

EVANS VS. MCKENZIE



www.LatterDayTruth.org

BISHOP R. C. EVANS

CONTROVERSY

Between

BISHOP R. C. EVANS,
Of the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ
of Latter Day Saints,
Toronto, Ont.

and

THE REVEREND J. A. MCKENZIE,
Of the Presbyterian Church,
Toronto, Ont.

The occasion for this controversy is:

Rev. Mr. McKenzie, delivered a lecture in his church, Toronto, on the evening of February 11th, 1917, in which he reflected upon Bishop Evans, giving the impression that the Bishop was a Bishop of the Utah Mormon Church. Bishop Evans writes Rev. McKenzie, requesting a retraction and apology. Receives an answer. He then sends a rejoinder. This is returned unanswered, and the Bishop un.masks the Reverend McKenzie and his creed.

(From Bishop R. C. Evans to the Rev. J. A. McKenzie.)

51 Ozark Crescent,
Toronto, Ont.,
February 15, 1917.

Rev. J. A. McKenzie,
44 Woodycrest Ave.,
Toronto, Ontario.

Dear Sir:

I am credibly informed that on Sunday evening last, Feb. 11th, you took upon yourself the responsibility of informing the people of your church just what I believed and taught to those who come to hear me. I would have little to say regarding this venture, had you confined yourself to the truth, but having ignorantly or maliciously misrepresented me in most every statement you made regarding my work, I take this opportunity to request you to make proper apology to me, and also to go before your congregation and retract those statements. If you refuse to comply with this request, then I shall take such action as I deem proper to vindicate my honor and reputation.

With regard to the position you took concerning Utah Mormonism, I have nothing to say. Those people can rest under the charges you are pleased to make against them, or call upon you to retract.

My complaint consists mainly in this:

You are reported to have stated that Latter Day Saintism is Mohammedanism suited to Western ideas. You made claim that the Latter Day Saint church believes in, and practises Polygamy, that they teach that Adam is our God, that every Latter Day Saint is a God, or will be, and that I baptize for the dead, and that R. C. Evans is a Priest of the Mormon hierarchy, and that the people can find Bishop R. C. Evans down in Shea's theatre, and in the Soho Street church preaching these self same doctrines.

You are also reported to have said that the reason that Bishop Evans only had one wife, was; not that he did not believe in, and teach polygamy, but that being a Bishop he was not permitted to have more than one wife, because Paul had written, "A Bishop must be the husband of one wife." In making this foolish statement you not only reflected upon my honor, but you make a miserable display of your ignorance, in that it is a well known fact that the Bishops of the Utah Mormon church have many wives. Their position on the statement of Paul, is; that the Bishops must have one wife, but he is not restricted to **only one, but must be the Husband of one.** In your effort to misrepresent me, you are to be pitied.

Now Sir, I cannot think that you are ignorant of the facts shown in the history of the church that I have the honor to be a credentialed representative of; namely, that **The Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints**, is an incorporated body, that they have no connection with the church known as the Brighamite Mormon church in Utah.

I have reason to believe that you know that the Reorganized church has always denounced the Utah church, because of its having taught polygamy, Adam God, and other corrupt doctrines. You are no stranger to our church, for you have conversed with our people. Sorry I am to make this discovery, for it does not speak well for you in the light of your statements made last Sunday. Honest Presbyterians will be slow to excuse your conduct, but I would not make your lot any harder than it is now, but my honor demands that you apologize and retract your statements.

The courts of the United States, and Canada, have drawn plainly the line of demarkation between the Reorganized church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, and that of the Apostate faction known as Utah Mormonism. The great Encyclopaedias have also shown that the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints

have no affiliation with the Utah Church. The Senate of the United States has heard some of the most eloquent Senators confirm our position on this matter, in fact, the civilized world know that the Reorganized church is a body of worshippers, who are patriotic, peaceable, and law abiding citizens, and were it not for some would-be Parsons who think their craft is in danger, there would be no one try to misrepresent the people known as the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Saints.

I have been an Ordained minister of the gospel since the year 1882, having preached in many parts of Canada, the United States, England, Wales, and Scotland. My boyhood and early manhood was passed in London, Ontario. I have preached in Toronto for many years, speaking to many thousands of people, not only in the several Latter Day Saint Churches in the City, but to the vast throngs who have listened to me for the last thirteen years in the different theatres of Toronto, and I defy you to prove that at any time, or any place, I have ever preached a sermon or spoke one word in favor of polygamy or Adam God, or that I have every baptized any one for the dead. Prove me guilty of any of these charges you have uttered against me, or sink disgraced before a discerning public. I am ready to meet you. All I ask is fair play and half the time in your church or mine or in any hall in the City.

You have chosen to compare Latter Day Saintism with Presbyterianism. Now Sir, I challenge you to discuss the real differences between the Doctrine and church organization of the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, and the Presbyterian Church. If your are desirous of measuring theological swords with me, propositions for an honorable discussion can be arranged, but not till you have complied with the request to apologize for the attack you have made upon my honor and reputation.

I despise the methods you have chosen to protect your people against what you are pleased to call the "Mormon

propaganda" and I am led to believe that many Presbyterians, some of whom may be found in your own congregation, do not agree with your disreputable methods.

If you do not reply to this letter by Saturday, Feb. 24th, I shall conclude that you refuse to repent of your folly and shall act upon my rights.

Yours in bonds,
R. C. EVANS.

(From the Rev. J. A. McKenzie to Bishop R. C. Evans.)

44 Woodycrest Ave.,
Toronto, Ont.,

February 20, 1917.

Bishop R. C. Evans,
Toronto.

Dear Sir:

In reply to yours of the 15th, re my sermon on "Mormonism or The Church of the Latter Day Saints," I may say, I believe you to be a High Priest and Bishop of the Mormon or Reorganized Church of the Latter Day Saints (Unchangeability of God pp 30-31). I believe you are a priest of the Church of which Joseph Smith was the prophet and founder. Enc. Brit. XVI: 828. You allude in your pamphlet (The unchangeability of God p. 30) to the Ency. Brit. you say, "no parson, priest or layman should question this august authority in such a matter." In Enc. XVI p.p. 826, 827 we read, "Some years previously (this was in 1841) he, Joseph, had prevailed on several women to cohabit with him, and in order to pacify his lawful wife and silence the objections of the saints, he had a revelation on the 12th of July, 1843, expressly establishing and approving polygamy." Also Doctrine and Covenants, Sec. 132, pp 3, 4, 6, 61, 62.

As a priest of that Church you repudiate the doctrine of the Baptism for the Dead. Let me again refer you to that august authority, the Ency. Brit. Vol. XXVI; p 828. In "A Word of Wisdom" (1833) Joseph Smith laid down these regulations. "The deceased, also, can be baptized by proxy, and in this way Washington, Franklin, and others have been vicariously baptized into the Church." See also Journal of Discourses Vol. XVI pp 7, 8. Joseph Smith, the speaker.

You say you do not believe in the Adam-God theory, then, I am pleased to hear it, but in The Pearl of Great Price, p 60, we read—"And also with Michael, or Adam, the Father of all, the Prince of all, the Ancient of days."

My reference to a Bishop having one wife, was a quotation from Bishop Spaulding, an honored Bishop of the Episcopal Church, Utah, U.S., an unimpeachable authority. "Since the Bishop must be the husband of one wife others may have more than one." He did not refer to you.

In my discourse on the evening of the 11th inst., I said, "I did not know you, I never heard you," nor would I be foolish enough to say what you believed, the priests of a church that has no creed. (The unchangeability of God p 22) believes in a continuous revelation (9th art) and lays down precepts ranging from chicken feed (Bk of Wisdom) to Celestial Marriage (Doct. Covts. Sec. 132 p. 3, 4, 6,) have scope enough to say anything and it would be madness to say what they all believe. Again I say I do not know what you believe, I never saw you, I never heard you.

Now, Sir, I am credibly informed that you purpose reading my reply in your service next Sunday evening, Feb. 25th. If you do not read it, and as I have here set it forth, I shall have it published together with your former correspondence. It is good to let a "Discerning public" know the Mormon propaganda.

Yours sincerely,

J. A. McKENZIE.



(From Bishop R. C. Evans to the Rev. J. A. McKenzie.)

51 Ozark Crescent,
Toronto, Ontario,
February 23rd, 1917.

Rev. J. A. McKenzie,
44 Woodycrest Ave.,
Toronto, Ontario.

Dear Sir:

Your letter of Feb. 20th was received by me this hour. You call it a reply to my letter of Feb. 15th, the truth is, it is not a reply, but a clumsy effort to evade giving a straight forward answer.

My complaint was that you claimed in the sermon referred to, that I was a High Priest and Bishop of the Mormon hierarchy, and that I taught the doctrines of polygamy, and Adam God; that every Latter Day Saint claims to be a God, and that I teach and practise the baptism for the dead.

You are reported to have said, "The people can find Bishop R. C. Evans down in Shea's theatre, and in the Soho Street church preaching these self same doctrines."

Now Sir, I have written you a denial to all these cruel charges, furnished the proofs (though you had them in your possession when you hurled these charges against me from your pulpit) and requested you to make retraction and apology before your people.

In place of complying with my modest request, you try to crawl, and at times, seek to insult me, and then try your hand at playing the infidel. You also seek to cover your folly by quoting from Utah Mormon works, such as "The Journal of Discourses," "The Pearl of Great Price" and other works published by the Brighamite church, thus trying to make it appear that I am a member of that church, and take those books as my guide. These methods are contemptible in the sight of honest people.

I have lectured against polygamy, The Adam God theory, and other doctrines of the Utah Church, in many parts of Canada, the United States, England, Scotland and Wales. Tens of thousands of my sermons have been printed and circulated over the world, and I hold Sir, in common honesty, to say nothing of Christianity, that you should make the apology, and retraction I have requested. Refusing to do so, you place yourself in an unenviable position before honest thinking people, and every effort made to evade the real issue between us will expose you.

I frankly admit that the Encyclopaedia Britannica has published the rumor that Joseph Smith claimed to have a revelation on polygamy, and that he practised plural marriage, but why were you not fair enough to state that the same article published a contradiction of the rumor, showing that those who knew and loved him best, affirm that there was no foundation for the rumor.

While I regard that work as good authority, good, because it is fair, in that it not only makes the statement against Joseph Smith, but publishes a refutation of it. The object of that great work is to give all the information on both sides of a subject, then leave the people to make their own decision.

Those who knew and loved Joseph Smith, that is, his wife, his three sons, and many thousands of his people urge that he was innocent of the charge. There is not a single word in all the Sermons, Lectures, Editorials, Books or other literature published during the life time of Joseph Smith wherein he, by a single word endorsed the doctrine of polygamy. Eight years after his death, long after Brigham Young had departed from the faith, organized a new church, different in faith, hope, and doctrine from the true Latter Day Saint Church, far away in Utah, Brigham Young presented a paper to his people which he claimed Joseph Smith had given on the subject of polygamy. When

challenged to produce the original paper he said Emma Smith, Joseph's wife, had burned it. Now Sir, Mrs. Smith lived to be an old woman, loved and respected by all who knew her, and she claimed all through her life to the day of her death **that she had never seen or heard of that paper; that she did not burn it; that her husband never had any wife but herself.**

You chose to reject all the public sermons, all the books and other literature given to the world by Joseph Smith, turn down the testimony of his wife, his children, and thousands of his followers, and accept the word of Brigham Young and those who with him wallow in the cesspit of polygamy. Yes, you prefer to take the word of Brigham Young and his kind. Well, I have heard that "A man is known by the company he keeps." You are welcome to the inference. I prefer to take the word of Joseph Smith, his wife, his children, and thousands of good men and women. You may continue to take the word of Brigham Young.

Perhaps there is a reason for your taking Brigham Young's side of the question; for there is an abundance of evidence that **the Presbyterian Church permits the practise of Polygamy in their church where the law of the land does not forbid it.** Dare to deny this and the evidence will be presented.

I freely admit that some books reflect upon the reputation of Joseph Smith. Has envy and slander become your guides in the search for truth? If so, read the stories that are circulated against the best men who have blessed the earth by their presence. The Prophets of the Old Testament and the Apostles of the New Testament went down to death when tried before such a tribunal. The Master of men, whose life was as pure as a Lily and as holy as a child's prayer, when the Parsons of his time had secured the ears of the people, slandered him till they placed

him on the cross. Any man who stands for the right, makes enemies. Some one has said, "A Radiant genius calls forth a storm of peevish, biting, stinging insects, just as the sunshine awakens the world of flies." Envy is fixed on merit, and like a sore eye, is offended with anything that is bright.

If the stories related in books against Joseph Smith is to be taken for truth, why not apply the same rule to John Calvin, the most prominent of Presbyterians. It is recorded that Calvin ruled with a rod of iron. He directed the civil as well as the ecclesiastical affairs of Geneva. In 1568, under his stern code a child was beheaded for striking his father. Women were chastized with rods for singing songs to the melody of the Psalms. He was responsible for the arrest and murder of Doctor Servetus; that great man was burned to the stake because he differed with Calvin on questions of religion. Is it true that my sermons, sent to the homes of your people have awakened your wrath against me? Think it over.

Your attempt to dodge behind what Spaulding may have said, is unworthy a clergyman. I am informed that you stated that I believed in and taught polygamy, but that I had but one wife, because Paul had said, "A Bishop must be the husband of one wife." Come now, did you say that?

In your efforts to be both insulting and funny, you leave the high position you profess to occupy as a minister for Christ, and descend to methods adopted by infidelity when making an attack upon the Bible. Your little spasm over the revelation on "Chicken Feed" is on a par with Ingersoll's comment on God giving Moses a recipe for making hair oil, another for making perfume, and how to make fringes and blue ribbands on their clothing, also how to make houses, how to make snuffers for the candles, and how to

turn Sand into Lice and how and when to rob birds' nests. If you survive the prostration occasioned by reading the instructions regarding "Chicken Feed" please give me your opinion on the revelation God is reported to have given to Moses (amid thunders and lightnings, fire and smoke, while the whole mountain quaked greatly) in which God commanded his people saying: "Ye shall not eat the Bat, and ye may eat the Grasshopper," Ex. 19: 16-20, Lev. 11: 19-22. Shame on you Parson.

Why should you abuse me because I believe in "Continuous Revelation." Is that unchristian, or just unpresbyterian? The invulnerable promise of Jesus Christ to his children was and is, "Ye shall receive the Holy Ghost." They are promised the "Spirit of Revelation." The "Abiding Comforter." If you do not believe this, please tell us who revealed to you, that you should be a minister of the Gospel. It is written "A man can receive nothing save it be given him from heaven." John 3:27. In the light of your statement, may I ask by what authority you preach the gospel, and who gave thee authority? If it be true, that the spirit of revelation is not given now, then all you know of Christ or the gospel is what you have read, or what some man or woman has told you; kind of a he said that somebody else said affair, in a word, merely a human institution. It seems that your only source of information and authority is earthly. How different from the real saints of the Lord. Christ said to Peter, "Blessed art thou; For flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in Heaven." Be careful Parson, your craft is in danger, and your brethren will look after you. First siding with Brigham Young; Second, with Ingersoll; and Third, denying the fruits of the Holy Spirit. Surely you are going some.

Now I cheerfully accept your honest statement when you say in your letter, "Again I say I do not know what you

believe." Good. Now all I ask in the future, is, **Do not attempt to tell the people something of which you know nothing.**

Yes, I will read to my congregation every word I write to you, and every word you write to me, and as to your threat to publish the entire correspondence, I ask you to do it. I wish you would publish it in all the city papers and in every presbyterian publication in the world, and when you leave the city I will try and see you safely on the cars, back to the woods.

I wish to remind you that I am still willing to meet you on any public platform to discuss the claims made for our respective churches. I will affirm for the Doctrine and church organization of the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, and you affirm for the Doctrines and church organization of the section of the presbyterian church to which you belong. Let the Bible be the standard of evidence.

Permit me to advise you to go before your congregation and tell them as you have me, **that you do not know what I teach.** Tell them that you made a grave mistake, in that you misrepresented me in your sermon of Feb. 11th, tell them that the church of which I am a member is well known in history; known in the leading Encyclopaedias, known before the courts of Canada, and the United States, as a separate and distinct organization from the Utah Mormon church. Tell them that you were unwise in trying to make them believe that I was a member of the Utah Mormon church, and that I taught polygamy and the Adam God theory, as also other doctrines that have placed the Utah organization under the condemnation of the civilized world. Tell them that thousands of people in the city of Toronto, even very good presbyterians have heard me denounce the very doctrines you have accused me of be-

lieving, and teaching. Tell them that you have been so exposed for your folly that you have learned to be more careful in the future. Do all this and many will pity you; refuse to do it, and every thoughtful person who know the facts will despise you.

Yours sincerely,
R. C. EVANS.

(From Bishop R. C. Evans to the Rev. J. A. McKenzie.)

51 Ozark Crescent,
Toronto, Ontario,

February 28, 1917.

Rev. J. A. McKenzie,
44 Woodycrest Ave.,
Toronto, Ont.

Dear Sir:

The registered letter I mailed to you under date of Feb. 23rd in reply to yours of Feb. 20th, was returned unopened. The public who are interested in the controversy between us will be slow to excuse you for this action, but they will have the pleasure of knowing that you commenced the trouble by making an ungentlemanly attack upon me, and that I will conclude it by exposing your position, as well as defending myself.

I have reasons to believe that you have the contents of my letter as I read it to my people at Shea's theatre, and it

was taken down in shorthand then; so having read it, you see that to make answer was to either admit my contention to be correct or to deny my allegations. For you to admit the correctness of my position would never do, you think, and to deny them would call forth a further exhibition of your folly, so you have concluded to return the letter. Is this either manly or Christian? Let the discerning public decide.

But I have concluded that you have gone too far to be permitted to escape without meeting the consequences of your unministerial conduct.

You have been pleased to misrepresent my Faith in God and the Gospel of Jesus Christ, and to some degree place your faith before the people. Now it is but right that I too have something to say of your faith. Of your church, of your God, it is true that we differ widely. I will show from the Confession of your faith what kind of a God you worship. What some of your doctrines are, and by history and convention Reports what the position of your church is on the practise of Polygamy.

Ah, my dear Parson, was it because I promised to expose your church on the question of polygamy, if you denied it, that you dared not to answer my letter, and deny the allegation? Well you will not escape in that way, for I purpose to prove that the Presbyterian Church permits the practise of Polygamy in their church where the law of the land does not forbid it. Does that prove that the Presbyterian Church would practise Polygamy in all the world if the law of the different countries would permit them? This may be a bitter dose to swallow, but you need it.

At a general assembly of the Presbyterian church held in Pittsburg Pennsylvania, in 1895, the following report was published regarding its last days proceedings. "Pittsburg, Pennsylvania, May 27th, 1895. The last day's session

of the Presbyterian General Assembly opened this morning with a crowded docket. An overture from the Synod of India, asking for a reply to the memorial upon the subject of baptizing **Polygamous Converts** was considered. The Mohammedan was admitted to the church. **He was allowed to retain both wives and house.** A memorial was presented asking the General Assembly that final power be given to the Synod of India in such cases. Doctor Thompson, of the committee on church policy, to whom it was referred, said there was no concrete case before the Assembly, and that the committee was indisposed to interfere until the judicial case involving polygamy was before it. Doctor Morrison, representing the synod trial cases and special legislation, held that the recognition of polygamous marriages by the church in India was an **absolute necessity.** "Any other rule," said he, "would rule David out of the church."

Here we have the Presbyterian church unmistakably sanctioning polygamy as an "absolute necessity." The church of Christ should hold to the same Doctrine the world over, and not denounce as unchristian in one part of the world that which they endorse as all right in another part of the world. If the Presbyterian church is the church of Christ in Canada, it is the church of Christ in India. Therefore, what is wrong here would be wrong there. Just think, the people are drained of their money so that the Presbyterian church can convert the heathen? They send back word of the great work they are accomplishing for Christ in far away India. The people are glad that the doctrine of the Saviour is being promulgated in the dark land. They pay their money gladly, and yet we are compelled to say **the saved of the Presbyterian Church in India are still living with their many wives.** This is not only disgusting, but it looks like as if some church was obtaining money under false pretence, claiming that it is for the work

of the Lord, and at the same time it is for the sustaining men and women in their polygamy, and leading men of the Presbyterian church say **"It is an absolute necessity."**

"The Calcutta Missionary conference (representing Presbyterian and some other churches) after frequent consultation and much consideration on the subject of Polygamy, as it exists in India, were unanimous in the following conclusion: "If a convert before becoming a Christian has married more wives than one, in accordance with **The Jewish and Primitive Christian Churches**, he shall be permitted to keep them all, but such a person is not eligible to any office in the church."

India, Ancient and Modern, p 601.

Here we have the members of the Presbyterian Church practising polygamy where the law of the land permits it, and worse than all, they have the impudence to tell us in the above convention, **"That the Primitive Christian Churches Practised Polygamy."** There is little wonder Sir, that you could accuse me of preaching and believing in polygamy, when your church has the audacity to say that the **Primitive Christian Church** was guilty of such vile conduct. Surely this is Presbyterian with a gush. The people will soon see why you refused to reply to my last letter. You knew that I had you on this matter, and while no man living can truthfully charge me, or the Reorganized church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints with either teaching or practising polygamy, yet you knew that the Presbyterian Church was guilty of the very dirty work you accused me of. Shame.

I have much more on this subject, but as I have several other matters to refer to, I will let the above suffice for the present, but if you desire more, **"Ask and ye shall receive."**

Now Sir, you have been good enough to teach your people that I did not believe in the **Same God That You Believe In**. You are reported to have said, "Bishop

Evans will preach to-night (Feb. 11th, when my subject was, "What is man?") that God is only a man." You also said, "I Believe that Adam is our God." I have denied this in both my letters to you, and my sermons before the world for thirty-five years prove that you cruelly misrepresent me.

Now Sir, I will read your Presbyterian definition of God. I admit that we differ widely from the Presbyterian church on the question, but I claim that you misrepresent me, and I will say here, that I am not the only one, nor is my church the only church who holds in abhorrence the of God the Presbyterian Church. Right here let me quote the great Doctor Bledsoe, "I would Prefer To Worship A Huge Gorilla Than the Presbyterian's God." The New Iron Wheel, by J. R. Graves, p 503.

But let us turn to the creed of the Presbyterian Church. There we will have your description of the God you profess to worship.

"There is but one only living and true God, who is infinite in being and perfection, a most pure spirit, invisible, without body, parts, or passions." Confession of Faith, Chap. 2, Par. 1.

Now all I wish to do in this letter on this question is to show that you believe in a god who is without body, parts, or passions. I confess that we differ there. Let us try and examine this queer God. Surely he is not the God described in the Bible. Some one has said, "This is simply a description of an infinite vacuum." Shall I say? It is just another name for nothing. I believe in a God who is a personal being, and must therefore in his identity be distinct from other beings, and if he is a personal being he must have form, and it is impossible for anything to have a form without extension and limits. Does the Bible tell us

of such a God? Or does it teach the Presbyterian theory, That God is "Without Body, Parts or Passions."

The cry is heard, "God is a Spirit." Surely, we both believe and teach that. Now read it, "God is a Spirit, John 4, 24, the indefinite article "A" in this quotation gives us to understand that God is a Spirit, among more, and of the Angels, He saith, who maketh His Angels spirits and his ministers a flame of fire," Heb. 1:7. Now this shows clearly that while "God is a spirit," yet so are Angels. He is an individual Spirit among others, having shape and form. Your confession of Faith says, "In Unity of the Godhead there be three persons, of one substance, power and eternity, God the Father, God the Son and God the Holy Ghost." Con. of Faith, Ch. 2. If it be true that God has no form, then how can he be a "Substance." You forget, as do your church, that you speak of Christ as being one of the three persons of the Godhead, and the same substance as the Father. May I ask you to enquire of your Sunday School children, they will likely inform you that Jesus was born and lived and Had a body, had parts, had passions, that He died, and rose again, and that He ascended to heaven and sits on the right hand of His Father, and that same Jesus who went to heaven will in like manner come again to earth. Yet you sneer at me because I say God has a body, has a form, has passions—Love is a passion. Now to be brief on this point, I affirm that the Bible teaches that God has body, parts, and passions. The Presbyterian Confession of Faith denies this. Now to the Bible. Just as it reads. I prefer it to the Presbyterian Confession of Faith, or to your sermon, which contradicts it. "And God said, let us make man in our own image, after our likeness,—So God created man in his own image." Gen. 1:26-27. You may say, this was the moral image, or likeness of God. It does not say that. All the facts disprove it, and your church teaches that man is morally depraved

and most of them were by your God foreordained for eternal torture. Of this more will be said later. But to continue, And Adam lived an hundred years and begat a son in his own likeness, after his image, and called his name Seth. Gen. 5:3. Here we cannot avoid the conclusion that God made Adam in His image and likeness. Adam begat a son in his image and likeness, and Paul caps the climax on this point when he said, "Christ was the express image of His Father's person." Heb. 1:1-3. If you had an image of Napoleon the Great, carved in marble, and a good likeness of Queen Victoria taken by a first class photographer, would you not have a good idea of what these two celebrated persons looked like?

Paul wrote to the Philippians, 2:6, that Christ being in the form of God thought it not robbery to be equal with God, and that same Jesus speaking to the wicked Jews said, (speaking of the Father), "Ye have neither heard his voice nor seen his shape," John 5:37. Here we have something concerning God having Form, shape, A Person, the same substance as Christ and that Christ was the express image of his Father.

That the Bible says that God appeared unto men and conversed with them. I submit the following: Gen. 17:1-22; Gen. 18:1-33; Gen. 32:24-32; Gen. 35:9-12; Ex. 24:9-14; Ex. 33:9-23; These all show that God Almighty appeared to men, that He talked face to face with some of them. You may try and make it appear that at times God appeared through the medium of an Angel, well I admit it, but we have learned that Angels are spirits. Are Spirits immaterial beings, or are they material substance? We hear of them coming and going, talking and walking, eating and drinking. To me, this all proves that Spirits are material beings, and God is a Spirit.

Yes, Doctor McKenzie, I believe that God is a spirit, that he has form, that he has a body, parts and passions, that he made man in his image and likeness, that Christ was the express image of his Father's person, that both the Father and Son will mingle with men in the eternity beyond death when this mortal body will become a spiritual body and this corruption shall put on incorruption, when Christ shall change our vile body that it may be fashioned like unto His glorious body. If you do not know that this is the hope of both the former day saint as well as the Latter Day Saint, then you have no right to make a profession of Christianity.

I have shown that your creed defines God as a mere **nothing**, an infinite vacuum. No wonder you ridicule me because I believe that He has a body, and has spoken to man in the past, and that He will speak to man now. But your folly does not end here, for this Presbyterian God, we are told, **made the world of nothing**. I admit this sounds too ridiculous to admit of belief, so lest the people would think I misrepresent your faith, I will quote the statement right from your creed.

“It pleased God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, for The Manifestation of the glory of His eternal power, wisdom, and goodness, in the beginning, to create, or **make of nothing, the world**, and all things therein, whether visible or invisible, in the space of six days, and all very good.”

Confession of Faith, Ch. 4:1.

All I care to say of this part of your faith, is that both the word of God and science contradicts your faith. The creation of something from nothing is not a truth. The original words rendered in our language, “create” and “make” are synonymous terms, signifying the formation of things out of original elements. There is no evidence whatever in favor of the creation of any substance. We

are justified in believing that the elements of every substance existed eternally. We are distinctly informed in the word of God that the corporeal bodies of the first vegetables and animals were made, **not out of nothing, as stated by your Creed, but out of the earth.** Gen. 1. Chap. It is unbelievable that there was a time when **nothing was no where**, and that He then made something out of **nothing**—This world.

I commend to your consideration a little poem. It may do you good:

“He took a lump of nothing and made the glorious earth,
Another bit of nothing and Oceans had their birth.
Another bit of nothing he made the glorious sun
And so he worked with nothing until skies and stars
were done.

He took a rib from Adam with nothing for a knife
And by mixing it with nothing made him a full grown
wife.

The creeds say God is nothing, has neither form nor sense,
Can neither smell, hear, feel or see, hence cannot
recompense.

Has no Body, Parts, or Passions, The holy Three is one,
Invisible and everywhere, Can neither go nor come.”

Now you will say that is almost bordering on blasphemy, but I ask who is responsible for it, and the answer is, **your creed.**

Closing the examination of your faith on these points, I give you something to think of, from the pen of Baron Swedenborg's writings, entitled, “The True Christian Religion,” page 38, “Things that come under no predica-

ment of substance are mere **nothings**, and that substance without form is a mere imaginary entity, and therefore both substance and form may be predicated or affirmed of God."

Now Sir, I cannot part with you till I have exposed another little Presbyterian folly. You have tried to make it appear that Presbyterianism was indorsed by the rest of the Christian world, while the church of which I am a member is despised the world over. In my former letters I have shown the standing of the church of which I am a member, so will say no more of it here, but just let me give a glance at the Presbyterian church through the tubes of history from the days of Calvin and Knox to the time of the Reverend J. A. McKenzie.

John Wesley, speaking of the doctrines of the Presbyterian church, as found in the confession of faith, says among many other things just as bad, "This doctrine not only tends to **destroy** Christian holiness, happiness, and good works, but hath also a direct and manifest tendency to **overthrow** the whole Christian revelation. . . . It represents our blessed Lord. . . . as a **Hypocrite**, a deceiver of the people, a man void of common sincerity." He says, "The Presbyterians, by their doctrine and teaching, not only destroy Jesus Christ and the whole Christian system, but God Himself. "It destroys all His attributes at once; it overturned both His justice, mercy and truth, yea, it represents the most holy God as worse than the devil, as more false, more cruel, and more unjust. This is the blasphemy for which I abhor the doctrine of predestination. J. Wesley's Sermon on Free Grace. The great Author John F. Rowe, speaking of Calvinism says, "There is nothing in Calvinism but the defeat of Christianity. . . . There is nothing in it on which a sinful and helpless world can lean for support. There is not a gleam of hope in it, it is a death dealing system."

History of Reformatory movements, p. 60.

Now Sir, as briefly as is possible, I will show why these men and hundreds of others who might be quoted, despise the doctrine of the Presbyterian church. I will quote from your own books something of the soul discouraging doctrines they refer to.

“God from all eternity did, by the most wise and holy counsel of His own will, freely and unchangeable ordain whatsoever comes to pass. . . . By the decree of God, for the manifestation of His glory, some men and Angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others foreordained to everlasting death. These Angels and men, thus predestinated and foreordained are **unchangeably designed; and their number is so certain and definite that it cannot be either increased or diminished.** Those of mankind that are predestinated unto life, God, before the foundation of the world was laid, according to His eternal and immutable purpose, and secret counsel and good pleasure of His will, hath chosen in Christ unto everlasting glory, out of His mere free grace and love, without any foresight of faith or good works, or perseverance in either of them, or any other thing in the creature, as conditions or causes moving him thereunto, and all to the praise of His glorious grace. . . . The rest of mankind, God was pleased, according to the unsearchable counsel of His own will, whereby He extendeth or withholdeth mercy as He pleaseth, for the glory of His sovereign power over His creatures, to pass by and to ordain them to dishonour and wrath, for their sin to the praise of His glorious justice.”

Presbyterian Confession of Faith, Chap. 3:1, 3, 4, 5, 7. The whole Confession of Faith is based upon and permeated by this doctrine. I make no comment upon the meaning of these statements at this juncture, but will give you the language of the originators and propagators of the system. Calvin says “Predestination we call the eternal decree of God, by which he hath determined in himself what

he would have to become of every individual of mankind, for they are not all created with a similar destiny. But eternal life is foreordained for some, and eternal damnation for others. Every man, therefore, being created for one or the other of these two ends, we say he is predestinated either to life or death". Zachius, the Swiss reformer, declares that the reprobates are bound by the ordinance of God under the necessity of sinning." Beza, his country-man, "That God hath predestinated, not only unto damnation, but also unto the causes of it whomsoever he saw meet," I cannot refrain from giving you some more from the leading Presbyterian of all time, John Calvin, regarding God's designs in relation to sinners: "He directs His voice to them, but it is that they may become more deaf; He kindles a light, but it is that they may become more blind; He publishes His doctrine, but it is that they may be more besotted; He applies a remedy, but it is that they may not be healed, and Peter Martyr, another confrere, says God supplies wicked men with opportunities of sinning, and inclines their hearts thereto; He blinds, deceives, and seduces them; He by His working on their hearts bends and stirs them up to evil." John Knox, one of the most brilliant lights of Presbyterianism, says: "The reprobates are not only left by God's suffering, but are compelled to sin by His power." This John Knox is the same gentleman, in whose honor so many church buildings are called "Knox Church." Just by way of diversion, let me say, this John Knox is the man of whom the histories speak as follows: "This firebrand of sedition, who delighted in nothing but broils, and tumults, could not be content with barely following the steps of—Calvin, who had not long before delivered him from the gallies of the prior Capua, where he had been three years for his crimes, unlawful amours, and abominable fornications, for he used to lead a dissolute life in several shameful and odious places, being also found guilty of the parricide and murder committed

on the body of James Benton, Archbishop of Saint Andrews." Bayles Historical and Critical Dictionary, Article John Knox, Edition 1738, London.

Just one more Mr. McKenzie, on the same man. "Knox, a priest and apostate monk, who was a debaucher of several women, and of his own stepmother, and a magician, returned to Scotland, in 1559, well provided with instructions from Calvin; he every where caused tumults, sacrilege, and violence."

History of the Protestant Reformation, Vol. 2, p. 490.

Now Sir, there are many books written against your leaders, Calvin and Knox. I do not say the terrible things written about them are all true, my only reason for descending to write a copy of such history is to show you that while you may write something that has been written against Joseph Smith, that those inclined can bury Presbyterian leaders with the same kind of history. While those who know, have proved that the slanders you hurled against Joseph Smith is false, yet if they were all true, he would be an angel compared with what has been written against the leaders of your church.

Passing by the history on the conduct of your leaders, I recall you to the doctrine your church is committed to, as referred to above, I am of the same opinion as Wesley and many great men of other churches, in that it makes God worse than the devil, that it destroys the hope of the Christian. It directly contradicts the scriptural statements of the great promises of God to the human family. Some of you try to crawl by saying, we do not teach it now. Today it is your Confession of Faith, I have quoted from your own Confession of Faith. But in this very effort, you make confession that your creed is only a human production. If God called the framers of your church and creed and inspired them to represent him upon the earth, there would

have been no necessity to make a change in His church organization or doctrine. The very fact that you, or some of you are becoming ashamed of your creed and you are trying to hide its deformity, first by making alterations in your creed; and second, by trying to form a union with other churches in order to take away your reproach, is proof that God did not call into existence, as His church, the thing that is first changing its creed and second trying to hide under an amalgamation with others whom they have for hundreds of years denounced as wicked counterfeiters of the true church. Further, the glaring inconsistency of your position will appear, if you are one of those who whine out, we do not teach those things now, in that to the last issue, or publication of your Confession of Faith that I have read, your church continues to publish the statement of faith I have charged you with.

Now let me call your attention to the word of God on the matters under consideration, which is diametrically opposed to your Confession of Faith.

1st. All men are free agents. Deut. 11:26-28; Deut. 30:15-19.

2nd. God is impartial, therefore has no pets or favourites. Acts 10:34-35; Acts 17:24-25; Eph. 6:8.

3rd. Christ died for all men. Heb. 2:9; Rom. 5:18; Luke 2:19; John 3:15-16.

4th. All men may be saved by obedience to the Gospel. Acts 2:21; Rom. 1:16-17; Rom. 11:10-17; Rom. 3:21-25; Rom. 2:16.

5th. God has foreordained the plan by obedience to which, all men may be saved. Acts 2:23-27; Acts 26:22-23.

Luke 24:25; Rom. 1:16-17; Rom. 13:1-2; 1 Cor. 2:7; 1 Cor. 15:1-14; 1 Pet. 1:20; 2 Thes. 2:14; Gal. 3:7-27; Eph. 1:4-14; Eph. 2:8-10.

In closing this point, permit me to suggest, that the foreknowledge of God, should not be questioned. He knew the end from the beginning, and because of this, as a wise, loving, powerful God, He foreordained the Plan, devised the system and arranged the gospel so that there may come redemption to all those who obey it. Gods fixed decree is that all who obey the gospel will be saved. He knew that man would fall, and has made full and complete provision for his final redemption.

I hope the time will come, and that right soon, when you will cease to represent God as a weakling who permits a successful rival in the person of the devil to secure the great majority of his creatures in order to continue their eternal existence in the flames of hell, and all to His glory. Learn the Bible story that "For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that He might **destroy the works of the Devil**. Yes Doctor, I teach that Christ will redeem man, He will destroy death, and him that had the power of death, that is the Devil. **Your Creed gives the Devil an everlasting position as King of the damned in hell.** My faith is that Christ shall **destroy the works of the Devil**, and having destroyed Sin and Death, He will be crowned Lord of All, which is Christianity. Robert Burns, the poet of the human heart, surely gave your creed a jolt when he wrote "**Holy Willie's Prayer**." It may do you good to read it all. I submit one verse of it just as food for thought. Think it over.

"O Thou, wha in the heavens dost dwell,
Wha, as it pleases best thysel,
Send ane to heaven and ten to hell,
A' for thy glory.
And no for ony guid' or ill
They've done afore thee?"

I wish you to know that I have nothing but pity for you. I hope that these letters will be helpful to you, in that you may see the Gospel of Christ as He taught it in the scriptures, and be led out of that God-dishonouring system, Presbyterianism, which you say has stood the test of ages.

Yours in bonds,
R. C. EVANS.

PREACHING AT
SOHO ST. CHURCH
EVERY SUNDAY AT 11 A. M. & 7 P. M.