

# The New Expositor

September 2011/Copyright 2011

A periodic newsletter from the Exmormon Foundation

We are a diverse community of former Mormons or questioning Mormons. Many of us have been church leaders, missionaries, teachers, and faithful members, and we are here to support those who, like ourselves, are creating a life after Mormonism.

## Board Members

Sue Emmett - President  
Kathleen (Phair) Jones - Vice President  
Jean Bodie - Secretary  
Mikayla Pratt - Treasurer/Membership Secretary

## General board members -

Tom Donofrio  
Robyn Hansen  
Micah McAllister

The New Expositor is in the process of being re-established as a regular feature of the Exmormon Foundation. Articles, reviews, personal stories, and opinion pieces for publication are welcome. Comments can be forwarded to Larry Pratt, the current editor, at [lpatt948@gmail.com](mailto:lpatt948@gmail.com).

## HOW TO JOIN OR DONATE TOTHE FOUNDATION

Membership in the Exmormon Foundation is open to everyone interested in Mormonism. Annual dues are \$20 per person, or \$35 for two persons at the same address.

The Foundation is an IRS Tax-Exempt Organization, and all donations made to the Foundation are fully deductible as charitable gifts. We welcome contributions of any size, and commit to using the funds carefully and efficiently in advertising our presence and supporting people in their journey out of Mormonism. Donations or dues can be sent to:

The Exmormon Foundation  
c/o Mikayla Pratt; 6235 Cottle Road  
San Jose, CA 95123

---

## What's in a Name? by Richard Packham

Mormons like to point out that their church is named after Christ, with Christ's name in extra-large letters in the church logo: "The Church of JESUS CHRIST of Latter-day Saints." This, they claim, is one of the signs of the true church, citing usually 1 Cor 1:12-13 and Eph 5:23, but, more clearly on point, 3 Nephi 27:8 ("And how be it my church save it be called in my name? For if a church be called in Moses' name then it be Moses' church; or if it be called in the name of a man then it be the church of a man; but if it be called in my name then it is my church...") Mormon missionaries like to point out to investigators that churches such as the Lutherans or the Presbyterians do not have Christ in their name, and therefore they cannot be Christ's church.

Few present-day Mormons are aware of the historical fact that their church was not always officially called by its present name. When Joseph Smith organized the original church in 1830, it was named simply "The Church of Christ." It did not receive its present name until April 1838 (see D&C 115:4).

Even fewer present-day Mormons know that from May 1834 until April 1838 - a period of almost four years - the official name of the church was "The Church of the Latter Day Saints."

Notice: no mention of Christ in the name of the church!

The inescapable conclusion, based on the same arguments used by Mormon missionaries against the Lutherans, is that between 1834 and 1838, the Mormon Church was NOT the "true church," because its name did not include the name of Christ. Where then WAS the "true church"? Did the church once again become the "true church" when it put "Christ" back into its name? Is it that easy to become the true church? If so, then the "Disciples of Christ" (a fairly large Christian denomination) has just as much claim to being the "true church" as do the Mormons. In my town there is a small Christian church called "The Church of Christ." And what about the Christian Scientists, whose church is officially named "The Church of Christ, Scientist"?

And why should Christ's name be part of the name of

his church? Is Joe Brown's shoe store not his shoe store because he named it "Uptown Shoes" rather than "Joe Brown Shoes"? Hardly. Were the Israelites not God's chosen people, because they called themselves Israelites, or "the people of Israel," and not "Jehovahists"?

Of course, to argue that the Mormon Church claim to being the "true church" is supported based on including the word "Christ" in its name is a fallacious

argument, an example of the fallacy of "affirming the consequent." Apologists are often guilty of this fallacy. The basic premise (unproven, at that!) is "If a church is Christ's church, it will include Christ's name in the name of the church." If the premise is true, it can only be used to show that a church is NOT Christ's church. It is useless as evidence that any church IS Christ's church, which is how the Mormons like to use it. Look up "affirming the consequent" on any list of logical fallacies.

---

## Temple Weddings are Doctrinal – Really? by Jean Bodie

The Mormon Church's policy that 'temple weddings' are essential was not taught until after 1876. I will demonstrate that change only became *necessary* when Doctrine and Covenants: 101 (excerpts below) was removed and replaced by Section 132. Until that time, polygamy was prohibited by the LDS canon of scripture. As a faithful member of the LDS Church I was unaware of those scriptural alterations or that D&C 132 was an endorsement of polygamy. Since the LDS Church no longer endorses plural marriage it would appear that there is no longer any need for *secrecy* and that the former law applies.

### Law of the Church according to Joseph Smith.

D&C Section 101.

“According to the custom of all civilized nations, marriage is regulated by laws and ceremonies: therefore we believe, that all marriages in this Church of Christ of Latter Day Saints, should be solemnized in a public meeting, or feast, prepared for that purpose:<sup>1</sup> and that the solemnization should be performed by a presiding high priest, high priest, bishop, elder, or priest, not even prohibiting those persons who are desirous to get married, of being married by other authority.<sup>2</sup> We believe that it is not right to prohibit members of this church from marrying out of the church, if it be their determination so to do, but such persons will be considered *weak in the faith* of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> This is very specific; **ALL** marriages were to be performed in a public place, according to D&C 101 1835 edition. At this time there was no *public* practice of plural marriage.

<sup>2</sup> Any priesthood authority was acceptable for the marriage to be considered legal, including 'any other' or civil marriage.

<sup>3</sup> This stigma is extant today in LDS circles; if one marries civilly; not in a temple, he/she is considered disobedient or unfaithful and may be judged by other Church members as 'unworthy'.

... "You both mutually agree to be each other's companion, husband and wife, observing the legal rights belonging to this condition; that is, keeping yourselves wholly for each other, and from all others, *during your lives.*" And when they have answered "Yes," he shall pronounce them "husband and wife" in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, *and by virtue of the laws of the country and authority vested in him...*<sup>4</sup>

When D&C 101 was reprinted in the Times and Seasons, Vol. 3, p.939, No. 23, on October 1, 1842, these words were added:

“We have given the above rule of marriage as the only one practiced in this church, to show that Dr. J. C. Bennett's "secret wife system" is a matter of his own manufacture... In support of this position, we present the following certificates:

---

<sup>4</sup> Where the law in a couples' country of residence requires a public, civil marriage ceremony, they are given a specific, short amount of time to receive the temple sealing ordinance, depending on distance to the closest temple. Keep in mind that missionaries have been attempting to convert people since mid 1830's and must have found that the laws varied from country to country. When the Mormon Church had settled in Utah Territory, they declared 'Mountain Law' which in essence meant that the Church and Territory (State) were one. Laws were instituted by *Church leaders* and rules were followed to avoid dire consequences. Safety was only found by obedience to Church leaders. This is in opposition to the Constitution's First Amendment; known as the Free Exercise Clause, which provides that **the government** shall make no law prohibiting the free exercise of religion. In the Territory of Utah, **the government** making the laws **was** the LDS Church leadership. Among church members there was **no free exercise of religion**. Leaders adopted this theocratic style of government' and still do today regarding many aspects of State and Church Government, even in countries *outside* of the USA.

The U.S. government now recognizes and accepts as legal, a combination 'marriage/temple sealing' in one single ceremony within the confines of an LDS temple. In other countries where a civil ceremony is also **not** a requirement, the Church advances the same regulations for its members. Those regulations carry a stiff penalty. Should a couple *choose* to be married civilly in order to include family and friends, they are not permitted to receive the sealing ordinance for one year.

We the undersigned members of the church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints and residents of the city of Nauvoo, persons of families do hereby certify and declare that we know of no other rule or system of marriage than the one published from the Book of Doctrine and Covenants, and we give this certificate to show that Dr. J. C. Bennett's "secret wife system" is a matter of his own manufacture..."  
S. Bennett, N. K. Whitney<sup>5</sup>, George Miller, Albert Pettey, Alpheus Cutler, Elias Higbee,

---

<sup>5</sup> Many of those who signed this document were in polygamous marriages or witnesses to such.  
[http://www.fairwiki.org/Joseph\\_Smith/Polygamy](http://www.fairwiki.org/Joseph_Smith/Polygamy). "Critics claim that on **18 August 1842** Joseph Smith wrote a "love letter" to Sarah Ann Whitney requesting a secret rendezvous or "tryst." **Joseph had been sealed to Sarah Ann three weeks prior to this time.**" You will see from the date of the sworn statement - Oct 1842, this was a lie by Newel K. Whitney; he being the officiator at the 'wedding' which took place at the end of July 1842.  
<http://www.xmission.com/~research/family/strange.htm>  
"Verily Thus Saith the Lord, unto My Servant N[ewel]. K. Whitney," A Revelation to Newell K. Whitney, 27 July 1842, and Joseph Smith to Newel K. Whitney, Elizabeth Ann Whitney, and Sarah Ann Whitney, 18 August 1842 (from copies in archives, Historical Department, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City, Utah)  
"Verily, thus saith the Lord unto my servant N[ewel]. K. Whitney, the thing that my servant Joseph Smith has made known unto you and your Family ... by virtue of the Holy promise which I now make unto you saith the Lord. These are the words which you shall pronounce upon my servant Joseph and your Daughter S[arah] A[nn] Whitney. They shall take each other by the hand and you shall say 'You both mutually agree,' calling them by name 'to be each other's companion so long as you both shall live preserving yourselves for each other and from all others and also throughout all eternity reserving only those rights which have been given to my servant Joseph by revelation and commandment and by legal Authority in times passed. If you both agree to covenant and do this then I give you Sarah Ann Whitney, my daughter, to Joseph Smith to be his wife, *to observe all the rights between you both that belong to that condition.* I do it in my own name and in the name of my wife, your mother, and in the name of my Holy Progenitors, by the right of birth which is of Preast Hood..." (My italics)

Whitney himself entered polygamy in 1855. Reynolds Cahoon, 1842; John Taylor, Dec. 1843; George Miller, 1846; Wilford Woodruff, 1846; they obviously converted to the principle.

**Ebenezer Robinson**, one of the men whose name appears on the first certificate, wrote concerning the statement that he signed as follows:

In October, 1842, a statement was written out, and signed by a large number of the brethren and sisters, including myself and wife, setting forth the fact that we *knew of* no other form of marriage ceremony in the church except the one published in the book of Doctrine and Covenants, which statement was true at *that time*, as we had no *knowledge* of such a ceremony, or that "spiritual wifery," or "polygamy," was taught by the *heads* of the church, as *they* had not up to that time taught it to us.

We knew it was talked of in secret, and had been for more than a year, ...

These secret rumors could not constitute a *knowledge* that certain persons taught such things when they had not taught them to us. Source: Ebenezer Robinson, "Items of Personal History of the Editor," *The Return* Vol. 3, No. 2, p. 28, (Davis City, Iowa, February 1891). (My italics).

Reynolds Cahoon, John Taylor, Wilson Law, E. Robinson, W. Woodruff, Aaron Johnson.

"We the undersigned members of the *ladies' relief society, and married females* do certify... Emma Smith, President, Elizabeth Ann Whitney, Counsellor, Sarah M. Cleveland, Counsellor, Eliza R. Snow, Secretary, Mary C. Miller, Catharine Pettey, Lois Cutler, Sarah Higbee, Thirza Cahoon, Phebe Woodruff, Ann Hunter, Leonora Taylor, Jane Law, Sarah Hillman, Sophia R. Marks, Rosannah Marks."<sup>6</sup> (My italics)

In 2007, upon realizing that we would be barred from attending any temple marriages of our loved ones, including our children and grandchildren who were yet to be married, Michelle Spencer and I, began circulating a petition asking the LDS Church to eliminate the punitive one year waiting policy imposed upon couples choosing to have a civil marriage ceremony first, in order to include all loved ones in their marriage ceremony.<sup>7</sup> Non-Mormon or 'unworthy' parents are expected to graciously foot the bill while being denied the opportunity to witness their child's wedding. This is because couples place their allegiance to *church policy* before love of family. Many good people's hearts are broken by this divisive policy which has its roots in the teachings of D&C Section 132.

"... Although the revelation (polygamy) was recorded in 1843, it is evident from the historical records that the doctrines and principles involved in this revelation had been known by the Prophet since 1831." Source: Chapter heading, D&C Section 132.

The first petition containing close to 500 names from 19 different religious denominations and countries was delivered to the Church Office Building in Salt Lake City, Oct. 15<sup>th</sup> 2010. The petitioners are trying to arrange for a second one in Oct. 2011.

### Who May Attend a Temple Marriage

Only adult members who have valid recommends and have received their endowment may attend a temple marriage. Couples should invite only family members and close friends to be present for a temple marriage. (*This means only adult members of the LDS Church.*)

---

<sup>6</sup> Elizabeth Ann Whitney, knew of her daughter's marriage to Joseph Smith; Sarah Cleveland and Eliza R. Snow were already married to Joseph in June 1842. [WWW.FAMILYSEARCH.ORG](http://WWW.FAMILYSEARCH.ORG). The 'witnesses' were carefully selected from among those who didn't '*actually know*' about polygamy and those who were sworn to secrecy. The addition was made later, when they DID know of polygamous marriages.

<sup>7</sup> [www.templeweddingpetition.org](http://www.templeweddingpetition.org)  
<http://www.thepetitionsite.com/1/templeweddingpetition/>

### **Special Meeting for Guests, Who Do Not Have Temple Recommends**

A couple may arrange with their bishop to hold a special meeting for relatives and friends who do not have temple recommends. This meeting provides an opportunity for those who cannot enter a temple to feel included in the marriage and to learn something of the eternal nature of the marriage covenant.<sup>8</sup> The meeting may include a prayer and special music, followed by the remarks of a priesthood leader. No ceremony is performed, and no vows are exchanged. No other ceremony resembling a wedding should be performed following a temple marriage. Ring ceremonies are discouraged and only create a poor substitution.

### **Sealing of Living Members after Civil Marriage**

A husband and wife who were *not* married inside a temple may be sealed *after* one full year from the date of the civil marriage. However, *this one-year waiting period does not apply to worthy couples* in the following cases: (My italics and underlining.)

1. The temple in which the couple will be sealed is in a country that requires a civil marriage and does not recognize a marriage in the (*non-public*) temple.
2. The couple lives in a country where *there is no temple* and the law does not recognize a marriage performed outside the country.
3. An un-chaperoned couple's travel to a temple will require one or more overnight stops because of distance.<sup>9</sup>
4. A couple could not be married in a temple because one or both had not been a member of the Church for one year at the time of their civil marriage. They may receive their endowments and be sealed any time after both have been members for at least one

---

<sup>8</sup> What prompted this 'eternal nature' of marriage? Prior to the announcement of plural marriage, *ALL* marriages were for time only and held in public places, as we saw in the second paragraph of this article.

<sup>9</sup> This does *NOT* say that a worthy, un-chaperoned couple must avoid sexual relations *after* their civil marriage. In fact it implies that sexual relations 'might' occur on the way to the temple if there are overnight stops – hence the (permission) necessity to be married civilly, while *NOT* being penalized by the one year waiting period.

Dieter F. Uchtdorf (Counselor to President Thomas S. Monson), was married civilly, and traveled afterwards to the temple as did some other church leaders. It would be impudent to ask them if they engaged in sexual relations before their sealing ceremony and it is just as impudent to imply as members do, that other couples are somehow made 'unworthy' by consummating their legal marriages.

year.

In the first three cases, *worthy couples should receive their endowment and be sealed as soon as possible after their civil marriage*.

Until LDS members realize that the temple wedding policy is just that; a policy; and learn to make the decision that is best for them and their families, people will continue to be excluded from this most special occasion – the marriage of two people and two families.

Couples should not be deterred by the dire pronouncement by Spencer W. Kimball regarding the possibility of an accident causing the death of one or both occurring *after* the civil ceremony but *before* the required one year wait has passed. One of the main purpose of temples is to vicariously seal deceased families and couples to each other for eternity – what is a one year wait compared with a whole eternity together? What is a one year wait compared to causing pain to good and loving parents? There is no comparison. This demeaning practice against women was clearly a 'doctrine' created to cover the sexual excesses of Joseph Smith and others early church leaders. Women who to this day, dutifully hand over their agency to the successors of Joseph Smith by banishing normal feelings of love for their parents, while embracing a policy made by their church leaders.

## Review: The Development of LDS Temple Worship; Jon Adams

I am currently reading Devery Anderson's *The Development of LDS Temple Worship*. The highly-anticipated book came out in March and has already made significant contributions to Mormon studies.

The book is a documentary history comprised of official LDS documents and church leaders' personal writings spanning 1846 to 2000. The fact that the book pulls from these official sources is both its strength and weakness.

Because it avoids non-Mormon/ex-Mormon sources, it doesn't read like an angry polemic or exposé. On the other hand, because we only get the LDS leadership perspective, we get a limited view of the temple ceremonies.

The title, *The Development of LDS Temple Worship*, is actually a bit of a misnomer. The book isn't concerned so much about temple *worship* as it is temple *policies*. And to the extent that the book discusses temple worship, it's always sensitive not to disclose those aspects that Mormons hold sacred. If you're more interested in the particulars of the temple ceremonies, I'd recommend David Buerger's *Mysteries of Godliness*.

I don't intend for this post to suffice as a review of Anderson's book (though you may want to check out [these reviews](#)). Rather, much like [my review of \*The Book of Mammon\*](#), I just want to share some interesting anecdotes from the book:

- Wilford Woodruff introduced vicarious endowments and shifted the focus of temples to getting sealed to families. Previously, the custom had been to be to friends and Church leaders. (p. 187)
- In the 19th century, men and women were prohibited from having any "sexual connection" for at least a week before entering the temple to receive endowments (p. 35). Somewhat relatedly, in a 1982 letter, the First Presidency identified those who engage in oral sex as unworthy for the temple. (p. 441)
- The LDS Church seriously (albeit briefly) entertained a proposal to build a so-called "floating temple" to dock in those countries where members didn't have a nearby temple. This ship was to be more affordable than financing dozens of temples across the world. (p. 370)
- Elder H. S. Palmer was initially denied a temple recommend in 1890 for refusing to break the law and practice polygamy. Woodruff later intervened in Palmer's favor, finding Palmer's obedience to the law to be a venial (meaning "forgivable") sin. (p. 86)
- David O. McKay, in a 1941 address to departing missionaries, acknowledged that many young people have been hurt by and confused about their temple experiences. He noted elsewhere that parts of the endowment ceremony even elicited repressed laughter from some youth. McKay suggested that these members were fixated on the "mechanics" of temple worship instead of appreciating their symbolism. (ps. 264-269)
- There were plans to dedicate rooms in both the St. George and Salt Lake temples for the purpose of animal sacrifices. Although these plans were never realized, [a few sources](#) indicate that such sacrifices might have been performed in the Kirtland temple. (p. 22)
- Brigham Young thought that Joseph and Hyrum Smith were assassinated because they weren't wearing their garments, which are widely believed by Mormons to have protective powers. The Smiths removed them due to the heat and perhaps for fear that the sacred garments might fall into the wrong hands and be desecrated. (p. xxxix)
- After receiving their temple anointings at Kirtland, temple-goers celebrated by enjoying cake and wine. (p. 18)
- Jane Manning James, an early black convert, repeatedly (and unsuccessfully) petitioned to be sealed to Joseph Smith as an adopted daughter. As a compromise, the First Presidency instead sealed her as an eternal servant to Smith. This incident was the subject of a post earlier this year. (ps. xlv-xlvi)
- The First Presidency in 1946 ordered the Alberta temple to stop holding seances and other reported "irregularities and innovations." (p. 279)
- The old temple endowment video included a scene illustrating the creation of the earth from the Disney classic "Fantasia." The church was able to purchase several minutes of the movie because the endowment ceremony wouldn't result in copyright violations—the ceremony is not advertised to the public, nor is it open to the public. (p. 295)
- Wilford Woodruff refused to seal (marry) three young girls, ages 12 and 13, to an old man (p. 21). Yet decades later, the church's 1902 regulations permitted temple marriages to girls as young as 12. (p. 123)
- President John Taylor and countless other church leaders went into hiding for extensive periods of time to escape the law from practicing polygamy. Temple recommends would be forwarded to this secret location for his signature, but this procedure was complicated due to "busybodies" who measured the time it took for a signed recommend to be returned so as to approximate Taylor's whereabouts. (p. 53)

- It was a longstanding policy that women married to non-Mormon husbands had to get their spouse's written consent in order to receive her temple endowments. The same was not true, however, for men. This double-standard was finally corrected in 1986, such that now anyone married to a non-Mormon spouse has to get his or her permission. (p. xlix)
- The church in 1953 bypassed Swiss customs to sneak the temple endowment video into that country. Because Mormons regard the video's content of a sensitive nature, it was imperative that the video not receive the normal scrutiny by customs agents. (p. 291)
- When the endowment video was being re-shot in the 1970s, it went through several drafts. President Harold B. Lee objected to some of the cast having long hair and beards, so another version was produced with a clean-shaven and clean-cut Peter, James, and John. The blonde Eve was also replaced by a brunette for the Latin American versions, because blondes are viewed as "freaks" in those cultures. (p. 296)
- For much of LDS Church history, the "[second anointing](#)" was the "crowning ordinance" of the Restoration. The first anointing is the endowment ceremony that continues today, and it concerns blessings in the afterlife, like becoming kings and queens, priests and priestesses. The second anointing actually bestows those blessings temporally and furthermore secures one's exaltation in heaven. By 1949, nearly 33,000 of these anointings had been performed, but as General Authorities eventually deprived local leaders the discretion to recommend the anointings, the practice became increasingly rare and is nearly non-existent today. (ps. xli-xlv)
- In 1927, the "law of retribution" (or "oath of vengeance") was omitted from the ceremony. This oath was to pray that God "avenge the blood of the prophets on this nation" (p. 218). It's not surprising that the oath was instituted by Brigham Young, who also taught [blood atonement](#).
- David O. McKay was a fairly progressive church leader for his time on the race issue. He was the first to allow black members to perform baptisms for the dead, and he also overruled a decision to invalidate a white woman's endowments for simply being married to a black man. (p. xlvii)
- The LDS Church didn't adopt a strict adherence to the Word of Wisdom until well into the 20th century. Consider this statement from John Taylor in 1886: "The Word of Wisdom as originally given was sent not by commandment or constraint, but ... for the temporal salvation of all Saints in these days" ... [N]o rule has been formulated, nor law proclaimed, nor counsel given since that time which makes its strict observance necessary to receive ordinances ... in the temples." (p. 61)

## Mormonism and Buzz Lightyear; Karl Butcher

Buzz Lightyear's loss of faith mirrors my own.

The first time I saw *Toy Story*, I was expecting a pure comedy movie. There was some comedy but I was disappointed that the movie did not focus on comedy. Upon repeated viewings I came to understand that the movie was really about Buzz Lightyear and his loss of faith in himself, and how he overcame that.

At first Buzz was totally dedicated to his cause. No matter what anybody said, he was on a mission from Star Command and he was going to fulfill that mission. He knew there were seemingly rational people, like Woody, who didn't believe in his mission but it didn't matter. In time he knew he would be proven right.

This mirrored my faith in the church. I knew the church was true, I knew that very smart people refused to believe it, but I also knew if they just saw the evidence, they would believe.

Buzz often heard criticism of his beliefs but found a way to compartmentalize the data - excuses for why the world didn't seem to be working the way he knew it should.

For me it was the same. I knew of problems with the church for as long as I can remember but I was taught how to deal with the information in a way that would not damage my faith.

Eventually, Buzz has an experience that rocks him to the core. While in an already-stressful situation, he sees a television ad that makes his world turn upside down. The problems he once laughed off come flooding back into his mind... he realizes that everything he ever believed in was false... and that many of the ideas he rejected now had to be dealt with.

In my case, again it was very similar. For me it came as an argument against God, written on a lost blog somewhere on the internet. Something that I was strangely compelled to read. It was rigidly logical, irreverent, blasphemous... but right. In a few minutes I went from a believer in God to a complete atheist.

Buzz decided to give his old beliefs one last chance. His new worldview couldn't be right, so damn it, he was going to risk everything to prove that his old views were correct. He jumped off a railing, attempting to fly, and the last bit of his faith crashed down to the floor with him.

For me, it was a bit less dramatic. But I was sure I was wrong to turn atheist, so I started scouring church history. I started a new investigation into every miracle I ever believed in, into every prophet that I ever loved.

Like Buzz, my last remaining bits of faith crumbled when I found logical, rational, easy-to-see explanations for everything; explanations that didn't require a God or any other supernatural power.

The one place we differ somewhat is in our immediate reactions. Buzz goes into a deep depression while I initially felt liberated and elated.

I think the reason for this difference is that Buzz loved the idea of being Buzz Lightyear and loved the idea of serving Star Command.

I hated attending church, and did it only because that's what "God" wanted me to do.

Eventually, Buzz's depression lifts as he finds a new mission in life.

My elation dropped when I realized I would have to confront my wife, family, and friends about my newfound lack of belief.

I love Buzz Lightyear, and though *Toy Story 2* was far funnier than the first and *Toy Story 3* has a perfect wrap-up story for the series, I will always love the story of the first movie the most.

To me, *that* story means something.