christ's second coming, there must come a falling away first and the man of sin had to be revealed. (Bible states word "apostasy" means complete falling away.) What does it mean to you?

Many scriptures pointed to the times of this destruction. (2 Thes. 2:2-4; Acts 3:20-21; 2 Tim. 3:1-7; 2 Peter, 3:3; Rev. 13:7-8, etc.) In 1 Tim. 4:1-3 and Matt. 21:41-46 he taught that a sign of the apostate church would be that of "forbidding to marry" and "commanding to abstain from meats." As you know, that has been the doctrine of the Catholic Church and it was doctrines like these that Paul said are "of devils". The internal collapse of the Church came through three channels:

1. The corrupting of the simple principles of the gospel by the admission of so-called philosophic systems of the times.
2. Unauthorized additions to the ceremonies of the Church, and the introduction of vital changes in essential ordinances.
3. Unauthorized changes in Church organization, government, and priesthood.

It was the councils where these "divers and strange" doctrines were often born. Hence your "incomprehensible" understanding of God, the Lord's Supper, the trinity, and now pomp and ceremony of the church. It meant the salvation of the Virgin Mary, who was to have been taken to heaven by God with no scriptural warranty. The adoration of the blessed virgin was quite the contrary to Christ's way of thinking towards His mother. (Compare Luke 11:27-28) We have a concept of her continuous virginity opposed to Matt. 1:25. We have a Papal claim of "Infallibility", 1800 years after the supposed first Pope of Rome. Can you find the word Pope in the scriptures? How about Cardinals or Arch Bishops? All of these things were vital in causing the complete destruction of all that was good and simple and pure. We have blasphemous statements concerning forgiveness of sin, and the salvation of mortal men to exalted positions. We have fantastic claims, unscriptural and blasphemous such as was given by Pope Paul VI, New York Times, Thursday, Sept.26, 1962, where he states, "Jesus charged the Apostle Peter with being the "cornerstone", the solid and stable fundament of the entire human-divine edifice that Jesus wanted to build and that He called the church."

In answer to your questions, (Matt. 28:19-20) was not only a promise given to the Church, but as verse 16 points out, ONLY TO THE APOSTLES. Eph. 3:21 has no reference to the Church of Jesus Christ in ancient times, because that church referred to there was in a "world without end." This world has an end. (Matt.28:19-20) In answer to the rock of Matt. 16:15-17 it couldn't have been Peter because the gates of hell prevailed against him, (Matt. 16:23), after Christ's announcement, and it couldn't have been his confession (Protestant belief) because the gates of hell prevailed against it. (Matt. 26:69-75) Besides, the way the grammar of the Bible puts it, the rock grammatically refers to the way Peter received the truth by revelation, hence the rock is revelation, therefore the church is built upon revelation which is another

reason why we need living prophets and apostles. In answer to Heb. 12:28, Paul probably had reference to the Kingdom of Heaven, because the kingdom of earth could be moved, (Matt. 21:43). As for Heb. 13:5, it was an identical promise given to Joshua which merely points out that the Lord will be with "all them that obey him."

That the church was to be restored is verified in Acts 3:19-21; Matt. 17:11-13; Rev. 14:6-7, and countless other places. This latter verse from Revelations is really good. John "saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on earth." Now if the gospel was already on earth why did an angel have to bring it here again? We know that angel to be Moroni, the angel who restored the gospel to Joseph Smith. If Clement were the Pope in A.D. 96, like tradition informs us, why did not he instead of John receive the revelation of the Isle of "Patmos"? Why was not he nor the Church of Rome recognized? Why are the scriptures completely void of any "transfer of any authority" when the apostles were to guide us into "all truth" and "unity"? Why haven't the signs followed, (Mark 16:17-18) nor the power followed? (Matt.10:8) Did it get lost in the transfer? Where is he called a prophet or apostle? Why cheap and meaningless imitations of ordinances, (1 Cor. 11:2) and "divers and strange doctrines", (Heb. 13:9), like the Virgin Mary, the Triune God, Immaculate Conception, Transubstantiation, Line of the Papacy, history and corruption of the Papacy, no revelation; yet Papal infallibility, (and that not until Pius XI).

Where do the Protestants have a leg to stand on? If they claim the Church of Rome fell, (as did the Church of England in her "Homily against Peril of Idolatry" in Book of Homilies), then they cannot be true, because Christ taught that a live branch cannot grow off a dead tree. (Matt. 7:18) If they can dare claim that it still had the truth, they should have recognized its ordinances. It was Roger Williams, considered by many to be the founder of the Baptist Church, that stated on Page 103 in Picturesque America, that there was "no regularly constituted church of Christ on earth, nor any person authorized to administer any church ordinance, nor can there be until new apostles are sent by the great head of the Church, for whose coming, I am seeking." This should be simple to understand, the only true church can be the s if you believe there was apostolic succession without evidence, the Jews if you do not believe in Christ, or the Mormons if you believe in the restoration as has just been shown to you from your scriptures. I bear you solemn testimony that there has been a restoration of all things, that there are living apostles and prophets as we have established here today, who have seen the Lord many times and heard His voice as well as receive inspiration from the Holly Ghost, and the Church is here upon the earth in its fullness in this latter-day.

United Church of Canada: Judge and gentlemen, I would like to point out to you a definite contradiction between Mormon writings and the Holy Scriptures. I hold in my hand a book supposedly inspired, "The Doctrine and Covenants". Within this book are the recorded revelations of Joseph Smith, the Prophet. We read in Section #2, verse 18 where the Lord was to have told the prophet, "And now, behold I speak unto the church. Thou shalt not kill; and he that kills shall not have forgiveness in this world, nor in the world to come." It's a good thing Joseph Smith wasn't back in Simon Peter's shoes on the day of Pentecost when Peter, before the vast multitude of people from "every nation under Heaven" and only 50 days since they had placed Christ on the cross, declared: "Therefore, let all the House of Israel know assuredly that God hath made Jesus, WHOM YE HAVE CRUCIFIED, both Lord and Christ." (Acts 2:36) We read where their guilt was so strong that "when they heard this they were pricked in hearts, and said unto Peter and to the rest of apostles, "Men and Brethren, what shall we do?" Then Peter declared, "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." In the Mormon Church, if a man kills another, all hope is lost but in the Bible they can kill the Christ will forgive them. Now, I ask you, could anything be so plainly contradictory?

Missionaries: Your lack of ability to read a scripture amazes me. Just because Paul would greet the brethren with a "holy kiss" doesn't make him a Judas, because "he betrayed the son of man with a kiss." You try and make a contradiction of two completely different incidents. You will notice in "The Doctrine and Covenants" the Lord was speaking to the members of the church who had been sanctified, baptized, received the Holy Ghost, tasted of the good word of God, gained a knowledge of the worlds to come, and from living apostles and prophets has learned the will of God. Paul said in Heb. 6:4-8, "For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame." After the knowledge and truths are revealed and a witness of the Holy Spirit is given, this places a Latter-day Saint in this position and when they break the commandment of murder, the consequences will not only be for this life, but for the life to come unless they atone for their own sin.

Anglican Church: Is it the doctrine of the Mormon Church that Christ's blood is of no affect to some and therefore they came up with blood atonement? This, the LDS Church has taken from the Law of Moses, hence they teach capital punishment and request that a murderer "offer his blood" to atone for his sin if he has killed another. I challenge you to produce from the teachings of the gospel of Jesus Christ, any place that teaches this man made and abominable doctrine. What I am pointing out is that if a Mormon were to kill another person, he must atone for that sin WITH HIS OWN BLOOD. Would you please point out the harmony of that doctrine from the Bible?

Missionaries: The doctrine of Blood Atonement was practiced in the days of Moses, because the civil and ecclesiastical laws were administered by the same hands. Noah, who had the "everlasting covenant" with God, and now had a fullness of the gospel, was commanded, "Whosoever sheddeth man's blood by man shall his blood be shed; for in the image of God made he man". (Gen.9:6) Paul taught in Romans 1:25-32 that murder and many forms of sexual sin "are worthy of death." Hebrews 5:9 tells us that Christ was the author of eternal salvation unto "all them that obey him," and yet when we "sin willfully after we have received a knowledge of the truth, there remains no more sacrifice for sins." (Heb.10:26) A sin of murder is a direct contradiction to the will of God, and makes it necessary that we have a personal "atonement" for these things. If it were not necessary, the Lord would not have commanded it of Noah, who did not live under the Law of Moses.

Salvation Army: Christ did not ever teach that doctrine. When they brought sinners before Him, He would either forgive them (the thief on the cross), or send them on their way with the command to repent, (as the lady caught in adultery). I still disagree that it's a doctrine that was never taught by the Savior.

Missionaries: How do you challenge that which I just read unless you challenge what the Lord said? The challenge was to support it by scripture and this I have done. The real problem is not blood atonement, but whether Joseph Smith was a prophet. If he was, as we have proven here today, then it was a doctrine of the Lord. I have proven from the scriptures that God commanded it, that it was practiced and taught, and where Paul made reference to it. He (Christ) may have forgiven, but still we have the words ringing through the air that "THEY WHICH DO SUCH THINGS SHALL NOT INHERIT THE KINGDOM OF GOD." (Gal. 5:19-21) Each individual has his different circumstances for committing sin, and if anything even in your distorted look of this doctrine, a request for personal atonement for a grievous sin would be an act of humble repentance and a request of mercy from our Redeemer. An adulterous person is not only a morally wicked person in body, but in spirit, is a liar, and a sign seeker. The doctrine was taught by prophets of God, and we have supported them from the scriptures.

Concerning the people which crucified the Lord, it was Christ, himself, who said, "Father, forgive them (the Romans) for they know not what they do." (Luke 23:34) As Paul said in Romans, "Where there is no law, there is no transgression." Paul wrote to Timothy and said, "I was before a blasphemer, and a persecutor, and injurious; but I obtained mercy, because I did it ignorantly in unbelief." (1 Tim. 1:13) Therefore, there is a great difference between killing with a vast knowledge and spiritual conviction of the truth, and killing in complete ignorance and lack of spiritual conviction of the Holy Spirit. We believe that a person who kills another outside the church will still be punished because God will judge "each man according to his works", but he could be forgiven by sincere and humble repentance and coming forth under this new light with a broken heart and contrite spirit. There is a similar section dealing with adultery in Section 42. If you should ask this question in relation to its forgiveness, once again it is dealing with members of the church while Bible references were dealing with outsiders.

Church of Christ: I have before me a Book of Mormon in which there are two contradictions that cannot be explained. We read that in 147 B.C. as recorded in Mosiah 16:17 that, "they were called the Church of God, or the Church of Christ, from that time forward, And it came to pass that whosoever was baptized by the power and authority of God was added to His church." Yet we read in Matt. 16:18 that Christ told Peter, "Upon this rock I WILL BUILD MY CHURCH." This is future tense so was the Church first organized in 147 BC, like "The Book of Mormon" says, or after A.D. 33 like the Bible says. We then read in Alma 46:11-15 that in B.C. 73 the people in your book were called "Christians" yet we read in Acts 11:26 that the people were called Christians "FIRST" at Antioch in approximately 45 A.D. How were they called Christians "first" in Antioch in 45 A.D. like the Bible says?

Missionaries: We covered this previously but you didn't understand it then either. I don't think you have an understanding of the two records yet. I guess we will have to take time and draw you a picture. Archeologists tell us that definitely during the time of Christ people lived upon this the American Continent. (The American Before Columbus, Farnsworth Publishing Company; The History of Ancient America, by George Jones, produced by Harper and Brothers; Ancient Cities of the New World, produced by J. Gonino and Helen S. Conant, published by Harper and Brothers; History of America Before Columbus, by Peter DeRoo, produced by J. B. Lippincott Company of Philadelphia, and many more). Now that we have this fact definitely established, we can continue; we will establish that the writers on the Eastern Continent, where the Bible was written, had no understanding that there was another race of people upon this the American Continent. We read in Acts 2:5 that on the day of Pentecost, "there were dwelling at Jerusalem, Jews, devout men, out of every nation under heaven." We know that there were none of their representatives on this continent at that time or it would have been recorded. Paul wrote in Col. 1:23, "If ye continue in the faith, grounded and settled, and be not moved away from the hopes of the Gospel, which ye have heard and which was preached to every creature which is under heaven; whereof I, Paul, am made a minister." Eph. 3:8 informs us that Paul was sent to "preach among the gentiles", and yet we have no record of his visit to them or to the people on this continent in any of his writings so we know that he wrote of the world which he knew which would not have been the new world in John 10:14-16 when the Lord said, "Other sheep I have which are not of this fold, them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice, and there shall be one fold and one shepherd." It could not have been the gentiles when He referred to the "other sheep", because Christ said in Matt. 15:20, "I am not sent, but to the lost sheep of the House of Israel." and also in Matt. 12:21, when he said "And in His name shall the gentiles trust." (also see Isa. 43:7)

Church of Christ: That was during His lifetime He referred to, but after His resurrection He told the disciples, "But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you; and ye shall

be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth." (Acts 1:8) Therefore, He was sent to the gentiles and they were the lost sheep.

Missionaries: But there is no record of this, only the command. You will notice in John 10:16 that the sheep Christ was referring to "would hear His voice" and the gentiles never heard His voice. Incidentally, Acts 1:8 also verified that the "uttermost part of the earth" that they were familiar with, was only their own continent, and they fulfilled that command of Christ. Caiaphas, prophesying of Christ's future mission, said, concerning John 10:16, "Consider that it is expedient for us, that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not, AND NOT FOR THAT NATION ONLY, but that also He could gather together in one the children of God, that were scattered abroad." (John 11:50-52) Now you can see as we have pointed out that there were other sheep, they lived on another continent, and the apostles did not have accessible means to preach the word of God on the other side of the ocean. Therefore, they had their own prophets, because God, being just, would reveal His word to all righteous people, and especially entire nations. Their prophets had great revelations, and prophecies of greater events concerning the birth of Christ, because He was to live among another people. Therefore, they knew His name would be Jesus Christ so they took upon themselves the name of "Christians". When Luke wrote that they were called Christians "first" at Antioch, that was according to his knowledge, because he had said earlier that Christ had told the disciples they would preach "to the utter most parts of the earth", and on Pentecost people were "gathered out of every nation under heaven," so therefore Luke's understanding that they were called Christians first in Antioch. That was the first time on the Old Continent that the people of that hemisphere were called by the name but such was not the case upon this continent, as we have demonstrated and pointed out previously.

The people on the American Continent, being a more righteous nation, learned many years before the Savior's birth that His name would be Jesus Christ. Therefore 147 years before His birth, they named the Church after him. They remained under the old law until His appearance to them in 34 A.D. When He appeared to them and taught them His principals they did away with the Law of Moses and accepted His teachings. He chose 12 apostles on this continent and did many wonderful things before these people. Therefore, we have pointed out that it was not a contradiction, but just a lack of knowledge due to communications which prevented the writers of the New Testament books to know of the events that were transpiring on this continent. If you say that they did know of these people, then that leaves you to explain when the apostles went over and taught them the gospel, (Acts 1:8; Col. 1:23), or how they made it over for the day of Pentecost. (Acts 2:5)

Pentecostal Church: Gentlemen, the Latter-day Saints claim scriptural support for their belief that the Bible prophecies of the coming forth of "The Book of Mormon". Among these scriptures, they take Ezekiel 37:16-19, and they themselves use a scriptural rail split. Speaking of the two sticks, (that of Judah and Joseph), the Lord went on to say (verse 17) what these two sticks were and that they would become one in His hand, and then explained what He meant, of which the Mormons do not include in this prophecy. "I will take the children of Israel from the heathen, whither they be gone, and will gather them on every side, and bring them into their own land: and I will make them one nation in the land upon the mountains of Israel, and one king shall be king of them all: and they shall be no more two nations, neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms anymore at all." (Ezk. 37:21-22) Therefore, they use verses 15-20 to refer to "The Book of Mormon", but as verses 21-22 point out, Ezekiel was referring to the reuniting of the Northern and Southern Kingdoms that had been divided in fulfillment to the prophecy of Elijah. Then in Isaiah 29:13-14 they claim a fulfillment to Joseph Smith and the restoration of the Mormon Church as "This marvelous work and a wonder," yet we find a direct fulfillment to verse 14 is found in 1 Cor. 1:19, Matt. 21:42 and John 9:30. The Latter-day

Saints go on to say that verse 18, (Isa. 29:18), refers to a book which was sealed, when it actually refers to the Book of Revelations which also in parts had "sealed books". They say Isaiah 29:4 refers to a literal fulfillment of when their book was to "come forth from the dust" and yet you will find that it was referring to Ariel, or the City of David, as verse 1 points out. Therefore, to my understanding, I have included both of your Book of Mormon prophecies and proven them false using the Bible.

Missionaries: I feel it is a great privilege to testify of the divinity of "The Book of Mormon". I challenge the Pentecostal Minister on his interpretation of Ezekiel 37 most emphatically. He took two completely separate prophecies that had similarities and tied them together to refer to the same thing. You will notice that in Ezekiel 37:16-17 that they were referring to the word "stick" and they were to WRITE UPON IT. In ancient times they would record their records on scrolls and roll them up on a stick as Jeremiah 36:2-8 very plainly points out. Ezekiel said that they were to write upon these sticks not for the two sticks to unite as yet but write on one stick or scroll for the record of Judah and his descendents, and a second stick for Joseph, and particular through his son, Ephraim. So there were to be kept two records of two separate nations. As you might recall, there were two houses in Israel after the dividing of the 12 tribes.

As we have pointed out, however, the sticks (books) were to be joined together first as Ezekiel points out, and then the tribes were to be fathered and become "one fold". Now no person or groups of people have claimed to have this record of Joseph except the "Mormons". This leaves "The Book of Mormon" as the "Stick of Joseph" and it has been joined with the "Stick of Judah", (the Bible), and they are one in the Lord's hand. But the next verse, verse 21 is a real key. It clearly states that these two records, the Bible, the stick of Judah, and the other record which is in the hands of the descendants of Joseph through his son Ephraim, ("The Book of Mormon"), will have been put together and available to all at the time that the Jews are restored to their lands. Brethren, the Jews have been gathered together since 1948. Where is the record which Ezekiel says is among us? Is there anyone in the world who has made a claim to have had it other than the Mormons?

As we examine Joseph's blessing at the hand of his father, Jacob, (Gen. 49:22-26) we read where "Joseph is a fruitful bough, even a fruitful bough by a well whose branches run over the wall." That the wall referred to a large body of water is pointed out in Exodus 14:22 and notice, his branches were to run "over" the wall, or over the water. Then in verse 26 to confirm it was the land of the America's, we read, "The blessings of thy father have prevailed above the blessings of my progenitors unto the utmost bound of the everlasting hills." The American Continent has the longest range of mountains in the world, the Rockies, which stretch from one tip of the North American continent down to the end of South America. Notice Joseph's branch (descendents) were to go "over the ocean". The blessing to Joseph was perhaps the most outstanding of the blessings of the twelve tribes of Israel. The descendents in "The Book of Mormon" to Joseph placed genealogical evidence that they were that "branch" and the evidence in their record is undisputed. The second part of the prophecy concerns the gathering of the twelve tribes.

In answer to Isaiah 29:13-14, I remind you that prophecies can receive partial fulfillment. Christ never said the prophecy in Matt. 15:7-8 was fulfilled, but that Matt. 15:7-8 merely referred to Isaiah's description of the troubled conditions. Christ said, "it prophesied of them", but it could also have prophesied of "others". Paul, likewise, made reference to Isaiah's prophecy in 1 Cor. 1:19, and yet his only comment was "for it is written". As you can see, He did not claim its fulfillment. Whenever a prophecy is fulfilled the prophets almost always indicate fulfillment. For example, "For these things were done, that the scripture should be fulfilled, a bone of him shall not be broken." (John 19:36) Also refer to Acts 3:22-23, Matt. 3:3, Isaiah 22:34 crossed with Luke 22:54-62. Matt. 21:42 did not fulfill Isaiah's prophecy, but

referred to Psalms 118:22. Therefore, since the Bible did not teach these scriptures were fulfilled, and we have already established that a scripture is fulfilled upon declaration by a prophet; this proves that all the references you gave merely refer to the prophecy, and that it awaited fulfillment. That Isaiah 29:18 refers to the Book of Revelations is ridiculous, since the Book of Revelations does not "OPEN THE EYES OF THE BLIND" and help them to see out of obscurity. Also your statement that Isaiah 29:11-12 refers to John and the removal of the "7 seals", as in the "Book of Revelations" is ridiculous because there is not a fulfillment to the verse. If you would try and make Revelations 5:1-8 the fulfillment to Isaiah 29:11-12, you would fail because the book that was "sealed" was to be delivered to one that was learned who would declare he could not read the book because it was sealed. It was then to be delivered to one that was unlearned who would likewise say he could not because it was sealed. In Rev. 5 John never stated that he could not read the book, so it did not refer to John. You will notice the Book was delivered in Rev. 5 to one person, the Lamb of God, and he opened the seals and read from it. It is blasphemy to assume that Christ, who was learned, "could not read the book for it was sealed," and then sat down and read the book. It only goes to show the weakness of your stand. This prophecy was fulfilled with the record being delivered to a professor in New York who asked to have the whole record and when he was refused he said he could not read a sealed book. Yet Joseph Smith, not a learned man, did translate the sealed book.

Another interesting thing you will notice in Isaiah 29:17 is that when this book was to come about or come forth, Lebanon was to be turned into a fruitful field and this was never fulfilled at the time the Book of Revelations was written, but only since 1948 when the beginning of the modern day Israeli country was established, it is also after one of our apostles went there and dedicated the land for their return. Now it has blossomed and become a fruitful field. This has also been fulfilled in the deserts of Utah. When the Mormons entered the Utah valley, one tree stood in the entire valley for as far as the eye could see. Within 50 years it was also like Lebanon, blooming like a rose.

You will notice in Isaiah 29:4 that the book would speak from the dust "with a familiar spirit." language is similar to the Bible, and familiar to the ear. You were mistaken in your interpretation of Ariel as the place it would come from, because you will notice in verse 2 that Ariel, (which is the city of David), was to be distressed, "and it shall be unto me AS Ariel" and not the actual city of David. In other words, the prophecy would be fulfilled in a plane like Ariel. Also the manner in which came forth, from the ground as a buried record, "from the dust of the earth", is how we reference that the people who wrote it were long dead. Psalms 85:11 also refers to "The Book of Mormon", when it said, "Truth shall spring out of the earth; and righteousness shall look down from heaven." So truth, "The Book of Mormon", came from the earth and righteousness, Moroni, the angel, sent from heaven to restore the truth, (Rev. 14:6-7). This, with Isaiah, has been literally fulfilled. The book came from the earth and an angel came from heaven. It further says that these two items "kissed" meaning they have come together. Can you find the fulfillment of any of this anywhere else other than our church? Since you can not it would be a forgone conclusion that "The Book of Mormon" is a true record of the history of the ancient inhabitants of America and that Joseph Smith was a prophet.

Church of England: The scriptures tell us that there were to be no other records added to the Bible. This is pointed out in Rev. 22:18, proving "The Book of Mormon" to be a fraud.

Missionaries: You will find identical statements in Deut. 4:2 and Deut. 12:32 and so using your logic, we cannot accept any writings after Deuteronomy. Also since the Book of Revelation was written before many other of the books in the New Testament that would mean that most of the New Testament books would be unacceptable. The only reason why that book is the last book in the New Testament is because that is how it was compiled long after everything had been

written. John only wrote in that book and never ever saw a compiled New Testament so how could he have meant the Bible? It was not part of any collection of books. What the writer referred to in John, when he spoke of not adding to "this book" was that any one who added or subtracted from the Book of Revelations would lose that portion in the life to come.

Agnostic: Gentlemen, I think that one of the most interesting doctrines of the Mormon Church was God's contradiction at the time of the Creation. In 2 Nephi 2:25 of "The Book of Mormon", it teaches that "Adam fell that men might be, and men are that they might have joy." In another book of writings, "The Pearl of Great Price", we read in Moses 5:11, that Eve said, "Were it not for our transgression we never should have had seed, and never should have known good and evil and the joy of our redemption, and the eternal life which God giveth unto all the obedient." If this is the truth, could you prove to me from the Bible that Adam could not have had children when the first command after his creation from the dust was to "multiply and replenish the earth." This seems most absurd in the line of logic and scripture. According to your doctrine, Adam had to break a commandment, either partake of the forbidden fruit so he could multiply and replenish the earth, or not partake of the forbidden fruit and live forever without good. That sounds to me like a contradictory God that would leave man without so much as a choice.

Missionaries: The scriptures give a very accurate description of the state of Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden prior to their partaking of the forbidden fruit. They lived under ideal conditions and all the fruits of the garden were theirs, with the exception of two trees. They had several great disadvantages, however, they had been commanded to multiply and replenish the earth, and yet they were in a state of innocence where "they were both naked, the man and the woman, and were not ashamed." (Gen. 2:25) As such, they had no fleshly urges or knowledge to multiply because they knew not the difference between good and evil. 1 Peter 1:18-20 informs us that Christ was foreordained to come to this earth, and atone for the sin of Adam and by not partaking of the forbidden fruit, they would have eliminated Christ's coming and saving the world. God had told them that "the day that thou partakest thereof, thou shalt surely die." (Gen. 2:17) Adam then had to partake of the forbidden fruit and bring death to the world, or Christ's foreordination would have been useless and He would not have been the Savior, therefore, God knew that Adam would partake of the fruit when He gave the commandment, because His son had already been commissioned to save the world. So Adam transgressed a law; he did not commit a sin. There is a big difference. If I tell you not to touch a flame because in that day you will be burnt, and you touch it you will suffer the consequences of the transgression, there would not also be a punishment for the wrong doing. It was when they partook of the fruit that "they knew they were naked; and they sewed fig leaves together, and made themselves aprons." (Gen. 3:7) God went on to tell them that they had become as God's "knowing good and evil." (Gen 3:22) Because of this knowledge they had acquired, they were driven from the garden and we find them fulfilling the first great commandment where "Adam knew Eve his wife; and she conceived." (Gen. 4:1) Since there is no doubt that Christ was foreordained to come into the world to "atone" for the sin of Adam, God gave the first command to rule the second and make way for His beloved son. Therefore it was a transgression of the law and not a sin. If Adam had not partaken of the fruit he would have remained in a state of innocence with Eve; Christ would not have come into the world as He was foreordained to do, and we would not have received the opportunity of becoming "as gods, knowing good from evil." Truly this was the Wisdom of God to give the commands as He did, so that seed could have been born, and so Christ could come into the world and pay for Adam's sin. Therefore, it was not a contradictory commandment in that sense, because the infinite wisdom of God knew how Adam would react with his wife, Eve, in the set of circumstances to which they would be subjected. Adam however, had to use his free agency to choose to do this. He recognized why it had to be done and did it.

Anglican Church: I understand, Elder, that the Mormon Church has the largest welfare program in the world. I think it is wonderful for your people to take care of their own. Out of curiosity, what scriptures do you use from the Bible in support of this program?

Missionaries: There are many, but I believe that Matt. 25:34-40 is the most beautiful account. In this account, Christ made a statement about those who had given meat to the hungry, drink to the thirsty, a home to the stranger, clothes to the naked, association to the sick, and fellowship to the prisoner of which He said, referring to the day of Judgment "come ye blessed of my Father for verily I say unto you, inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me."

Church of Christ: I think one of the most controversial doctrines on earth today is the stand the Mormon Church took on the Negro. The scriptures say "God is no respecter of persons" and yet the Negro in the Mormon Church had assumed a second rate membership. They could partake of the sacrament and baptism, but could not hold the priesthood which would allow them into the holy temples, pass the sacraments, and perform in positions of responsibility among the hierarchy of the Church. This doctrine, clearly racial prejudice, was taught by the founder of the Church, Joseph Smith, and is completely contrary to the doctrines of Christ. We read where Philip did not hesitate to baptize the Ethiopian eunuch. Paul said "For by one spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jew or Gentile, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink one spirit". (1 Cor. 12:13) If I am not mistaken, it is supposed to do with some pre-existence idea where they sinned before they came to earth. This of course, contradicts the Bible, where it states "And the Lord formed man from the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life and man became a living soul." (Gen 2:7) While you are at it, maybe you can explain your unusual plural heavens, and prove from the scriptures your stand on the Negro, the life before, and the life hereafter. This is what I call "diverse and strange doctrines."

Missionaries: There was great wisdom when God told Isaiah, "For my ways are higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts saith the Lord." We believe in a pre-existence of life, and that we once lived with our Heavenly Father. We pointed out earlier in Isaiah 42:5 where the breath and spirit were entirely separate. In the creation we see the Lord placed His breath in man by breathing into his nostrils the breath of life, but his spirit had come from God as it says in Heb. 12:9. That is why the preacher wrote in Eccl. 12:7 "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it;" The Lord told Jeremiah, (1:1-5), "Before I formed thee in the belly, I knew thee; and before thou camest out of the womb, I sanctified thee, and I ordained thee to be a prophet unto the nations." Paul wrote, "We have had fathers of our flesh which corrected us and we gave them reverence, shall we not much rather be in subjection to the Father of spirits and live." (Heb. 12:9) The pre-existence was well know to the Lord's apostles as is recorded in John 9:1-3 when they asked the Lord if the blindness in the man in question had been caused by his parents or himself, as he had been born blind. In the pre-existence the negro was less valiant and therefore the dark skin was placed upon him as a curse and a blessing, and he was brought forth from the seed of Cain.

Methodist Church: That means just because Cain received a mark, all of Cain's offspring suffer because of his killing Abel. Is this a just God?

Missionaries: We didn't say this dark skin came because of Cain. Ezekiel 18:2 points out that "the son shall not bear the iniquity of the father." It was his seed, however, that the Lord chose to send those less valiant spirits into the world. Because they were less valiant in the pre-existence there had to be a way of knowing who they were so that they would have less responsibilities than those who were valiant in the pre-existence. And by valiant we mean that

in that great war in heaven recorded in the Book of Revelations, there were those who did not fight for the Lord, while others were fighting for Lucifer and then there were those who did not fight, they were not valiant in support of the Lord. Those who fought for Satan, of course, we know were cast out of heaven. Now it is a blessing for the Black people because they were not required to serve others and would not be accountable for that service. They merely had to save themselves. Now of course they are on an equal standing with everyone else.

Methodist Church: I want scriptural support for that statement.

Missionaries: You live by only one-fourth of the word of God so it makes it pretty difficult to give you any answer that would satisfy you. You seem to want to execute judgment on the Lord's way of doing things just because you do not comprehend the mysteries of heaven. Paul said that God "hath made of one blood all nations of men to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times BEFORE appointed, and the bounds of their habitation." (Acts 17:26) This clearly shows that the Lord, before the earth, chose the time and place in which we would be born and this He did through His judgment and mercy or as we believe, based on our performance in the war in heaven which obviously took place in the pre-existence of which you do not believe. That is why future events could be spoken by the Holy Prophets and even individual experiences be revealed. The only thing the Negro was deprived from in the Church was the Priesthood. The situation with the Negro is identical with that of the Old Testament and Gentiles in the times of Christ. We read that "Christ was sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel". Yet, Christ was just but it was His purpose and will not to go to the Gentiles; His apostles were sent out with the same restriction, (Matt. 10:5-6) and it was with some difficulty that He persuaded them to go to all men when the period of Israel's prior rights were expired. (Mark 16:14; Acts 10). Such was the case with the Negro. They were not restricted to Church membership, but to serve others. The Lord had promised that the day would come, just as it came to the Gentiles, that the Negro would receive God's Priesthood and the blessings from it. We believe that the Negro can go to the highest kingdom, for as Paul taught, "Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, so shall he reap." (Gal. 6:7) The same holds true in Christ's parable of the talents. Where much is given, much is required. I have pointed out to you why they were restricted, from the scriptures, and explained to you the reasoning, it is in harmony with Holy Scripture. Was this any different from what was taught in the Old Testament in Ezra chapter two?

There is a long list of genealogy given for only one purpose, to prove who was allowed to hold the priesthood. In Ezra 2:60-63 we specifically learn that a certain group of people were not found in the lineage which was allowed to hold the priesthood and were considered "as polluted, put from the priesthood". It further stated that until "there stood up a priest with Urim and Thummim" they could not hold this priesthood. Now tell me brethren, which one of you possess this thing? We read that Joseph Smith said he had one, there were twelve witnesses that testified to that fact even at their death bed. Now the definition of Urim and Thummim is truth and light or in other words it would take a prophet to restore the rights of the priesthood to those who previously could not hold it. And of course that has been done. Also notice that throughout the Bible only the house of Israel held the priesthood...more specifically the tribes of Levi, Judah and Joseph. If you trace the genealogy of the Negro you will soon see they do not come from the house of Israel but from Ham, the son of Noah who married a Negro and thereby continued the race. You will notice that the blessings of the chosen people come through Shem. The blessing of Japheth would be that he could be adopted into the house of Shem. ("And Japheth may dwell in the tent of Shem.") Now you have the scriptures and the answers yet your churches never followed these scriptures in this matter either.

Now to expound on the rest of your questions, after we die we go to a place called the Spirit World, which encompasses a place called "Paradise" and a place called "Spirit Prison". (Luke

23:43; 1 Peter 3:18-20; Job 32:8) It is not heaven because on the cross Jesus said to the one thief: "Today thou shalt be with me in Paradise" and yet three days later He told Mary not to touch him because He had not yet ascended to His Father in Heaven, (John 20:17) therefore heaven and where ever the Lord went for three days are obvious not the same place. This should be very plain to see from the scriptures. There is a gulf between these two places so no one goes from one to the other without a proper baptism. (Luke 16:26) While Christ's body was in the tomb, His spirit went to the "world of spirits" which is the correct translation of the Greek words used in the original text. It could not have been prison because we have already established that the Lord could not have been in the spirit prison because no unclean thing could be with the Lord, therefore He would have gone to the world of spirits into the paradise side and there set up the missionary program which would allow for missionaries to go to the prison side and teach them the gospel so that when the work for the dead such as baptism for the dead, as we have previously shown, would have an effect on those that were in the prison. (1 Peter 3:18-20; 4:6; Isaiah 12:55, etc.)

If not here upon the earth, a person will learn of the gospel in the spirit world, thereby giving all of our Heavenly Father's children a chance to hear the gospel and receive equal opportunities. (1 Tim. 2:5) This does away with the heresy called "heathen damnation". Since baptism is a necessary covenant and can only be performed in the flesh, and many have lost the opportunity to be baptized because of where they were born or when they were born, a just God has sent His servant Elijah, (Malachi 4:4-6; Heb. 11:40) with the priesthood keys necessary to do baptism for the dead by proxy, (1 Cor. 15:29; Heb. 11:39-40) as was taught by Paul in the Holy Scriptures. Our Father in heaven loves all His children and will not forsake them because of they did not have an opportunity in life to hear the true gospel. Everyone will have that chance and will have the free agency to accept the truth or reject it. That baptism is necessary is without question. (John 3:5; Heb. 6:1-4)

We believe in the literal second coming of Christ (1 Thessalonians 4:15-17), and that we will ascend to meet Christ in the air at His return if we are faithful. The earth will experience 1,000 years of righteousness then, (Rev. 20:1-6) and Christ will reign as King of Kings and Lord of Lords. All the righteous people that live on the earth will inhabit homes, and continue to produce for their physical needs and live as families. (Isaiah 65:17-25) During this millennial rain Satan will be bound and not be released again until the end of the 1000 years, then he will be loosed for a season, (Rev.20:7) and after a great battle he will be cast into the lake of fire and brimstone. Then we will all stand before the judgment bar of God, (Rev.20:12-13) and receive our rewards according to our works.

Our exaltation will be through the grace of Christ, (Eph. 2:8-9) after all we can do. (Philippians 2:12) Christ has prepared many nations for us (John 14:1-3) in the Father's Kingdom, but we await one of three rewards, (1 Cor. 15:40-42), which by name are called the Celestial Kingdom (verse 40), the Terrestrial Kingdom, (verse 40), and the Telestial Kingdom (Doctrine and Covenants 76). Notice the Bible compares the Sun to one, the Moon to the next, and the Stars to another kingdom, but in the years of translating the Bible, the name of the third place was omitted, which is why we need more revelation which can only come from and through the prophets. That place we know by name, only because of modern day revelation. Paul was privileged to see the Third Heaven in 2 Cor. 12:2-4, thereby proving a first and second. The highest will be occupied by the presence of God and Christ and the Holy Ghost and will be as Paul stated "like the glory of the sun." Those that receive this kingdom will have been members of His Church, and those who lived the teachings and commandments of God and were righteous. The second kingdom will have the presence of Christ and the Holy Ghost but not the Father. The lowest kingdom (compared with the stars of the firmament) will be where the wicked of the earth will dwell. They have inherited the "lake of fire and brimstone" which figuratively describes the sorrow they will find by losing their opportunity of living with God and

Christ while have a full knowledge of what they could have had. Paul said this group would be punished with everlasting destruction FROM THE PRESENCE OF THE LORD. (Thess. 1:9) Our claim is supported by scripture as we have just listed. Christ with a body of flesh and bones, (Luke 24:39), will change "our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto His glorious body, according to the working whereby He is able even to subdue all things unto himself." (Philippians 3:21) Now if we are all saved no matter what we do, why then is there a need for three heavens?

Church of Christ: There is a definite contradiction as to the time of the crucifixion between the Bible and "The Book of Mormon". The Bible, in Luke 23:44, places it between the sixth and ninth hours, (3 PM), while "The Book of Mormon" in 3 Nephi 10:9 has it "in the morning". This is a definite contradiction. How could the timing be different on the times of the crucifixion if God himself gave the sign to the inhabitants of the American Continent?

Missionaries: The answer to your question is a testimony that is authentic and true. In "The Book of Mormon", the writer was writing in the U.S.A. and Luke was writing in the Jerusalem which is about 120 miles West of Jerusalem. On a time scale, 3 PM in Jerusalem would be 7:30 AM in the morning on this continent, so you can see, although Joseph Smith or the writers on the North American Continent could not have recognized this little discrepancy, the Lord inspired these men to write the truth and once again, what you thought was a contradiction was a revealed truth, and a strong stamp on the authenticity of the book.

Seventh-Day Adventist: In the book, "Jesus the Christ," on Page 81, Dr. James Talmage, a Mormon apostle, stated that Christ was begotten of Elohiem, or God the Father, yet we read in Matthew 1:18 that "Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost." Since Matthew teaches that Christ was begotten of the Holy Ghost, why do you teach that Christ was begotten of the Father?

Missionaries: You should have read Apostle Talmage's answer. Luke records, "He shall be great and shall be called the Son of the Highest (1:32), so He was to be called the "Son of God". Then in Luke 1:35 we read "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, AND THE POWER OF THE HIGHEST SHALL OVERSHADOW THEE: therefore, also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called THE SON OF GOD." The Father was God, and the Holy Ghost bore record of the Father. The Mother was the Virgin Mary and as scripture tells us, "He was the only begotten of the Father." Therefore, Matthew is answered by Luke's account which is much clearer and deals with the details of the life and birth of Christ in greater detail.

Pentecostal Church: The Lord is to have established His Church on the day of Pentecost through His disciples. This is pointed out by Acts 1:6-8 and with Acts 2, where the Comforter was sent. Why do you teach that the Church was set up before Pentecost?

Missionaries: Christ declared to Peter "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock, (the rock of revelation) I will build my Church." The Lord confirmed He would build it. Then in Matthew 18:17-18 when confronted with a problem concerning the law of the Church, He took it out of the future tense and in the present tense and said "And if he shall neglect to hear them tell it unto the Church, but if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican." Here the Lord claims that His Church had been established, at least, in part. In Luke 17:20-21 He told them the Kingdom of God was among them. That the Church was established definitely before Pentecost we read in Luke 22:18, "For I say unto you I will not drink of the fruit of the vine until the Kingdom of God shall come." We read in Acts 10:41-42 that Christ did eat and drink with him, (the apostles with Christ), after He rose from the dead. That is why Paul said "we are built upon the foundation of apostles and prophets. Jesus Christ Himself being the chief cornerstone." Since the foundation of the Church was established with His power,

along with the pastors, evangelists, and teachers, (Eph. 4:11) and that they had POWER AND AUTHORITY, (Luke 9:1) and won converts, therefore, the Kingdom of God was here upon the earth and had been established before the Lord left. What the apostles meant in Acts 1:6-8 was to restore the Kingdom to its fullness. In verse 8 the only thing they received was power, not kingdoms.

Lutheran Minister: Why do you go around and tell our people that we do not teach with authority and that their baptisms do not count? We have gone to school for many years and trained for our professions and teach salvation through the Cross of Christ.

Missionaries: Christ taught "I am the way, the truth and the life." Paul clarified the exactness of truth when He said "apostles and prophets were necessary to bring people to a "Unity of the Faith" and a "Knowledge of the Son of God unto a perfect man." With over 800 different churches there is no unity, and with their various creeds they demonstrate they have no knowledge of the Son of God. Christ gave the power and authority to the apostles, (Luke 9:1), and it was they who controlled and passed it on to others (Titus 1:5-6; I Timothy 3:1-4). In Act 8:17-21 we also see that the authority to act in the ordinances of the priesthood require the laying on of the hands from those with the authority to do so. Their duty was to receive revelation from the Lord and guide the people. They warned against "false teachers" who had a "form of godliness, but deny the power thereof." (2 Tim. 3:5) Gentlemen, you are no part or parcel of the original church, and not one of you can trace your authority to the apostles or prophets. Unauthorized servants baptisms were not recognized, (Acts 19:1-6) nor were their miracles, (Acts 19:13-17). You have taken this power unto or upon yourself, of which Paul said "no man taketh this honor unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron." And how was he called? By Moses, a prophet. He did not read the Bible and say that reading it he was called.

There is a specific way to receive the priesthood from one who has the authority to pass it on. (Heb. 5:4) Aaron was called by Moses, a prophet, (Exodus 28:1). You are zealous in your labors but in the wrong direction. Ours is the narrow path that leadeth unto life. More important than your departure from the truth is our restoration of the truth. As we established here today, God has established it to the earth and we have established it through the scriptures. God always works through prophets, (Amos 3:7), and the heavens have been closed over your churches as far as revelation for 1800 years, and you admit it.

Our message to the world is that we have the truth and either we are right or you are right, and this has been the purpose of our visit today in this courtroom situation, to establish truth. We have been on the defense only to establish that our doctrines can stand the assault of any outsider of truth. We read in "The Book of Mormon" where Nephi "thought he saw God" and ministers have told me "Didn't Nephi know if he saw God or not?" Yet in Revelations 22:8-9, John mistook the angel for the Son of God and fell at His feet to worship him. People have asked why we named our church the "Church of Jesus Christ" yet Christ said "I will build MY CHURCH", and His name it bears today. We read "Neither is there salvation in any other for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." (Acts 4:12) Sure it was called the Church of God in six or seven instances, but Hebrews 12:22-24 carried the name of "Church of the First-Born," and Ephesians 3:21 calls it the "Church of Jesus Christ" yet Christ said "I will build 'MY CHURCH'" and He is the cornerstone, and His name it bears today. We have been accused for the women speaking in the Church in reverse of 1 Cor. 14:34, yet people seem to forget that the churches in those days had personal problems from within and at the Church of Corinth they had women problems. Because Paul warned the Romans against their sinfulness, that doesn't mean we are living in sinfulness. The women were out of line, and Paul pointed it out. Acts 2:17-18 tells us that in the last days "Your sons and your daughters shall prophesy" and how can they prophesy if they don't or are not allowed to speak in the church? It says "I will pour out in these days of my spirit on my

handmaidens", and when they get that spirit, are they supposed to sit and not open their mouths? Gentlemen, I know the Church we represent is true and I love it. Not one of you has been able to dispute the scriptures of which we have referenced.

Presbyterian Church: Why do you believe in foreordination when in Romans 9:13 it teaches that the Lord loved Jacob and hated Esau although Esau by right was the eldest and heir to the birthright, and also in Romans 9:20-21 where we read "Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump we make one vessel unto honor, and another unto dishonor." If it were not predestined, why didn't God make us all good?

Missionaries: Sir, Genesis 25:23 will show you that Jacob was more favored of the Lord than Esau, and Acts 17:26 shows that Jacob was more righteous in the pre-existence. Esau was hated of the Lord hundreds of years after his death because of his wickedness. 2 Tim. 2:20-21 answers your question on Romans 9:20-21 where it teaches that free agency is predominant over what type of vessel we will be. Free agency is taught throughout the scriptures. Joshua said "Choose ye this day whom ye will serve, as for me and my house, we will serve the Lord." (Joshua 24:15) Hebrews 5:8-9 says Christ was the author of eternal salvation unto "all that obey him." It's in a hundred places God is just and Paul said in 1 Cor. 10:13, "There hath no temptation taken you, but such as is common to man, But God is faithful, who will not have you to be tempted above that ye are able, but will, with the temptation, provide a way to escape, that ye may be able to bear it,"

Church of Christ: If you still believe in revelation today, why have you not had one in the Mormon Church since the 136th section of "The Doctrine and Covenants" on January 14, 1847?

Missionaries: We have had continuous revelation since then. Sir, "The Doctrine and Covenants" was concluded at that time and distributed to the world as a living evidence of God's word today. The church from time to time does add to the canonized scriptures, however we get our current revelations over the pulpits of the church every week and every six months at the church's general conferences. They are accessible to all people who desire to learn of them. Also, the teachings of our leaders constantly bear God's word to the ears of our people. The revelations are written every 6 months and published to all who will receive them, and our monthly magazines have messages from the prophet and apostles.

United Church of Canada: Why do you use Old Testament Priesthood when Heb. 7:12 tells us that "the priesthood being changed, there must also of necessity be a change of the law." Also, we know that Christ is the eternal High Priest and that Old Testament Priesthood was done away, why do you teach it today?

Missionaries: Paul taught in Heb. 7:11-12, 14, 17, and 24 that the law or Schoolmaster (Gal. 3:24), was to lead the people to Christ, but Paul clarified in those verses that the Aaronic, (or Levitical) Priesthood could not do it alone. Therefore, it was necessary for the Lord to send another Priest after the order of Melchizedek. The Priesthood now being changed by Christ coming as that Priest, there was also of necessity a change of the law, which would be the Law of Moses. We read of Melchizedek in Heb. 7:1-3 and of his righteousness, and then verse 38 reads "Without father without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life; but made like unto the Son of God; abided a priest continually." This clearly indicated that Melchizedek could not have been referred to in verse 3 because he had a mother and father, but we learn from careful examination that it would have had to have been His priesthood which would be without beginning of days, nor end of life. Then we read in Heb. 5:1 the requirements of a High Priest "For every High Priest taken from among men is ordained for men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins" and as verse 4 points out "and no man taketh this honor unto himself, but he that is

called of God, as was Aaron." The scripture goes on to point out that even Christ glorified not Himself to be made a High Priest but was chosen and appointed by His Father as a High Priest forever.

We read where Moses, a prophet, called Aaron to the Priesthood. Now that Christ was a High Priest He proceeded to call others, hence "Then Jesus said unto them (the twelve) again Peace be unto you; as my father hath sent me, even so send I you." (John 20:21) "And He ordained twelve, that they should be with him and that He might send them forth to preach, and to have power to heal sicknesses and to cast out devils." (Mark 3:14-15) That is why Peter said that the Church had "a royal priesthood" and was "a holy nation." (1 Peter 2:9) So you see, the Priesthood was passed on and the only change was that a new Priest arose after the order of Melchizedek which was Christ. Peter, James, and John brought that Priesthood back to the earth to Joseph Smith, the Prophet, in 1829 and we have it in the Church today, with the same powers as were held in ancient times, but most of you take it upon yourselves and think that somehow by reading the Bible it gives you what only the laying on of the hands of the apostles had power to give. In Acts chapter 8 we learn that Simon was preaching and baptizing yet when Philip arrived and taught the true gospel they were all rebaptized. When Peter and John heard about the converts they arrived and "Laid they their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost", (verse 17). When Simon saw this he offered them money to have this same power and found out it could not be bought, yet you think you can have this power because you went to school or in a sense you have tried to buy that which can only be received by the laying on of the hands of a person who has the authority and priesthood to pass it on. Brethren, we are the only church to even make such a claim. It is because of the restoration of the priesthood by Peter, James, and John, to Joseph Smith, that we have this knowledge of the priesthood.

Priest: Why is Joseph Smith so honored by all people when Christ said "A prophet has no honor in his own country"?

Missionaries: Your presence here today to attempt to find fault in the Lord's Church is a perfect demonstration of fulfillment of Christ's atonement. Thousands of books have been written against the prophet, and his name, as he said, has become an emblem of both good and evil among all nations. I want you to know this day, gentlemen, that Joseph Smith was truly a great man. From the moment of his first vision in 1820 until his last breath in 1844, he was arrested or put on trial 48 times but never sentenced for having done anything. He lived in constant tyranny and persecution. He was tarred and feathered three times, beaten, and his family and loved ones cruelly treated and murdered. The Mormons appealed to the highest courts and to the US congress because their lands and property were stolen and they were driven out of the homes. The government said they could do nothing. In all of this he never lost the dignity of his office, and was a man of God after the highest order. A group called the Carthage Greys vowed they would not so much as eat until they had spilled his blood, and many of his friends turned out to be his "judges". He was honest, and dealt with all men in an honest and god-fearing way. He was one of the greatest prophets of all times. Several days before his death, tears in his eyes, the great Lt. General of the Nauvoo Legion, a prophet of the Most High God, stood before his people for the last time and expressed his love for them. Then He said, "Greater love hath no man than this, than to lay down his life for his friends." The prophet voluntarily gave himself up to a tyrant governor who had pledged protection, and two days later at the expense of the Carthage Greys and a vicious mob, the blood of him and his brother was spilled in Carthage Jail. This was June 27, 1844. He lived a prophet, he died a prophet. Gentlemen, I know Joseph Smith was a prophet, that this Church is divinely guided today, and that the things I have borne witness are true. May God bless you to find the truth in my humble prayer.

Judge: This has been a trial I will never forget. I only wish my two sons had been here today to hear your defense of your religion. I have felt the spirit of righteousness in your sincerity. I declare this day that these two young men are preaching the word of God, that the presentation has not even on one matter proved contradiction in the revelations of the Mormon Prophets, and that their revelation has been progressive, needful, and harmonious; and their leaders also fulfill all the divine qualifications as laid out by the prosecution in the scriptures. Their claims are just and their God is with them. I was asked by the prosecution to weigh what was said, and I have done that. Because, as a Rabbi, I consider myself a good man and honest, I want these two young men to visit me and my family. I understand, Elder, that you give lessons about how to join your church; therefore, you will come over. As for the prosecution, you were unable to agree with yourselves and were unable to explain or account for the scriptures these missionaries pointed out. I rule that they have a more perfect way, and would advise you to come unto our God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. This court and case are closed!

Missionaries: Amen.

APPENDIX I

CHALLENGES OF “THE BOOK OF MORMON”

DEVELOPED FROM A LIST BY BRUCE R. MCCONKIE

Criteria/Requirements to fulfill the prophecies of the Bible; to be a prophet of God; to restore all truth to the world, and become the third largest Christian church in America, fourth in the world.

The “Bible” is the recorded history of Gods dealings and teachings to an ancient group of people whose descendants became the tribe of Judah of the 12 tribes of Israel and the lineage of Jesus Christ. “The Book of Mormon” is similarly a recorded history of Gods dealings with an ancient group of people whose descendants were from Joseph of the same 12 tribes of Israel. The history of Judah is found in the “Bible” and took place in modern day Asia Minor. The history of Joseph is found in “The Book of Mormon” and took place in modern day North America. The last living prophet of ancient America buried the record in 421 A.D. and in 1830 delivered it to Joseph Smith for translation and publication in fulfillment of numerous biblical prophecies.

Now we have two records of the teachings of Jesus Christ. Ezekiel says that these two records will exist in one hand after Israel is established again in the latter-days. Isaiah, the Book of Revelation, and numerous other scriptures, tell us the exact method of the restoration of this record. The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints is the only church in the world to claim to have this record. Both the “Bible” and “The Book of Mormon” testify of Jesus Christ. If this is not the second record spoken of, where is it since according to Ezekiel it should be in our hands today?

Occasionally you hear someone say, I could believe your Mormon doctrine if I just didn't have to swallow the story about Joseph Smith seeing Jesus Christ and God the Father and that he translated from some golden plates to which some angel lead him to a hillside where they were buried. It is even possible that you, yourself, have doubted his story. Well, let us consider some facts or conditions, with which you must comply, in order for you or someone else to produce a similar record under comparable conditions.

1. You must be between 23 and 24 years of age.
2. You cannot be a college graduate; in fact, you can have only three years of formal schooling during the 1820s and yet be able to translate a language which is no longer part of any language on earth known or unknown.
3. Whatever you translate and record must be on the basis of what you now know; no research is permitted.
4. You must write a book with 239 chapters, 54 of them about wars, 21 about history, 55 about prophecy, 71 about doctrine, 17 about missionaries and 21 about the mission of Jesus Christ. Your record must be 522 pages with over 510 words per page, 266,220 words.
5. You must include in your writings the history of two distinct and separate nations, along with histories of different contemporary nations or groups of people of which no one ever knew existed. The main group of people is also divided into two groups and covered a period from 600 B.C. to 421 A.D. The second group covered a time 1000 years earlier yet lived in approximately the same place of which the latter group had the records of the former group and had translated their record into their language and included it in their history. And as if that is not complicated enough, there are also

single and double overlapping flash backs included without breaking the congruency of the story line. All three nations will have artifacts and complete cities discovered by modern archeologists which will prove and will bear record of their existence down to the minutest detail.

6. Your writings must describe the religious, economic, social and political cultures, the manner of their written and spoken languages, types of buildings, geographic locations including their topographies, tools and materials used, the monetary system, which was a base 8 system of math completely unknown to the world in 1830, and many other facts completely unknown to the rest of the world in 1830, yet subsequently discovered.

7. You must include three independent dating systems that are all maintained accurately throughout over 800 years and are consistently accurate and include their various government types. The well known ancient Aztec calendar stone, found many years after this publication, is just one of the many discoveries which have proven these civilizations existed, of which Joseph wrote.

8. You must weave into your history the religion of Jesus Christ and the pattern of Christian living and not have it be in conflict with the Bible or within its own record.

9. When you start to produce this record, covering a period over 2000 years of these two groups of people, you must finish it in approximately 80 days. Of course it is known by man today that the bible was translated by a group of 52 scholars from a known language and it took them 16 years to complete the work and it has numerous contradictions.

10. When you have finished you must not make any changes in the text. The first edition must stand forever not withstanding punctuation or changes in modern day grammar and typos in type setting from 1830 to now.

11. After pauses for sleep and food, if you are dictating to a stenographer you must never ask to have the last paragraph or last sentence or even the last word read back to you because you are translating not creating. Without watching what your scribe is writing, you stop and correct his spelling of many of the new proper nouns and other mistakes that come up and still do not go back to read what was written by your scribe.

12. You must add 180 proper nouns to the English language. William Shakespeare added only 30. Some words and names are used in a way that is contrary to known applications at the time of translation. Time has proven them accurate. As an example, the proper name Alma has only been used as a female name throughout history, yet in this translation it is a mans name. Recent discoveries show that it was originally a man's name. How could Joseph Smith had known this? Also the use of many words and phrases in his translation were unknown in his time or anywhere in history outside of the time period of the record. Such is the case with the use of the word "precious" to describe a metal. The only other place in literature it is found is in the Bible about 600 B.C., the same time period it is used in "The Book of Mormon", and the word valley being referred to as "steady and immovable". Lehi, a prophet in the book, was referring, of course, to the sand deserts where sand dunes move but valleys stay the same. There is no way Joseph could have known these things. He had never even seen a sand dune.

13. You must announce that your "smooth narrative" is not fiction but true, yes, even that it is an ancient sacred record of history.

14. In fact, it must fulfill the Bible prophecies; even in the exact manner in which it shall come forth, to whom given, its purpose, and accomplishments, respectively--Psalms 85:10-11; Isa. 29:2-4; Isa, 29:11-14; Ezek. 37:18-21, etc.

15. You must publish it to every nation, kindred, tongue, and people, declaring it to be the Word of God at your own expense and persecution.

16. You must include, in the record itself, this marvelous promise recorded in the book by a prophet; "And when you shall receive these things, I would exhort you that ye would ask God, the Eternal Father, in the name of Christ, if these things are not true; and if ye shall ask with a sincere heart, with real intent, having faith in Christ, He will manifest the truth of it unto you, by the power of the Holy Ghost. And by the power of the Holy Ghost ye may know the truth of all things."

17. Tens and hundreds of thousands must bear record to the world from then on that they know the record to be true, because they put the "promise" to the test and found it to be true, the truth manifested to them by the power of the Holy Ghost.

18. Thousands of great men, intellectual giants, and scholars must subscribe discipleship to the record and its movement even to the point of laying down their lives for it.

19. There can be no flaw whatsoever in the entire record. No contradictions or inconsistencies, yet you must not make any absurd or impossible statements.

20. Even so, many of the facts, ideas, and statements given us including where they lived, you must profess as true in your record and must be entirely inconsistent, even the direct opposite of the prevailing beliefs of the world where very little is claimed to be known about these civilizations and their 2,000 years of history.

21. You must invite the ablest scholars and experts to examine the test with care. You must strive diligently to see that your book gets into the hands of all those most eager to prove it a forgery and who are most competent to expose any flaw in it.

22. Thorough investigation, scientific evidence, and archaeological discoveries for the next 150 plus years must verify your claims and prove even the minutest details of your history to be perfectly true, even to the types of roads they built.

23. After years of extensive analysis, no claim or fact in the book is disproved, but all is vindicated. Many theories and ideas, as to its origin, rise and fall, leaving your claims as the only possible ones.

24. Internal and external prophecies must be confirmed and fulfilled from time to time.

25. Three honest, credible witnesses must testify to the whole world that an angel from heaven appeared to them and showed to them the ancient records from which you claim your record is translated and the voice of the Redeemer declares to these three witnesses that your record is true and that it is their responsibility to bear their testimony of this truth. And they do it. Eight other well know public men must also testify that they have seen the gold plates from which this record was supposed to have been taken. They must handle and feel the engravings on the record as did the other three witnesses.

26. Shortly after the Church is organized, 12 Apostles are called along with the first presidency of the church and all of them testify that they saw the Father and the Son. This they do for the remainder of their lives.

27. The first three, the second eight, the Quorum of Twelve Apostles, and the First Presidency must all witnesses and bear their testimony not for profit or gain, but under great personal sacrifice and severe persecution, even to their death.

28. You must find someone to finance the publishing of your book with the understanding that neither they nor you will ever receive any monetary remuneration from it. You must sell the book at cost or at less than its production value or cost.

29. You must tell the world that the written record from which you have translated was engraved on gold plates, even though at the time you make this claim, no one has ever found anywhere in the world of past history, any civilizations using gold as a method of keeping records, and not until about 100 years later were any similar engraved gold plates found thereby vindicating your claim.

30. Finally, after suffering persecution and revilement for 20 years after you finished the book, you must willingly give your own life for your testimony that the record is from God as a mob breaks into your jail and kills you and your brother.

Surely no one, without God's help, could produce a similar record complied with all of the above conditions without being an instrument in God's hands. Is there anyone else in all of history, outside of the prophets of the scriptures, who has done anything even remotely close to this? Did any Pope, any founder or leader of any church or organization, or Plato? Yet how many people follow their teachings and study their works, none of whom have ever done even the minutest portion of what Joseph Smith accomplished? Did any other founder of any church ever write such a complete history of unknown nations and then have science – archeologists, actually prove everything you have said to be absolute fact?

Did Buddha, Confucius, Mohammad, or any other founder of any sect ever walk on water, raise the dead, or resurrect himself as did Jesus? Of course not! Yet they are all revered as “great” men or “prophets” and spiritual leaders. If Joseph Smith was not a prophet of God, then he was the most intelligent man ever to live on this earth and that should be cause and reason sufficient enough to study his teachings and read “The Book of Mormon” more so than any other person who has ever lived on this earth. It would also make “The Book of Mormon” the most correct book ever written.

If the book is true, Joseph Smith was a prophet of God. If Joseph Smith was a prophet the book is true. If this book has additional teachings of Jesus Christ and He actually did restore the true church, would you not want to know? Shouldn't you investigate the Book and the man and pray about them?

APPENDIX 2

ANOTHER CHALLENGE OF "THE BOOK OF MORMON"

Criteria/Requirements to be a prophet of God

RECORDED BY RUSSELL M. NELSON --

REFLECTIONS OF SAMI HANNA

My neighbor, Sami Hanna, is a native Egyptian. He is an academic scholar who moved into our neighborhood to accept an assignment with the University as a specialist in Middle Eastern Studies and the Semitic group of languages such as Arabic, Abyssinian, Hebrew, Aramaic, and Assyrian. Being a newcomer into our community, he felt the Mormons were a bit of a curiosity. Upon learning the name Mormon came from our belief that the Book of Mormon is divine scripture, he was intrigued by the existence of the Book of Mormon. He had erroneously thought this was American literature.

When he was told that the Book of Mormon was translated from the ancient Egyptian or modified Hebrew type of hieroglyphic into the English language by the prophet Joseph Smith, he became even more engrossed, for this was his native language and he knows much about the other Semitic languages as well as the modern languages and if Joseph Smith were a fraud he would be able to tell.

So challenged was he by this book that he embarked on the project of translating the Book of Mormon from English to Arabic. This translation was different from other translators, for this was to be a translation back to the original language of the book. To make a long story short, the process of this translation became the process of his conversion; for he soon knew the Book of Mormon to be a divine document even though he knew virtually nothing of the organization of the Church or of its programs or the angel Moroni returning to earth to restore the true gospel as foretold would happen.

His conversion came purely from the linguistics of the book which he found could not have been composed by an American, no matter how gifted. Some of these observations I think will be of interest to you, as they were to me, for they clarify some of the unique aspects of the book.

1. Jarom 2: "It must needs be..." This expression, odd and awkward in English is excellent Arabic grammar. Elsewhere in the book the use of the compound verbs "did eat", "did go", "did smile" again awkward and rarely used in English, are classical and correct grammar in the Semitic languages.
2. Omni 18: "Zarahemla gave a genealogy of his fathers, according to his memory." Brother Hanna indicates that this is a typical custom of his Semitic forbearers to recite their genealogy from memory.
3. Words of Mormon 17: Reference is made here as in other parts of the Book of Mormon, to the "stiffneckedness" of his people. Brother Hanna perceives that this word would be a very unusual word for an American youth, Joseph Smith, to use. An American would likely prefer an adjective such as stubborn or inflexible. But the custom in the Arabic language is to use just such a descriptive adjective. Stiffnecked is an adjective they use in describing an obstinate person.
4. Mosiah 11:8 "King Noah built many elegant and spacious buildings and ornamented them with fine work and precious things, including ziff." Have you ever wondered about the meaning of the word "ziff" referred to in this scripture? This word, although in the Book of Mormon, is not contained in dictionaries of the English language. Yet it translates freely back into the Arabic language, for ziff is a special kind of curved sword somewhat like a scimitar which is carried in a sheath and often used for

ornamentation as well as for more practical purposes. The discovery of the word "ziff" in the Book of Mormon really excited my neighbor, Brother Hanna.

5. Alma 63:11 Reference is made to Helaman, son of Helaman. Why did not Joseph Smith interpret this as Helaman, Jr., which would have been more logical for him, bearing the same name as his father, Joseph, and being named Joseph Smith, Jr.? In Arabic, Brother Hanna explains, there is no word "junior" to cover this circumstance. Their custom is to use the terminology Joseph, son of Joseph; Helaman, son of Helaman, etc.

6. Helaman 1:3 Here reference is made to the contending for the judgment seat. Brother Hanna observes that the use of the term "judgment seat" would be quite strange to an American who might have used a more familiar noun such as governor, president, or ruler. Yet, in Arabic custom, the place of power rests in the judgment seat and whoever occupies that seat, is the authority and power. The authority goes with the seat and not with the office or the person. So, this, in the Semitic languages, connotes the meaning exactly.

7. Helaman 3:14 In this verse, there are a total of eighteen "ands." Reviewers of the Book of Mormon have, on occasion, been critical of the grammar in such a passage where the use of the word "and" seems so repetitious. Yet Brother Hanna explains that each of the "ands" in this verse is absolutely essential to the meaning, when this verse is expressed in Arabic, for the omission of any "and" would nullify the meaning of the words.

8. Helaman 3: 18-19 Have you wondered why the Book of Mormon cites a numbering system such as this? Do we say "forty and six, forty and seven, forty and eight?" No! Joseph Smith's natural interpretation would more appropriately have been forty-six, forty-seven, forty-eight without the "ands." Brother Hanna excitedly observes that the use of "and" in "forty and six" is precisely correct Arabic. Remember they number, as well as read, from right to left and recite their numbers with the "and" to separate the columns. Well, I have just cited a few of these examples. There are many more! As Latter-day Saint, we are aware of the Semitic origin of the Book of Mormon as the book itself testifies. The fact that an Arabic scholar, such as this, sees a beautiful internal consistency in the Prophet Joseph Smith's translation of the book is of great interest, if not complete recognition of its divinity. The Prophet Joseph did not merely render an interpretation, but a word for word translation from the Egyptian type of hieroglyphic into the English language. Brother Hanna said the Book of Mormon simply flowed back into the Arabic language which could only have been done if it was in actuality originally derived from that ancient language as it in fact purports to be.

> > Russell M. Nelson

APPENDIX 3

SCRIPTURES THAT SUSTAIN
THE BOOK OF MORMON APPROACH
IN TEACHING THE GOSPEL

From The Book of Mormon

Title page Note especially the first paragraph – why written, how preserved, how it was brought forth.

1 Nephi 6: 3-6
 1 Nephi 9: 3-6
 1 Nephi 13:39-40
 1 Nephi 19:1-6
 2 Nephi 3:7-16
 2 Nephi 5:28-34
 2 Nephi 33:10-15
 Enos 13-16
 The Words of Mormon 1-11
 Alma 37:8-12
 Mormon 3:17-21
 Mormon 5:8-15
 Mormon 7:8-10
 Mormon 8:25-32
 Mormon 9:31-37
 Ether 12:22-29
 Moroni 10:2-7

From The Doctrine and Covenants

D&C 3:16-20
 D&C 5:2-26
 D&C 6:21-23
 D&C 10:40-64
 D&C 17:6
 D&C 19:26-37
 D&C 20:1-11
 D&C 84:54-62

From The Pearl of Great Price

Joseph Smith 2:10-13

INDEX

Adam & Eve – sin or transgression	61
Adam God discourse (theory)	36-37
All truth – is in the Bible (not)	1-2, 7-8, 10, 12, 14, 20, 22, 32, 34, 55
Anointing the sick	25
Apostasy	15, 39, 52, 54-55
Apostolic succession	27, 51, 54-55
Apostles	
Are Elders	21, 25
Are married	37
Are Prophets	51
Death	20-27, 52-54
Duties of	22, 27
Foundation of the church	20-21, 25-26, 66
How many	1, 21, 52
Need for living Apostles	7, 16, 26-28, 40, 55, 66
Witnesses of the resurrection	27
Atonement – see Christ	
Athenasian Creed	6, 28
Authority	
After Christ is gone	21
Apostles & Prophets have equal	22
Joseph Smith's	19
Passed on	52, 54-55, 66
Required laying on of hands	66, 68
Bad fruit	15-16
Baptism	
By Immersion	29, 49
False	29, 66
For the dead	11, 64
For the living	64
Infant	33, 47-48
Needed	47-48
Remission of sin	47-48, 55
Bind on earth & heaven	19, 30
Bishops	21, 24-25, 49, 52, 54
Blood atonement	32, 56
Blossom as a rose, Lebanon	60
Book, delivered to learned & unlearned	60
Book of Mormon	
Contains what?	15, 33, 35, 41, 47
How it came to be	5, 34-35, 43, 50, 60
Book of Revelation	
Last book	60
Needful	2, 14, 27, 60
Bread & Wine	22-23, 33, 47, 49

Breath of life (spirit)	4, 10, 62
Catholic Church	54-55
Christ, Jesus	
Atonement	46-48
Birth – where	7-8
Cornerstone/foundation	19
Father & Son are two & one	3, 5-7, 29, 35-36, 46
Jehovah	9, 16-17
Only begotten	65
Priesthood of	67-68
Resurrection	10, 21, 35, 40, 65
Church name (the correct name)	16-17, 66
Contradictions in the Bible	8, 33, 41
Creation – spirit & body (father of our spirit)	2-4, 9-10, 40, 46, 62, 64
Crucifixion, time of	8, 33, 40
Dancing – is OK	51
David's wives	30, 38
Day of Pentecost	26, 32, 55, 58, 65
Divorce	29-30, 37
Double Sabbath	41
Elders	
Heal sick	16-17, 25, 27, 44, 68
Married	24
Needed	21, 27
Elias/Elijah	10, 19, 33, 38, 58, 64
Eternal life	7, 26, 33, 46, 56, 61
Faith – see Unity	
Falling away – see Apostasy	
Father of our spirits	38, 62
Foreordination / predestination	61, 67
Free Agency	61, 64, 67
Fruit, by their fruits	14-17, 32
Genealogy / lineage	21-22, 36, 61
Gifts of the Spirit	17, 25, 44
God is father of all	62
God's body	3-5, 11, 65
Grace	45
Grammatical	34, 42, 55
Gulf – spirit world	64
Head of the Church-President	19-20
Heal the sick - see Elders	
Holy Ghost	
God Head	6, 36

Revelator	17, 20, 27, 34, 40, 45, 48, 58
Sin against – murder	26, 55
Witness	5-6, 65
Jehovah – see Christ	
Knowledge needed	2, 5, 7, 28, 36, 49, 56, 65
Last book – see Book of Revelation	
Lebanon – see Blossom	
Marriage	
Eternal	30, 37
Plural	38
Miracles	24, 44, 47, 66
Mystery – kingdom	2, 7, 39, 47, 63
Name of church – see Church	
Need for prophets etc.	2, 7, 15, 19-21, 26, 39, 52-55, 66
Negro	45, 62
Nicene Creed	6
Noah	22-23, 34, 56, 63
144,000	11, 13
Other sheep	57
Paid Clergy	43
Paradise – see Spirit world	
Passover	41
Priesthood	
Aerobic	51, 67
Authority of / to act	27, 64-65, 68
Genealogy of	22, 63
Melchizedek	12, 67
Need for	25
Offices	20, 26, 45
Restored	15, 68
Prophecy	14-15, 17-18, 32, 38, 39, 41, 58-59
Remission of sin – see Baptism	
Restitution of all things	15
Resurrection	2, 10, 12-13, 19, 27-29, 35, 40, 46-47, 64
Revelation	2, 7, 11, 14, 21, 26, 41, 43, 49, 55, 64-65
Rock of revelation	65
Sabbath	11-12, 16, 40
Sacrament	12, 21, 47, 49, 62
Satan's power	45
Saved by grace	45

Sealed records	11, 59
Spirit World – paradise & prison	2, 10, 64
Spiritual gifts	24, 44
Temptation	34, 67
Testator	19
Third heaven	34, 67
Tithing	45
Translating	34, 45, 64
Two records	57-58
Unity – of faith & knowledge	5-6, 20, 26-27, 39, 45, 51, 55, 66
War in Heaven	63
Wine – see Bread & wine	
Wives – also see marriage	20, 30-31, 35, 37
Word of Wisdom	15, 22-23