The School of Prophets

Leaning Knowledge is the real order of the Priesthood

[Matthew 18:19-20](https://www.lds.org/scriptures/nt/matt/18.20?lang=eng" \l "19)

Again I say unto you, That if two of you shall agree on earth as touching any thing that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven.

For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.

This does not say that two can have power over the third or many beyond the two that agree. I question the power of even twelve having power over and entire kingdom. A single man can receive knowledge and commandments from God and give those instructions to the people, but that should not control them in any way. A better way to express this says *or three*, but still this poses problems when three seek any degree of unrighteous dominion.

[Doctrine and Covenants 6:32](https://www.lds.org/scriptures/dc-testament/dc/6.32?lang=eng#31)

Verily, verily, I say unto you, as I said unto my disciples, where two or three are gathered together in my name, as touching one thing, behold, there will I be in the midst of them—even so am I in the midst of you.

The Lord did not seem to clarify this point in the above. Therefore the Restored church misses any attempt to broaden decisions based on only three. In some case, such as adding new doctrine, twelve are required. It is not that the Lord did not clarify, It is because man by nature seeks power and choses those above him having grater power in order to obtain more for himself. The agreement of two or three can simply be the covering of one’s personal agreement with the fear of being rejected. In essence the two or three do not really agree because of the nature of idolatry. So in this sense the Lord is right if all are honest in their assessment. I often offered suggestion is a bishopric meeting that the decision of one and the joyful following of some of the others consider certain missed points. A vote was never taken nor in classes the slightly differ concern is never opened to discussion. The reason is the power to agree moves from the tradition of the one in power to the many, and those lusting for power what to keep the tradition whether in a meeting of leadership or a Sunday school class. All opposition is dismissed, brushed over with intimidating conclusions that a majority will accept.

It is this majority that has come to be the consensus simply to avoid discussion of the point in question. It can be either a decision or simple interpretation. The agreement of two or three does not work because there is a third, forth or even one of say 14 that is suggesting something slightly different. Do all agree? No! The problem is in majority rule and this by assumption. When it is presented to all in a given meeting to accept a choice of change in leadership, what is one to do that had no voice in a meeting regarding the choice. My argument seems irritating to most because it is not the majority view or that which has become tradition over time by the few in power.

[Doctrine and Covenants 90:6-9](https://www.lds.org/scriptures/dc-testament/dc/90.7?lang=eng" \l "6)

And again, verily I say unto thy brethren, Sidney Rigdon and Frederick G. Williams, their sins are forgiven them also, and they are accounted as equal with thee in holding the keys of this last kingdom;

As also through your administration the keys of the school of the prophets, which I have commanded to be organized;

That thereby they may be perfected in their ministry for the salvation of Zion, and of the nations of Israel, and of the Gentiles, as many as will believe;

That through your administration they may receive the word, and through their administration the word may go forth unto the ends of the earth, unto the Gentiles first, and then, behold, and lo, they shall turn unto the Jews.

The mention of a school suggests that more than one or two are required to agree as touching one thing. In addition to this, to be a member they must avoid sin. Last the school perfects one for the ministry. It is the body that that goes forth unto the ends of the earth. In each cast one or two individuals speaks according to what they learned unanimously in the school, but cannot force by any means of intimidation the points learned upon those they teach. As a missionary, I was never a part of the school mentioned. Everything came by a lecture of one. Traditionally my attitude seems negative, and so many times I have been treated with intimidation by such words as, “Get with the program.” Another statement received personally from a mission president and a bishop in southern California about twenty years later was, “You are to smart for your own good.” So what is the point or even a solution?

I have had countless opinions that differed from teachers, college professors, and many employers. Sometime arguments were with parents who I respected. Even my wife, but rarely my children would be intimidating. This intimidation receive by so many is a way of maintaining control and it actually avoids discussion and a vote. Again, that’s life, so what is the point? If that is life then why the priesthood in the first place when they avoid discussion and use intimidation in order to maintain control.

In management my whole life, I never dictated or used the expression “get with the program.” I might have said, “we are stuck with this rule” but never used intimidation to those under me accept in one case and that came back to me form above. I knew the employee who made the complaint and my boss used it against me. I will tell you the intimidating remark. It is a religious concept. “You do not see yourself as other see you.” I knew then, my methods were not liked. I was also intimidated with using the word philosophy too much, coming from the same employee. It was in sales management and I would often say, “My philosophy of selling is…” Later with the next company, I was intimidated to intimidate the sales staff, yet all sales people where then taking a sales instruction course that corporate paid for and it was identical to what I always taught. Intimidation should never be used in order to make a sale or increase sales. This same point should be used in missionary training, but it is not. One perfect example I remember is when a missionary ask Joseph Fielding Smith, “How do you know that interpretation?” Smith’s response was, “Because I said so.” I have never heard, nor will I ever here such statements save from an ignorant parent, or a prideful boss. Instead of this type of remark the leader should take the question as a sigh to open a discussion giving an equal privilege of all to speak. Perhaps the leader will lean that he has an assumption that he was using to gain acceptance or convince his own mind that he had the power. Both are fear based. The point is, we need to search for a better way and stop appealing to the majority.

I often found it troubling that the Supreme Court made decisions based on majority rule. Even if the few had excellent remarks, the nay or yay of the majority dictated the law. If at any time the rule should be unanimous it is with the Supreme Court. There is nothing stopping the members from discussing among them as we expect from a jury, that they all modify there ruling to such an extent that all can agree with the final statement of judgment. If there is not a unanimous agreement there is no judgment of the truth. When a popular sentiment rules the Court we loose the wisdom of common consent. Most will say, “That’s not fair?” when the other side wins. That is because we are in a political divide due primarily of a divide of two parties. One must win as in a team sport. The principle is never as important being on the wining team—even if the team is wrong. That is the problem with majority rule. The winners pass back and fourth each time they play. What is the point?

Common consent is the solution, but from where does it come. I cannot prove it, but I think from the method of Abraham and before that it was Enoch. It was the method of the High Priesthood. My only proof is from the following:

[Doctrine and Covenants 26:2](https://www.lds.org/scriptures/dc-testament/dc/26.2?lang=eng#1)

And all things shall be done by common consent in the church, by much prayer and faith, for all things you shall receive by faith. Amen.

The conditions are by prayer and faith, but the emphasis is that all things should be done by common consent. The Mormon Church claims that this is the backbone of Church administration by allowing all to agree after the choice is made. Anyone who raises his hand in objection is ignored or escorted privately to determine his or her reasons. If the reasons are determined to be overly opinionated without proof that person is intimidated and the decision is final. In fact all who raise their hands in agreement are intimidated because they have no voice. Does that mean that a vote is not a voice? Yes!

The school of the prophets is far too extensive to explain in its entirety, but here are a few excerpts from the *Doctrine & Covenant Section 88*:

…

118 And as all have not faith, seek ye diligently and teach one another words of wisdom; yea, seek ye out of the best books words of wisdom; seek learning, even by study and also by faith.

…

 122 Appoint among yourselves a teacher, and let not all be spokesmen at once; but let one speak at a time and let all listen unto his sayings, that when all have spoken that all may be edified of all, and that every man may have an equal privilege.

…

127 And again, the order of the house prepared for the presidency of the school of the prophets, established for their instruction in all things that are expedient for them, even for all the officers of the church, or in other words, those who are called to the ministry in the church, beginning at the high priests, even down to the deacons—

…

 136 Behold, verily, I say unto you, this is an ensample unto you for a salutation to one another in the house of God, in the school of the prophets.

There is almost nothing included in this section that the church practices today or has since those times. Common consent has atrophied into a vertical power structure of central control. As early as Section 27, all things were to be done by common consent and this order is defined where all priesthood members *even down to the deacons*, *may have an equal privilege*. Although one specks at a time, it should be apparent that *all things* would include economic expenditures and the choosing of presidents, bishops and teachers not of the priesthood. The Lord perhaps did not give the extreme details; because it was a test to see which direction they chose. Instead of evolving into a broader process, they chose to constrain and centralize. We will never know what could have been accomplish or even it the leaders of the time could have overcome the enemy within that eventually abolished the school of the prophets.

Then comes section 90:7-10 indicated partly in the beginning of this article.

As also through your administration the keys of the school of the prophets, which I have commanded to be organized;

That thereby they may be perfected in their ministry for the salvation of Zion, and of the nations of Israel, and of the Gentiles, as many as will believe;

That through your administration they may receive the word, and through their administration the word may go forth unto the ends of the earth, unto the Gentiles first, and then, behold, and lo, they shall turn unto the Jews.

And then cometh the day when the arm of the Lord shall be revealed in power in convincing the nations, the heathen nations, the house of Joseph, of the gospel of their salvation.

The Lord had commanded but the Mormon Church has abolished. The priesthood as two or more can take up the school of the prophets at any time by gathering and agree on any one thing. This was the intent of the Lord, but Satan has turned it into a hierarchy of one commanding in all things. If any soul attempts to suggest the redemption of Zion is to come, including the school of the prophets, his or her comments become smothered over by traditional remarks pointing only to those above, selected by one and intimidated to consent by all. With this type of idolatry, the school of the prophets cannot survive. Thus, the church discourages discussion naturally by those wishing to maintain control and keep their honor and power. This will not prevent the Lord from revealing his knowledge to individual priesthood members. Wait and you will see. Remember it is the *key of knowledge* that is the power that cannot be controlled by Satan. Idolatry, central control, pride of position, and intimidation are the hallmarks of Satan. God will not correct those who cannot see. It is better that they remain in darkness until a remnant can call upon the Lord in true common consent.

The day will surely come when the iron teeth of Church and government become so entrenched that the only way to redeem Zion is without the arm of the Lord. When we apply the faith and organize in common consent, the Lord will arise in our hearts and nothing will stop us from spreading like the sun that rising in the east.

Under construction-This will attempt to show that the Scholl of the Prophets follows the principles of a Republic and not a Theocracy.