

The God-given Right To Not Sustain the Church President

By Richard J Holmes

Part 1

In my own life when I was 24 years old (I am 59 now in 2009) I was very intensely seeking that Summer for answers, guidance and personal revelation.

I had been back from a LDS mission to Italy for two years, and was a student at BYU, and I decided to stay in Provo for the summer. I was very active in the church, but was seeking to understand a few things that I could not resolve. I prayed and fasted a lot that summer.

I finally had a very intense response from this effort. What I was shown surprised me, because it did not seem that important. I realize now it was overwhelmingly important.

The Spirit very clearly showed me that I must not automatically trust "any" other man as a spiritual guide-- but I must continually seek guidance for myself.

The Spirit led me to this scripture that teaches this same truth:

JST Mark 9:

44 Therefore, LET EVERY MAN STAND OR FALL, BY HIMSELF, AND NOT FOR ANOTHER; OR NOT TRUSTING ANOTHER. ..

46 And if thine eye [The revelator for the church] which seeth for thee, him that is appointed to watch over thee to show thee light, become a TRANSGRESSOR and offend thee, PLUCK HIM OUT.

Just reading the above verses once will certainly not give you the intense, overwhelming understanding of what it implies. You might want to print it out in large letters on a piece of paper and hang it up, and read it every day for a year or two.

I should wait until you do that before going on, but will add more, even though I realize most LDS readers will reject what I have to say next.

One might read verse 44 and think that this "not trusting another" applies to everyone in the church, EXCEPT, of course, obviously, it cannot be applied to the President of the Church -- certainly he should always automatically be trusted.

But if you read on to verse 46, as you see, it does make it absolutely clear that it applies to even the President of the church, which it calls the "Eye" of the body.

Who can handle that? The scriptures teach that the President of the church is NOT above failing us and needing to be removed.

These verses make it absolutely clear that it is the responsibility of the members of the body (the church) to remove the President of the church if he transgresses-- and it is NOT the responsibility of the LORD to do so.

And in fact, in the Doctrine and Covenants there is a specific revelation on how to hold a special trial over the President of the church (or one of his counselors) to remove him if necessary. This is found at D&C 107:81-84.

But I realize that there are no end to statements that are circulated in the church to the effect that, above all else, we must remember that the President of the church is above failing us.

For instance, there is a quote where an old man remembers that he heard the Prophet Joseph say, "if you follow the records of the church, and the majority of the twelve, you will never be led astray."

But notice, the above statement is actually just hearsay-- somebody said that somebody said something. Can such statements really be used to overrule the Law of the Gospel as contained in the Doctrine and Covenants?

Such second hand quotes, or even statements by Presidents of the church, certainly should not be used to overrule the scriptural law that clearly allows legitimate controversies over the President of the church-- teaching that such controversies will be settled by a special trial.

Some of us have suffered for trying to claim our right, in good faith, to legitimately not sustain the President of the church, and to ask for a trial to settle intense controversies over him, but the suffering has been worth it-- because the Spirit has supported us.

Can you not see that those who seek to deny members of the church the right of legitimate dissent against the head of the church are not living by correct celestial principles? The church is not a democracy, but neither is it to be a dictatorship.

Part 2

Here is an issue I sincerely believe should be settled by a such a trial: Are you old enough to remember June of 1978 when the church began ordaining blacks to the Priesthood? Was it truly done by common consent?

"All things shall be done by common consent in the church" (D&C 26:2)

The first thing that happened then was that the church announced the new revelation to the world's news media. I believe most active members, including myself, heard it first from the media.

Then immediately, the church began ordaining blacks. Before October Conference, blacks were ordained, allowed into the Temples, and even blacks and whites were married in the Temple.

Then in October Conference, the church members were asked to "sustain" this new revelation and change. Any member who questioned the matter was scoffed at, or excommunicated.

Why did the church leaders not first bring the new revelation to the attention of their brothers in the Priesthood, and allow them to pray about such a significant change?

And then have common consent voting over the matter before the change was made?

There was no written D&C type revelation given out, just the word of President Kimball that he had received such a significant revelation.

But this revelation contradicted the teachings of all Church Presidents before him. For instance, President Brigham Young had taught many times that the blacks were the seed of Cain, and they would not receive the Priesthood until all the other children of Adam, including the seed of Able, (which seed is not here) received it first.

President Young also repeatedly taught that any Priesthood member who married a black would lose his Priesthood immediately-- and all blessings. If blacks are given the Priesthood and all Temple blessings, then there is no longer any reason to not marry them.

If God does not really guarantee that the President of the church will never be allowed to lead us astray, then should we not be extremely careful to not automatically accept the claims and teachings of the President of the church on extremely serious issues such as this one?

Part 3

Let me present my concerns again:

How many times have you heard the following (or similar) quote?

"I have heard the Prophet speak in public on many occasions. In one meeting I heard him say: I will give you a key that will never rust-- if you will stay with the majority of the Twelve Apostles, and the records of the church, you will never be led astray." (Statement by William G. Nelson in Young Woman's Journal 17:542-543, December 1906)

It is very likely that you have heard this, or a similar statement many, many times-- in General Conference and in church publications, and over the pulpit at your local meetinghouse.

Now, how many times have you heard this quote?

81 There is not any person belonging to the church who is exempt from this council of the church. [a First Presidency court]

82 And inasmuch as a President of the High Priesthood [a member of the First Presidency itself] shall transgress, he shall be had in remembrance before the common council of the church, [a bishop's court] who shall be assisted by twelve

counselors of the High Priesthood;

83 And their decision upon his head shall be an end of controversy concerning him.

84 Thus, none shall be exempted from the justice and the laws of God, that all things may be done in order and in solemnity before him, according to truth and righteousness. (D&C 107)

It is likely that you have never heard this quote, and that you do not really know what it is saying when you just read it this first time.

Yet both these quotes deal with the same issue.

The First quote I gave gives the impression that we can always be certain that the leaders of the church will never be allowed to lead the church astray. The Second quote directly teaches that anyone, even the President of the church, can fail us, and if he does, we should hold a trial over him to settle the controversies over him.

These two quotes do not seem completely compatible to me.

The First quote comes from a man who remembered something he heard the Prophet Joseph say about 65 years earlier. It is hearsay-- a second-hand quote. Somebody said that somebody said something. It is not the Word of the LORD, and no one is put under covenant to live by it.

And what else did Joseph say that day, or at other times on the subject? Often we say things, and then go on to put conditions on what we said.

Consider these words by the Prophet Joseph that indicate the importance of not automatically trusting a Prophet:

"President Smith rose, ... said if the people departed from the Lord, they must fall-- that they were depending on the Prophet, hence were darkened in their minds from neglect of themselves." --26 May 1842, Relief Society Minutes

The Second quote comes from the D&C. It is the Word of the LORD to the Latter-day Saints. It is part of the Law of the Gospel that the Saints covenant to live by.

So which one should we trust in the most? Which one should we quote and expound in General Conference the most? Which one should we teach one another the most?

But why is the first one taught the most? Why is it taught incessantly while the other one virtually totally ignored?

I am sincerely convinced that the reason for this cannot possibly be a good reason. Placing the heads of the church above possible controversy may seem like a righteous, good idea-- but it directly contradicts the Law that the Lord gave the Latter-day Saints.

Part 4

In the past how has the LORD dealt with mankind? His persistent pattern is not to come first with power and force to make things happen-- but it is to send prophets with His word-- crying repentance. Is it not possible that He could do the same today?

If a prophet came in at the gate and was ordained correctly to the Priesthood, and was foreordained to be a prophet, why could the LORD not use him, even if the heads of the church-- in need of repentance-- cast him off?

Whether anyone realizes it or not, Bishop John Koyle's dreams are a perfect example of what I am saying. His gift of dreams cried repentance to the heads of the church-- and I have faith he was not doing it of himself, but the Lord was doing it through him. The Lord's ways do not change.

The Lord only fully promises one thing: *"I, the Lord, am bound when ye do what I say; but when ye do not what I say, ye have no promise."* D&C 82:10

Part 5

The D&C is full of instructions the church does not live!

Most of these instructions, such as United Order instructions are not illegal. Others, such as doing Missionary work without purse or script are not necessarily illegal-- if done right.

Having the congregation kneel with the Priest when the sacrament is blessed is obviously just inconvenient, not illegal.

The D&C 132:44 law that a woman married in the New and Everlasting covenant of marriage who loses her husband to adultery must have a faithful man in the covenant to marry, even if it means plural marriage, may be technically illegal, but in reality could quietly be lived.

And if the LORD's laws are righteous, why should we not be willing to fight to live by them? For one thing, American law can be changed.

Of course the church does not live by D&C 107:81-84 either. Intense controversies over Presidents of the church have been brought forth at times by sincere Elders-- and they never have been settled by such a trial. Usually those who present these controversies are simply cast out of the church immediately.

In fact, the failure to live by this law is the Kingpin that undermines any attempt to live in the church all the other D&C laws that are not lived. How can a controversy be dealt with if it is automatically a sin to even have such a controversy?

I am convinced that this following scripture teaches a principle of the Gospel that the members of the church must learn:

JST Mark 9 (<http://scriptures.lds.org/jst/mrk94048>)

44 Therefore, let every man stand or fall, by himself, and not for another; or not trusting another. ...

46 And if thine eye [The revelator for the church] which seeth for thee, him that is appointed to watch over thee to show thee light, become a transgressor and offend thee, pluck him out.

It is clearly the member's responsibility to remove the "eye of the body" when he transgresses by a D&C 107:81-84 type trial-- and we cannot expect the Lord to overrule the member's responsibility and do it Himself.

This doctrine that every man is to stand or fall by himself, and not automatically trust even the President of the church is a sacred doctrine,

based on the principles of free agency.

How can a man become like Christ and God if he cannot stand totally alone when necessary?

I predict that the church will eventually accept this sacred principle, and will learn to live by ALL the laws given in the D&C.

Part 6

About this:

"It is contrary to the economy of God for any member of the church, or anyone, to receive instruction for those in authority, higher than themselves; therefore you will see the impropriety of giving heed to them; but if any person have a vision or a visitation from a heavenly messenger, it must be for his own benefit and instruction; for the fundamental principles, government, and doctrine of the church are vested in the keys of the kingdom." (TPJS, 21)

This was given in a sermon, and is not part of the canon of revelations-- so this statement may be correct, but it cannot be used to overrule the revelations that are to be the law of the church.

At the time the Prophet Joseph said this the head of the church (himself) was a man endowed with the gift of God to receive and write the Word of the Lord. The church was basically "in order" at the head.

So, this statement certainly was a correct principle, and it was important to teach it.

The conviction that the church could never get out of order at the head contradicts the revelations. So again, since this statement is not canonized revelation, one cannot use it to overrule the commandments and revelations given to govern the church.

The Word of the Lord to the Latter-day Saints gives clear instructions for holding a trial over the President of the church (or one of his councilors) to end a controversy over him.

The idea that President Wilford Woodruff taught that, *"If a Prophet truly did something against the*

will of the Lord, and did not repent, they would be [immediately] removed,..." is also not canonized revelation.

And yet this whole conviction of guaranteed faithful leaders ultimately lies upon this "immediately" idea. Because if the Lord does not "immediately" remove the leader, then there is the clear possibility that many serious errors could creep into the church before the Lord gets around to removing him.

If in fact it is the responsibility of the members of the church to remove even the President of the church if he transgresses, and is not the responsibility of the LORD, then this tradition that we must "automatically" trust and sustain the current head of the church collapses.

D&C 107:81-84 and JST Mark 9:40-48 clearly place the responsibility of having a trial over the President of the church on the members of the church, and not on the LORD:

<http://scriptures.lds.org/dc/107> verses 80-84
<http://scriptures.lds.org/jst/mrk94048>

There have been numerous extremely serious "controversies" over the heads of the church during this dispensation-- and yet not once have these controversies been settled by a trial according to the instructions given to the church. (Unless we count the trial President Young held over Sidney Rigdon after Joseph died.)

The church was given a "government by law" and not a "government by men", and that law is the D&C instructions.

"Thou shalt take the things which thou hast received (the D&C revelations), which have been given unto thee in my scriptures for a law, to be My law to govern My church," (D&C 42:59)

And yet the D&C is full of instructions the church does not live-- including the law I am mentioning to settle controversies over the President of the church.

Part 7

So what could be the problem? The Book of Mormon very clearly warned against Gentile pollutions among the people in our times. And you would agree I am sure that the nation is full of such pollutions.

But in a world in which almost all men as soon as they get a little authority immediately exercise unrighteous dominion, am I saying that the Lord might allow such a thing to happen at the head of His church? Of course He would. One is honestly naive and foolish to think otherwise.

For one thing, the fifteen church Apostles (who are the only permanent, full time church leaders besides paid employees) control billions of dollars, and do not show the books to regular members; and thus account only to themselves and to the IRS. Does not wealth often corrupt?

Is it not conceivable that the spirituality of men such as Joseph Smith who produced the amazing Book of Mormon, and other scriptures with almost no formal education, and with no wealth, and relatively few followers, might be different than that of men with PhDs from non-spiritual American universities, controlling a multi-billion dollar church corporation, who never bring forth written oracles or translated books, and condemn anyone who questions their claim to prophetic gifts?

But would the Lord allow Gentile church leaders to cast out members who tried to bring a trial against them because of sincere concerns? Of course He would.

This is the testing ground where the Lord has allowed men to do unjust things over and over and over -- and over again.

Will He eventually clean it up? Yes, He will. As President Wilford Woodruff said, *"and so He will [remove] any other man who attempts to lead the children of men astray from the oracles of God and from their duty."*

Certainly "any other man" would include men like Hitler. But did the Lord remove Hitler immediately? No. But He did eventually, and He will eventually remove every unjust leader who

resists Him and His laws. This earth is the Lord's, and in time all those who resist the Lord will be removed from any power. But not immediately.

He gave us His law for removing the President of the church when he transgresses, so He will give us time to live by His law, and will not do it Himself. He wants to see if we really have a heart to live by His laws.

Many agree that this is the Lord's church, and that He will be responsible for it. But He said that He would try it in all things (D&C 136:31) and that certainly could include letting the head of the church get out of order and in need of being removed according to the revelations.

Part 8

A church member may feel very convinced that the Presidents of the church have all acted correctly, but he must decide if he believes the revelation on how to end controversies over a head of the church.

If the member uses a bunch of non-scriptural statements and quotes to support denying anyone the legitimate right to not sustain the President of the church and to seek a trial to end a controversies over him, I am convinced that he is on the side of coercion and not on the Lord's side.

We need to know: Should a member of the Priesthood be automatically cast out of the church for not sustaining President Monson and for not rejecting evidences, until after the trial, that he should be removed?

The Second Book of Commandments is simply evidence that such a trial should be held-- it strictly forbids anyone setting up another church, and declares the church to be the Lord's only church. It clearly prophesies that the Lord will set it in order at the head at some point. (2BC 24)

The 2BC is in full harmony with the D&C and its teachings by my understanding. The man who received it "came in at the gate" (baptism) and was ordained to the Melchizedek Priesthood around 1950.

He was completely faithful to the church for

years, and his first revelation in 1961 came unexpectedly. He immediately sent it to the First Presidency.

That's right-- he immediately, under the direction of the Spirit, sent his first revelation to the First Presidency.

His revelations were to cry repentance first and only to leaders of the church, but they rejected him-- and after 11 years finally cast him out of the church without even talking to him.

And he remained alone as a prophet for about 10 years after that. Then a few of us were called by revelation to be with him in a School of the Prophets. We do not seek members.

Part 9

Could the Lord give a revelation to someone besides the head of the church? Elder Wilford Woodruff received one. His 1880 Sunset, Arizona revelation was given to him when President Taylor was the head of the church.

This revelation is recorded twice in Wilford Woodruff's famous pioneer Journal, and is certain to be authentic.

Notice what the Lord says in that revelation, speaking to the Apostles:

70 You, each of you, have power to unlock the veil of eternity, and hold converse with God the Father, and His Son Jesus Christ, and to have the ministration of angels.

71 It is your right, privilege, and duty to inquire of the Lord as to His mind and will concerning yourselves, and the inhabitants of Zion and their interests.

72 And whenever any one of you receives the Word of the Lord, let it be written, and presented in your councils.

73 And whatever by a united consent you deem wisdom to be presented unto the people, let it be presented by the President, My servant John Taylor, as the word of the Lord.

74 In this way you will uphold him, and strengthen his hands, as all the burden should not rest upon one man. (First Book of Commandments 179:70-74)

And even though this revelation is speaking to the Apostles, there is no reason to disbelieve that the Lord can give revelation to any member of the Melchizedek Priesthood, as long as they present it to the head.

The Lord's ways are not our ways, and we cannot judge Him. He has the right to give revelation to whosoever He chooses.

Sure, He will not do anything contrary to His laws, but WE DO NOT KNOW ALL HIS LAWS YET, so we must be very, very careful not to deny the Spirit of revelation because of our traditions and incomplete knowledge of His truths.

He has tried to give us all of His laws, but since we do not live by what He has given us already, many things have not been given yet.

But He has said such revelation should be sent first to the head. And it was. The problem was that the head did not like what the revelation said, because it called them to repentance.

For instance, it clearly revealed that the church could not deny a widow, or a woman whose husband committed adultery-- married in the New and Everlasting covenant-- the right to remarry a faithful man in that covenant, even if it meant plural marriage.

The church leaders simply had to keep petitioning the government for the right to live by this particular D&C law (D&C 132:44)

The Lord promised if they did stand up for His law, He would support them. Apparently, they did not want to do that.

And they teach the church incessantly that, above all else, it is certain that they, the church leaders, will never be allowed to lead the church astray or they would be immediately removed.

Part 10

Can you show me just from the "revelations" that my position is not correct? Does a member not have the "right" to not sustain the President of the church and to not reject evidences that he is in serious error?

And does a member not have the "right" to seek a trial to end intense, deadly serious controversies over a President of the church?

Remember, the Saints do not covenant in the Temple to live by every hearsay and every church discourse by church Presidents.

If they did, they would be under covenant to accept Adam-God doctrine, which President Young clearly taught repeatedly in General Conference. (And they would also at the same time be under covenant to reject it, since later Presidents rejected it.)

Clearly no revelation proves that the Lord will not try the Saints with a situation where the President of church should be tried and removed. He has said He will try the Saints in all things.

"My people must be tried in all things, that they may be prepared to receive the glory that I have for them, even the glory of Zion; and he that will not bear chastisement is not worthy of my kingdom." (D&C 136:31)

Is it not priestcraft, and a form of idolatry, in the church that establishes the false idea that the President of the church is above possible controversy? That anyone who chooses to not sustain the President of the church, and to not reject evidences that the President is in error, should automatically be excommunicated?

It is very unfortunate that there was not a D&C 107:81-84 trial over President Brigham Young when he was teaching Adam-God doctrine, and Elder Orson Pratt clearly did not accept it.

Such a trial, of course, cannot determine if a revelation is true or false, but it can determine if a man claiming revelation is being truthful. A bishop has that discernment. (D&C 46:27)

We know some in the church will ridicule this idea. But this is the Lord's law, and somehow we believe it is best to act in good faith and "try" to live by His laws.

This revelation says such a trial will "end the controversy." Sounds good to us. We do not

have to judge the matter, the trial will.

But, apparently those who want to keep the President of the church above possible controversy want the right to judge the church leaders automatically righteous against any evidence.

And they want the right to speak evil of anyone who does not accept their right to make such judgments.

Part 11

The church was to be a theocracy-- a government by the Lord's Laws given in the D&C (D&C 42:59) and not a government by men. But now you understand, do you not agree that D&C 107:81-84 should be a critical part of that law?

Another part of that law that is not lived today is D&C 20:76 (also Moroni 4:2) which teaches that when the sacrament is blessed the congregation is to kneel with the Priest. Could we not live this?

The D&C is full of such instructions which the church does not live-- and the idolatrous doctrine of an infallible First Presidency is the kingpin teaching in keeping the members from living these laws.

The church today clearly has a government by men-- the men in the flesh with blood in their veins are clearly to be trusted and obeyed above the scriptures. They are the law to the church.

In my faith, if the leaders of the church were in harmony with the LORD, then such men would allow other members to not sustain them, and to seek for a trial to end controversies over them. If in fact the church leaders will not allow this, is it not a proof that they want to be above the law-- a coercive position?

The Lord's will is that we become like our Father in Heaven. That means, we must learn to not automatically trust any other man. And that includes the President of the church.

He can fall, or there would not be revelation on how to hold a trial over him to possibly remove him. I again recommend that you read and re-read D&C 107:81-84 and JST Mark 9:40-48. I

recommend that you memorize these scriptures. I have a testimony of the church, the Doctrine and Covenants laws, and also of the Second Book of Commandments.

Part 12

If it was automatically a sin to not sustain the President of the church, and to ask for a trial to settle a controversy over him, then in honesty there would be no need to ask members to sustain him.

Does it make sense to ask: "All in favor of sustaining the President of the church, raise your right hand; and now all in favor of committing a sin worthy of excommunication and spiritual death, you can now raise your hand to not sustain him"?

This version of sustaining would be a mockery of common consent, and not unlike the compulsive spirit of communism which had "free" elections where one could vote for the communist leadership or suffer the consequences.

It is very normal in a "bully system" for the leaders to require acts of proving one's allegiance to those in power. Is this all "common consent" is in the Lord's church? Or is it part of the Lord's "balance of power" he set up in His church-- giving members the right and responsibility to detect and overrule possible errors by their leaders?

Does the church ask the members to "sustain or not sustain" the church's teachings to not commit adultery or other great sins? The reason there are no sustaining votes over these matters is that they are not matters of common consent.

Would it make sense for a leader to stand up and say, "All in favor of now allowing Adultery to be committed in the church, raise your right hand"?

Adultery is not an issue of common consent, and it would be a mockery to have a sustaining vote over whether the church should allow it.

But having a sustaining vote over the President of the church IS a matter of common consent, and the right to not sustain him cannot automatically be a sin.

With the "de facto" church rule that it is a sin to not sustain the Prophet of the church, valid controversies over him are not allowed to even be heard, let alone to be settled by a trial.

I am sure a member would not be excommunicated just for not sustaining the President of the church if he just kept quiet-- but if they caught the member telling anyone about evidences that the President of the church needs to be tried, then the member would be certainly excommunicated.

Thus church members are denied the right of real legitimate dissent against the President of the church. The President of the church-- a man in the flesh, with blood in his veins, being tried in all things like the rest of us-- has been placed above all laws of the church.

D&C 107:22-37 explains that five separate quorums were to be equal in power. But this balance of power does not exist at this time. Also the once powerful office of church Patriarch (D&C 124:91-96) has been removed.

But I am convinced that at some future point the church will learn its lesson, and live by the law given to it, and these balances of power will be restored or set up.

Part 13

By now, you must realize that I must have been excommunicated from the church. I was brought before the Page, Arizona High Council court in December 1984.

The Stake President had privately and falsely accused me of immorality (I never fully understood his accusations) but in the trial, the only charge was apostasy.

Yet I did not believe or accept any other church, and in no way did I believe or teach anything which would encourage anyone to leave the church.

To me this was not between me and the church, but between me and men in the flesh in the church. I believed and still deeply believe in the church.

In the trial the Stake President hardly let me say a thing, interrupting me when he disagreed. When I tried to bring up President Young's Adam-God teachings as an example of First Presidency errors, the Stake President ridiculed the idea-- saying the Adam-God controversy was all misquotes and misinformation-- President Young never taught anything different about Adam and God than what the church teaches today.

I was told that six of the High Councilors were to defend me (as per D&C 102:15-17) When he finally had a chance to say something, one of the men called to defend me jumped up and said something like: "If you do not sustain the President of the church, obviously you should be excommunicated." Three months after my excommunication at this trial, this same man was excommunicated himself for adultery.

After the quick trial, I asked how to appeal the decision. Someone in the Stake explained I was to write a letter to the First Presidency, and then give it to the Stake President to send in. I did so, but the Stake President refused to send it in.

However, the next Stake President, over a year later, did agree to send it in. I later received a one line reply from President Benson's office that my appeal was denied. I doubt President Benson actually saw my appeal.

Was this excommunication court guided by the spirit of truth and love? I am certain it was not. It was a mockery of justice. It was clearly the politics of men defending the authority of men in power. It was not the politics of humbly and carefully living by the precepts of the Holy Ghost found in the scriptures.

I was a seventh generation member of the church. My self and extended family back for generations have supported the church with much effort, time and money. One would think someone in the church would care enough to come and talk things through with me, and try to understand and resolve the matter. Yet no one talked to me but the Stake President, who always did most of the talking.

The only charge against me was apostasy, and yet I did not really claim to be right-- just to have the right to not reject evidences against the church President. My excommunication clearly was the politics of men, not the living of a Gospel of love.

Part 14

So if what I am saying is basically correct, one of the main obstacles to the coming forth of Zion at this time is the failure of the present Gentile church to allow members to legitimately not sustain the President of the church and to seek to settle sincere controversies over him by a trial as explained in D&C 107:81-84.

If members are supported in this God-given right of honest dissent over the leadership, then members will also have the right to not reject "evidences" against the leadership of the church.

How can one truly have the right of dissent if they are automatically cast out of the church if they refuse to reject the evidences they have for their concern?

One of the evidences I still accept against the present leadership is the *Second Book of Commandments* revelations.

God gave this gift to receive oracles to an Elder because the current Apostles had lost the gift of revelation by refusing to live by what the Lord instructed them.

Remember, there is no evidence that this gift to receive and write the "Word of the Lord" has existed among the church leaders since the 1889 revelation found in Wilford Woodruff's pioneer journal-- 120 years ago.

The Second Book of Commandments does not set up another church, but it does bring forth further knowledge for the establishment of Zion and its laws. It establishes a work with many parallels to the work of the prophet John the Baptist.

And as the Lord turned the keys against ancient Judah through John, the Lord has now turned the keys against the Gentiles through this prophet.

The time for the promised latter day identifying and gathering of all the tribes of Israel, and finally the establishment of political Israel, or Zion, is now at hand!

For more information:

United Order Publications
PO Box 396
Salem, UT 84653

<http://www.2bc.info>

<http://groups.yahoo.com/group/SecondBookOfCommandments/>