



DOCTRINE & BELIEF · TOUGH QUESTIONS, STRAIGHT ANSWERS

Why Couldn't Black Latter-day Saints Hold the Priesthood Until 1978?

The restriction was real and lasted 126 years. Its end is in the standard works. Its explanations are disavowed by name. And its origin is the one question the Church has formally declined to answer — a fact this article neither resolves nor hides.

By **Todd Noall** • July 2026 • 16 Minute Read • Sourced to the **scriptures**, official **Church publications**, and the primary records they cite

THE SHORT ANSWER

Why couldn't Black members hold the priesthood until 1978?

The history of Blacks and the priesthood holds three questions inside one, and they have three different answers. *What happened* is documented: Black men held the priesthood under Joseph Smith — Elijah Abel among them; President Brigham Young announced a restriction in 1852, amid territorial slavery debates, grounding it in the era's inherited "curse of Cain" theory; the restriction hardened for 126 years and was defended by First Presidencies as divine — in 1949, as "direct commandment." *Why it was explained as it was* is disavowed: every theory offered — Cain, Ham, premortal valiance — was rejected by name in the Church's 2013 essay. *Why it existed at all* — whether God willed it — is the question the Church has formally declined to answer: "Church records offer no clear insights into the origins of this practice," a sentence current Church curriculum designates as the official position, with speculation discouraged in both directions. What ended it is not ambiguous: a revelation received June 1, 1978, and canonized that September as Official Declaration 2 — extending priesthood and temple blessings to all worthy members, of every nation, kindred, tongue, and people. This from a church not yet 200 years old — an age at which no Christian community in history had yet settled its own gravest questions.

WHAT TO KNOW — THE SHORT VERSION

- **The record is told straight here.** Ordinations under Joseph Smith; the 1852 announcement; Elijah Abel denied his endowment in 1879 and Jane Manning James hers; official assertions of divine origin in 1949, 1969, and 1973. No euphemisms, no trimming.
- **The explanations are disavowed by name.** The 2013 essay "Race and the Priesthood" rejects every theory advanced — black skin as curse, premortal unrighteousness, the sinfulness of mixed-race marriage — and condemns all racism, past and present.
- **The origin is officially unrevealed — by designation.** "Church records offer no clear insights into the origins of this practice" (Official Declaration 2 introduction) — a line the Church's 2025 seminary curriculum explicitly calls the official position, adding that members should not speculate about why the restriction existed.
- **Faithful interpreters divide inside that silence — and this article maps all of them.** The prophetic-agency reading (a prophet with agency can err), the instructions-versus-reasons reading (the reasons were human; the instruction's status is unknown), and the official agnosticism itself. Each is presented at full strength in §06.
- **Context is calibration, not excuse.** Brigham Young's assumptions were mainstream American assumptions in 1852 — the same decade Dred Scott was decided and a generation after America's largest churches split in slavery's defense. And they were contested in his own quorum: Orson Pratt, 1856. The era explains; it does not exculpate — and this article says both.
- **The correction is canon.** June 1, 1978: revelation in the temple. September 30, 1978: sustained by common consent into the standard works — a datable, written correction that came seventeen years before the Southern Baptist Convention's apology for its own founding.

On This Page

- 01 What the Standard Works Actually Contain
- 02 The Record, Told Straight: 1836–2025
- 03 One Timeline, Three Tracks: the Church, the Churches, the Country
- 04 Three Questions, Three Answers — and the Doctrine Test
- 05 How Much Doctrinal Weight Does Each Claim Carry?
- 06 Inside the Unrevealed Lane: Every Faithful Position, Stated
- 07 The Strongest Objection
- 08 The Verdict
- 09 The Nine-Principle Review
- 10 Quick Answers & FAQ
- 11 From the DMs

READING 1 — THE INDICTMENT

"126 years of racist doctrine, quietly abandoned"

The critic's version: a church that taught divine commandment, reversed under pressure, disavowed the reasons without apologizing for the restriction, and now shelters behind "we don't know."

STATED AT FULL STRENGTH IN §07

READING 2 — THE RECORD

"A restriction inherited, contested, asserted, and corrected — by canon"

The documented version: an inherited assumption announced without a produced revelation, disputed inside the Twelve within four years, defended for a century, ended by revelation, its explanations disavowed by name — and its origin left, deliberately and officially, unanswered.

What the Standard Works Actually Contain

Begin where the Doctrine Test begins: with what is actually canonized. On race and the gospel's reach, the canon's standing rule predates the restriction by decades:

"...he denieth none that come unto him, black and white, bond and free, male and female; ...all are alike unto God."
— 2 Nephi 26:33 (published 1830); compare Acts 10:34–35

Search the standard works for the restriction's institution and a striking fact emerges: **it is not there**. No canonized text establishes a priesthood restriction on any race. The passages later recruited to defend it — Abraham 1's Pharaoh, Moses 7's "blackness" — say less than the theory needed and were not cited in the restriction's earliest records; our companion study of the curse of Cain examines them verse by verse. What the canon *does* contain is the restriction's end: Official Declaration 2 — the revelation received by President Spencer W. Kimball and the Twelve in the Salt Lake Temple on June 1, 1978, announced June 8 ("the long-promised day"), and sustained by the common consent of the whole Church on September 30, 1978. Extending "the holy priesthood" and "the blessings of the temple" to every faithful, worthy man and his family, it is the only event in this entire series whose correction stands, datably, in the standard works themselves.

And the canon's own front matter now frames the mystery honestly. The introduction to Official Declaration 2, added to the 2013 edition of the scriptures, states: "Church records offer no clear insights into the origins of this practice." The Church's 2025 Doctrine and Covenants Seminary Teacher Manual instructs teachers that this sentence "represents the official position of the Church" — and that members should not speculate about why the restriction was in place. Mark what that means for everything that follows: the official position is not that God commanded the restriction, and not that a prophet erred. It is that the origin is unknown — a designated, taught, deliberate agnosticism. This article stands exactly there, and maps everyone who stands elsewhere.

At a Glance: What Is Canon, What Was Asserted — and What Is Neither?

Claim	Status	Source
"All are alike unto God" — the gospel for every nation, kindred, tongue, and people	CANONIZED	2 Nephi 26:33; Acts 10:34–35; D&C 1:34–35
The restriction's end: priesthood and temple blessings for all worthy members, by revelation	CANONIZED	Official Declaration 2 (June 1, 1978; sustained Sept. 30, 1978)
"The restriction was commanded by God"	ASSERTED — SUPERSEDED	Taught 1852–1973 (incl. 1949: "direct commandment"); the current official position: origins unknown
"The restriction was a prophet's mistake"	UNREVEALED	A faithful interpretation (§06) — held by respected historians; never declared by the Church
"The Church admits it was mere racism" / "the Church still teaches Black inferiority"	MISINFORMATION	The essay disavows theories without adjudicating the ban; current teaching condemns all racism, past and present

The Record, Told Straight: 1836–2025

The story of Blacks and the priesthood begins with ordinations, not restrictions — Black men were in the priesthood from the Church's earliest years. Elijah Abel was ordained an elder in 1836 and a seventy — evidently in Joseph Smith's presence — serving missions for the Church he never left. Q. Walker Lewis was ordained in Massachusetts; in 1847 Brigham Young himself praised him to a Church council as "one of the best Elders, an African." There is no reliable evidence that any Black man was denied priesthood for race during Joseph Smith's lifetime. The turn came in 1852, and its setting matters: Utah was a new territory under the Compromise of 1850, its slavery question left to "popular sovereignty," with Southern converts arriving with enslaved people and territorial leaders — historians note — convinced that accommodating the national politics of the moment served the road to statehood. That winter the legislature passed an act legalizing "servitude," and President Young, addressing it, announced that men of Black African descent could not be ordained — grounding the restriction in the inherited curse-of-Cain theory of his generation. His assumptions were, by the mainstream lights of 1852 America, unremarkable: this was five years before the U.S. Supreme Court would rule that Black Americans possessed "no rights which the white man was bound to respect." Judged by today's standards, those assumptions were racist; judged by his own era's, they were the American consensus — and both of those sentences belong in the record. So does a third: the consensus was contested in his own quorum. Apostle Orson Pratt argued in 1856 that "we have no proof that the Africans are the descendants of old Cain" — the era explains Brigham Young; it does not unanime him.

The restriction outlived its era and hardened. Abel, ordained under Joseph Smith, petitioned for his temple endowment in 1879 and was denied; Jane Manning James — who had walked to Nauvoo and crossed the plains — asked repeatedly for her temple blessings and was refused. Successive First Presidencies defended the practice as divine: in 1949, as "not a matter of the declaration of a policy but of direct commandment"; in 1969, as originating with God; President Kimball himself told reporters in 1973, "It is the policy of the Lord who has established it." Those assertions are quoted here at full strength because the honest arc requires them — for it was the same Spencer W. Kimball who took the question back to the source. Through months of pleading in the Salt Lake Temple's upper room, and then on June 1, 1978, with the Twelve, came the revelation; President Hinckley, present, later wrote "There was perfect unity among us." Weeks later Elder Bruce R. McConkie — long the restriction's most systematic defender — told Church educators, "Forget everything that I have said," acknowledging the Brethren had spoken with limited understanding. On September 30, 1978, the Church in conference sustained the revelation into the canon.

The reckoning with the *explanations* took longer. The 2013 essay "Race and the Priesthood" placed the 1852 justifications in their American context and disavowed the theories by name; the same year, the new introduction to Official Declaration 2 stated that Church records offer no clear insight into the practice's origins; and by 2025, Church curriculum was teaching that sentence as the official position — while instructing against speculation in either direction. In 2018 the Church marked the revelation's fortieth anniversary with the "Be One" celebration, where President Oaks described watching the pre-1978 pain, studying the offered reasons, and finding he could not confirm any of them; that same era brought the Church's ongoing partnership with the NAACP and, in October 2020, denunciations of racism from the pulpit of general conference by President Nelson and President Oaks. The arc, start to finish, spans a church that will not mark its 200th birthday until 2030 — a calibration \$07 takes up directly.

One Timeline, Three Tracks: the Church, the Churches, the Country

Calibration, not excuse: no event below makes another right. But the restriction is usually judged in a vacuum, and it did not happen in one.

Year	The Church of Jesus Christ	American Christianity	Law & Government
1830	Church organized; Book of Mormon publishes "all are alike unto God"	Slavery defended from major pulpits, Genesis 9 as warrant	Slavery legal in half the Union; the Missouri Compromise holds
1836-47	Elijah Abel ordained (1836); Walker Lewis — "one of the best Elders" (1847)	1844: Methodists split over a slaveholding bishop; 1845: Baptists split — the SBC founded so slaveholders could serve as missionaries	Gag rule bars antislavery petitions in Congress (1836-44)
1850-52	1852: restriction announced amid the legislature's "servitude" act — statehood politics in the room	Pulpits North and South split the Bible over slavery	1850: Utah Territory created; slavery left to "popular sovereignty"
1856-57	Apostle Orson Pratt disputes the Cain rationale (1856)	Proslavery theology at high tide	1857: Dred Scott — Black Americans have "no rights which the white man was bound to respect"
1861-70	Restriction continues	Denominations bless both armies	Civil War; Emancipation; the 13th-15th Amendments (1865-70)
1877-96	1879: Abel denied endowment; James refused temple blessings	Churches settle into segregated parallel denominations	Reconstruction abandoned (1877); 1888: Utah enacts an anti-miscegenation law; 1896: Plessy — "separate but equal"; Utah statehood
1900-48	1949: First Presidency: "direct commandment"	Scientific racism taught in mainline seminaries; congregations segregated by custom and covenant	Federal segregation entrenched; the U.S. military segregated until 1948
1954-65	Internal leadership debate grows; missions expand toward Brazil and West Africa	The era's reformers lament Sunday morning as America's most segregated hour	Brown (1954); Civil Rights Act (1964); Voting Rights Act (1965)
1963-67	Ghanaian congregations form and wait — Billy Johnson preaches for 14 years unordained	Pulpits divide over the civil rights movement itself	1963: Utah repeals its anti-miscegenation law; 1967: Loving v. Virginia strikes the bans 16 states still enforce
1978	June 1: the revelation. Sept. 30: canonized as OD-2 — Ghana and Nigeria opened within months	The SBC's apology for its founding is still 17 years away	—
1995-2000	Growth across Africa accelerates	1995: SBC formally repents of its proslavery founding; 2000: a major Christian university ends its interracial-dating ban	—
2013-20	Essay disavows the theories by name (2013); Be One (2018); NAACP partnership; conference denunciations of racism (2020)	Major denominations issue their own race reckonings through the 2010s	—

THE POINT

Read the middle and right columns first, then the left. The restriction arose **inside the American consensus at its worst hour** — five years before Dred Scott, seven after the SBC organized in slavery's defense — and it ended **by canonized revelation seventeen years before that denomination's apology**. Nothing in this table excuses 1852. Everything in it indicts the vacuum in which 1852 is usually judged.

Three Questions, Three Answers

One Question Fuses Three — Each with a Different Answer, on Different Authority

1 • WHAT HAPPENED?

Ordinations under Joseph Smith;
1852 announcement; 126 years;
ended by revelation, June 1978

ANSWER: DOCUMENTED

told straight in §02

2 • WHY WAS IT EXPLAINED AS IT WAS?

Curse of Cain • curse of Ham •
premortal valiance — inherited theories

ANSWER: DISAVOWED BY NAME

"Race and the Priesthood," 2013

3 • WHY DID IT EXIST AT ALL — DID GOD WILL IT?

"Church records offer no clear
insights into the origins" — designated
the official position (2025 curriculum)

ANSWER: UNREVEALED — OFFICIALLY

speculation discouraged, both directions

Critics fuse the three into one indictment. Some defenses fuse them into one vindication. **The record keeps them apart.**

The article's structure in one figure. Answering question 1 honestly requires the hard quotes; answering 2 requires the disavowal verbatim; answering 3 requires the discipline to stop where the Church stops — the fourth lane of the Doctrine Test, below.

The Doctrine Test — Applied to "God Commanded the Priesthood Restriction"

1 • Is it in the standard works —
canonized by common consent?

YES

DOCTRINE — binding

NO — no canonized text institutes it; what canon contains is its end (OD-2)

2 • Taught consistently, "frequently and
by many," in official channels?

YES

CURRENT TEACHING — governing

NO — the current official position: origins unknown; the assertions were superseded

3 • Taught by leaders on occasion —
never canonized?

YES — 1852-1973

► REPORTED TEACHING — ASSERTED

incl. as "direct commandment" (1949) — superseded

and the question beneath the claim — did God will the restriction at all?

4 • Does revelation address
the question at all?

NO

► UNREVEALED — NO ANSWER IS DOCTRINE

"no clear insights" — the official position

And at any point: contradicts canon or strips context → MISINFORMATION — e.g., "the Church admitted it was mere racism" (overreads the essay) and "the ban proves prophets were never inspired" (the correction came by the very mechanism alleged to fail).

VERDICT: THE END IS CANON — THE ORIGIN, OFFICIALLY UNREVEALED

Explanations: disavowed by name (2013). Speculation in either direction: officially discouraged (2025). The first Unrevealed verdict in this series.

The gold trace is the claim's actual path; grayed branches are roads not taken. Criteria from published teachings: canonization by common consent; "taught frequently and by many" (Andersen, 2012); a single leader on occasion = opinion, not binding (Christofferson, 2012). The trace uniquely continues to the fourth question — the lane built for exactly this case.

05

WEIGHING THE CLAIMS

How Much Doctrinal Weight Does Each Claim Carry?

Canonized: "All are alike unto God" (2 Nephi 26:33) — and Official Declaration 2, the restriction's end by revelation, sustained by common consent. Binding.

Asserted, never canonized — superseded: That God commanded the restriction. Taught 1852–1973, including by First Presidencies; never presented for canonization; replaced by the current official position that the origins are unknown. The 1949 and 1969 statements are quoted in §02 at full strength.

Disavowed by name: Every explanation offered — the curse theories and premortal-valiance theory ("Race and the Priesthood," 2013). See our companion study of the curse of Cain for the texts themselves.

Unrevealed — by designation: Whether the restriction reflected God's will. "No clear insights" is, per current curriculum, the official position — with speculation discouraged. Both the mistake-thesis and the command-thesis live in this lane, not above it.

Misinformation: That the Church admits the ban was "mere racism" (the essay disavows theories and contextualizes origins; it renders no verdict on the ban); that the Church still teaches racial inferiority (current teaching condemns all racism, past and present); that there were no Black Latter-day Saints before 1978 (Abel, James, Lewis, Chambers, the Ghanaian congregations — the record says otherwise).

06

THE UNREVEALED LANE, OCCUPIED

Every Faithful Position, Stated

Inside the official silence, faithful interpreters divide three ways — and a reader deserves all three at full strength. **The prophetic-agency reading** (historians including W. Paul Reeve, Armand Mauss, and Richard Bushman — much of it now published through Church-adjacent presses) holds that the restriction began with Brigham Young without a produced revelation and reflected his era's assumptions: God does not revoke a prophet's agency in calling him, and agency includes the capacity for error; the essay's cultural framing is read as the institution conceding this gently. **The instructions-versus-reasons reading** (defended in faithful scholarly venues) holds that the Lord gives prophets instructions and rarely reasons — President Oaks's testimony that "the Lord rarely gives reasons" is its anchor — so the *reasons* were human sense-making, rightly disavowed, while the *instruction's* divine status remains open: what 2013 rejected, on this reading, was the justifications, not the restriction. **And the official position itself** is a third place to stand: origins unknown, speculation discouraged — in both directions.

Notice what each camp must concede. The agency reading asserts an error the Church has never declared; the instructions reading asserts a command the Church has withdrawn to "unknown"; each, in the Doctrine Test's terms, is an interpretation living in the fourth lane while reaching for the first. This article maps them and joins neither: on the question the Church has deliberately left open, the most accurate answer a publisher can give is the official one — *we do not know* — held without embarrassment, the way the canon itself holds Job's unanswered questions. What no camp disputes anymore is the part that governs: the restriction is over, by revelation; the theories are dead, by name; and the gospel's reach is what 2 Nephi 26:33 always said it was.

The Strongest Objection

The concessions come first, and they are substantial. The restriction fell on real Saints — Abel denied in 1879 after four decades of faithful priesthood service; Jane Manning James refused to her death. The institution asserted divine origin for over a century — "direct commandment" (1949), "the policy of the Lord" (Kimball, 1973) — and now teaches that the origins are unknown: that is a reversal, and this article names it as one rather than smoothing it. And the Church has disavowed the explanations without apologizing for the restriction — a critique made by Black Latter-day Saints as well as critics, reported here at full strength. The strongest form assembles the whole: *a church claiming living prophets enforced a racial exclusion for 126 years, called it God's command, reversed it a generation after the civil rights movement, and has never said sorry. Doesn't that record disqualify the claim to prophetic guidance?*

The response begins with the measuring stick the objection always omits: **this church is not yet 200 years old — and no Christian community's first two centuries would survive the consistency standard being applied.** At the same age, roughly A.D. 230, the church of the apostles had no settled doctrine of the Trinity (Nicaea was a century away), no fixed New Testament (the first list matching today's arrived in A.D. 367), bishops excommunicating each other over rebaptism, and whole movements later ruled heretical. And on race specifically, the comparison sharpens rather than softens: churches eighteen centuries old split in slavery's *defense* in the 1840s; the Southern Baptist Convention was founded in 1845 expressly so slaveholders could serve as missionaries and formally repented in 1995 — seventeen years *after* Official Declaration 2. None of this makes 1852 right; commonness is not correctness, and the harm to Abel and James was real whatever Baptists were doing. What it demolishes is the vacuum: the demand that a 196-year-old restoration exhibit a doctrinal consistency no 200-year-old Christianity — including the original — ever possessed. As for the reversal: an institution that asserts, is contested from within (Pratt, 1856), and is finally corrected by canonized revelation is not displaying the failure of its mechanism but the operation of it — the same canon-over-assertion pattern this series documented with Adam-God and blood atonement, here operating on the institution's own First Presidency statements, with the correction written into the standard works. And the apology question deserves its honest sentence: the Church has chosen disavowal, condemnation of all racism, and partnership over the word "apology" — its leaders have acknowledged the pain directly, the critique of that choice is legitimate and ongoing, and our companion page on the present-day question treats it in full. The last word here belongs to the record's most remarkable fact: the Saints the restriction burdened largely stayed — Abel back on a mission in his seventies, James in the temple doing the one ordinance permitted her, Billy Johnson preaching in Ghana for fourteen years before a missionary could ordain him. They were not waiting on the institution's perfection. They were waiting on the promise — and on June 1, 1978, it was kept.

So — Why Couldn't Black Members Hold the Priesthood Until 1978?

What happened is documented; why it was explained as it was is disavowed; why it existed at all, the Church says it does not know — and this article declines to know more than the Church does. The restriction arose inside the American consensus at its worst hour, was contested in its first decade, was defended past its era, and ended the way Latter-day Saints believe truth arrives: by revelation, canonized, "the long-promised day." The gospel it obstructed now ordains on every continent.

The accurate one-sentence version: **The end is canon, the explanations are disavowed by name, the origin is officially unrevealed — and the Saints it burdened are the story's best witnesses.**

The Nine-Principle Review: How This Article Was Stress-Tested

The Doctrine Test on page 6 classifies *claims*. This second instrument reviews the *article itself* against nine principles drawn from the published teachings of the Church's prophets and apostles on how doctrine should be taught. On this subject, the fourth principle — no speculation — carries unusual weight, because the Church has made non-speculation itself the official instruction.

Principle	The Test	How This Article Passes
1 • Centered on Christ	Is the content meaningfully connected to the Savior?	The verdict rests on the "long-promised day" — the gospel's reach to every nation, kindred, tongue, and people — and on the faith of the Saints who waited (§7–8).
2 • Scriptural & prophetic authority	Do scripture and official statements speak for themselves?	2 Nephi 26:33, OD-2, its introduction, and the 2025 curriculum designation are quoted exactly; so are the 1949 and 1973 assertions (§1–2).
3 • Multiple witnesses	Is any conclusion built on an isolated statement?	The record rests on canonized text, three official statements, current curriculum, and named primary records; the comparative timeline is drawn from the public record (§2–3).
4 • No speculation	Does the material go beyond what is established?	The article's central discipline: it declines to answer what the Church has designated unanswered, and maps — without joining — every faithful position (§5–6).
5 • Spiritual edification	Is the tone sober on a subject involving harm?	Abel, James, and Johnson are the article's moral center, not its exhibits; the era's rhetoric is quoted at the minimum accuracy requires (§2, §7).
6 • Doctrinal balance	Are fragments kept with their balancing truths?	The 1949 assertion stands beside its 2013 supersession; the era-context beside Pratt's dissent; the calibration beside its own limits (§2, §7).
7 • Clarity	Is truth communicated plainly?	Three questions, three answers — the structure is the clarity; the verdict compresses to one sentence (§4, §8).
8 • Accuracy	Are hard facts owned — including the ones that cost?	The reversal is called a reversal; the no-apology critique is reported at full strength; "commonness is not correctness" is stated in the article's own voice (§7).
9 • No distractions	Does anything overshadow the gospel's core message?	The curse-of-Cain texts route to their own study; the present-day question routes to its own page; this article holds to the restriction and the record (§1, §10).

Principles drawn from published teachings including: D. Todd Christofferson, "The Doctrine of Christ" (Apr. 2012); Neil L. Andersen, "Trial of Your Faith" (Oct. 2012); Dale G. Renlund, "Your Divine Nature and Eternal Destiny" (Apr. 2022); Boyd K. Packer, "The Pattern of Our Parentage" (Oct. 1984); Russell M. Nelson, "Hear Him" (Apr. 2020) — all available at churchofjesuschrist.org. The same nine-point review is applied to every doctrine article we publish.

Quick Answers

Was there really a priesthood ban?

Yes — from 1852 to June 1978, men of Black African descent were not ordained, and Black members were restricted from temple ordinances.

YES — 126 YEARS

Did Joseph Smith start it?

No reliable evidence of any race-based denial in his lifetime — and Black men were ordained, Elijah Abel among them.

BEGAN 1852, UNDER YOUNG

Was it doctrine or policy?

It was asserted as commandment (1949) and practiced as policy; the current official position declines to classify its origin at all.

OFFICIALLY: ORIGINS UNKNOWN

How did it end?

Revelation, June 1, 1978 — canonized as Official Declaration 2 by common consent that September.

BY REVELATION, IN THE CANON

What did the Church disavow in 2013?

Every explanation — the curse theories and premortal-valiance theory — by name, with a condemnation of all racism, past and present.

THE THEORIES, BY NAME

What does the Church say about why it existed?

"Church records offer no clear insights into the origins of this practice" — the official position, with speculation discouraged.

UNREVEALED — OFFICIALLY

Frequently Asked Questions

Didn't the Church only change because of social pressure — civil rights, athletic boycotts, Brazil?

The pressures were real and the record includes them; the São Paulo temple neared dedication, and Ghanaian congregations had waited years. What the documents show is a president who took the question to the temple over months and a quorum that recorded unanimity — "There was perfect unity among us" (Hinckley). Latter-day Saints read that as revelation arriving through, not despite, gathering circumstances; critics read it otherwise; the article reports what is documented and lets the timeline speak.

Doesn't 126 years of error disqualify a church led by prophets?

Apply the same standard to Christianity at 200 years old — no settled Trinity, no fixed New Testament, bishops excommunicating each other — and the standard collapses. On race specifically: denominations eighteen centuries old split defending slavery, and the largest apologized in 1995, seventeen years after Official Declaration 2. Commonness is not correctness — the harm was real — but the consistency demanded of this restoration has never existed in any Christianity's first two centuries.

Why hasn't the Church apologized?

Its leaders have chosen disavowal by name, condemnation of all racism, acknowledgment of the pain (President Oaks at Be One, 2018), and sustained partnership with the NAACP — while declining the word itself. The critique of that choice comes from Black Latter-day Saints as well as critics, and it is legitimate; our companion page on the present-day question treats it in full.

What about the scriptures used to defend the ban — Cain, Ham, Pharaoh?

Examined verse by verse in our companion study: none says what the theory needed, the earliest records of the restriction never cite them, and the racial reading predates the Restoration by centuries. The 2013 essay disavows the theories built on them.

Who are the Black Saints of the restriction era I should know?

Start with Elijah Abel — elder, seventy, three-time missionary; Jane Manning James, whose faith outlasted every refusal; Green Flake and Samuel Chambers; and Billy Johnson of Ghana, who built congregations for fourteen years on a radio testimony and a borrowed Book of Mormon before June 1978 reached him. Their heritage deserves — and will receive — its own full treatment on this site.

The Harder Questions, Answered

1. "1949: 'direct commandment.' 2013: 'no clear insights.' That's not revelation — that's an institution gaslighting its own past."

VERDICT: IT'S A REVERSAL — NAMED AS ONE ON PAGE 4 — MADE BY THE ONLY BODY AUTHORIZED TO MAKE IT.

The 1949 statement was an assertion that was never canonized; the 2013 position replaced it in the only way Latter-day Saint teaching recognizes: the living Church classifying its own record. An institution incapable of superseding its past statements would be the one critics should distrust. The uncomfortable sequence you're citing is, on the Church's own published standard, the correction mechanism working on itself — and it is printed in this article, not buried.

2. "Orson Pratt knew better in 1856. So 'Brigham was a man of his time' is an excuse that dies on its own evidence."

VERDICT: CORRECT — WHICH IS WHY THIS ARTICLE NEVER USES THE ERA AS AN EXCUSE, ONLY AS A MEASUREMENT.

Pratt's dissent is in our timeline precisely because it proves the era was contestable. "Man of his time" here does one job: it locates 1852 five years before Dred Scott and seven after the largest denomination in America organized in slavery's defense — calibration for readers who imagine the restriction arose in a tolerant world. The moral weight stands: some contemporaries saw further, and the article says so by name.

3. "'We don't know why' is the safest possible answer. Isn't official agnosticism just institutional cowardice?"

VERDICT: IT IS THE ONLY ANSWER THE EVIDENCE PERMITS — AND THE COSTLIEST ONE AVAILABLE.

Consider what the agnosticism concedes: it surrenders the century of confident divine-origin claims (a real institutional price), refuses the easy exit of blaming one man, and leaves members to sit with an unresolved hard thing — which institutions almost never voluntarily do. A church seeking comfort would pick a story. The Church picked "we do not know" and put it in the scriptures' front matter and its seminary manual. Whatever that is, it is not cowardice; it is the fourth lane of doctrine, held in public.

Sources

- 2 Nephi 26:33; Acts 10:34–35 — the canon's universal rule. [churchofjesuschrist.org/study/scriptures/bofm/2-ne/26](https://www.churchofjesuschrist.org/study/scriptures/bofm/2-ne/26)
- Official Declaration 2 and its introduction (2013 edition) — the revelation, its canonization, and "no clear insights." [churchofjesuschrist.org/study/scriptures/dc-testament/od/2](https://www.churchofjesuschrist.org/study/scriptures/dc-testament/od/2)
- Doctrine and Covenants Seminary Teacher Manual (2025), Lesson 156 — the introduction's line designated "the official position of the Church." [churchofjesuschrist.org/study/manual/doctrine-and-covenants-seminary-teacher-manual-2025/493-official-declaration-2](https://www.churchofjesuschrist.org/study/manual/doctrine-and-covenants-seminary-teacher-manual-2025/493-official-declaration-2)
- "Race and the Priesthood," Gospel Topics essay (Dec. 2013) — the 1852 context; Abel and Lewis; the disavowal by name. [churchofjesuschrist.org/study/manual/gospel-topics-essays/race-and-the-priesthood](https://www.churchofjesuschrist.org/study/manual/gospel-topics-essays/race-and-the-priesthood)
- President Dallin H. Oaks, remarks at "Be One" (June 1, 2018) — the pain observed; the reasons unconfirmed; "the Lord rarely gives reasons." [newsroom.churchofjesuschrist.org](https://www.newsroom.churchofjesuschrist.org)
- Gordon B. Hinckley, "Priesthood Restoration," Ensign, Oct. 1988 — "There was perfect unity among us." [churchofjesuschrist.org/study/ensign/1988/10](https://www.churchofjesuschrist.org/study/ensign/1988/10)
- Bruce R. McConkie, "All Are Alike unto God," CES symposium, Aug. 18, 1978 — "Forget everything that I have said." speeches.byu.edu/talks/bruce-r-mcconkie_allike-unto-god
- First Presidency statements, 1949 and 1969; Spencer W. Kimball press remarks, 1973 — the divine-origin assertions, quoted at full strength (primary records).
- Brigham Young, remarks to the Utah territorial legislature, 1852; Orson Pratt, 1856 — the announcement and the apostolic dissent (primary records).
- "The Long-Promised Day," Ensign/Liahona, June 2018 — Abel, James, and the era's faithful Black Saints. [churchofjesuschrist.org/study/ensign/2018/06](https://www.churchofjesuschrist.org/study/ensign/2018/06)
- Comparative-timeline context (denominational schisms of 1844–45 and their 1995 sequel; Dred Scott, 1857; Plessy, 1896; Loving v. Virginia, 1967; Utah territorial and statehood history) — the public historical record; court opinions quoted are public domain.
- "What Is the Curse of Cain?" — this series' companion study of the theory and its texts. mormonismexplained.org/curse-of-cain

Trademark notice: Mormonism Explained operates under a trademark license from Intellectual Reserve, Inc. It is an independent publisher and is not owned or operated by The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

© 2026 Mormonism Explained | 501(c)(3) Nonprofit Organization 33-4022618

OBJECTIVE · FAITHFUL · FACTUAL