

# The Prophet Won't Lead The People Astray

November 20, 2018

The Lord will never permit me or any other man who stands as President of this Church to lead you astray. It is not in the programme. It is not in the mind of God. If I were to attempt that, the Lord would remove me out of my place, and so He will any other man who attempts to lead the children of men astray from the oracles of God and from their duty.<sup>1</sup>

We're told in the scriptures, noted above, that the lord won't permit the President of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints to lead people astray. It is in the scriptures, it is doctrine. End of story.

Well not so quick. What about when those prophets are speaking as men? When they declare things to be doctrine which are later disavowed? An example of such doctrine? Interracial marriage. Brigham Young taught the following:

Shall I tell you the law of God in regard to the African race? If the white man who belongs to the chosen seed mixes his blood with the seed of Cain, the penalty, under the law of God, is death on the spot. This will always be so. The nations of the earth have transgressed every law that God has given, they have changed the ordinances and broken every covenant made with the fathers, and they are like a hungry man that dreameth that he eateth, and he awaketh and behold he is empty.<sup>2</sup>

But, some will say, he was simply speaking as a man!

Was Brigham also speaking as a man when he stated the following?

I have never yet preached a sermon and sent it out to the children of men, that they may not call scripture.<sup>3</sup>

Other prophets have quoted Brigham Young in that saying as proof that the prophet of God does not have to say "Thus Saith The Lord" to give unto people scripture.<sup>4</sup> If the prophet doesn't have to say thus saith the lord to dictate scripture, then how are we to know when they are giving their own personal thoughts and those thoughts which are from God? If they are not clear and concise, how do we know?

In 1978 the ban on the priesthood and temple ban for blacks was lifted. It was set aside as we didn't know what we were doing. The church has never apologized because of it, and will probably never will. They claim certain teachings about it wasn't doctrine. Mainly the fact that the African Americans weren't valiant in the pre-existence. That such a notion was false and that it wasn't doctrine at all. But what about the times it was taught as doctrine?

Our living prophet, President David O. McKay, has said, "The seeming discrimination by the Church toward the Negro is not something which originated with man; but goes back into the beginning with God.... "Revelation

---

1 Wilford Woodruff, Official Declaration 1

2 Brigham Young, Journal of Discourses 10:110.

3 Brigham Young, Journal of Discourses, 13:95.

4 Fourteen Fundamentals in Following the Prophet, June 1981 Ensign First Presidency Message

assures us that this plan antedates man's mortal existence, extending back to man's pre-existent state."<sup>5</sup>

So we have an official announcement by the first presidency of the church that the discrimination against the blacks began in the pre-existence. It was part of the plan. How does that go along with what is being taught after the 1978 revelation?

Forget everything that I have said, or what President Brigham Young or President George Q. Cannon or whomsoever has said in days past that is contrary to the present revelation. We spoke with a limited understanding and without the light and knowledge that now has come into the world.<sup>6</sup>

It would seem with a flick of the wrist the words of past prophets can simply be dropped because an apostle says so. It was taught as doctrine, if God's laws do not change and His doctrine is eternal, and it was wrong, why was it even taught in the first place? Could this be one account of the prophet leading the church astray? Well more than one prophet actually.

Another thought comes to mind. The use of the term Mormon. It is true the term Mormon came about as an insult to the members of the early church. But since then, it had been adapted and accepted. It was okay to use, there was a campaign sent throughout the church titled "I'm a Mormon", and then with the latest prophet, Russel M. Nelson, it was no longer acceptable to use the term Mormon. It's a nickname that, when used, is a "major victory for Satan."<sup>7</sup>

If using the term Mormon offends God and Jesus and is a victory for the Devil, why was it allowed to be used for so many years? The Prophet Joseph Smith even used the term when talking about the doctrines of the church. Is it another case where the prophets have been leading the church astray only for the latest prophet to announce a course correction? Or is it another case where they didn't know what they were talking about and had a "limited understanding."

Another teaching contrary to what we believe in as a church, is the November 2015 exclusion policy towards the children of gay parents. We believe that men will be punished for their own sins, not the sins of their parents, not the sins of Adam; their own sins.<sup>8</sup>

Yet, in November of 2015 we are told that it was received as revelation<sup>9</sup> that children of gay parents are not to be blessed in the church, baptized, receive the priesthood, be endowed etc. Until they turn 18 and move out of their parents home, disavowing their parent's lawful and legal marriage.

I only wonder how long before other teachings are labeled as such and we no longer teach them as doctrine. The further along we get, the further away from Jesus Christ's gospel it would appear that we are going.

Those are of course the personal opinions of the author of this article, nothing more.

---

5 Statement of the First Presidency, 15 December 1969

6 All Are Alike Unto God, Bruce R. McConkie, Aug 18 1978 Devotional

7 The Correct Name of the Church, Russel M. Nelson, October 2018 General Conference

8 Article of Faith 2

9 Becoming True Millennials, Russel M. Nelson, January 10, 2016 Devotional