

## Continuing Revelation and Schism in the Church

DEFENDERS OF THE FAITH:  
VARIETIES OF RLDS DISSENT*By William Dean Russell*

AS IS WELL KNOWN TO SUNSTONE READERS, MORMON fundamentalists began to break away from the LDS church after it stopped the practice of plural marriage and teaching related doctrines. They wanted to preserve the "true" gospel taught by Brigham and Joseph. Currently the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints (RLDS), of which I am a member, is confronting a similar challenge of fundamentalist schisms as a result of theological changes, and the parallels are often interesting and occasionally deadly frightening.

There has been a deepening theological division within the ranks of the RLDS church over the past thirty years or so. A growing professionalism in the top leadership of the church has led to a more liberal or ecumenical approach to theological issues. This has meant that those aspects of RLDS belief which are held in common with other Christians have been given comparatively more emphasis and those aspects of our thought which are unique to our movement have been given less emphasis.

This de-emphasis of certain RLDS fundamentals—such as the idea that the primitive Christian church fell into apostasy and was later restored—has quite naturally been resisted by people who are sometimes called "conservatives" or "traditionalists." Most often they are called "fundamentalists" because they want to hold fast to certain fundamental doctrines and practices which they feel are absolutely essential. Fundamentalists believe that the leaders of the church have been moving away from many of the unique or distinctive features of RLDS thought and, in the process, are becoming more like mainstream Protestantism. Therefore, they regard ecumenism as apostasy.

The issues for the RLDS are fairly similar to those which divide fundamentalist and liberal Protestants. The central issue

in both the Protestant and RLDS cases is the authority of scripture: fundamentalists explicitly or implicitly adopt some form of the idea of biblical inerrancy or infallibility, and liberals regard scripture as conditioned by human fallibility and historical circumstances.

In Latter Day Saintism, the fundamental/liberal division has an additional dimension: biblical inerrancy is expanded to include the Book of Mormon and the revelations to the latter-day prophets. The fundamentalists take these additional scriptures as fully trustworthy and tend to interpret them in a strict, literal fashion. Liberals contend that these scriptures are also conditioned by history and human fallibility. But Latter Day Saint liberals have an additional problem: the unique Latter Day Saint scriptures support the fundamentalist interpretation of the Bible. For example, scriptures produced by Joseph Smith assume that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, that John the son of Zebedee wrote the book of Revelation, and that the book of Isaiah had a single author. These assumptions are contrary to the majority consensus of biblical scholars.

In the mainline Protestant denominations, the fundamentalist/liberal controversy was fought early in the twentieth century, with the liberals prevailing in most cases by the end of the 1920s. In my view an appropriate date to begin an overview of the developing controversy in the RLDS church is 1958—the beginning of W. Wallace Smith's tenure as president of the church. Many RLDS people on both sides of this issue see this as the point when these schismatic issues began to emerge.

At the October 1958 World Conference, W. Wallace Smith was ordained prophet, and he named F. Henry Edwards and Maurice Draper as counselors. Edwards was a holdover from the First Presidency of Wallace's brother and predecessor, Israel A. Smith. W. Wallace Smith called Clifford Cole and Charles Neff to the Council of Twelve. He also broke lineage in the office of Presiding Patriarch by calling Roy Chevillie to that office, passing over apparent successor Lynn Smith, son of the outgoing patriarch, Elbert A. Smith, grandson of David H. Smith and great grandson of Joseph Smith, Jr. Although the RLDS Presiding

---

*WILLIAM DEAN RUSSELL is a professor of history and political science at Graceland College in Lamoni, Iowa, and is writing a book on the recent RLDS schism. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 1989 SUNSTONE Symposium in Salt Lake City.*

Patriarch does not have much power, the appointment of Cheville broke with a significant tradition and was a symbol of change. In fact, some fundamentalists believe that passing over Lynn Smith for Presiding Patriarch was the first sign that W. Wallace Smith was in apostasy. Each of the men Smith called to high office—Maurice Draper, Clifford Cole, Charles Neff, and Roy Cheville—played a role in the movement of the RLDS church toward a more ecumenical understanding of the nature of the gospel and the church.

In the early years of W. Wallace's presidency, some staff members at the offices at World Headquarters in Independence, Missouri, began to take graduate courses at Saint Paul School of Theology, a Methodist seminary in Kansas City which opened its doors in 1959. A few members of the church's religious education department began taking courses the first year they were in operation, and several staff members graduated with Master of Divinity degrees.

Formal theological training of church staff members had a liberalizing effect on the materials published for Sunday School use, on the materials published in the *Saints' Herald*, and on other church publications. These trends were apparent at least as early as the fall of 1960 when the religious education department published a year-long series of quarterlies on the Old Testament for senior high students. These quarterlies adopted an essentially evolutionary view of the Old Testament. Written by Garland Tickemyer, then the president of the all-church High Priests' Quorum, these quarterlies created controversy. Some congregations refused to use the quarterlies. Some members of the Quorum of Seventies were quite vocal in their opposition to Tickemyer's interpretation of the Bible.

In the summer of 1960, Chris Hartshorn retired as editor of the *Saints' Herald*, the official magazine of the church. Seventy-two-year-old conservative Hartshorn was replaced by twenty-nine-year-old Roger Yarrington, a professional journalist with a moderately liberal theology. Hartshorn had trained his copy editor to be on the lookout for statements in articles which were "not in harmony" with traditional RLDS teachings. Yarrington had to retrain her, explaining that since he had approved the articles for publication by the time they reached her desk, she need not concern herself with correcting the theology.

There were a number of liberal articles printed in the *Herald* in the early 1960s; the two most controversial were by James Lancaster and Lloyd Young. In "By the Gift and Power of God" (1962) Lancaster concluded that the Book of Mormon was translated as Joseph Smith sat with his face buried in a hat dictating to his scribe, the plates under cover on a nearby table. This was a shock to many Latter Day Saints schooled in the traditional story which has Joseph looking at the golden plates through a spectacle-like Urim and Thummim and translating the reformed Egyptian characters into English. Lloyd Young's article, "The Virgin Birth" (1964), cautiously suggested that the evidence for Mary's virginity at the time of Jesus' birth is not very strong. Letters of protest poured into Herald House when these two articles were published.

Finally, from 1958 to 1960 Graceland College added four

liberal faculty members in the religion and philosophy areas: Lloyd Young, Paul Edwards, Robert Speaks, and Leland Negaard. Speaks and Negaard had graduate degrees from two of the leading Protestant theological seminaries in the country—the University of Chicago and Union Theological Seminary in New York. A few years before their arrival, two historians, Robert Flanders and Alma Blair, began to examine Latter Day Saint history with the tools of their discipline. Charges that these faculty members undermined the faith of students were often heard in the early 1960s.

I mention the department of religious education, Herald House in Independence, and the faculty at Graceland because, generally, the threat to orthodoxy which concerned the fundamentalists was coming from the staff of church departments and institutions, not from the top leaders themselves. At this point, it appears the fundamentalists saw as their mission to inform the leaders about the dangerous things their subordinates were teaching.

**I**N the 1970s the fundamentalists became concerned that the liberal theology which certain staff members had articulated in the 1960s was being accepted by the top leadership—the First Presidency and the Twelve Apostles. This concern was triggered in around 1969 when the fundamentalists discovered certain facts relating to the development of a new curriculum by the religious education department. Certain theological papers—called position papers—had been authored by members of a curriculum committee which included some members of the First Presidency and the Council of Twelve. When these papers were leaked to the church public, fundamentalist saints were shocked at their extremely liberal contents. One example illustrates the point quite well. In the position paper on the Book of Mormon, the author viewed the book as fiction and Joseph Smith as its author.

Most of these papers were written by department of religious education staff members Donald Landon, Geoffrey Spencer, Wayne Ham, and Verne Sparkes. Sparkes was a graduate of Union Theological Seminary in New York; Spencer and Ham were graduates of Saint Paul School of Theology in Kansas City.

By the end of the 1970s, W. Wallace Smith's son, Wallace B. Smith, was president (ordained in 1978), and it was becoming clear that the top leadership espoused the ecumenical approach. The position papers of the late 1960s might have been dismissed as the work of staff members, but in 1979 the First Presidency delivered a series of lectures promoting similar ecumenical or liberal views. The Presidential Papers, as they were called, brought the fundamentalists' search for heresy right to the door of the prophet and his counselors.

The early 1970s also saw the first significant separatist or schismatic movements resulting from the theological shift. In 1970 Barney Fuller began publishing *Zion's Warning*, a fundamentalist newspaper challenging the liberal direction the church leadership was taking. Before long he had organized a congregation of RLDS fundamentalists in Independence, which

rented a building for Sunday morning worship services. But Fuller himself eventually rejected Joseph Smith and the Restoration tradition, becoming an evangelical Protestant preacher. However, his associate, Gene Walton, eventually proclaimed himself a prophet and now heads a very small RLDS splinter group. Walton has produced several revelations.

At this point most fundamentalists had no desire to separate from the church. They continued to have hope for the institutional church, but they longed to hear the old fundamental gospel preached. So in 1979 a Restoration Festival was held. This consisted of a weekend of preaching, praying, and testifying in the old tradition. Led by Greg Donovan of Detroit, this independent group of fundamentalists rented facilities at Graceland College and attracted between two and three thousand worshippers. Because the first Restoration Festival was a big success, it was repeated several times. Eventually, the Restoration Festival became an independent organization holding similar weekend retreats several times a year. Fundamentalists began publishing a monthly magazine, the *Restoration Voice*, which often reprinted articles from the *Saints' Herald* of the 1940s and 1950s—the period just prior to W. Wallace Smith's presidency.

Still, in 1984 there were only a few small fundamentalist groups meeting outside the authority of the institutional church when Wallace B. Smith announced his revelation permitting the ordination of women. For many fundamentalists, this act was the last straw. To their way of thinking, the gospel is unchangeable, and, since no women had been called before, it was obvious that God didn't want women in his priesthood.

In the six years since the revelation was announced, many separatist "branches" and "congregations" have been organized. At the present time, I have identified 221 independent local groups in thirty-two states, Canada, and Australia. Fifty-five of these groups are in Missouri, many in the Independence area. Other states with large numbers of such groups are Michigan, Oklahoma, and Texas.

I use the word branch for a group of people who organize themselves in a fashion comparable to a regular congregation with elected officers and regular worship and study meetings. Many of these branches administer communion, baptisms, ordinations, and weddings, even though they are not recognized by the RLDS church and even though many of the priesthood administering these ordinances have been silenced by the institutional church (silencing means priesthood authority has been removed).

On the other hand, a "group" is simply a collection of people who meet to study or worship but have not as yet organized in the form of a congregation with elected offices. Frequently such small groups meet in homes for scripture study or prayer. In some cases they simply have no priesthood leaders. On a recent fact-finding trip west, for example, I stopped in Salinas, California, where there are about twelve fundamentalist schismatics. (A "schismatic" is a person who is willing to break with the church; some fundamentalists still attend the regular RLDS congregations and thus are not schismatic.) However,

in Salinas since they have only one priesthood member—an eighteen-year-old deacon—they cannot have the normal congregational worship activities and cannot perform any of the sacraments or ordinances. They meet regularly for Bible study but travel to another area for communion. These branches and groups are independent of the institutional church and normally hold their classes and worship services at the same time as the institutional church—Sunday School and preaching on Sunday morning and prayer and testimony meetings on Wednesday night.

I AGREE with the opinion of Apostle William T. Higdon, expressed to me in an interview on 17 August 1989, that the fundamentalist reaction to the ordination of women has come in three waves responding to the biennial World Conferences of the church held in 1984, 1986, and 1988.

In the first wave immediately after the approval of the revelation approved at the 1984 conference, there were not many people yet ready to leave the church or organize separate branches. Higdon estimates that there were only about 100 formal withdrawals from the church which were caused directly by Section 156, the revelation granting women the priesthood. Formal withdrawals may only be the tip of the iceberg, of course, but the important point is that there were few local schismatic groups formed in these early months. There were many meetings of concerned fundamentalists such as the International Elders Conferences but little formal schism.

Many fundamentalists still believed Wallace B. Smith was a prophet—he had just made a mistake and it would be corrected, probably at the next World Conference in 1986. They came to the 1986 conference determined to get the conference to formally rescind Section 156. But President Smith ruled that a motion from a stake to rescind a revelation in the Doctrine and Covenants was out of order. Since he reasoned that only the prophet can propose a revelation only a prophet can initiate a move to rescind a revelation. About 90 percent of the conference delegates supported his ruling. This action meant that the fundamentalists could not look to the World Conference to remedy the situation, since they could not initiate a rescission of a revelation. And even if they could have, they would not have had the votes needed to succeed.

Instead, the fundamentalists developed a strategy of preserving beachheads or enclaves in the church where true saints (namely fundamentalists) could maintain local congregations or stakes which would resist liberalism and resist ordaining women or using women in priesthood capacities. In a stake, for example, they might all gravitate to the congregation which was the most fundamental. (Unlike the LDS, we do not insist that a member attend the congregation closest to home.) That congregation could decline to call women to the priesthood and decide not to use ordained women who moved into the congregation. Liberals in the congregation would tend to transfer to other congregations which were not so fundamental.

Ideally, these beachheads or enclaves would allow both fun-

damentalists and liberals to remain within the church. In defense of this strategy, fundamentalists noted that several jurisdictions in the church had permitted such special-interest enclaves for persons whose views are to the left of the mainstream. There were many issues involved in this struggle, but the ordination of women became a convenient symbol and litmus test: if a congregation had not ordained any women and was not using women in priesthood capacities, it was regarded as fundamental. Those congregations which were ordaining women were regarded as liberal.

Many fundamentalists saw the Blue Valley and Central Missouri Stakes as such beachheads. The delegations from these two stakes had been strongly fundamentalist at the 1986 World Conference. At stake conferences they were able to vote down all priesthood calls for women which were presented for vote. Since both stakes are near Independence, fundamentalist members from outside of the Center Place, as we call Independence, could "gather to Zion," so to speak, by moving to the Independence area and attending fundamentalist congregations in one of these two stakes. And fundamentalist members already living in nearby stakes could transfer their membership to congregations in the Blue Valley or Central Missouri Stakes and not have to drive far to their new congregation. In a three month period after the 1986 conference, about 600 persons transferred their membership into Blue Valley Stake.

In response, the leadership of the church decided not to allow fundamentalist enclaves or beachheads to exist. Some fundamentalist-controlled congregations were dissolved or reduced to mission status. In others the headquarters replaced fundamentalist pastors with pastors who were either liberal or at least supported the World Church leadership, especially on the use of women in priestly capacities. In addition to the use of ordained women, other tests of loyalty to the World Church have been whether congregations use the new hymnal and the church's curriculum materials and whether they follow priesthood guidelines established since 1984. When a loyal pastor was installed, in many cases the fundamentalists have walked out and formed their own separate branches.

The World Conference of 1988 voted to uphold the actions of the church leaders which disallowed enclaves of fundamentalists who do not support the World Church. As a result, a third wave of schism has occurred. Many fundamentalists who previously had held out hope now saw no reason to stay in the church if fundamentalist beachheads were not to be allowed. They saw little option but to leave the church altogether or worship in separate congregations unauthorized by the RLDS church but faithful to a fundamentalist interpretation of the gospel.

It doesn't appear that anything occurred at the 1990 conference which will produce a fourth wave of fundamentalist defection. Yet it is certain that the defection has not as yet run its course. There are still plenty of fundamentalists who have not yet made a final decision as to which way to go. It is a very difficult break to make because the RLDS church places a very high premium on the authority of the institutional church and the need for loyalty to it. The dilemma is this: The more

firmly you believe the traditional message of the church the more likely you are to be disturbed by the direction the church is going. But the more firmly you believe the traditional message of the church, the more difficult it is for you to break with the authority of the church because you take that authority so seriously.

It is possible that most of the defection which will occur has already occurred. The interesting question, is what will happen to the fundamentalist groups? Will they become stable and cooperate with one another? So far they seem to be achieving that objective, although certainly there are rifts within the fundamentalist community. Another question is whether by missionary efforts they can grow in the future.

As I indicated earlier, at the present time I have identified 221 local independent branches or groups. I estimate that about ten percent of the original RLDS membership is involved. Many of these local groups of fundamentalists seem to be aligned in a loose way with the Association of Independent Groups and Branches, commonly called "The Association." The Association takes what I call the "non-separatist strategy." The founder of the Association was Terry Emerick of Independence. Its leading strategist and spokesperson is Richard Price of Independence. Their strategy is to consider themselves still to be RLDS. They are the true RLDS church because they hold to the true RLDS gospel. The RLDS hierarchy is considered the "liberal faction" of the church and is held to be in apostasy. Therefore, these non-separatist fundamentalists do not attend the regular RLDS congregations because they see them as being controlled by the hierarchy. Neither do they pay tithing or give other financial support to the institutional church. They do, however, retain their RLDS membership and priesthood. It is true that frequently the regular church leaders have silenced fundamentalist priesthood, and, in a few cases, they have expelled them from the church. But the fundamentalists simply don't recognize these silencings or expulsions as valid. They reason that the silencings were performed by church leaders who have gone into apostasy and therefore have lost their authority. Indeed, for some it has become a badge of honor to have been silenced. One prominent fundamentalist told me, "When we get calls to administer to the sick, they often ask for us to send a silenced elder."

It seems to me that the Association of Independent Groups and Branches is somewhat like the Southern Baptist Convention—a loose association of local congregations, each retaining its own autonomy. But Latter Day Saints believe in having a prophet and apostles and bishops. So the RLDS fundamentalists do not expect to remain in independent Restoration branches forever. They believe God will some day move to purify the RLDS church, either by removing President Smith and his liberal associates or by causing Wallace to repent and return to the true gospel or by raising up a new prophet. If someone arises proclaiming himself or someone else to be the true prophet, the Association would take no position on the question as to the validity of such a claim.

If the time comes when Association members have accepted

one or more claims to the office of prophet, the Association will no longer need to exist. Its purpose is only to serve in the interim. During this interim the proper thing to do is to organize independent Restoration branches because of the lack of World Church leadership with authority.

**A**LTHOUGH the vast majority of fundamentalist schismatics are taking this non-separatist strategy, a second and different approach—which I call the separatist approach—is being taken by other fundamentalists. They are considerably less numerous than the non-separatists. The separatists consider the RLDS church hopeless and believe that God has given up on the RLDS church, and that true saints should leave the church and look for God to call a new prophet, apostles and other officers of the general church. A major difference between the separatists and the non-separatists is that the non-separatists do not do anything more than that which a local branch can do by itself. They will ordain up to the office of elder but will not ordain a person to any of the high priestly offices or the office of seventy. They will not organize the church higher than the local branch. They have local autonomy, similar to the Southern Baptists and other denominations with congregational church government.

The separatists, however, are prepared to organize beyond the local level. The best example so far is the Church of Christ Restored, with its base in Michigan. Their leader is Bud Ormsbee from Cheboygan, Michigan. They have more than a dozen congregations and have ordained seven apostles. To vote in their meetings, one must formally withdraw RLDS membership. When they feel that God has designated his choice for prophet, they will proceed.

A similar group is the Church of the Lamb of God, which originated in Maine, has a stronghold in the state of Washington, and only recently began holding regular worship services in Independence. They have ordained twelve new seventies, and many believe they will soon formally organize as a new church.

**T**HERE is a third approach to dissent: the self-proclaimed prophet. The Church of Christ Restored in Michigan and the Church of the Lamb of God do not yet have prophets. They are building a church first and anticipate that a prophet will emerge. But some men have stepped forward and proclaimed themselves as prophets, expecting to build an organization thereafter.

Eugene Walton, former RLDS seventy, is one who has produced revelations. His following is very tiny—only six members. His ability to get out and win yet more converts was hampered last year by six months in jail for refusing to pay alimony to his exwife. He refused on the grounds that God had instructed him to spend full time preaching and, therefore, he couldn't earn the money necessary to meet the alimony obligation. (Before we laugh at Walton, however, we should recall that there is historical precedent for prophets doing time. And in the civil

rights movement being jailed was a badge of honor, just as being silenced is an honor for the fundamentalist.)

Another reasonably well-known would-be-prophet was John Cato, who in 1986 proclaimed himself prophet and also produced revelations. His group, the Church of Christ, Zion's Branch, publishes a newsletter which has included Cato's revelations. His term as prophet was short lived; less than a year after his calling he left Zion's Branch and joined the LDS church. Zion's Branch survives but without a prophet to lead them.

Another well-known prophet is Bob Baker, a Graceland college alumnus. He had a considerable following before he proclaimed himself prophet. Since then his following has dwindled and is now very small. Several lesser-known figures have asserted their prophetic claims. A couple of them have died before getting much earthly recognition of their calling.

Undoubtedly, the best known prophet is Jeff Lundgren who with twelve of his followers now stands accused of a mass murder in Kirtland, Ohio, in April 1989. He was dissatisfied with the decision to ordain women and gathered a following in Kirtland, mainly among persons similarly dissatisfied. He had a revelation which asserted that ten people needed to die to purify his community. Once that purification took place, they would receive the golden sword (apparently the sword of Laban in the Book of Mormon), and Lundgren would establish world dominion as prophet. He read something in the scriptures which led him to conclude that the number could be cut in half, so the five members of the Dennis and Cheryl Avery family were murdered. His group had dissolved a few weeks before the bodies were found, and indictments were issued in January 1990.

I am not yet certain whether to include the community established by "the Brother of Clark," east of Lamoni, Iowa. Their leader, formerly known as Ron Livingston, and his people apparently have no quarrel with ordaining women. So possibly they do not fit within the confines of this study, which focuses on the fundamentalist reaction to the growing liberalism or ecumenism in the church. But part of the fundamentalists' critique is the apparent deemphasis of the Book of Mormon in the RLDS church, and the Brother of Clark is, above all, a zealous believer in the Book of Mormon. My impression is that many of the people he has attracted are fundamentalist and strong Book of Mormon advocates. So his group probably fits.

**F**INALLY, looking again now at the whole movement, I cannot at this point see any strong leader emerging to unite the RLDS fundamentalists. The largest single figure in the movement is Richard Price. He has earned his prominence from his three books and many other writings, including quite a few full-page *Independence Examiner* advertisements—in effect long articles criticizing RLDS church actions. But Price is a quiet little man. I don't think he has the charisma necessary to be prophet himself. And Price himself looks for a descendant of Joseph the Martyr, one named Smith, to be the next true prophet. Where he will find such a man is difficult to imagine. But Price's

strategy of retaining the true faith in independent local Restoration branches is a satisfactory strategy for those who are comfortable having the church exist on the local level only. They are comfortable with the American tradition of congregationalism—of local control. Although the RLDS scriptures call for central authority in various general church offices and officers, perhaps many of these people are really Southern Baptists with two extra books of scripture to interpret strictly. And since their disappointment has been with general church officers thwarting their efforts to preserve the gospel as they know it in their local congregations, they don't want to be in a hurry to create a new central bureaucracy which might frustrate them all over again. Better to take your time and be very sure before accepting anyone's claim to be prophet; better to beware of those who attempt to create a central organization and collect tithing. Meanwhile local leaders can retain control of their own groups and preach the true gospel as they see it.

I think Richard Price's non-separatist strategy can enable the RLDS fundamentalists to survive for a reasonable period of time, although I doubt that their numbers will grow significantly. Those who claim to be prophets so far have achieved very little success. Non-separatists, of course, are always capable of becoming separatists any time a prophet arises in whom they

can place their trust. If a charismatic leader does not arise as prophet, drawing many of the separatists and non-separatists to his side, the RLDS fundamentalists will continue to be split in many directions. Eventually, even the more prudent faction informally led by Richard Price might dwindle as they wait for a prophet. I assume they can't wait forever. Yet it is true that even today, James J. Strang's followers still await the calling of another prophet to succeed Strang, and Strang died in 1856. That really takes patience. But there are only about 300 people patient enough to continue the vigil, 134 years after Strang's death. ☒

New in paperback from

## NORTH CAROLINA

### Exiles in a Land of Liberty

*Mormons in America, 1830-1846*

by Kenneth H. Winn

"Winn's analysis of shared republican principles places the Mormons very much inside antebellum American culture. By highlighting the centrality of such beliefs to early Mormon society he performs a service, for he forces those who have viewed the Saints as a counterculture to think again about their judgments."—*Journal of the Early Republic*

"A study that must be read by all students of early Mormon history."  
—*Illinois Historical Journal*

294 pp., \$10.95 paper, \$32.50 cloth / Studies in Religion

available at bookstores or from

**The University of North Carolina Press**

Post Office Box 2288 / Chapel Hill, NC 27515-2288

☎ Toll-free orders: 1-800-848-6224

---



---

#### FOR THOSE LOOKING TOO HARD FOR LOVE

You wonder, when the tree boughs hang heavy  
With apples that swell with days of sun and rain,  
Why the fruit has not yet fallen into your hands.  
You have forsaken climbing, for the boughs of love  
Are too fragile, too tenuous for the studied search.  
Standing in the orchard's shadow has cost you time  
As you wait and wait like a wine goblet filled  
To overflowing, that sits untouched on the table.

Arise now. You have stood by the fence, searching  
The horizon like a poet bereft of vision too long,  
Or a disciple whose master has left him to his own fire.  
The fields lie about you, untilled and untamed.  
They know your name, but you are deafened  
By the sound of your voice, calling out names  
That have no face, no meaning to them.  
Blinded by your desire, you cannot hear the beat  
Of the earth that does not cease.

It is the rhythm of growing things that live each day  
In the fullest measure of joy and grace. And you,  
So gifted with more thought and feeling, do not understand  
As much as the green and winged children of the planet.  
They fell from Paradise with you, but it lives within them,  
Never really lost, but hidden from the view of man.  
If you could see, how much more joy is yours in the finding.  
You, lined with the thoughts of godhood, you with the  
lineaments of  
The Creator. His stamp is upon you, but in your loneliness,  
His gentle breath at your back is nothing but a chill wind.

—CARA BULLINGER