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Introduction

From its beginning, a key part of Mormonism’s general appeal was its accessibility; its ability to make abstract conceptions of divinity tangible, systematic, and readily understood.\(^1\) Joseph Smith Jr., Mormonism’s founder and first prophet, rejected the creeds of wider Christendom as “[teaching] for doctrines the commandments of men [while] having a form of godliness, but [denying] the power thereof.”\(^2\) Throughout his prophetic career, Joseph Smith consistently “eternalized” temporal concepts as his emerging theology transformed early Mormonism from a mostly-Protestant form of Christianity into what Jan Shipps has called a new “full-scale religious tradition.”\(^3\)

Perhaps the most poignant and most significant example of this process can be seen in Joseph Smith’s evolving conception of God.\(^4\) While it would be difficult to argue that Smith ever held strict Trinitarian views, it is clear that in Smith’s first prophetic act – the purported “translation” of the Book of Mormon by dictation to a scribe between 1827 and 1830 – Smith’s views were at the very least, modalistic.\(^5\) By 1838, however, Smith had completely rejected both Trinitarianism and modalism and began to teach the complete and distinct separation of members of the Godhead. In 1843 Smith taught that “the Father has a body of flesh and bones as tangible as man’s; the Son also; but the Holy Ghost has not a body of flesh and bones, but is a personage of Spirit.”\(^6\) In
essence, Smith had stated that man is of the same species as God; that God the Father was quite literally, an “exalted” man.

In this paper I will briefly examine the implications of this teaching on modern Mormonism’s conception of God and gender; two ideas which within Mormonism’s systematic theology, are inexorably intertwined. Given this context, I will then explore how this conception has lead directly to modern Mormonism’s moral opposition to homosexuality generally and its subsequent political opposition to same-sex marriage specifically. I will also argue that the modern Mormon dogmas used to justify this political and moral opposition may in fact, represent a significant departure from the original teachings of Joseph Smith.

The Mormon Conception of God

I will begin by outlining the modern Mormon conception of God as is taught throughout the Church today.

Mormonism completely, absolutely, and explicitly rejects the creeds of wider Christendom. It maintains that at a very early point the Church experienced a “Great Apostasy” wherein the “fullness of the Gospel”, which had been taught by Jesus and perpetuated by the Apostles, became lost and through Joseph Smith a “restoration of all things” was brought about. Part of this restoration was knowledge of the true nature of God.
In Mormon theology man is quite literally of the same species as God or, in other words, God is exalted and eternal man. He possesses a body of flesh and bones that is not ancillary to his eternal nature, but is rather, essential to it. Thus God is a sexual being quite literally the father of humankind and as such, has a female counterpart: an exalted and eternal woman.⁹

Indeed, it is God’s ability to procreate that is a key part of what makes him God. God is the father of spirit children¹⁰, which as part of providing an opportunity for growth, experience, development, and exaltation; he sent to Earth to obtain physical bodies and to be tested in their willingness to emulate God and the perfect example of God’s Son: Jesus Christ.¹¹

God’s children represent an eternal expansion, therefore, of God’s glory.¹²

**Origins of the Conception**

The origins of this radical reconceptualization of God’s nature can be found in Joseph Smith’s earliest prophetic work, the Book of Mormon, although it took at least 8 years for the conception to be solidified and stabilized and an additional 3-4 years for the conception to be explicitly preached. The Book of Mormon does not openly reject Trinitarianism but seems to embrace a type of modalism wherein Jesus Christ is both Father and Son.¹³ Significantly, both the Holy Spirit and a pre-mortal Jesus Christ make anthropomorphic appearances to Book of Mormon prophets.¹⁴
By 1838, Joseph Smith began to disseminate a finalized story of his “First Vision” wherein both God the Father and Jesus Christ – as separate beings – visited the teenage Joseph in response to a prayer of inquiry.\textsuperscript{15} Yet, it was not until 5 years later in 1843 that Smith began to preach openly about the separate distinction between Father, Son, and Holy Spirit as well as the physical nature of God’s being.

The development of this conception cannot be separated from Joseph Smith’s emerging views on marriage. Beginning in 1831 Smith showed a keen interest in the Patriarchs of the Hebrew Bible and felt compelled to “do the works of Abraham” thus becoming an extension of the Abrahamic covenant. A key aspect of “[doing] the works of Abraham” was the adoption and practice of plural marriage.\textsuperscript{16} Possibly as early as 1833\textsuperscript{17}, Smith began to marry other women in addition to his first wife, Emma. Throughout the 1830’s Joseph Smith adopted this practice very slowly but by the time of his murder in 1844, Joseph Smith had married at least 27 women as part of what came to be known as the “new and everlasting covenant.” The Mormon practice of plural marriage was never acknowledged during the life of Joseph Smith and was only made public in 1852 once the Latter-day Saints, under the leadership of Brigham Young, felt isolated and independent enough within the confines of the Great Basin of Utah, to make the details of this practice known.

In 1844, Joseph Smith delivered two sermons that form the basis on which the modern Mormon conception of God is constructed. These sermons have
come to be known as the “King Follett Discourse” and the “Sermon at the
Grove.”

The Sermon at the Grove is an exposition on the plurality of Gods. Within
the Sermon, Joseph Smith utilizes the Hebrew Bible’s use of the word Elohim to
argue for a form of henotheism. Smith proclaims: “the heads (sic) of the Gods
appointed one God for us; and when you take [that] view of the subject, it sets
one free to see all the beauty, holiness and perfection of the Gods.”

Smith reasons, based on a problematic King James Translation of Revelation Chapter 1
that:

If Jesus Christ was the Son of God, and John discovered that
God the father of Jesus Christ had a Father, you may suppose that
He (God the Father) had a father also. Where was there ever a son
without a father? And where was there ever a father without first
being a son? Whenever did a tree or anything spring into existing
without a progenitor? … Hence if Jesus had a Father, can we not
believe that He (God the Father) had a Father also?

Thus, Smith puts forth the notion of an eternal chain of Gods; each with a
progenitor as well as an heir, or heirs. In the King Follett Discourse, he expands
on this assertion:

God himself was once a man as we are now, and is an
exalted man, and sits enthroned in yonder heavens! That is the
great secret. … I say, if you were to see him today, you would see
him like a man in form – like yourselves in all person, image, and
very form as a man; for Adam was created in the very fashion,
image, and likeness of God, and received instruction from, and
walked, talked and conversed with him, as one man talks and
communes with another.
Smith explains further:

These are incomprehensible ideas to some, but they are simple. It is the first principle of the Gospel to know for a certainty the Character of God, and to know that we may converse with him as one man converses with another, and that he was once a man like us, yeah, that God himself, the Father of us all, dwelt on an earth, the same as Jesus Christ did. 22

Smith then teaches his audience:

Here, then is eternal life – to know the only wise and true God; and you have got to learn how to be Gods yourselves, and to be kings and priests to God, the same as all Gods have done before you, namely, by going from one small degree to another, and from a small capacity to a great one; from grace to grace, from exaltation to exaltation, until you attain the to the resurrection of the dead and are able to dwell in everlasting burnings, and to sit in glory, as do those who sit enthroned in everlasting power. 23

Some mothers in Smith’s audience were evidently concerned about the eternal welfare of their children who had died before having an opportunity to accept the ordinances enabling eternal progression. To these mothers, Smith said:

Mothers you shall have your children; for they shall have eternal life; for their debt is paid … but as a child dies, so shall it rise from the dead, and be for ever living in the learnings of God. It will never grow; it will still be the child in the same precise form as it appeared before it died out of its mother’s arms, but possessing all the intelligence of a God.

Further:

Eternity is full of thrones, upon which dwell thousands of children reigning on thrones of glory, with not one cubit added to their stature. 24
Significantly, this passage regarding exalted children has been edited out of “mainstream” Church publications due to the fact that Smith’s teaching here that children would forever remain in a state of physical arrested development contradicts some of his other teachings on the physical development of children in the hereafter. Yet, it is essential to note that Smith spoke here of individuals (in this case Children) becoming Gods and “reigning on thrones of glory.” Also, Stan Larson, in his exhaustive amalgamation of this Sermon’s text, retains this significant passage.

Shortly after giving this sermon, Joseph Smith was murdered in Carthage, Illinois yet this idea of “eternal progression” remains central to Mormon theology to this day.

**Expansion of the Conception**

The death of Joseph Smith began a chain of events that led to the expulsion of the Mormons from Illinois and their eventual settlement in the Great Basin of Utah. This isolation within the Rocky Mountains allowed the Mormons to openly practice plural marriage and, in 1852, publically announce the practice to the world. Plural marriage had been taught secretly by Joseph Smith in Illinois to a relatively small number of his closest associates and Smith taught that the practice of “celestial marriage” was essential in order for men and women to become exalted and become Gods. None of the scant records we have of Joseph Smith’s private teachings explicitly link sexuality and procreation
with the potential for Godhood. Rather, Smith employed terms such as “eternal increase” and “a continuation of the seeds”\(^{29}\) to describe the exaltation of man and wife (or wives).

This all changed once the Mormons reached Utah under the leadership of Brigham Young. In an attempt to explain the necessity of plural marriage, Brigham Young and Mormon Apostle, Orson Pratt, began to explicitly link “eternal increase” and exaltation with sexual procreation and in the process, they also began to describe God in more explicit sexual terms.\(^{30}\) Both Young and Pratt argued that a greater posterity, made possible through plural marriage and similar adoptive sealings, equated to a greater glory in Godhood.\(^{31}\)

The Mormon Church faced increasing pressure from the federal government because of plural marriage and, in 1890, eventually disavowed the practice under the leadership of Wilford Woodruff in order to avoid the seizure of all Church property and further arrests of those in Church leadership. Under Woodruff’s leadership, Mormon theology moved away from plural marriage being central to exaltation toward monogamous eternal marriage being normative. Yet, sexuality was, in essence, still what made exaltation possible. A man and wife married in eternity would have the ability to procreate, create new worlds and ever-increase their eternal glory through posterity.\(^{32}\)
Modern Opposition to Homosexuality

In 1995, the leadership of the Mormon Church issued what has come to be known as the Family Proclamation. In this proclamation, the Church declares, “gender is an essential characteristic of individual premortal, mortal, and eternal identity and purpose” and notes that “each [individual] is a beloved spirit son or daughter of heavenly parents” (emphasis added).

Further:

By divine design, fathers are to preside over their families in love and righteousness and are responsible to provide the necessities of life and protection for their families. Mothers are primarily responsible for the nurture of their children. In these sacred responsibilities, fathers and mothers are obligated to help one another as equal partners.

This proclamation reiterated the Church’s strong views on gender roles - both earthly and eternal.

Homosexuality is anathema to Mormon theological conceptions. Two men, or two women, because of their very eternal nature - are unable, as a couple, to reach their full potential as exalted beings capable of becoming Gods, creating worlds, and producing eternal offspring.

Therefore, in my view, modern Mormonism opposes homosexuality for several reasons. First, homosexuality stands in opposition to Mormonism’s view of God’s plan for the union of male and female; second, the Church feels a responsibility to “protect” morality in the public square; and third, the Church
may fear government encroachment on its ability to restrict celestial marriages to heterosexual couples.

**The Possibility of Change**

Within the Mormon theological framework, however, there is always the possibility of change. Mormonism proudly boasts of “continuing revelation” which may, as God sees fit, expand current understandings or discard previous held notions or practices. Thus, it is entirely possible that the Mormon Church could become more amenable to the idea of same-sex marriage in some form depending on a number of cultural and religious factors. Perhaps the most influential factor would be for modern Mormonism to reevaluate Joseph Smith’s original teachings on the nature of human sexuality and potential for Godhood sans the later extrapolations of Brigham Young and Orson Pratt.

That Joseph Smith taught that God is an exalted human being is beyond question as is the fact that Smith taught some sort of relationship between the sexes – as it relates to creating familial ties -- is essential to Godhood. However, I contend that this relationship was not meant to convey explicit sexuality but rather, it was intended to represent familial relationships to bring both individuals and families into the wider Abrahamic covenant so central to Joseph Smith’s eschatological ideas.

Joseph Smith viewed himself as a modern Abraham and felt it was his calling to “do the works of Abraham” in part, by restoring the practice of plural
marriage. Both Richard Bushman and Todd Compton argue that many of these plural marriages were dynastic in nature: binding Joseph Smith with other influential Mormon families. Joseph Smith, unlike later Mormon polygamists, actively practiced polyandry. Also, we know of no offspring that resulted from Joseph Smith’s plural marriages. Thus, Joseph Smith’s own practice of plural marriage is more understandable in the context of familial dynastic relationships than in the context of sexual offspring enabling both glory and Godhood.

Also, before the administration of Wilford Woodruff – and especially in the early days of celestial marriage, it was a common practice to seal one man to another in an eternal father-son relationship thus forming a non-sexual family tie. Such sealings were known as adoption and support the eschatological notion of familial dynastic relationships.

It seems evident that Joseph Smith intended all to become part of the Abrahamic covenant and the reconstitution of plural marriage and celestial marriage were the means to this end. When Joseph Smith spoke of “eternal increase” it is very likely that he was not speaking of an increase in procreated offspring. Rather, “doing the works of Abraham” by entering the “new and everlasting covenant of marriage” qualified individuals to take part in the larger Abrahamic covenant thus enabling them to receive an eternal increase of God’s glory and kingdoms – to become Kings and Priests, Queens and Priestesses unto God.
Conclusion

The interpretation I present here of Joseph Smith’s original teachings is a radical departure from modern Mormon notions of sexuality as it relates to the eternal potential of humankind. Also, it is not without problems. However, its key strength is that it is based entirely upon the extant words of Joseph Smith regarding human exaltation and also on the notes and journals of his immediate contemporaries. In other words, I have given primacy to contemporary, rather than late, sources.

As social orthodoxy moves towards greater acceptance of same-sex relationships, the modern Mormon Church is likely to make some accommodations in response. It would be fruitless to speculate on what these accommodations may be. However, modern Mormonism has been keen to downplay, and even disavow some of the teachings of Brigham Young when such teachings have proven problematic.\(^{39}\) It seems to me, then, that Brigham Young’s explicit sexualization of God, and its resulting dogma, may be a teaching yet to be discarded. Teryl Givens has noted that Mormonism is a religion of paradox.\(^{40}\)

Paradoxically, modern Mormonism may need to look back in an effort move forward.
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