

A Visit with Denver Snuffer

Questions and Answers
5-13-15 Tim Malone

Question One: *In a recent talk (3-22-15) on plural marriage, you said (page 39), "There have been many signs given by God that He was about to do something new from the time of the death of Joseph Smith till today. All that was left at the end was for a witness to be appointed, to come to declare, 'Now it has come to an end.' In the last talk in the ten lecture series I said, the witness has now come, and I am he. It has come to an end with something new now begun. One of the signs of it having come to an end was the passing of Eldred Smith."*

*Will you elaborate on the significance of the passing of Patriarch Eldred G. Smith on April 4, 2013 and how or why we should take this as a sign that something has come to an end? In particular, **what** has come to an end? You are declaring you are a witness of an end-time event. This seems vital. What is that event, how are you a witness, why is it important for us to recognize this event and how should we, or how do you think God expects us to acknowledge such an event in our own lives?*

ANSWER (Denver): In a word, the "fullness of the Gentiles" is ending. One of the last signs of that, was the passing of Eldred Smith in 2013, and with him the office of Patriarch of the Church. That office was never well understood. I've never been told that it was necessary to fully explain the significance, so I've left most of the details unexplained, but to what I said already I would add the following: The LDS Church makes enthusiastic claims about their priesthood, and those claims would be much more accurate if they were dialed back some, if they were considerably more modest. They claim to have Melchizedek priesthood, which has the following list of things associated with it when it is described for us in Genesis 14:30-31 of the Joseph Smith Translation; the authority:

- to break mountains,
- divide the seas,
- to dry up waters,
- to turn waters out of their course,
- to put at defiance the armies of nations,
- divide the earth,
- break every band,
- and stand in the presence of God.

I have previously pointed out that it's not necessary for the holder to do all these things, but any one of them is enough to show that the authority is present. But this priesthood does have signs.

The ordination of Hyrum Smith in 1841 was "to the office of Priesthood and Patriarch." That's in Section 124:91. The reference to "Priesthood" is significant. What was intended with that ordination was so that (and again I'm reading from the same revelation) "his name may be had in honorable remembrance from generation to generation, forever and ever." That's in 124: 96. There was a colorable claim to priesthood while Hyrum and his descendents remained in the office of Patriarch to the Church. That ended. So far as the LDS Church was concerned, it was "good riddance," because the leaders found the office was troublesome. That office was not part of the Twelve, yet claimed the status of "prophet, seer and revelator," while it was part of the General Authorities. It was uncontrollable because only descendents of Hyrum were the holders. That gave the office holders independence, and the LDS leaders wanted the office to be discarded so as to finish the consolidation of control in the Twelve, and it has been.

There are many prophecies that foretell the Gentiles will reject their invitation to have the fullness of the Gospel. Christ said that this would happen in 3 Nephi 16:10: "And thus commandeth the Father that I

should say unto you: At that day when the Gentiles shall sin against my gospel, and shall reject the fulness of my gospel, and shall be lifted up in the pride of their hearts above all nations, and above all the people of the whole earth, and shall be filled with all manner of lyings, and of deceits, and of mischiefs, and all manner of hypocrisy, and murders, and priestcrafts, and whoredoms, and of secret abominations; and if they shall do all those things, and shall reject the fulness of my gospel, behold, saith the Father, I will bring the fulness of my gospel from among them."

There have been many signs that Christ's prophecy was fulfilled. At the end of that series of events only one thing remained to be done. God needed to send a witness to be the final required sign to declare His intention to begin something new. He always sends a witness to remove doubts. In this event there have actually been two witnesses, inasmuch as Keith Henderson added his witness to the conclusion of the ten lectures.

The signs include, but are not limited to, the condemnation of the Church in 1832 (which was D&C 84:54-58), the expulsion from Missouri, (that happened and was explained in D&C 101:1-2), the forced winter exodus from Nauvoo, the suffering during and following the exodus, the afflictions, judgments and wrath of God at the Saints, (foretold in D&C 124:44-45), their pride, lying, deceit, hypocrisy, murderers, priestcrafts and whoredoms, all of which Christ foretold in 3 Nephi 16:10.

There was an inquisitorial abuse of the Saints by their leaders once they were isolated in the wilderness. As part of the Mormon Reformation, the population was interrogated to root out heresy, sin, and to root out disbelief with the threat of blood atonement, which was "slaying the sinner to save them from hell" (then being taught).

There were mass murders. Over 200 non-Mormons were executed in Mountain Meadows to vindicate an oath to avenge the death of the prophets. Originally the oath was aimed at those who slew Joseph and Hyrum, but news of Parley Pratt's slaying arrived just at the time that the Mountain Meadows emigrants were going through Utah. And since Parley Pratt was regarded as a prophet by the Saints, the oath of vengeance included him also. Brigham Young traditionally has not been directly implicated, but everyone including the LDS Church Assistant Historian, Richard Turley, admits that his blood atonement rhetoric during the Mormon Reformation, coupled with the temple oath of vengeance that Brigham Young added to the rites of the temple, as well as First Presidency counselor Jedediah Grant's fiery additions on top of that, were responsible for creating the environment in which the murders at Mountain Meadows took place.

Just as an aside, an oath of vengeance for slaying the prophets could not have been put there by Joseph Smith, because he and Hyrum Smith had not yet been slain while Joseph was initiating the rites. And so the oath of vengeance was necessarily the product of the mind of Brigham Young. But it was part of the temple oaths, and everyone including LDS Historians now admit that the blood atonement teaching, the oath of vengeance, the threatening spirit of the Mormon Reformation, and Brigham Young's and Jedediah Grant's fiery rhetoric all contributed to the murders of over 200 emigrants.

Other signs we have seen are contradictions in what the LDS Church has called "fundamental teachings." For example, plural marriage was once required for exaltation, now it will result in excommunication. Ordaining blacks would once forfeit all Church priesthood, now it is unequivocally condemned as false and those who taught it are likewise denounced and condemned.

Adopting a well-paid professional ministerial class. In Alma, there is an incident involving a man named Nehor. Nehor advocated that priests should not labor with their own hands, but they should get supported with the believer's money. This was something the *Book of Mormon* condemns as being "priestcraft." Alma, on the other hand, ordained priests in Mosiah 18:18, "and he instructed them that they must labor

with their own hands for their own support." In Mosiah 18:24, "And he commanded them, that the priests whom he had ordained should labor with their own hands for the support." King Mosiah adopted the standard as the law in Mosiah 27 4-5:

That they should let no pride nor haughtiness disturb their peace; that every man should esteem his neighbor as himself, laboring with their own hands for their support. Yea, and all their priests and teachers should labor with their own hands for their support, in all cases save it were in sickness, or in much want; and doing these things, they did abound in the grace of God.

I could raise money if I wanted to. I could raise a lot of money if I wanted to because there are those willing to support me and what I teach. If I raised money off the religion I preach, I could certainly get a lot more done with the time it would free up. Instead, I labor with my own hands and I work nights, evenings, and weekends to advance the restored faith.

The amount of work that is going into the book that will come out next involves enormous sacrifice. That includes not just me, but also my wife who edits the manuscript, and practically every spare moment that we both have is required to get the labor done. But it has exactly the effect described in the Book of Mormon. We should esteem our neighbor as ourselves, laboring with our own hands. We should not think that we are better than anyone. When you take money from someone else in order to advance your religious purpose, the mere act of doing that creates an inequality, it instills an arrogance in the recipient. It removes the burden of sacrifice, it removes the humiliation of having to lose sleep and to fret and to worry about things, and to face an uphill battle in everything that you do in order to please God. But you can't please God by taking advantage of your fellow man.

There have been changes to the ordinance. Isaiah 24:5 warned that:

The earth also is defiled under the inhabitants thereof; because they have transgressed the laws, changed the ordinance, broken the everlasting covenant.

Those changes include the most single radical change to the temple endowment in 1990. There were other changes made over the years, but the most radical single change was in 1990.

In 2005 the LDS Church eliminated washings and anointings. Before the January 2005 changes, washings and anointings were literal. The 2005 change made them only symbolic thereafter. That has significance. And I leave it to people to query why it has significance. There was a reason why Christ was anointed preliminary to His death by the woman that blessed and anointed Him. It was to preserve Him into the resurrection. Now the LDS Church no longer does that.

There is a Mormon quest for popularity. Gordon B Hinckley was the original employee and secretary for the, what was then called, the "Radio Publicity and Missionary Literature Committee" in 1934. That committee was predecessor to the Public Communications Department. By the time he became the 15th LDS Church President, his work had hardwired public relations into the institution. This quest for popularity has required public opinion to be considered, resulting in the motivation to make the other changes. The earnest believer interprets the changes as proof of continuing revelation. It is instead the conscious institutional effort to become popular—a way to market Mormonism to the targeted audience.

Another problem has been the centrally controlled, tightly correlated, rejection of teachings through the Correlation Department. This process is the one which David O McKay predicted would lead the Church into apostasy. I discussed this in *Passing the Heavenly Gift*, you can read about it there if anyone is interested.

The history of Gentile Mormonism has been a long downward path. I laid that out in *Passing the Heavenly Gift*. The Gentiles have walked away from the light and increasingly embraced darkness and foolish trust in men. All Mormon sects are now ruled by traditions contrary to the scriptures and commandments of God. They are asleep and cannot be awakened. God is now leading something new and left the leaders of all the various Mormon sects to find their own way. Emma Smith, Sidney Rigdon and William Marks said that, "Without Joseph Smith, there was no Church." That comment was preserved by William Clayton in his diary in August 1844, because to William Clayton, that was offensive. (See *The Nauvoo Diaries of William Clayton, 1842-1846, Abridged*, p. 64, August 27, 1844.) The election of the Twelve to lead had taken place on August 8th, and so when Emma Smith, Sidney Rigdon and William Marks said that "Without Joseph Smith there was no Church," Clayton recorded it in his journal because he thought it was inappropriate and offensive. But Emma, Sidney and William were right.

Following Joseph's death there was a complete overthrow of the Church by the Quorum of Twelve. The Quorum of the Twelve substituted themselves in place of the equal distribution of power established by revelation. The First Presidency and the Quorum of the Twelve are supposed to be equal in authority. That's in 107: 24. Joseph never moved a single Apostle into the First Presidency. They were independently equal bodies and Joseph never moved an Apostle into his presidency.

Likewise the Quorum of 70 was equal with the Twelve. That's in 107:25-26, and therefore that body should be regarded as equal to the First Presidency also.

The Standing High Councils of Zion were also equal in authority to the Twelve and the First Presidency. That's in 107: 36-37.

All the keys (to the extent that there were any) were, and are held, 100% by the First Presidency, 100 % by the Twelve, 100% by the Quorum of the 70, and 100% by the High Councils. There was no primacy in the Twelve when originally organized by Joseph Smith according to the revelation.

In the years before Joseph's death, the Twelve were away from Nauvoo doing missionary work as their calling required. Joseph Smith spent his final three years in close association with the Nauvoo High Council, as the Nauvoo High Council minutes reflect. Following Joseph's and Hyrum's death, Emma remarked:

"Now as the Twelve have no power with regard to the government of the Church in the Stakes of Zion, but the High Council have all power, so it follows that on removal of the first President, the office would devolve upon the President of the High Council in Zion ...the Twelve... were aware of these facts but acted differently." (Linda King Newell and Valeen Tippetts Avery, *Mormon Enigma: Emma Hale Smith*, Doubleday, (New York, 1984), pp. 206-207.)

Emma was the wife of Joseph Smith. I know she's taken a lot of bad press from LDS Mormonism. At one time I enjoyed that same opinion about her. But these were her comments made in the immediate aftermath of Joseph Smith's death. She was not interested in destroying her husband's work. That cost him his life. She was telling the truth.

None of the equality of these four different bodies survived Brigham Young. When Brigham Young assumed control, all equality was destroyed and the Church became an oligarchy run by the Twelve. This continues from Young until today. Now the Senior Apostle automatically becomes the Church President, an unscriptural and unwise system for consolidating power. Equality among many has been replaced with the dictatorship of one. Here's another quote:

"[Emma] bore testimony to [Lucy Messerve] that Mormonism was true as it came forth from the servant of the Lord, Joseph Smith, but ...[said] the Twelve have made Bogus of it. " (*Id.* p. 211.)

"Bogus" is another word for counterfeit. In those days the term bogus was always a reference to counterfeit money. Joseph cautioned the Saints about violating God's trust. As he put it:

His work will go forward in these last days in purity, for if Zion will not purify herself so as to be approved in all things in His sight, He will seek another people. For His work will go on until Israel is gathered. And they who will not hear His voice must expect to feel His wrath. (TPJS p. 18.)

To the same effect, during the Mormon Reformation Heber C. Kimball said:

"We received this priesthood in power and authority. If we make a bad use of the priesthood do you not see that the day will come when God will reckon with us and he will take it from us and give it to those who will make better use of it?" (JD 6:125.)

George Albert Smith said essentially the same thing:

"God has set his hand at the present time to establish his kingdom. But unless the Saints will so live and so exert themselves that they can preserve the purity of the holy Priesthood among them, the work will be left to other people." (JD 6:161.)

Brigham Young said essentially the same thing.

"God will preserve a portion of the meek and the humble of this people to bear off the Kingdom to the inhabitants of the earth, and will defend His Priesthood; for it is the last time, the last gathering time; and He will not suffer the Priesthood to be again driven from the earth. " (JD 2:184.)

We should expect God's house to be ordered around only one principle: repentance. When the pride of a great organization replaces repentance, the heavens withdraw, and when they do, "amen to that portion of God's house." The Restoration through Joseph Smith will always remain, even if God chooses to order it differently before His return. It is His to do with as He determines best.

He has now sent me as a witness to state the moment has passed and something new has begun. Keith Henderson has likewise testified. The conditions promised by the Lord have been met. Whether anyone notices is of little consequence. God is now doing something to further the Restoration and bring it to its final culmination.

The passing of Eldred Smith was a moment in time that reflected the cumulative effect of a lot of decisions, including and beginning with the initial overthrow of the government of the Church by the Twelve at the passing of Joseph and Hyrum, and culminating in the final overthrow of the priesthood itself, by the death of the discarded Eldred Smith and the discontinuation of the authority that was supposed to have been kept in "honorable remembrance from generation to generation." God will bestow that authority again and it will go forward, but it will go forward without these organizational pretenders that amass wealth and practice priestcraft.

Question Two: *In the lecture on Christ, the Prototype of the Saved Man given in Ephraim (6-28-14), you said, "...either I am a liar, and you ought to forget everything I've said, or I have been sent by someone greater than I am. If I have been sent and you reject and quibble over the things I declare to you, it is at*

your peril! It ought to be that way. I ought to be damned if I'm a pretender, and I ought to be damned and rejected by God if I'm saying things about which I know nothing! But I bear witness to you I know what I'm talking about. I have no reason to lie to you. I have no reason to pay to reserve a place to speak to you, and ask nothing of you but to listen. It requires a sacrifice to do what I am doing. I have no other reason to do this than to tell you the truth. Joseph Smith testified to these things and I am come as a second witness. Therefore you now have two proclaiming the same doctrine."

You bring up Joseph Smith. Joseph testified the heavens are open. He bore witness of God the Father and His Son as two separate and distinct personages possessing glorified and perfected bodies. He also testified he was an instrument in the hands of Christ to bring about a restoration of things hidden since before the foundation of the world. You say you know what you are talking about. Do you mean this in the same sense Joseph Smith declared his knowledge, that it was received through revelation, vision and the visits of angels? As a second witness, how is the Savior working through you to continue the restoration He began through Joseph Smith?

ANSWER (Denver): The answer to that question is "yes." If that were not the case, I would not be doing anything. What I do, teach and write is a product of contact with heaven. I've not elaborated on all the contacts, messengers, and visitations I've received because that would be, in my view, very counterproductive. It would suggest I'm more important than I am. God matters and men do not. God can save you and I cannot. The most important issue involves the substance of what I have taught. The most important individual is whoever hears what is taught.

When Christ appeared on the Road to Emmaus to announce His first lengthy post-resurrection message, He did not bother announcing who He was. All He did was announce His message, which was to expound the scriptures beginning with Moses and all the prophets, in order to show how in all things, it was testified that He needed to suffer and He needed to die. All I'm doing is modeling the One I serve. That is by taking Joseph and all the revelations of the Restoration, and showing how in all things, it is necessary for exactly what has, and is happening, to occur in order to fulfill the word of the Lord.

If I started talking about all the visits and visitations, immediately what people would say is, "This is a great man! He has stood in the presence of various angelic personalities! He's had various interviews and instructions. O my! Isn't he wonderful!" And the fact of the matter is, I'm not wonderful. I labor for my support, I have a hard time making all of my ends meet, I have a very difficult time meeting all of the responsibilities my wife and I have. She and I work together on a lot of problems dealing with family, dealing with money, dealing with limited means and a budget, and dealing with just life's challenges. I am no better than the next man and feel keenly my own inadequacies.

For me to say something other than the content of the message is to inspire either adoration or envy. It's foolish. It is unnecessary. It would be regarded as boasting by some, nuttiness by many others. It would not advance anything and may well set things back.

But the answer to your question is "yes." If it were not so, I would keep my mouth shut.

Question: *As a second witness then, which you claimed you are, how is the Savior working through you to continue the restoration He began through Joseph Smith?*

ANSWER (Denver): God could, does, and will work through anyone who awakens and then pays attention. There's an army of witnesses and awakened individuals that are being assembled by God. It's required to know Him. I know Him. I have taught, and I know and understand His gospel. The first task is to assure people that He lives and His gospel exists as an authentic method for saving souls.

The second task is to remember the Restoration that Joseph gave his life to commence. We are ungrateful when we fail to remember and practice it. At the moment, there is almost no clear understanding of that gospel. I'm working to set that out in a comprehensive way.

The Restoration had never been completed. There is a great deal prophesied to roll out as part of the Restoration that is not even commenced:

-Do we have Zion?

-What about the lost teachings of the brass plates?

-Do we have the rest of the *Book of Mormon*?

-Do we have the testimony of John?

-Do we have restored knowledge of the Jaradites?

The list could be very long. But the fact that there is a list tells us that the Restoration must resume at some point in order to be completed. We don't have the Restoration on the table yet. Remarkably we have forgotten what we once had. So the first job is to show that we are grateful enough to remember, and to remember it in a fulsome comprehensive way before God is going to say, "Now I will permit it to move forward." We haven't gotten to the point of remembering yet, which is why we ought to be studying a lot more diligently the material that we got in the Restoration. We ignore it at our peril.

Question Three: *In the Phoenix or Mesa lecture (9-9-14), you stated, "The Lord has said to me in His own voice, 'I will bless those who bless you, and curse those who curse you.' Therefore, I want to caution those who disagree with me, to feel free, to feel absolutely free to make the case against what I say. Feel free to disagree, and make your contrary arguments. If you believe I err, then expose the error and denounce it. But take care; take care about what you say concerning me for your sake, not for mine. I live with constant criticism. I can take it. But I do not want you provoking Divine ire by unfortunately chosen words if I can persuade you against it."*

In Genesis 12:3, The Lord said unto Abraham, "I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee." Abraham was further blessed to be the father of many nations, that in him "shall all families of the earth be blessed." Abraham was a prophet. Isaac and Jacob were prophets. Abraham referred to the Fathers going back to Adam. You spoke about that in the talk on plural marriage and elsewhere. It seems there is something significant about connecting to the Fathers. Abraham was a patriarch. The LDS Church no longer has a presiding patriarch, or even such an office. Is there a patriarch on the earth today who can connect us to the Fathers?

ANSWER (Denver): Well, the simple answer is there's always one on the earth. That has been true from Adam to the present.

(Tim): John the Beloved.

(Denver): Yes.

Remember that in Nauvoo the Lord had offered to reconnect the Saints, with the clearly defined condition that for that to happen it was necessary for an acceptable temple to be constructed where He could come and restore the connection. The reconnection is ordinance-based, and will require an acceptable temple before it goes beyond the single representative.

First, ideas need to be advanced and accepted. Then second, we need to act on the ideas primarily by repenting and opening ourselves to the influence of God. Third, we have to be humble and patient and willing to practice the religion before we can have any hope of God deciding to gather us.

Practical experience is absolutely necessary. Theories and pretensions are not going to get us anywhere. The gospel requires hard won virtuous experience and not just theoretical or imaginary virtues. Everyone can theorize the virtues that are necessary to gather people together and live together in harmony.

Everyone can envision themselves as one of the residents of the City of Peace. But the practical experience required to iron out our selfishness and competitiveness so that we can actually live in peace is another order of magnitude harder.

In the Nauvoo City Council minutes you see them grappling with a society that is trying to be composed of Saints, and the practical problem-solving that happened. There were moments when I was reading the Nauvoo City Council minutes when I was laughing out loud, because they go to solve one problem but the solution creates another.

Basically people are discourteous of one another. Because they are discourteous of one another the City Council adopted an ordinance in order to end one discourtesy, only to create yet another discourtesy on top of that.

For example, one of the problems that they had was that Nauvoo was organized as a city in which everyone had a garden plot. Because most of the garden plots were not fenced, horses and foot traffic would go through the gardens. That killed the plants and caused the destruction of needed foodstuffs. They couldn't get people to build fences around their gardens despite encouraging them to do so. The solution to the problem was to turn the hogs loose, because when the hogs are loose they go in the gardens and root around, killing the plantings. And so they adopted an ordinance that let hogs in Nauvoo go free. In pretty short order that produced the required fences they wanted, at the expense of creating a hog problem. There were hog wallows in the middle of the streets of Nauvoo. Until finally some guy, tired of the hog problem, went out and killed, butchered and ate a couple hogs that another guy said belong to him. The owner sued him, and they had the public fight over it.

The point of this isn't hogs and the Nauvoo City Council, the point of this is we need practical experience and not theory. The way in which the practical experience can be had is in gathering in fellowships and societies, collecting our own tithing, and then grappling with the fact that there is a pile of money sitting there, which is ever a temptation, and to deal with that in a responsible way. That forces individuals to confront their own self will, their own pride, their own desires, their own jealousy, their own envy, their own ambition, and their own covetousness.

In the fellowships that have been organized there have been moments of profound breakthroughs in the kind of attributes required for Zion. One group, when they begin their meeting, gathers all the needs on written slips of paper and put all of the needs together in an unopened basket. Then they gather the money, which is always cash, into another unopened container. They don't know how much cash there is. Without opening the cash then, they first open the needs. As a group they reason together and agree on what the priority of the needs are, so that they have a list of the most compelling, and on down.

Once they know what the most compelling, the second, the third, the fourth are, they open and count the money. On one occasion, there was a married couple whose need could be satisfied because there was enough money, but they looked at the person next in line in priority behind them, and concluded that in their heart, they thought that need greater than their own. If they satisfy the next person's need, there would be nothing left for them. So they voluntarily passed on their priority and took none of the money, and allowed it all to go to the next person in line behind them.

That is a couple that I would willingly add to a community, because they've learned self-sacrifice. They are no threat, and are instead an ideal contributor.

Someone who advocates incessantly, "We've got to live the United Order! We've got to have consecration," —because he intends to benefit from that change and better his circumstances—is unfit to be gathered. He would destroy Zion because he is selfish and thinking of what he can gain. Someone who

says, "What can I give?" at the cost of his own self-sacrifice, and yet is willing to live the Law of Consecration in order to bless and benefit *others*, not expecting themselves to be blessed or benefited but instead expect themselves to carry a burden, those people can be gathered. They present no threat. They can be "one" with others. They are willing to lose themselves, as Christ instructed.

The way in which those people get identified is by practical experience, which is what the fellowshipping communities are designed, by the inspiration of God, to allow to now begin to take place. Every one of us theorizes themselves a great candidate for Zion. But go out and get some practical experience and see how great a candidate you truly are. You will be disappointed in yourself. Most of us would be anyway.

Question Four: *In the same lecture, you quoted from your journal, describing the disciplinary process you went through, your appeal and the significance of section 121 which contains the phrase, "Amen to the priesthood of that man." You then read, "Last general conference (April 2014), the entire First Presidency, the 12, the 70, and all other general authorities and auxiliaries, voted to sustain those who abused their authority in casting me out of the church. At that moment, the Lord ended all claims of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, to claim it is led by the priesthood. They have not practiced what He requires. The Lord has brought about His purposes. This has been in His heart all along." This is an astounding declaration. It has been the subject of much discussion on the forums and blogs. It was and is a difficult thing for many LDS members to hear or read. FAIR and other apologetic sites have fallen all over themselves to show how impossible such a claim can be. The idea of a modern, living prophet, authorized and in possession of all priesthood keys held by Joseph is the bedrock of the LDS Church claims to be God's kingdom on earth today. Your claim evokes emotional distress in some who consider it. It's been a while since this declaration came out. Is there anything you would add now to help multi-generational members of the LDS Church deal with such a devastating, all-encompassing foundational claim? What would you add?*

ANSWER (Denver): I would add that it's a mistake to focus on me when you think of this issue. The issue is larger than a single man, and the issue deserves careful consideration of everything that was covered in that first answer in this interview.

I am no happier than others are about this. Does anyone really think that this does not upset me? Does anyone believe that I have pride in this, or it makes me pleased to say what I have said? Those that think that, have no idea who I am or what is in my heart. I'm probably more brokenhearted by the things I've been told and commanded to teach that the audience could be. I receive unwelcome news and then deliver it to others. This is an ordeal, nothing else. Unwanted, unwelcome, unsought, and unpleasant. I do it to please God, not to get praise. It does not inspire praise from most people who hear what I say or read what I write.

I have spent days mourning, unable to speak about some things, even with my wife, as the events have unfolded. There have been times when I have been so upset that have not been able to carry on a conversation about what is underway. It has required two and three days for me to adjust to unwelcome news. I could give you an example but I'll pass on that.

On second thought, I will give you one example: The section you read in the question quoted from my journal was written months before it was read to an audience. When it was written, I thought that writing was only for my family, my kids. I did not expect it to become public.

There are some times when the Lord gives you the words to write, and there are some times when you compose it yourself. That particular entry was given to me to write. I considered it extremely private. I considered it extremely personal. Outside of my wife alone, no one was aware of that entry in my journal until the talk made it public.

Every one of the 10 talks were given by inspiration to me in outline form before they were delivered to an audience. On the day I first began to prepare to give the talks, I sat down and in one sitting I wrote all the outline notes for the first five talks. I ran out of time that day and so only the first five were outlined. I also didn't want to put any notes down for the next series until after I delivered the first two, so I could gage the time it would take to cover the topics. The first two talks were given in fairly rapid succession, only eighteen days apart. It was after those were given that I went on to outline the sixth, seventh, eight, and finally the ninth talks. But I never got anything for the 10th talk.

You should understand these outlines were prepared months in advance. I had a long hiatus between first and second parts of the year—between talks given in the beginning months and the conclusion the next year. During winter we didn't drive, and so I had all nine talks outlined but I had nothing for lecture 10. Nothing. My eventual conclusion—because the content had been given by inspiration to me on lectures 1 through 9—ultimately, was all the 10th lecture was going to contain was a summary of the first nine. So, literally, I began to go back to the notes and to highlight what I would use as a summary in the 10th and concluding lecture. I prayed about it and nothing was given to me. So left to my own I thought it was a reasonable conclusion.

I finished the 9th talk in St. George and with it concluded all the notes I had. But on the night that the ninth talk was given, that night I was awakened and the content of the 10th talk was revealed to me. If I had known anywhere along the line the content of the 10th talk I would have done something to prepare the audience for what was coming. I didn't know what was going to be in it. When I got the content of the 10th lecture, it was so distressing to me that I told my wife the next day while on a walk down in St. George (we stayed in the area for a while) that this was not going to be good. This was not going to be a pleasant thing. She asked me about it, but I told her I would not be able to discuss it right then.

I wrote down all the notes, I transcribed what needed to be said, but I didn't give any preview of the talk to her. Unlike the other ones, I just continued to try and change the Lord's mind about the content. She heard the talk for the first time with the audience. She knew how upset and distressed I had been and what I had been saying about the material. At the first break in the lecture she got up, came up to me and said, "I now get it." That lecture was not easy to give.

People who think that I'm enjoying this, and that I look out and say, "Good! Now I'm giving the Mormon Church their comeuppance!" don't realize anything about what it takes to do what has been asked of me, or how extremely difficult all of this is. I'm not happy about the burden. It ill-suits me.

Multigenerational families may have their family traditions, but I was truly converted at the age of 19. I invested my heart and soul into the Church. It was like coming home for me. I believed I was the Church's best friend and loyal supporter.

I was the single most successful missionary in the mission in which I was baptized, as just a lay member of the Church. I produced investigators continually, and baptized many of them, the missionaries baptizing many others.

When I transferred by the military to Texas I was called as a stake missionary. There was a third missionary serving there who was waiting for a visa to go to Brazil. In those days it was difficult to obtain visas. Every night when I came home from work, that missionary showed up and he and I were missionary companions. We went out and tracted, and taught, and baptized. There was a young couple, the husband was studying to become a minister in the Church of Christ. We began teaching him with him trying to convert us, and us convert him. We got the couple to the point of having a testimony of the Restoration. They got an answer from prayer. They had a testimony, but they were faced with the crisis of

losing his profession and of alienating his family. They concluded, despite the fact they had been converted, they couldn't pay the price to be baptized. They told us they didn't want us have come by anymore.

I taught Gospel Doctrine in Sunday School for nearly 3 decades. I was on the High Council. When I spoke as a High Councilor in my Stake, the Bishops announced in advanced who the visiting High Councilman would be, because attendance would go up. I loved the gospel and I was devoted to the Church. To say it is more distressing to multigenerational families than to me is incomprehensible to me. It is a tragedy what has happened to the Restoration. But it has happened. Ignoring it will not change the events. To focus on me when dealing with so important a matter is ridiculous. Forget about me and study the issues.

Question Five: *You have proclaimed God has ended the way he works with his children on the earth today. You have announced yourself to be a witness of this fundamental change. You have declared yourself a second witness of the many works of God through the prophet Joseph Smith. You have reaffirmed the importance of the Patriarchal Priesthood, the law of adoption or sealing to the Fathers in the family of God. You have announced the LDS Church can no longer claim to be led by the priesthood of God, virtually making it no different from any other church today. Yet the title and focus of the last lecture in the series "Forty Years in Mormonism" is "Preserving the Restoration." You have counseled those who have accepted this message and you as the Lord's servant, witness or messenger in this great change, to be baptized. Specifically, you quoted 3 Nephi 11:26–27 and said, "I am telling you in the name of the Lord that commandment is renewed again by Him today, to you. This is His command ... confirmed again today." Thousands of individuals have been baptized at your invitation. Will you elaborate on how your declarations and baptismal invitation preserve the restoration, as opposed to tearing it down?*

ANSWER (Denver): All—universally—all of the various iterations of Mormonism are less and less like the foundation and we need to return. If you go back to what I said about baptism you will find that on the topic of baptism, there is an example taken from the *Book of Mormon* in which Alma, who had been ordained in the court of King Noah, he was chosen precisely because he was wicked. Alma, who probably had a line of authority compromised by wicked men. He went out to baptize Helam. Before he did so, he asked heaven to give him the power to baptize. He got the power to baptize, and he baptized Helam.

What I suggest in that talk, is that everyone who has been ordained in the LDS tradition, who fits in the category President Boyd K. Packer in General Conference lamented—we have done a good job with spreading the *authority* of the priesthood, but we've done a poor job of getting *power* in the priesthood¹—

¹ "We have done very well at distributing the *authority* of the priesthood. We have priesthood authority planted nearly everywhere. We have quorums of elders and high priests worldwide. But distributing the *authority* of the priesthood has raced, I think, ahead of distributing the *power* of the priesthood. The priesthood does not have the strength that it should have and will not have until the *power* of the priesthood is firmly fixed in the families as it should be." *The Power of the Priesthood*, April 2010 General Conference. The talk contains interesting admissions about how Correlation revolutionized the Church: "During those years of correlation, the whole operating face of the Church was changed. The entire curriculum was restructured. The objectives and relationships of the organizations one to another were redefined. The key word during those years of correlation and restructuring was *priesthood*." He presumed this was a good development, not the catastrophe President David O. McKay predicted. President McKay was, however, correct. Elder Packer cannot recognize that the lack of priesthood power is attributable in part to the assertion of improper control over others in the name of priesthood.

therefore we must go out and obtain from heaven the connection that gives power in the priesthood. The temple rites tie together “power in the priesthood” with conversing with the Lord through the veil. It is an appropriate connection. I explained all this in the lecture on Priesthood given in Orem, Utah. Accordingly, it is necessary for now those who are to baptize others to get the power from heaven. Let us have them go out and baptize again with power from heaven, so we know it is done with God’s power and not done merely relying upon an authoritative tradition lacking in power that cannot be accepted by heaven.

The evidence of Alma's authoritative baptism was the outpouring of the Spirit. There have been those who have been baptized and spent their life in Mormonism, or some other sect of Mormonism, who say they never felt like they had the confirmation of the Spirit. They have gone out, sought for, obtained power from heaven, been re-baptized, and the ordinance has had an effect upon these people.

The purpose of renewing baptism is to take what may be a hollow gesture, performed by people who have authority but no power, and turn it into an event with power that connects people to heaven. This is how we can renew the Restoration, like it was renewed in the days of Alma, through Alma and the model of the *Book of Mormon*. That book answers so many doctrinal imponderables for us today.

Why do we have authority and no power, as the President of the Quorum of the Twelve apostles in General Conference lamented to the Church? It's because we are not doing what we should be doing. It's not necessary to have a revolution that divorces us from the Restoration. It's necessary to have a revolution that connects us back to the Restoration and its beginnings.

Question Six: *You proclaimed Jesus Christ has revealed Himself to you. You declared you have seen Him, embraced Him and have been given specific assignments of things to teach, which you have done at your own expense in publications and lectures. The focus of these teachings is the establishment of Zion. You have counseled those who wish to prepare for Zion to institute fellowships for gathering and practicing the principles of Zion, specifically to use tithing as a means to help the poor. You have taught there is to be no new church, no legal entity to receive and centrally manage funds and property, yet you acknowledge the need for a temple.*

A new website has been established for a central recorder, where those who have been baptized are encouraged to submit their names. The purpose of this gathering of names is to present them to the Lord in a temple. You said in Mesa, “We do not need numerous temples, but we will need one to which Christ can come. We will not need to perform endless work for the dead until first there has been a covenant made for us. We must be first connected to the fathers in heaven. Only then can we do something to liberate the dead.” You have already taught much on the sealing to the fathers, but will you take a moment to elaborate on the difference between the visit of Christ to an individual and the visit of Christ to a temple yet to be built?

ANSWER (Denver): Yes, I can. Individual salvation and promises of eternal life are just that, they are individual. A restoration of the family of Israel requires more, including cooperation and interrelationships that will be formed by God Himself. Promises made to individuals give the individual hope. If you take the vision of the redemption of the dead in D&C 138, he saw a vision where:

There were gathered together in one place an innumerable company of the spirits of the just, who had been faithful in the testimony of Jesus while they lived in mortality; And who had offered sacrifice in the similitude of the great sacrifice of the Son of God, and had suffered tribulation in their Redeemer's name. **All these had departed the mortal life, firm in the hope of a glorious resurrection**, through the grace of God the Father and his Only Begotten Son, Jesus Christ. (D&C 138:12-14, emphasis added.)

All of them. These were the righteous. They were in Paradise and all of them were worthy, they had been given hope of a glorious resurrection. Not only did the Savior give them hope before death, He visited with them in the spirit world during the time between His death and His resurrection. But that did not get them reconnected to the fathers in heaven, nor did it even get them resurrected, because it goes on to say in the transcript of the same vision:

...from among **the righteous**, he organized his forces and appointed messengers, clothed with power and authority, and commissioned **them** to go forth and carry the light of the gospel to them that were in darkness, even to all the spirits of men; and thus was the gospel preached **to the dead**.

(D&C138:30, emphasis added.)

So the righteous who departed this life firm in the hope of a glorious resurrection, who had offered sacrifice in the similitude, many of whom had seen Him in the flesh, who witnessed Him and were ministered to by Him, and given authority by Him, in the spirit world, *remained* in the world of the dead to preach to the dead. They were NOT resurrected.

Only the organization of God's family through a temple and associated rites, results in finishing the family of God in the House of Order. IF this were to be done it would allow the recipients to follow the results achieved, or allowed the results achieved by Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, which are described in D&C 132:37. Abraham Isaac and Jacob:

...did none other things than that which they were commanded; and because they did none other things than that which they were commanded, they have entered into their exaltation, according to the promises, and sit upon thrones, and are not angels but are gods.

Note that in D&C 138:41 Abraham, the father of the faithful, Isaac and a Jacob were also there in the spirit world among the dead seen in the Vision of the Redemption of the Dead. In verses 41-42 of 138, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob were there. But in the revelation recorded in 1843 they were sitting on thrones. They were not left behind in the spirit world proselytizing. Instead they are sitting on thrones. The difference between these two categories of the righteous are the differences between individual salvation, which gives hope of a glorious resurrection, on the one hand, and reorganizing the family of God which must occur by an ordinance in a temple to be acceptable to God, on the other hand. This was why the command was given to build the temple in Nauvoo. And why God offered to restore to them the fullness that they did not achieve.

We need to let God take the lead, and then we need to patiently await each step along the way. This is the stuff of which the prophecies speak, and it is the stuff that will be fulfilled. But the rites and the ordinances necessary to accomplish that? People in this generation don't even have a clue how that necessarily has to roll forth. But rest assured it will. God intends to set His house in order. He alone will do this.

Question Seven: *I have heard your say, and read in many places in your books and on your blog, you dislike the public attention received as a result of performing the assignments given you by the Lord.*

You've been emphatic we should not replace one idol with another. Yet the people look to you for leadership. For example, in the Phoenix lecture you provided some direction on tithing, the sacrament, ordinations, worship or fellowship groups, and in particular, the requirement that the approval of seven women is needed to sustain a man in performing ordinances in public. You also said a man was unworthy – the Lord's word – if his wife will not sustain him.

In the Jewish tradition, when questions arise, everyone turns to the Rabbi. In the LDS Church, local leaders consult the handbook or turn to a General Authority for help with difficult procedural questions. You have stated you don't like the term used by some – Snufferites – to describe those who read your writings. You have made it clear every man should have a sufficiently strong relationship with the Lord to get answers to procedural and doctrinal questions. Yet, you are the one the Lord sent as a servant, witness or messenger to declare the orderly dismantling of the established hierarchy. Does that not make you a prophet and de-facto leader?

ANSWER (Denver): Let me clarify. I view my role only to be a teacher at this point. I hope to remain in that role alone. But I would hasten to add, that if you search the scriptures to look at what role was occupied by Enoch and the success that he had in his day, the only thing he claimed to be was a teacher and a preacher of repentance. That's it. The success he had was not because he was some great dictator, it was because he was a teacher that provoked people to repent.

Melchizedek, Joseph Smith clarified, was not a king of a city, or king of a country, he just preached. He was a teacher and a preacher. He preached and the people, according to the *Book of Mormon* who heard him, Alma clarifies that they were wicked people, but they repented. (Alma 13:17-18.) And because they repented they were able to gather and live the principles that brought them together.

I think the idea of a strong central leader is no more likely to succeed in our day than it was in Joseph's. At the end, when Joseph lamented that the people were depending too much on the prophet, and they were neglecting the duties that were devolving upon themselves, therefore they were darkened in their minds. (TPJS, p. 237-238.) It was too late. In 1842 when he made that comment in the meeting of the Relief Society, it was too late. The moment had passed. They were dependent upon him. I try to learn from earlier examples and not repeat the same errors. If there are errors to be made, I want them to be new ones, not a repetition of the same old ones that caused the failure before.

The responsibility of preaching the Gospel is to take the burden and put it upon the individual; to have the individual connect to God. One man being saved and saying, "I've got a pipeline to God, and so now I get to be your boss," won't save him nor those who listen to him. But someone who says, "God is willing to speak, and does speak to everyone of you," and who teaches to encourage you to use the gifts that God gives every one of us, that teacher may help others. All individuals have gifts, and curious though some of them may be, all of us have some kind of gift. Use it to reconnect to God. And then build upon that to have your life filled with light and truth.

I really think it is unnecessary to build a new canon of scripture when we haven't paid enough attention to the canon of scripture we have already. We need to plumb the depths of the volumes that we have been given and figure out what they are saying, because they say whole lot more than we have drawn out of them as yet. What I've talked about in the 10 lectures and in the 14 volumes I've written is the scriptures. Hopefully it serves to remind people of what the scriptures actually do contain, because they are plentiful. And I think the only role I would carve out for myself is a teacher.

Question Eight: *A follow-up to the last question about the need for leadership in this movement can be illustrated by a recent post from Keith on the Recorder's blog. In there he noted some people are submitting names of children baptized as young as five years old. The scriptures specifically teach the age*

of accountability is eight years old. He also noted the fact that some baptisms are being submitted for recording as having been performed by a woman. He quoted, again from the Phoenix lecture, your statement about priesthood being confined to men because of the Fall. You elaborated much on the idea there are so many opportunities for believers to go off the rails. I see it all the time when we discuss doctrinal questions on my blog.

For example, the worship of Mother in Heaven is a subject about which some people feel very strongly. They advocate a practice – a sacred dance – in which the objective is for a manifestation of divine favor. Specifically, they look for, expect, and report they have experienced the presence of Heavenly Mother in their ritual. This is similar to what happened with the children of Israel when Moses was up on the mountain for forty days communing with the Lord. In the end, Moses wore himself out because he had to judge every little thing that came before the people. What is the right way? How will the Lord provide leadership for His people who are awaiting His return? I'm looking for a practical answer here, not idealism.

ANSWER (Denver): For those who think they can please and appease a Heavenly Mother by that sort of innovation, I think they will be very surprised when they finally have an opportunity to meet Her. She may not be at all the soft, kindly, genteel little old lady some people imagine. She may be tougher by far than our Father.

Do you imagine for a moment that Lucifer would have been cast out of heaven without the Mother consenting, approving, and advocating? Do you think for a moment that could be the case? Do you think that those who were cast out with him had some weak-willed woman weeping at their departure? Do you think She wasn't protecting Her Family, and approving the compulsory exile? I don't talk about Her, but I think there is a lot of imagination about Her that needs to be reined in. When Her fearful presence is revealed the fools will then shut their mouths. Stop rushing forward because what you find in your impatience may condemn you and your foolishness.

Gifts are an open conduit. What flows through the gifts will include opposition. Just because you have a gift doesn't mean that this gift is not equally accessible by the opposition as it is accessible by God. "It must needs be that there is an opposition in all things." (2 Ne. 2:11.) You can't bring about righteousness without there being an opposition in all things. So how do you avoid mistakes when you allow something to influence you through your gift, that actually comes from the adversary pretending to be the source of light? The pretensions of the Bringer of light, the Light Bearer, which is what Lucifer's name mean, do mislead.

Well, to avoid mistakes, first of all, I would look to the scriptures as a standard against which to measure any new revelation given to you. If you look at Christ on the Road to Emmaus, and you look at Moroni's lectures to Joseph, everything communicated was scripture-based.

I've given a more comprehensive restatement of the Restoration that anyone since Joseph, but have almost entirely confined it to the scriptures and statements attributed to Joseph. That measuring standard is where you first find the anchor needed to keep the truth. People who don't read their scriptures are subject to all kinds of foolish presumptions about things that aren't there. If you go back and look at the exact wording, sometimes the foolish presumption is not justified by the actual language and content of the scripture you think justifies what you are doing. Study and compare everything to the scriptural standard. The more familiar you are with their language the better equipped you will be to recognize truth.

Second, personal worthiness. We have to live our lives in conformity with the light that we have. We cannot ignore commandments, or excuse ourselves from departing, and expect that we can avoid deception. If we are willing to disobey and excuse ourselves, then we become unable to distinguish the

light from the shadows. It's just the way it is. If we lie to ourselves, we love a lie. And if we love a lie we're going to be deceived by lies. We make ourselves open to lies, we make ourselves willing to accept them.

We have to rely on light and truth and the Holy Ghost. D&C 45:56:

And at that day, when I shall come in my glory, shall the parable be fulfilled which I spake concerning the ten virgins. For they that are wise and have received the truth, and have taken the Holy Spirit for their guide, and have not been deceived—verily I say unto you, they shall not be hewn down and cast into the fire, but shall abide the day.

The way you do that is by knowing what is in the scriptures with some considerable care, living according to the truth that you have, and allowing the Holy Ghost to become your guide, even if what you hear from the Holy Ghost challenges, disappoints, or even frustrates you.

(Tim): *Do you want to address the part about leadership? I know it was kind of an add-on. It didn't quite fit.*

(Denver): Yes, the narrowness of the question at the end was delightful, because it allowed me to avoid that. But I do think the work that I have been doing, the lectures that were given as part of a single talk, and the stuff that I am trying to remind people of, it's all in the scriptures. It is all in the foundation of the Restoration. I don't think that "leader as micromanager" is an answer to anything and failed in Joseph's day. "Teacher" as someone who brings material to your attention, allowing you the freedom then to choose, is good and worked for Enoch and Melchizedek.

If people engage in the sort of inordinate wickedness Moses found when he came down from the mountain—if that is practiced anywhere among those that are responsive to my message, they simply won't be gathered. They will be left behind. Those that are patient and humble will inspire the confidence of angels who will do the gathering, and they will be gathered. Gathering won't be because some boss manages to whip people into line. They need to be given the freedom to get out of line. And then once out of line, they must be permitted to go their way.

Question Nine: *You have declared we have an opportunity to bring about the conditions for Zion. You had proclaimed the Lord is willing and ready to help individuals and groups prepare themselves to become the kind of people who can be sealed to the Fathers, join with the City of Enoch when the Lord comes and not be burned at His coming. Joseph tried to accomplish this in his day. The people, he said, were too thick skulled to accept the things he wanted to teach them. They would fly all to pieces, he said, at the first hint of something not held in their orthodox tradition.*

The response to some of the things you have tried to teach has been similar, even though you have taught them from the scriptures. Change is hard for most people, especially when it involves changing long-held beliefs that are mostly tradition. One of the most difficult things for the LDS people to accept is the idea that the Lord could possibly have had in mind what you have declared has taken place. In particular, Daniel's interpretation of King Nebuchadnezzar's dream is interpreted by most LDS folks to mean the LDS Church IS the kingdom of God, that it IS Zion and that they are the chosen people. How do you help closed-minded people who are steeped in tradition open their eyes to the idea of non-traditional possibilities?

ANSWER (Denver): I can't change their mind, but if they will pay heed to the scriptures, the scriptures can.

That wicked one cometh and taketh away light and truth through disobedience from the children of men and because of the tradition of their fathers.

One of the tools used by the enemy of your soul is to take away light and truth through the tradition of your fathers. If the tradition of your fathers is what governs you, then you can't be saved. You just can't be saved. You have to become childlike, you have to be humble, you have to be teachable.

The theme of the book, *Come Let Us Adore Him*, was how very offensive, revolutionary and difficult it was for those who heard Christ to recognize Him as sent by God. The test is exactly the same. If people will not hear what I have to say, they would not have listened to Joseph, and they would not have listen to Christ. The test is exactly the same. I'm not saying anything that our Lord wouldn't say. I'm not saying anything that Joseph wouldn't teach in our day.

Question Ten: *I'd like to end this first section of questions with something near and dear to my heart and that is the pursuit of personal spiritual communication with the Lord. I have delighted in your focus and emphasis from your first book that we can and should seek and audience with the Lord. You have declared He is willing to come to us in a literal, physical sense and that we can come into His presence, embrace Him and be taught by Him personally. If there is anything that gives more power to your teachings than your declaration you have seen Him, I don't know what it is.*

*In my own pursuit of an audience with the Savior I rely on a sacred dream received shortly after I read The Second Comforter for the first time. Without going into any detail, the dream satisfied my desire to know **when** I could expect to enter into the presence of the Lord. In interpreting my dream, which I prayed to understand, it is not soon. I have years of work ahead of me – years of faithful and diligent effort to do as the Lord asks. And He has asked things of me, some of them very difficult. I note some people looking to unusual sources for inspiration and help – Shamans, questionable scripture, etc. I know you're asked this all the time, but if you don't mind, what counsel would you give for my readers who are anxiously seeking an audience with the Lord, and have become weary with the length of the process?*

ANSWER (Denver): The fact is that it requires patience, and patience is an absolute, necessary virtue that even Christ was required to accomplish. He thought He was ready at age 12, but it was 18 years later before He finally had the day come when He was allowed to begin His ministry. He wanted to be about His Father's business, and His mother told Him get back home.

There are those who, (including our Lord Himself), find the most difficult virtue of all is patience. It was 27 years in the coming for me. Godliness is a gradual thing. Even what is revealed is not necessarily going to be immediately understood, as that last talk I gave mentioned. It's one thing to receive, it's another thing to comprehend, and it still another order of magnitude difficult to teach. They are a gradual process, and to think that you can leap...that's remarkable because I don't see a precedent in scripture where that was the case. What did the apostle Paul take? 14 years from the encounter on the road to Damascus before he began to preach?

It took 40 years from the day Enoch was ordained at 25, before he walked with God at 65, and that was remarkably quick accomplishment.

Moses 40 years in the wilderness before he had his encounter with God at age 80. If you think you can rush it, you're probably going to be deceived.

Question Eleven: May I share something? This is from a fellowship community member in Arizona. It's called "River Church." *I'd like to know your impressions after hearing it if this is what you had in mind when you talked about organizing:*

“What a beautiful day. The water was so clear I could see the bottom. The sun was bright and warm. I arrived at the Waters of Mormon about 4pm. As I walked down the bluff, I could see many people going in the water. So many were gathered at the edge of the water cheering and clapping. It was a magnificent scene for sure.

“As I arrived, so many of you greeted me with warmth and kindness. It was like the first time walking through the veil into the celestial room with loved ones there to greet the newly endowed. Such a feeling of peace and acceptance. Thank you. I counted about 33 members of our community there.

“The most wonderful part of the afternoon was right after the bread and wine were blessed and passed. There was such a wonderful feeling in the group. It was so quiet, just children playing in the distance and toddlers cooing. The rest of the group sat earnestly as the waters rushed by.

“Right then I was in the moment. I pushed myself to take mental note. A wonderful experience to hold in my memory. For all my life I will remember that wonderful moment. This morning a word came to me to describe the feeling of that moment: ‘solemn’. I hope many more of you will join us in the future. I love river church.”

ANSWER (Denver): To me the description sounds heavenly. It's in nature, it is worshipping God, it describes fellowship and worship both of which are godly.

It is necessary to allow creative solutions to be independently functioning among different groups. There was not a single "New Testament Church." There wasn't one. There were Churches. Each of the 12 and Paul, established different Churches with markedly different emphasis.

-Petrine Churches emphasized authority and order.

-Johannine Churches emphasized love.

-Pauline Churches emphasized both evangelical fervor and Gentile participation.

-Jacobian Churches emphasized charity.

They were all adapted to teach of Christ. There wasn't a central, hierarchical, command and control in the New Testament era.

In fact there's a book, and the title of the book really says it all: *The Churches the Apostles Left Behind*, by S.S. Raymond E. Brown. The idea of a universal or a "Catholic" Church was imposed some centuries later. When it was founded it adopted the title "Catholic" or "universal" in order to try and achieve a missing ingredient of uniformity in the early Christian diversity. The fellowships ought to have diversity.

We should not think it is impossible to have godliness with diversity, nor should we assume that a one-size-fits-all solution is going to work among different groups. There are some groups in which there are a lot of children, and the emphasis needs to be directed toward the needs of the children. There are some groups that are primarily childless adults. They need to emphasize what suits them. Every one of them needs to adapt to whatever the local conditions are, and have the freedom to do that as was once the case with the early Christian and Restoration Churches.

At the beginning of the Restoration they were called Churches, plural, they were not called a Church, singular. They were "societies of believers" in different locations and they governed themselves differently and locally.

Question Twelve: *Daryl's group is just one of dozens of communities organized in a tithing and fellowship group. However, as far as I can tell, most of these fellowships are only along the Mormon Corridor, specifically in the areas where you presented the lectures. I know some have created webpages*

to help interested people connect to one another in a specific geographic region. In my case in Southern California, our fellowship is very, very loose with participants ranging from Alaska to San Diego.

I see the movement growing. I imagine you get a lot of emails from people asking about organizing and fellowshiping. You gave good counsel in the Mesa lecture when you suggested our time would be well spent if we did nothing more than read the scriptures – printed version – to one another and pray together. Will you share a little more about why fellowships are so important in bringing unity to our churches?

ANSWER (Denver): We cannot bear one another's burdens without fellowship with one another. And bearing one another's burdens presumes that you know what the burdens are that someone else carries. Which means that I have been patient enough, I have been attentive enough, I have been friendly enough, and I have been trusted enough that I can find out what the burden is that they carry.

I have a very good friend who I went to elementary, junior high, and high school with, and have kept in touch with him for many years. He has recently contracted a terminal form of cancer. He called me to talk about that, without telling his family, without telling his neighbors, without telling his friends, because he and I have a friendship that is built upon the kind of trust that allows me to share that burden with him, because of the relationship. There was nothing odd to me about him confiding in me. He has been a lifelong friend.

We are supposed to help one another get through this ordeal of mortality. Mortality is an ordeal for every one of us. It is not easy. Even the people you envy, if you were living inside their world, you would find that they have burdens that they are carrying as well. Fellowshiping allows us to bear one another's burdens, and bearing one another's burdens implies a whole universe of connectivity, trust, confidence, friendship and affection between one another, before you get to the point where you even know what their burdens are.

But that is supposed to be a blessing and part of what it means to worship together. Worshiping together by assisting one another, allows all of us to feel a great part of what it is that Christ is and does. It allows us to know who we worship, and allows us to know how to worship Him, and it allows us to know what makes us one with one another. (See D&C 93:19.)

Now it's really hard to accomplish that across state lines, but it still can be done. The example I use of my friend, he lives in Idaho and I live in Utah. He and I have spent a lot of time on the phone since I've learned of the illness about a month ago. That is because I care, and because he needs to talk to someone, and he finds it a relief to be able to do so with me. It can be done across state lines. It can be done across any barriers.

All of us are victims of institutional abuse. Many of us can sense it when the slightest hint of abuse appears. One recent writer on your blog has identified it as "paternalism." and that's not an inappropriate designation for it. We should learn how to be loving and equal with one another.

The idea of equality is resisted by a lot of skeptics who accuse me of wanting authority and control, when I despise control. But I absolutely welcome fellowship, equality and worship with one another. This isn't easy. But it is godly to pursue.

We are going to make mistakes. There are going to be a lot of institutional habits holding over. We will want to control others to "whip this into shape." The idea of a whip...when Christ resorted to the scourge it was to drive them out. He didn't drive them in, nor did He send them out to organize them. He drove them out to keep them away. If we are going to whip anything, we are going to drive people away.

We would be better off practicing the kind of patience and kindness that persuades people gently. We should all realize that, in terms of Mormonism, almost everyone is a refugee suffering post-religious trauma syndrome. People are going to think you are also abusive. They are going to think you want to use them as a tool for another powerbase. They will think someone wants to use them, and it is a reasonable thought.

The idea that there's someone who doesn't want to use them or abuse them, but who wants to fellowship with them and help them bear a burden is a foreign idea for most Mormons. But that's the idea of Christianity at its core, and that's what really alien in this world. We need to bring that back again.

Question Thirteen: *I love the heading on your old blog, "The content of this blog presumes you are already familiar with Denver Snuffer's books. Careful explanations given in the books lay the foundation for what is contained here. If you read this blog without having first read his books, then you assume responsibility for your own misunderstanding and misinterpretation of the writer's intent. Please do not presume to judge Mr. Snuffer's intentions if you have not first read his books."*

From the Wikipedia page created about you: "Snuffer claims his intentions are faith-promoting: 'I have loved every minute of being a Mormon since I joined the church in September 1973 in New Hampshire,' he says. 'I am actually advocating activity and fidelity to the Mormon church.' Snuffer claims that he intended Passing the Heavenly Gift and his other works to promote loyalty to the LDS Church." Have your intentions changed? Do you still advocate LDS Members stay faithful and active in their wards and stakes? How can they do that and yet accept the invitation to be baptized which was renewed at the conclusion of the lectures?

ANSWER (Denver): Here's the problem: Since the *Forty Years in Mormonism* talk, the LDS Church has behaved poorly. I wish they would allow people to worship God and still be accepted in fellowship with the LDS Church. That seems to have been a naïve expectation on my part. The LDS Church simply will not permit it if they can find it out. Therefore, I'm not certain it is possible. That having been said, I think it ought to be attempted.

I attend LDS services. Sunday I was at Sacrament meeting, then I attended a High Priest's Group. I talked with two members of the Stake Presidency in the hallway. I contributed in the High Priest Group. I'm not sure how long the Church is going to tolerate that, but from my end I don't have any animosity. I'm not argumentative.

I have to say that the fellowship groups I have attended are remarkable. I have witnessed prophecy and miracles. I have seen gifts that are evident. I have seen things in the fellowship groups that I don't see when I go to an LDS meeting. I wish it were possible not only to coexist peacefully, but to import some of the blessings from the one into the other, but there seems to be a hostility there. There seems to be a desire not to permit that kind of coexistence to take place. I actually think that a Catholic could be baptized and join one of these fellowships and be better accepted in the Catholic Church, than a Latter-day Saint could in the LDS Church. The same is true for Presbyterians, Methodists and others. And that is coming, but right now we're still focused on the Mormon corridor and the Mormon community. But eventually it will spread more widely.

There are actually, right now, people who have been baptized in Iran, who are putative Muslims, but who have been baptized as members of this Restoration. It will go worldwide. It will penetrate every clime, it will cross every barrier, and it will do so in a non-institutional way. It will do so in a way that cannot be controlled, because an idea cannot be taxed, cannot be regulated, cannot be overcome by the cares of this world. You cannot prohibit an idea. Even if you make a law against it, you can't shut an idea down. This

assumes a form in which man has no ability to resist it. It will spread. The “stone cut out of the mountain without hands” is an uncontrollable idea. It is virtue. It is individual. It resists all opposition. It will be done “without hands” because our thoughts are where we connect with God, atop the mountain.

Question Fourteen: From page four of the Mesa lecture: “The Holy Ghost does not thrill you, it informs you. It gives you *understanding*. ... *thrilling music can rouse you. A great TV show can get you thrilled and feeling goose bumps. That is not the Holy Ghost. The Holy Ghost enlightens your mind, it enlivens your senses, it brings light into your life, and you understand something anew. There are some people who have the Spirit with them in such a degree, that to be in their presence is to understand things better. Understanding, comprehension, light and truth—these are the Holy Ghost, not emotion, thrills and goose bumps.*” (See DS blog 1-21-15 for more)

I can't tell you how many times I have been in LDS Church meetings and heard the individual offering the invocation say, “Please bless that we will feel the spirit in our meetings today.” I can't begin to recount the number of testimonies I have heard where the person sharing their thoughts becomes emotional, and states they are feeling the spirit so strongly. I suppose this is based on our interpretation of D&C 8:2 (mind and heart) and D&C 9:8 (bosom shall burn). Are you saying the Holy Ghost NEVER causes one to feel emotional? I have felt strong emotion in prayer that I attribute to the presence of the Holy Ghost. Isn't that the comforter?

ANSWER (Denver): The Holy Ghost is informational. Its purpose is "to enlighten the mind" and to inform you. It is a Revelator. Our reaction to the information can be very emotional. How we react is up to us. I've had very strong emotional reactions to some of the things revealed to me by the Holy Ghost. And those aren't always positive, warm feelings. It is been sometimes dread, it has been sometimes fear, it's been sometimes anxiety and being troubled in mind, body and spirit.

But if I were to liken the Holy Ghost and its function: imagine that you are sitting in this room and the room is absolutely pitch black, so much so that you cannot even see your hand in front of your face. It is just black. Assuming you want to determine what is in this room, you would only be able initially to do so by feel. You may be able to feel enough to determine there is a table in front of you. And you may be able to determine how wide the table is immediately in front of you. But you are going to have to get up and move around in order to find out how long the table is, because your arm will not reach to the other end. If you're going to explore that, between here and the other end of the table, you've got a lot of obstacles, including as we sit here, a chair that you occupy, next a chair that is unoccupied, then another chair that is occupied, then several empty chairs down further still, and you are going to have to feel your way through all of that, and it would be a long, arduous process. This is what knowledge in this world is like. It is acquired only by what we come immediately in contact with by our physical senses. It is limited, and we think it is reliable.

Let's assume that the Holy Ghost is a light. And let's assume that the light is initially only a single candle. And you light the candle and set it in front of you, the first thing you realize is that sitting in front of me is not only a table, but there are papers on the table. Then you can notice there is a book on the table, and a glass of water and a watch on the table, and that the table is actually made of wood. I can see that because I've lit a candle, but I still cannot see the far end. I don't know what's down there, because the candle does not exert enough light for me to perceive that. It has been lost in the shadows.

The Holy Ghost illuminates something. You comprehend it. Sight does not require handling anything, it only requires you to take notice of it. You can learn much more and much quicker by sight than you could every learn by feel alone. The Holy Ghost can open understanding that is more accurate and more complete than what we gain by the coarse tools of this world's learning.

When you get the fullness of something revealed to you, you turn the light switch on and you no longer have to feel your way to the far end of the table. At a glance you can look and you can take in the fact that there are a dozen chairs around this table. That the table is probably 20 or more feet long, that the ceiling in the room is vaulted, there are four lights overhead, there are windows on two of the four walls, and a door through which you can enter and exit. There is wainscoting in the middle of the room, and different colored wallpaper between what is below and what is above. You can take that all in and I think I can recognize Pennsylvania Avenue and the Capital building on a painting on the wall. All this knowledge flows into your mind because someone turned on the light in the room. Nothing more than someone turned on a light provides you more information than you could ever gain by feeling your way around in the dark.

Let me give an example: I got a phone call from a fellow asking me a question about a matter that I knew nothing about, and I cared nothing about. I was about to tell him, "Stop calling me with stupid questions. I'm not interested in that. If you're interested, go search the Bible and see if you can find an answer for this rubbish." Instead, I had the impression that I ought to say, I'm not going to talk to you about it on the phone, why don't you come in. I did say to him, "I don't want to talk about this over the phone, why don't you come in, let's get together in a couple of weeks." I hung up the phone and I thought: I'm not even interested in the subject, but if I'm going to talk about, I probably ought to look into it. And so I spent a few minutes until I was distracted by work. I found nothing.

The two weeks came and went. I'm a busy person. I didn't have any time to look into it. The fellow arrived for the appointment, and when he arrived I thought to myself, "Oh crap! I was going to look into that and I don't have an answer. The guy's come. I asked him to come, and now he's here and I got nothing. I have absolutely nothing."

I went out and brought them in—it was two instead of one, he had brought a friend with him—I brought them in and sat them down in my office. As I was shutting the door to my office and taking a breath to say, "I'm sorry I made you come in, I don't have anything to say to you"—in the time it took to take that breath, in that instant, a light came on and I knew everything there was about the subject. I knew where it was in the scriptures, I knew what the answers were, I knew what the explanation was, and I even knew nuances and details about the scriptures that are only implied, and therefore you have to tease out of them. This was because a light went on. When the light went on, I turned and for the next 45 minutes, using the scriptures I now have in front of me, I found and read examples to prove the answer to the question that he asked.

The Holy Ghost illuminates. Your reaction is your reaction. The purpose is to enliven and enlighten and to reveal. And that's what it does. But how we respond to that is up to us.

Our time is now spent.

(Tim): *Thank you.*