

There is still another class that rests in their sins from the conviction that Jesus is all-forgiving, all-pardoning, if we will but utter with our lips that we believe Him to be the Christ. The force of tradition has had such a weight upon the inhabitants of the earth that they are found resting in content and pursuing their avocations without bringing their minds earnestly to bear upon this all-important subject.

I am qualified to say—like thousands of others who have yielded obedience to this call—and to say with the fear of God before my eyes and in the name of Jesus, that I do know that this message has been sent to the children of men in this age of the world, and I pray all who have not received this testimony to do as I did—go on their knees and ask our Heavenly Father for a testimony of this all-important truth.

How any one can attach so much importance to a revelation given to a people 1800 years ago as to hold it to be all sufficient in our present circumstances of life, without continued revelation, I am at a loss to understand. Let this congregation ask themselves the question, what has this thing called reason done for the inhabitants of the earth outside of revelation? Has it not taught some that there is no God? Has it not taught others that there is no future state? Do you not know that there are many intelligent men in the world today who draw no distinction whatever between virtue and vice, only so far as the laws of the land are concerned? And reason has taught them this, they say! There are others again that make no distinction between cutting a man's throat and relieving his necessities, only as far as the law of the land is concerned. There are others, philosophically minded men, who have come to the conclusion that matter does not exist at all, in contradiction to their own senses. Others that there is no such thing as free agency, in contradiction to their own experience. Why, this reason, so-called, by analyzing all things, can prove there is nothing in existence! Now, how much that principle of reason could do for us to institute a code of morals or of religious obligations to our Heavenly Father, I leave you all to conjecture. There is one thing certain: not all the boasted enlightenment of Greece and Rome ever succeeded in creating such a code of morals for the guidance of the children of men as Jesus of Nazareth did, notwithstanding all their philosophy. There is no disputing that. Again, how many different sects are there claiming to be the Church of Christ? I do not want to say one word to the disparagement of any of these. I certainly do respect all men's opinions, as I expect them to respect mine. I entertain the most profound reverence for that man who sincerely prays to God and has a firm belief in the Savior and the atonement. Such a man will unquestionably receive all the blessings that a just, wise and merciful Father can bestow upon him. But I am trying to illustrate the necessity now, not only of a revelation having once being given to the children of men, but the necessity of the spirit of revelation being continued from time to time, that their minds may not be led away from the truth "by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive," as it has been so manifestly among the nations of Christen-

dom. In the absence of the light of revelation men have drifted into a contrariety of opinions with regard to what the original revelation of the Gospel meant. Hence we have just as much need now of apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers for the work of the ministry as they had in the days of Christ. Why? Paul gives the reason—that we may all "come in the unity of the faith, unto the measure of the fulness of the stature of Christ." That is the purpose of a ministry. But without continued revelation being left with our good old Bible alone, what has been the result? Multiplied confusion and unbelief! I cherish the Bible. I love to read it. To me it is a source of pleasure to read the good old book. But I find from observation that so many different interpretations are put upon its teachings, its doctrines and dogmas that we do need some new light from on high that we may see eye to eye. The Catholics say they have such light and authority; that it has been handed down from the days of Peter. Compare their doctrines, however, with the good old book that was given to the early Christians—the epistles of the evangelists and all the letters that were sent by Peter, Paul, James, John and other inspired ministers of the churches, and that we have received as the canon of scripture. Do these scriptures substantiate the doctrines of the Catholics? Do the Catholics teach the necessity of baptism of adults for the remission of sins? No. Do they lay on hands for the gift of the Holy Ghost? No. Do they teach the necessity of apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers? No. Do they teach that the signs shall follow the believers? No. Yet these constitute the very fundamental principles of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, and inasmuch as they are absent from that body as well as from all the Protestant denominations, I am constrained to say: "O, Father, give us some new revelation, that we may all see eye to eye."

To illustrate this idea further, take the doctrine of sacrifice. I maintain that there is no stronger proof of the divinity of the five books of Moses than this one fact—that the idea of vicarious atonement by sacrifice has been entertained by every people that have ever lived on earth since the days of the flood. Men may differ in their religious opinions; but there is not a spot of ground under the sun that you can visit wherever human beings dwell but you will find that they have preserved, in some form, a tradition of the doctrine of appeasing their offended deities, by offering some kind of a sacrifice. All agree in this, although everywhere differing in doctrine. What does this prove? It proves that there must have been a time when the true nature of sacrifice was understood among men as contained in the books of Moses, and that it has been communicated from time immemorial, from father to son, to every corner of the earth. We need not marvel that they have changed their views about it. Modern Christianity has done the same about the Gospel. They have drawn away from the original idea, which idea was that in the meridian of time Jesus Christ, the Great High Priest of our salvation, should come and offer Himself up as an atonement for the sins of the children of men, that they should be unconditionally redeemed from the effects of Adam's fall, so far as related

to their physical death, that they should be unconditionally resurrected, whether they believed in Him or not, and that they should be entitled to spiritual life and exaltation and become joint heirs with Jesus upon certain conditions. I say that this was unquestionably the original idea of sacrifice as communicated to Adam and his descendants, and as memorialized in the Levitical law. But in their rejection of the light of revelation, men so far wandered from the original truth that they instituted all manner of sacrifices, and even went so far as to offer up their own children to appease their offended deities. Not only was this the case with the Gentiles, but God's chosen people did the same. This I mention to show the tendency of the reasoning faculty of man, so-called, to draw away from the truth, and to conjure up all kinds of ridiculous thoughts and ideas, when unaided by the revelations of God. Herein is the source of a great deal of the infidelity that now reigns among the children of men, because they very wisely conclude that God could not possibly be the Author of so much confusion and false doctrine.

Dr. Nelson, in his work on infidelity, makes use of the following: "Infidels are made from two causes; the first or primary cause is the depravity of our natures; the second is our lack of knowledge." Now, at first glance it seems astounding to say that such men as Voltaire, David Hume, Thomas Paine, Colonel Ingersoll and others, were infidel from want of knowledge. Bear in mind, however, those two causes. In the first place, the primary cause—original depravity—gives us a tendency to lean towards the side of falsehood and wickedness, and to discriminate against the revelations of God in favor of things of a carnal nature. And this first cause leads to the second, because if we are inclined to falsehood, if we desire that which is unrighteous, unholy, or impure, we are not likely to seek after the things of God with a view to find them true, but rather to find flaws in them. In this connection I remember what Thomas Carlyle said about Voltaire. He said Voltaire was disqualified from being a testator on this subject because he was in no sense religious although he criticized religion so strenuously and earnestly without, he says, possessing any knowledge of Christianity beyond the most superficial. Take the case of the great infidel, David Hume, the leader of the infidels in his day in England, and well known as an essayist and historian. Dr. Johnson once said in a company of literary gentlemen: "No honest man can be an unbeliever in the Bible after giving it a proper investigation." "Excuse me, sir," said one. "I think you will make an exception in the case of David Hume." "No, sir," said the Doctor, "Mr. Hume once admitted to a clergyman in the Bishopric of Durham that he had never read even the New Testament with attention." What does Thomas Paine, the great anti-Christian, say? "I keep no Bible." Yet how bitterly he railed against it! He was one of a class that took a certain ground. He became a specialist on that ground, and in that order of reasoning, and he rehearsed the doctrines of negatists that had gone before him, and with that stock-in-trade he went before the world. Halley, the astronomer, happened to say in the presence of the great Sir Isaac Newton that he was an unbeliever in Christianity. Sir Isaac turned to him in