

MORMONS IN POLITICS

January 26, 2008



I have been lax in putting something on this page, and my New Year's resolution is that I will try harder. However, I will probably leave this particular one on here until after the presidential elections.

I have been asked my opinion on whether a Christian should vote for a Mormon, in particular, Mitt Romney.

I will keep this as brief as I can for the sake of those who prefer reading something short. But, for those who want to absorb the subject in greater depth, I have written an article entitled, *The Political Agenda of the Mormon Church*, which will be posted to my site soon. It will present the subject in far more detail, and include more LDS references in the endnotes. The link to it will appear on my home page along with the list of my other articles. So, be sure to watch for it.

In response to the question about Mitt Romney, let me say that a candidate's religion, in most cases, isn't a major concern for me. A voter should be thinking about a candidate's qualifications--certainly his or her values--along with experience, capabilities, and if the candidate's political views are in line with what one believes.

Unfortunately, I know some individuals who will only vote for a candidate whose religion is the same as theirs, and become blind to the rest. By doing that, they fail to live up to their full responsibility as a voter. The danger, of course, is that a candidate may exhibit high standards and ethics due to his or her religious affiliation, but the rest of his qualifications may reveal that he doesn't have the necessary experience.

Now to the question. Rather than give my opinion of Romney--who I'm sure is a nice person and holds the typical values and high standards of many Mormons--I would rather address the subject in general . . . that of the risk of Mormons holding political office, and let you be the judge.

The risk factor--and there is one--will probably be new to many of you. In fact, it may startle you. But, here it is:

The Mormon Church has a secret agenda for the nation that they hope to achieve, in part, by promoting as many Mormons as they can into political office. This agenda has controlled every president of the church since Joseph Smith, and is a large part of the motive as to why the church expends so many dollars into their missionary program.

To understand how this secret agenda first started requires a look at Mormon history.

Joseph Smith set up two organizations:

1. The *public* one--the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints and its theology that most are generally familiar with.
2. A secret one--an organization called, The Kingdom of God (*also called The Government of God...the two names often used interchangeably*), to be ruled by a Council of Fifty who were sworn to secrecy about its existence under penalty of death.(1)
This Kingdom of God was never an organization *within* the LDS Church. It was a *separate* entity, although it grew out of the church and was directed by men holding the Mormon priesthood. When members of the Council died, they were

replaced so that the Council would continue down through the church.

Since the LDS goal was to create a theocratic *kingdom*, this necessitated a king. The Kingdom of God was set up so that there would always be a king ruling over the Council of Fifty, namely, whoever was the President of the Church.

The first king was Joseph Smith, who declared himself, "king over all the earth," and was ordained as such.⁽²⁾ Two of his Apostles, Lyman Wight and Heber C. Kimball referred to Smith's title as, "President Pro tem of the world." The Council of Fifty immediately had Joseph Smith announce his candidacy for President, hoping to achieve control of the nation sooner, and sent out missionaries to electioneer for him. However, he was assassinated before this could materialize. Later, in turn, Church Presidents, Brigham Young, John Taylor, Wilford Woodruff and Lorenzo Snow were also ordained kings by the Council of Fifty.

The organization's ultimate aim was to eventually take over the United States government, which would particularly be achieved by encouraging as many Mormons into political office as they could; plus, acquire more voting converts, which would increase the chances of a Mormon winning. Once their take-over was successful, the church would create not a democracy, but a theocracy (*a form of government where God's laws are interpreted by church authorities*).

Brigham Young, in the *Journal of Discourses*, describes it by saying:

"[This] means no more or less than the complete overthrow of the nation, and not only of this nation, but the nations of Europe." (3)

The agenda, historian Bancroft reported, is also reflected in Brigham Young's statement that "*he would himself become President of the United States, or dictate who should be President.*" (4)

After acquiring national rule, the whole world would then be organized into a one-world government ruled by priesthood-holders.

The church's motivation for this was to prepare the world for Christ's Second Coming and the millennial reign, and since they believe they are the only true church that God recognizes, it is imperative when that time comes that they be in charge. But, if they can acquire enough converts and back more Mormons into politics *before* the Millennium, all the better.

The Biblical passage the LDS church uses to validate their political organization is Daniel 2:31-45. Especially note verse 44:

And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed; and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever. (v. 44 KJV)

While the general membership interpret this passage and description of Daniel's vision of the stone which is to fill the whole earth and destroy other governments as the LDS church and its theology, Joseph Smith actually taught that it referred to the *political* system that he created.

Most Mormons are unaware of the church's political organization and the Council of Fifty. They do believe in a millennial reign, but think only in terms of "church," as reflected in John Heinerman and Anson Shupe's statement, in *The Mormon Corporate Empire*, about the Mormon understanding of the above scripture:

The Mormon people and the resources of their corporate empire will be the prime movers in a millennial overthrow of the United States government." (5)

Since part of the process in achieving their organization's goal is to encourage Mormons to run for office, whether in the Senate, the presidency, or wherever, church leaders will make contact and influence them about voting on particular issues, and thus inch their way into controlling the government their way.

How Romney might respond, no one knows. He may prove to be enough of his own man, who when contacted and told what to do, would refuse to obey--but, Mormon control is strong, especially considering the following:

According to the church, published in their *Political Manifesto* on April 6, 1896, and as reported in the *Deseret News*:

It had always been understood that men holding high church positions should not accept political office without first obtaining the approval of 'those who preside over them.' In line with this policy, the signers of the manifesto agreed that before any 'leading official' of the church accepted a political position, or nomination for such a position, he should apply to the 'proper authorities' for permission.

Does this pertain to Romney? One might say the church was talking about *really* high-up positions, like stature in the Salt Lake City hierarchy. But, since Romney holds the Melchizedek Priesthood, has been through the temple, and no doubt has held high office in the local Ward or Stake level, this would include him. Therefore, if Romney had to ask permission, how could he then refuse to obey?

However, it should be noted that some Mormon politicians in the past have done their own thinking.

Wallace Turner, in *The Mormon Establishment* stated that in 1965, church leaders tried to influence Mormon congressmen. LDS Pres. David O. McKay and his two counselors contacted eight congressmen and three senators, asking them to vote to repeal Section 14B of the Taft Hartley Act. One Congressman said he would vote that way, but only because he already felt so inclined. Five signed a letter saying they would not.(7)

Is the Council of Fifty still in existence today? Historian, Klaus Hansen, in *Quest for Empire*, stated that since "world government was one of the Council's primary missions," modern-day Church leaders are not going to do away with it.(8)

Jerald and Sandra Tanner, in their book, *Mormonism: Shadow or Reality?* said they contacted a Mormon who claimed to have spoken with LDS Apostle, B.H. Roberts (1888-1933), "in which Roberts claimed that the Council of Fifty was established by revelation and would always be a part of the church." In addition, Heinerman and Shupe, state that as late as 1945 the Council of Fifty "operated openly within Mormonism."(9)

Do they still anoint a king? Heinerman and Shupe claim they do:

Though the ceremony of coronation continues to this day, it is not publicized outside the Church. Conducted privately with only a few members of the Church hierarchy permitted to attend, it is nevertheless an explicit recognition that the kingdom of God is to be a political and spiritual reality.(10)

Some may still argue by saying that back then religions had weird ideas, so it may not be true for the LDS Church in 2008. But, all one has to do is look at how its political organization, the Kingdom of God, was faithfully carried down.

The Council of Fifty implemented their political machinery when they migrated from Missouri to the Great Salt Lake Valley under the leadership of Brigham Young. Most members, as well as non-Mormons, believe the trek was unplanned, and that it was undertaken the last minute because they had to flee religious persecution. They fail to realize that the Council of Fifty, long before the migration took place, were already talking about a journey westward. The leaders wanted to move to a territory where they could set up a political nation all to themselves. When they arrived in what eventually became known as Utah (*first called, The State of Deseret*), the Council of Fifty dictated all governmental nominating and appointing.

This method of dictating which presidential candidate to vote for was still practiced when I was in the church. I recall the very moment when I heard that they were no longer going to do this. Other members and myself felt very disheartened. We *wanted* our prophet to tell us who to vote for. We believed he was a recipient of heavenly revelation and would naturally know which candidate God approved of (*it sure beats thinking for yourself!*). But, even with that change in policy, the leader knew that faithful Mormons were already aware that the church favors the Republican Party.

Therefore, the church's procedure now is to encourage as many members to run for political office as they can, knowing that this would be a more realistic way that could prove beneficial to their long-range goal.

But, even though the Presidency no longer tells members how to vote in Presidential elections, one aspect of the Kingdom of God's political governing system is still used in the LDS church today. It is used in appointing the President of the Church, as well as officers and teachers in local Wards. It is called the *Law of Common Consent*, in which members are presented with the name of an individual who is to be called to a church position, and asked to show by a raise of hands their vote of consent.

Actually, the choice has already been made, and members know this, so they would never dare oppose because, (1) appointments are supposedly made by revelation, and if a member wishes to remain in good standing with the church, he or she wouldn't dare vote contrary, and (2) they may be threatened with excommunication. There have been a rare few who bravely dissented, but the threat of excommunication, or at least being called in on the carpet before the bishop, is a traumatic experience consisting of powerful feelings of fear and guilt. To buck the powers that be is not a pleasant experience in the LDS church.

Though unable to fully implement their political Kingdom of God as yet, the leaders of the Mormon Church await the day when they can, knowing it will only happen when they have enough Mormons in key political positions and have gained enough members. When this happens, it is believed members may not be told out-and-out, but will be persuaded in a manipulative way who to vote for. Again, no one would refuse.

The church believes the "times" will dictate when this will occur. But, they often state that it will happen when the world will be in such chaos that it will be more than ready for their theocratic government--especially one that claims to have a living prophet at its head. At that point, Mormon leaders are confident that the United States, as well as other world governments will *beg* the Mormon Church to step in and take over.

At some stage, leaders believe that whether the President of the United States is LDS or not, the church and its political organization will control the presidency. Heber C. Kimball stated:

The President of the United States *will bow to us and come to consult the authorities of this church* to know what he had best do for his people. You don't believe this. Wait and see." (11)

Those who are already aware of the LDS Church's political agenda are hesitant to vote for a

Mormon President--even if they think he may be qualified. They struggle over the question whether or not a particular Mormon might prove to be one of those who would buck the LDS leaders and act according to their own conscience, or not.

Whether Romney, or any other Mormon gaining political office would be able to do that, is anyone's guess. And if the politician succumbed to the Church Leaders, the people would never know, since any attempted influence on them would be conducted in private.

The success of the LDS church's agenda remains to be seen. However, one thing is for sure, they have no intentions of giving up.

"Mormons are making important strides behind the scenes," claim Heinerman and Shupe, who also address the question in everyone's mind: *Will the church be successful in gaining its political objective?*

Their success [will be] directly related to *general public ignorance about their methods and ends.*(12)

END

January 26, 2008 references, footnotes & sources:

- (1) D. Michael Quinn's *Mormon Hierarchy: Origins of Power*, p. 128, quoting from William Clayton diary, 1 March 1845, in Smith, *An Intimate Chronicle*, p. 158.
- (2) See *Mormon Hierarchy: Origins of Power*, by D. Michael Quinn, p. 124, referring to the writing of the clerk of the Kingdom of God, William Clayton, in his "Beloved Brethren, 15 June 1853, in *Harbinger and Baneemy's Organ*, 3 (July 1853): 53.
- (3) *Journal of Discourses*, Vol. 18, Joseph F. Smith, ed, p. 341.
- (4) *History of Utah*, p. 505, quoted in Jerald and Sandra Tanner's *Mormonism – Shadow or Reality?* (Salt Lake City, Modern Microfilm Company), p. 421. (Italics are the Tanner's.) Their book hereinafter, will be called Tanner and Tanner.
- (5) John Heinerman and Anson Shupe, *The Mormon Corporate Empire* (Boston, Beacon Press, 1985), p. 19.
- (6) *Deseret News*, Salt Lake City, April 6, 1896, as reiterated in Tanner and *Tanner, Mormonism – Shadow or Reality?*, p. 423.
- (7) Wallace Turner, *The Mormon Establishment*, pp 292-293. See also D. Michael Quinn's, *The Mormon Hierarchy: Extensions of Power* (SLC, Signature Books), p. 364.
- (8) Klaus J. Hansen, *Quest for Empire* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1967), p. 65. (9) Heinerman and Shupe, *The Mormon Corporate Empire*, p. 20. (Hereinafter, Heinerman and Shupe.)
- (10) Heinerman and Shupe, p. 20.
- (11) *Journal of Discourses*, Vol. 5, p. 93, quoted in Tanner and Tanner, *Mormonism – Shadow or Reality?*, 418) Italics are the Tanners.

(12) Heinerman and Shupe, p. 28. (*Italics mine*)

© Copyright 2008 - 2010. This story cannot be copied and used in a professional publication without express permission of the author.