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THANKS FOR THE TRIP

I KNEW AFTER a glance at the first paragraph that I had to read aloud to my wife Robert Kirby's, "Is Laughing in Church a Mormon Sin?" (SUNSTONE, Mar.-Apr. 1999). We roared with laughter, only to have the bishop's reprimand sober us up. But the last paragraph set us off again. By that time, my stomach was so tired from our raucous laughter I had to lie down and relax.

A deacon in my childhood ward had a similar accident with a bread tray in the days when the trays were large salad plates held by detachable handles. Our chapel had a floor that sloped down to the podium. Near the back of the chapel, as the deacons were marching back to the sacrament table, somehow the lead deacon's bread plate separated from its handle and bread flew onto the podium. The deacons, without missing a step, continued their march. The embarrassed deacon, simply picked up the plate and handed it to one of the priests.

As I recall, no one laughed then, but I have laughed about the scene off and on for years since.

J. CARLYLE PARKER
Turlock, California

UNLIKELY APOSTLE

A RECENT ISSUE (SUNSTONE, Mar.-Apr. 1999) referred to "imprisoned, polygamous Apostle George Reynolds." Reynolds was certainly imprisoned, and it was indeed for polygamy, but for years he was secretary to the First Presidency, and in 1890 was installed as one of the presidents of the Seventy. He was never an apostle.

DOUG JENSON
Idaho Falls, Idaho

NUMBERS GAME

B RIGHAM YOUNG's family was about 1 percent polygamous. This is based on his having about thirty wives and seventy children. Since Brigham Young was the only "polygamist" in this group, the proportion was one in one hundred, or 1 percent.

On this basis, Church President Joseph F. Smith argued before Congressional hearings that the LDS church was only 3 percent polygamous. He based his argument on the number of men who were polygamists, thus evading the fact that over 23 percent of the Church lived in polygamous families.

President Hinckley stated to the nation on Larry King Live that, "according to my information," only 2 to 5 percent of the Church practiced polygamy during the early days, but the actual number was about ten times that.

GARY PORTER
Ann Arbor, Mich.

CASTING STONES

J AY BAXTER'S letter (SUNSTONE, Mar.-Apr. 1999) justifying reasons why the majority of Mormons are and should be Republican, lacks both historical knowledge and a clear understanding of the issues surrounding the impeachment of President Clinton. So much of the debate in the House and Senate centered on exactly what constitutes "high crimes and misdemeanors." The vast majority of Constitutional lawyers, among them many prominent Republicans, concluded that what the President had done, as disastrous and deplorable as it was, did not rise to that level. And many have concluded that the impeachment was instigated by the egregious overreach of the Office of Independent Counsel and fueled by partisan Republican politics. Be that as may, to argue that all of the Republicans were motivated by high moral standards and all of the Democrats were lying is such a reductio ad absurdum as to defy reason.

What makes Baxter's argument even harder to accept is his failure to consider President Clinton's behavior in a broader context. For example, he omits mention of the Republicans' attitudes toward Presidents Reagan and Bush during the Iran-Contra hearings. There is credible evidence that both Reagan and Bush knew of the diversion of funds to the Contras and were cognizant of the fact that this was a subversion of the Constitution. Where in this matter is there evidence that "the Republicans were the party of higher ethical and moral standards?" In fact, if Baxter were to carefully review the extensive corruption in the Nixon, Reagan, and Bush administrations, he could hardly be critical of the Clinton administration, as corrupt as it has been.

Baxter might also benefit from a review of Mormon history. It is ironic that Mormons, with zero tolerance for President Clinton's deception about his affair with Monica Lewinsky and his manipulations to avoid detection and prosecution, belong to a Church in which Church leaders at the highest levels
SUNSTONE

willfully broke the law when they continued to practice polygamy after the Morrill Anti-bigamy Act of 1862 and then engaged in a pattern of deception to avoid detection and prosecution. Church leaders and other Mormons continued to resist even when the Supreme Court ruled against them in 1879.

With the passage of the Edmunds Act in 1883, which was designed to prosecute Mormons for "unlawful cohabitation (i.e., adultery)," federal prosecutors became more vigorous in attempting to enforce the law among the Mormons. When federal agents apprehended them, Mormon men were deceptive about their polygamous wives. When wives and children were called to testify against their polygamous husbands and fathers, they were evasive and misleading in their testimonies. As Richard S. Van Wagoner reports, one polygamist's son, when asked by U.S. marshals where his father was, responded, "He has gone as far as you can run north, and as far as you can run west with your mouth full of chicken manure." According to Van Wagoner, Agnes W. Roskelly instructed her sons to reply to questions about their father, "that they didn't know what their name was; they didn't know where they lived; they didn't know who their dad or mother was" (Mormon Polygamy: A History, Signature Books, 1989, 118).

While there are many differences between the recent impeachment hearings and what transpired in the Great Basin Kingdom, there are some striking similarities as well. Consider, for example, the language of a petition sent to President Grover Cleveland on 2 May 1885: "'Spotters' and spies dog their [the polygamists'] footsteps. Delators [ac- cusers] thrust themselves into bedchambers and watch at windows. Children are questioned upon the streets as to the marital relations of their parents. Families are dragged before commissioners and grand juries, and on pain of contempt, are compelled to testify against fathers and husbands. . . . Modest women are made to answer shamefully indecent questions as to the sexual relations of men and women. . . . Notoriously disreputable characters are employed to spy into men's family relations" (Mormon Polygamy, 118-19). This could almost be a description of the activities of the various private individuals and government officials who propelled the impeachment hearings.

The heart of the anti-bigamy laws was, of course, a preoccupation with sex and lying about sex. For the Mormons, the issues were that the United States government had no business delving into such personal matters, that the laws were unconstitutional, and that the government's methods of prosecution were unlawful. They felt, therefore, no obligation either to abide by the law or to cooperate with law enforcement officials by telling the truth. While many eluded the prosecutors, many also went to prison for their convictions. Probably the majority of constitutional lawyers today would argue that the anti-bigamy laws themselves and the ways in which they were enforced were unconstitutional. (See the SUNSTONE, Mar-Apr. 1998 Stanford Law Review.)

Last October, President Hinckley cautioned that "a tattoo is graffiti on the temple of the body."
Baxter says that "Church leaders are always excommunicated for adultery or telling lies." As the above historical record reveals, that was not the case in the nineteenth century. And, thank heavens, it is not always the case in today's Church.

It would be pretty hard to conclude that Mormon Republicans have a monopoly on virtue, but the recent Olympic scandal also hints that we might want to be a little more tentative about trumpeting our virtues. This is not to say that the Church condones immoral behavior or that it does not have high standards of ethical conduct. It is to say that Republicans and Democrats, as well as Civil Libertarians, Green Party members, political dropouts, and all others equally struggle with moral issues.

ROBERT A. REES
Brookdale, California

FOR THE RECORD

ELBERT EUGENE PECK'S riveting account in the anniversary issue, "The Origin and Evolution of the Sunstone Species: Twenty-five Years of Creative Adaptation," mentions as an example of how Sunstone provides forums for discussing the appropriate role of Mormon studies an address I gave in 1992 on the "alleged LDS ecclesiastical repression of scholars, intellectuals, and feminists. Her revelation of the existence of the apostle-led, dissident-monitoring, Strengthening the Members Committee prompted a fiery Utah hailstorm." It's a great story, but that's not quite the way it happened.

For the record, I did not mention the Strengthening Church Members Committee (the correct title) in my presentation. I didn't then know it existed. At the conclusion of my address, during the audience-response period, Eugene England took the podium and identified as "the chief danger the group that is compiling the files . . . The Committee to Strengthen Members, an ad hoc Church group without General Authority standing but apparently great influence, headed by one William Nelson . . . I accuse that committee of undermining our Church."


At the time of my presentation, I knew who Nelson was. He had been executive assistant to the president of the Quorum of the Twelve, Ezra Taft Benson, from 1974-85, and he was then managing director of Correlation Review, which reported to Elder Boyd K. Packer, but I had not heard of this committee. Associated Press bureau chief Vern Anderson (no relation), who was sitting at the end of a row at the south end of the hall quietly stood up and walked into the lobby. The next day, Saturday, 8 August 1992, an AP story under Anderson's byline appeared. It quoted Church spokesman Don LeFevre's acknowledgment that such a committee "provides local church leadership with information designed to help them counsel with members who may hinder the progress of the church through public criticism." It also quoted Omar Kader of Washington, D.C., who described learning that Nelson, then his stake president, had kept a file on Kader's political activities as a Democrat in Provo where he taught in BYU's Political Science Department in the late 1970s. Nelson "categorically denied keeping a file on Kader" and also "denied knowing Omar and Nancy Kader." (Vern Anderson, "LDS Official Acknowledges Church Monitors Critics," Salt Lake Tribune, 8 Aug. 1992)

Upon learning that the committee was headed by apostles (Nelson's role was never clarified), England apologized, both in person to Elders James E. Faust and Russell M. Nelson, and in a letter to SUNSTONE for being critical of General Authorities. A revised version of my address was published in Dialogue and won the Lowell L. Bennion Prize for Essays in Gospel Living ("The Intellectual Community and Church Leadership: A Contemporary Chronology": Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought 26: 1 [spring 1993]).

Following this publication, Elder Lorin C. Dunn, then Utah North Area president, provided a photocopy of the article to Marlin S. Miller, my stake president. In May 1993, Miller told me that I must "repudiate" the article and stop publishing accounts that showed members who had difficulties with their ecclesiastical leaders. I declined. After several exchanges over the summer, he ex-
communicated me, in September 1993, for "apostasy."

I greatly appreciate Sunstone's role in providing a forum for the discussion of these events and deeply regret the punitive aftermath that affected Sunstone itself, me and my family, many other individuals in the Mormon community, and the climate for how much "understanding" faith can safely seek—a question that reverberates even to the present. I believe the 1990s will be regarded by future generations as an unfortunate aberration in Mormonism's larger story of hope, enlightenment, and joyous community.

LAVINA FIELDING ANDERSON
Salt Lake City, Utah

MISSING THE "MORE"

I WOULD LIKE to respond to Todd Compton's plea for an "open" temple ("Thoughts on the Possibility of an Open Temple," SUNSTONE, Mar.—Apr. 1999). His core argument, as I understand it, runs somewhat like this: There is grave spiritual danger in self-proclaiming one's righteousness, as is shown in Christ's parable of the tax collector in the temple who freely, but privately, berates himself for his wayward nature, while the self-congratulatory Pharisee proudly boasts of his own righteousness, especially in contrast to what he sees as the moral squalor of others. Compton sees a parallel here in the requirement for a "worthiness" interview and the granting of a recommend before we are allowed to attend the temple. By declaring our worthiness to the bishop and stake president, we openly declare our righteousness in a manner that may violate the principle Christ was trying to teach in his parable. Perhaps we are, he suggests, flaunting our good works like the boastful Pharisee does.

Worse, according to the argument, because it can sometimes be openly apparent in wards who is "temple-worthy," holding a valid recommend is tantamount to doing one's alms in public, since being temple-worthy tacitly acknowledges full-tithe-paying status—a seeming violation of Christ's injunction with regard to almsgiving not to let the "right hand know what the left hand doeth." How then can we tolerate this apparent contradiction between LDS practice and Christ's teachings? To Compton, the solution seems obvious: do away with the requirement for a recommend, which entails, as a matter of course, an "open" temple.

In rebutting this argument, we can't neglect the fact that having a recommend only demonstrates one pays tithing (or claims one does, at least), not how much one pays. The larger issue here, however, is quite similar to

"Though rumored to be Joseph Smith's favorite, it was never used."
the philosophical problem of "other minds." How can we know that other people have minds? Why, it is only by their behavior and their utterances, which we interpret as being directed by individual minds such as the one each of us believes we possess. So then, how can we know if a person is righteous? Only by his or her behavior and utterances. There is no other way. Hence, to gauge righteousness, something very much like an interview is unavoidable. (All of this is, of course, well understood by most Mormons. I break no new ground here.) But then we face the question of why must one "declare one's righteousness" in a temple recommend interview?

As I pointed out in a Sunstone presentation years ago, the temple is a "mystery" as this term was understood anciently. A mystery is a sequestered initiation, ordinance, and/or ritual, kept apart from the profane world. In a recent conference, a general authority objected that the temple is not a "mystery religion." He is indisputably right: it is not a mystery religion, but the mystery religion. It is the mystery from which temple-believing Mormons are convinced all other shadows of the temple (i.e., Freemasonry and the Eleusian Mysteries) devolved over the centuries and millennia. One of the most universal and enduring requirements of the ancient mystery tradition is that not just anyone may be admitted, but only those who have satisfied specific requirements—often involving strict standards of purity and righteousness.

Since anyone who meets the specified requirements may gain entry, this screening is in no way elitist (it is usually only those who don't believe in it, or who don't want to have to meet the entry criteria who make the accusation of elitism, anyway). And it is only secondarily meant to preserve secrecy. Its main purpose is to insure, as much as is possible with imperfect beings such as we, that only those who are prepared and have earned the privilege of entry are admitted. If we change that, we change the very nature of the temple itself utterly, irrevocably.

Perhaps Compton is right that, for some members, successfully "passing" a temple recommend interview fills a need "to be seen amongst" or displayed to others as righteous. There is a possible social stigma attached to being an untempled Mormon. Indeed, weaker souls might feel tempted to vaunt their righteousness to earn (as they believe) the regard of their fellow Saints, rather than for the blessings one finds for oneself and others in temple attendance.

But for those with a proper attitude, there is no merit in boasting. The interview is merely a gate one must pass to gain access to the temple. For these, the interview process serves more as a reminder of how much ground they yet must cover to become like the Savior (the attitude demonstrated by the Pharisee), rather than as an opportunity to boast (like the Pharisee) about how far they have already traveled. Such people pay scant attention to who else holds, or doesn't hold, a temple recommend.

Seen this way, the interview process is not so much like the boasting of the Pharisee, but like the humble confessions of the tax collector. The interview space is more like the outer court of the Jewish temple, where these two markedly differing behaviors may be acted out in accord with the inner motivation of the actors. In this light, I think we can dismiss this argument for an open temple.

But its dismissal leaves open one more argument: Compton also recommends abolition of the interview process and of "closed" temples to avoid seeming injustices such as the one against Steve Epperson (fired from BYU for failing to maintain a valid recommend). Assuming the facts really are as stated, Epperson's example does seem to be a case in which a leader's inflexibility led to a regrettable lack of mercy.

However, Compton's linking of the Epperson case to an open temple shows that he, as do many others, views the temple primarily as a religious and cultural phenomenon, rather than as a social and mystical one. To someone with only a social and cultural perspective, there is no good reason for the temple to be "closed" to anyone. Temple worship is an arbitrary, anthropological practice that smacks of an exclusive social club, and placing qualifications on the behavior of those who may be admitted is seen as a psychological trick played in order to motivate people to toe the orthodoxy line.

With all due respect to the societal and cultural elements involved, the temple is far more than that. But anyone viewing it from a more narrow secular perspective will altogether miss what this "more" is.

PAUL SMITH
Austin, Texas

Letters for publication are edited for clarity, tone, and space (send to <SunstoneUt@aol.com>). Letters to authors are forwarded, unopened. Visit <Sunstoneonline.com> to comment on articles or to read comments by others.
Godspeed Gene England's recovery

On 21 February 2001, Eugene England unexpectedly collapsed and underwent emergency surgery to remove a cancerous growth and several cysts in his right temporal lobe. Gene continues radiation treatment, and he is doing well in physical therapy for his weakened left side. He and his family are grateful for the many messages of love and encouragement and humor they have received. Gene feels strengthened and blessed by the love of good friends.

Individuals may write to Gene and Charlotte by e-mail at <gene.charlotte@attglobal.net>. Visit the Sunstone website <Sunstoneonline.com> to share your comments about Gene, to read comments by others, and to read the family's periodic e-mail updates on Gene's condition. Below is an excerpt from a letter sent by his childhood friend and BYU English Department colleague, Bert Wilson, who is currently in Finland.

I F YOUR HEAD weren't already swollen from your surgery, it would certainly swell now as solicitous letters, calls, and e-mail messages keep pouring in from around the world, each writer or caller claiming a piece of you... But I have a claim on you that none of them can match. I have known you since we were both five years old. Who else can claim to have lain with you on the canal bank behind your home and pulled the legs off water skippers? Who else has memorized with me the shortest page in our fourth grade history book so we could mass produce it to meet the punishments Miss Salvesen meted out—one page copied from the history book for each of our misdeeds...? Who else has faced you with a loaded rubber gun across the narrow space of your dad's grain silo? A wonder we didn't blind each other! Who else has hiked with you through the Cedars and cleansed ourselves at Downatta? Who else knows of your passionate and unrequited love for Marjean Ware? Who else has traded comic books with you? Who else has lain out with you under Idaho's star-studded skies and dreamed dreams of grandeur?

Others may have better claims than I on your scholarship, your razor-sharp mind, your thousand and one entrepreneurial schemes and projects... but no one has a better claim on a life-long friendship that has brought me much joy. You have preached many a sermon in essay after essay, but your greatest sermon has always been your own life, a life that has on many occasions merged with mine... —WILLIAM A. WILSON
FROM THE PUBLISHER

EPHANITY AT SHORT MOUNTAIN

By Elbert Eugene Peck

BUSINESS FIRST

THIS IS MY last editorial in SUNSTONE. The horizon of my full-time tenure at the Sunstone Foundation rapidly approaches. After fifteen years, the long-feared "burn-out" set in. Not heeding the example of Moses, I wore too many hats for too many years. As I stumbled, so did the organization, and I apologize for the disarray of the last year.

Sadly, this kind of organizational crisis is not unusual for Sunstone. Historically, we have always put too many of our eggs in one person's basket. Happily, out of each crisis the Sunstone phoenix has risen stronger and with a broader wing span (symposiums, regional symposiums, etc.). That is also true this time. Thankfully, many have stepped in to help, but much more help is needed.

The torch of editor has been passed to the able Dan Wotherspoon, whose first editorial is in this issue. Carol Quist now directs our bookstore, the Sunstone Mercantile, where all books are 10 percent off. Drop by the office and browse through the stacks; our goal is to make available every worthy book on Mormonism, no matter how obscure. William Stanford is our business manager and website guru. In time, the website will provide volumes of information about past, present, and upcoming symposiums and magazines, as well as an online version of the Mercantile. That enterprise alone will need regular office volunteers to stock inventory, ship orders, and update the website. If you can, consider helping out like Virginia Borgeous did for years. She volunteered a half-day each Wednesday at the office. We will soon need many Virginias. Additionally, individuals can help at home, on their own computer.

Finally, Sunstone needs financial help. All small intellectual organizations rely on a subsidy. Even big ones do. One upside of the "graying of SUNSTONE" is that many of our retired subscribers are quite affluent and can afford to make a thousand-dollar-a-year donation to stabilize current and future operations.

With optimism, work, and help, this time of transition will be looked back on as the point when Sunstone stabilized its operations while, once again, expanding its reach. This is a time of opportunity.

THE HOMILY

RECENTLY, I visited with a journalist from a national publication who was in Salt Lake researching a story on the Mormons. "Boy, your sacrament meetings are boring," he moaned. I acknowledged that without the right interpretive tools they can be as somnolent as a still Virginia river on a hot, humid summer afternoon. But just below the placid surface is a thriving, fecund ecosystem.

Yes, technically, Mary Smith's sermon was deadly dull, but for those who know her, it was electric, a monumental success—the culmination of years of building her self-confidence. And, true, Brother Stanford's conducting is pompous and self-righteous, but he's so much better than he used to be. And there's bumbling Brother Jones, coaching the deacons. How he cares about them! Just a year ago, he was severely depressed and self-absorbed: that calling changed his life. And, look! there's Jane helping Sister Quist into her gown. In time, the Horizon of my tenure at Sunstone will be looked back on as the point when Sunstone stabilized its operations while, once again, expanding its reach. This is a time of opportunity.

Nevertheless, the Church of Jesus Christ is an incredible force and source in the world for goodness and love. Just below the surface of our boring meetings and the roof of our uninspiring meetinghouses, life burgeons!
replied, "And they see Mormons as being nighted." I laughed at the contradictions and at my comfortableness in each group. I thought again of the real love I had experienced that weekend and, conscious of the irony, I sang the campfire song, "They will know we are Christian by our love..."

THEN came the bolt: the presence of love within a community does not prove it is Christian: "If you love those who love you, what reward can you expect? Even the tax collectors do as much as that. If you greet only your brothers, what is extraordinary about that? Even the heathen do as much" (Matt. 5:46-47, Rev. English Bible).

Each of these two communities brim with love, and that in itself is an impressive achievement. Yet each community looks to the other with some degree of hostility, in part because each sees the other as a threat, as an enemy. "But what I tell you is this," said Jesus: "Love your enemies and pray for your persecutors; only so can you be children of your father, who causes the sun to rise on the good and the bad alike, and sends the rain on the innocent and the wicked" (44-45). By that standard, few of us are Christians, even if we print His name in large, boldface type. I suppose loving one's enemies is one of the last virtues acquired in becoming a Christian. Certainly, individuals and peoples must first learn to love themselves and their neighbors. And just that involves a lot: learning to forgive and ask forgiveness, to give help and to receive help, to not expect perfection of humans but to accept the persistent weaknesses of others just as much as you expect them to give slack to yours, to encourage rather than condemn, to see possibilities rather than pronounce judgments, to accept and value views and styles that irk you, to lower your standard of living to raise others', to delight in the successes of others, to give good gifts simply out of love. These Beattitudes are learned inside the community of love I described to the journalist. Why is it so difficult to apply them outside the community, especially to those with whom we differ? Regardless, that is the goal: "there must be no limit to your goodness, as your heavenly Father's goodness knows no bounds" (48). And the person or people who achieve that Father-like being truly are what the Apostle Paul called "new creation" (Gal. 6:15), a thing hard for us to comprehend. "It doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him" (1 Jn 3:2).

There is some consolation in being able to say, "I may not love them, but I don't hate them." But not much. And, really, there is little distinction between indifference and passive love ("I love the sinner but not the sin."). Jesus' love of enemies is not a nebulous, warm fuzzy. No, it's specific and active and democratic. Follow the Father's example, send sun to warm and rain to nourish, and do it for everyone. How simple—treat those outside your community exactly the same as you treat those inside it.

Well, that's easier said than done. And right now, while writing this, I feel a growing hypocrisy in myself. I have noted in my heart specific enemies, or as Gandhi would call them, opponents, with whom I need to reconcile. I can get some consolation realizing that I'm like the mediocre Saint preaching a sermon that calls him to be better. (My, how we seek absolution so fast!) But that notion only has any virtue if I act on it.

DURING the last two centuries, Mormonism has had its share of enemies, perceived and real, and we have struggled to learn how to "live together in love" (D&C 42:45), the core knowledge I think the Restoration is to give to the world. Persecution has helped us create the bonded community I extolled to the journalist; although, no one would say that in the past Mormons loved their enemies. The boundaries that helped create and then maintain our loving, "Christian" community are the very ones we must now cross to become truly Christian.

We've come a long way from pioneer oaths of vengeance, which fostered a xenophobia that the Mountain Meadows Massacre was only the extreme manifestation. Today, Latter-day Saints and their Church are more singularly focused on growth and service. And because of our pragmatism, we learn from our past and avoid over-zealousness as we diligently work to make sure our labors improve.

We enter this new century as an international Church, and that will change us dramatically. That new, international identity will not simply mean that our membership and Church way are now spread around the globe. In engaging different peoples, we have the opportunity to learn how to love, if not our enemies, at least people quite other than us who do not want our American ways. Fortunately, we are in a psychological place where we are comfortable with ourselves and our relationship to God, and are open to change, and that means we can engage others without feeling threatened. I hope we can engage them with the same active love that we give to our own. There are indications that we are moving in that direction. The careful LDS steps into humanitarian service, the providing aid to anyone without regard to status, is one indicator. The comfortable, non-threatened attitude of Church President Gordon B. Hinckley is another.

If that trajectory is correct, we are not just on the edge of a new century, but a Millennium. And it does not yet appear what we shall be.

To comment or to read comments by others, visit <www.Sunstoneonline.com>.

FASQUE OMNE RUPTUM

At this angle of sun and earth, the blackbird's belly lifts to shine on the wingbeats' ictus, winks dark on the surus.

Chaos in the state, and locally we are still fiddling around with making images: a weak froth of green shoots on the fire-blackened stump was just now trying to stand for regeneration, but this is a cold time after the death of the hero, and satire hardens everywhere like frost.

—JAMES OWENS
IN MEMORIAM

KARL C. SANDBERG

By Douglas Parker

KARL SANDBERG grew up in the Mormon village of Monroe, Utah, and throughout his life, he harvested lessons from those formative years. He drew upon the idealism of its United Order period and the hard realism of its present. For Karl, that small town was a microcosm of the full human condition, etched in the ordinary lives of ranchers, farmers, midwives, and young lovers. There he found the meaning of birth, life, and death, failure, of strength, courage, perseverance, and character. His collected sermons could be titled, “All I ever needed to know, I learned in Monroe.”

Karl Sandberg engaged people, God, and life with honesty, thoughtfulness, art, and humor. Sunstone readers have known Karl since 1978, when one of his poems was the cover feature. He taught French and humanities for 24 years at Macalster College, showing students the joy of living the examined life. Karl and I first met in the 1950s in Boulder, Colorado, when I was a professor at University of Colorado school of law and Karl was a visiting professor for the summer in the economic institute. Ever since, we have had a friendship that was an ongoing, expansive conversation. He changed the lives of many, and with his death last year, countless men, women, and children now miss his easy personality that somehow brought out one’s best.

DOUGLAS PARKER is emeritus professor of law at Brigham Young University. A version of this essay was presented at Karl Sandberg’s funeral.

When Karl and Dawn traveled, they often stayed with friends. They were relaxed house guests. Karl often wandered around the kitchen in his pajamas. Once, when Karl stayed with us in Boulder, we placed him in a downstairs bedroom next to the bedrooms of our young children. We told them to be quiet in the morning so Karl could sleep in. In the morning, things were too quiet. When we investigated, we found all of them in bed with Karl, listening in rapt attention to him...
friends at greeting and departure, but he was not an emotional man, and not one given to tears. Recently, however, while he and I were driving to a small mountain town for lunch, he shed tears and had difficulty controlling his voice while talking about his pride in and love for his children. One by one, Karl discussed his children’s gifts and competencies, he extolled their individuality, and he delighted that each was unique.

Their children grew up in a loving home, graced with conversation, tenderness, and humor. But love can sometimes be overprotective and stifle individual growth. Karl and Dawn gave them freedom. They mandated no strict conformity against which to rebel. They gave them freedom to discover and become what they are, encouragement to think and act for themselves. Just as listening is essential to friendship, a freedom supported by love and confidence is essential to the rearing of children.

ONE distinguishing quality of Karl’s, and perhaps the one in which he was most gifted, was his love of language, poetry, and words. Almost everything he said and wrote was carefully crafted. In 1971, he sent to Corene and me copies of a few of his poems, with these introductory words:

Dear Doug and Corene,

Though I was born modest, it wore off, and your invitation to exchange letters on subjects which involve our deepest probings and ponderings has led me to believe that I might share with you a few poems which I have written over the past few years, knowing that the intuitions of friends will make up for the deficiencies in idiom.

Consider the comprehension and grasp in this poem:

SABBATH

No, nothing will do just now
but to sit beneath a mesquite tree
in a dry creek bed and look long at cactus.
The Saguaro does not sway or bend or mark the breeze.
It has no use. It simply is.
I can look at it until time is lost
and it will not move.

No, I will not leave just now.
Here the bow is not cracked.
Here nothing is drawn taut.
I must get away from every place
where people have sold soap and automobiles
and have drawn themselves taut.

No one has seen a cactus move.
Even its birth did not part the womb of stillness.
I will intrude upon its world of being.
I will sit on earth prepared by long dying
and wonder what people mean when they say,
“What time is it?”

O KARL often pondered death and the existence of a life after death. We talked about this on several occasions during his last two months. Karl knew that his body was completely worn out, but he was not ready to die. He had unfinished business of the mind and pen. His mind was filled with poetry and essays he felt an urgency to write. About a month before he died, when his capacity to type failed, he acquired a voice-activated computer which he never had a chance to use. He clearly saw, however, that death is a necessary adjunct of mortal life. For all of us, the process of dying starts the day we are born, and we merely await the timing. Death’s approaching shadow invigorates and nourishes the richness of life and stimulates its productivity and fecundity.

Karl was sure life continues after death. It went beyond hope. I was somewhat taken aback by his surety. Karl was sure that thinking, feeling, loving, knowing, freedom, and individuality continue after death. This was not a matter of cocksure knowledge held in place of hope and belief. It was just that his mind was completely and totally accepting about the matter, and he was totally at peace.

Karl, the expert on Pierre Bayle and the historical struggle between faith and reason, was totally at peace. Distinctions between believing and knowing were irrelevant. Karl, in dying, had no fear that he was saying goodbye to himself. Several spiritual experiences had provided some of the grounding for his peace of mind. During his last month, his mind and heart were close to a reunion with his father and mother to whom he had much to say. Watching Karl anticipate and contemplate his approaching death makes me less fearful of dying.

On the question whether there is a loving God, Karl’s answer was always YES, but he made no pretensions about capturing God in finite theological detail, or of knowing God’s
Karl Sandberg in Sunstone  
(references to Sunstone magazine or symposium tape number)
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"Requiem for a Town" (Mar.—April 1978)
"The Last Speaker Will Give the interpretation of Tongues"(Jan. 1987)
"Autumn" (Sept. 1987)
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"Whither Mormon Scholarship?" (Dec. 1998)
"Worlds in Collision" (Apr. 2001)

SELECTED SYMPOSIUM PRESENTATIONS
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Karl was a man of deep spirituality. It was not a testimony-bearing spirituality and was not self-professed. It was manifest in the way people felt when they were around him, and in the way in which he imparted dignity and respect to persons whom he met. His was a non-dogmatic spirituality not necessarily limited to identification with a particular creed. It was one identified with the highest upward thrust that might be found in persons of all faiths and persuasions who radiate a reverence for life. By his interest and concern, he lifted people up. We know some prominent leaders of recent history who were possessed of spirituality that bore no trademark. Lincoln was one. Impressed by his great reliance upon God and prayer, people were always seeking to have Lincoln reveal his denominational preference, but he declined to chose one. Other such individuals are Nelson Mandela and Ghandi. We regularly meet people who do not have the public prominence of these individuals, but they do have the same generic spirituality. They are found in every creed and culture. Such persons play out their lives on a smaller, less conspicuous stage. Karl saw this kind of spirituality in others, and it fueled his interest in comparative religions.

Nevertheless, he also had a passionate preoccupation and love for his Mormon faith and heritage. He was a keen interpreter of its traditions and growth. Karl loved the scriptures and made them a life-long study. Even as literature, they were on a level above Shakespeare. These topics he pursued in papers delivered at the Sunstone symposiums.

Karl was passionate about living in and for the present. At every moment of eternity, the present is here to be dealt with, enjoyed, made meaningful, and celebrated. The future will always be in the future; it is an abstraction. We are confronted eternally with the ongoing now. Do well by the present, and the future will take care of itself. If you wish to be happy, be happy now; don't put it off. A poem, written in 1971, speaks to this:

Mind, likes, and dislikes better than God knows them himself. Karl was not given to preaching or to being God's spokesman, press secretary, or campaign manager. He graciously permitted God to be bigger than his grasp of him. Karl, in a way, sought possession of spirituality before me, not even the highest and most correct idea you or I possess of God. He met people who do not have the public prominence of these individuals, but they do have the same generic spirituality. They are found in every creed and culture. Such persons play out their lives on a smaller, less conspicuous stage. Karl saw this kind of spirituality in others, and it fueled his interest in comparative religions.

Nevertheless, he also had a passionate preoccupation and love for his Mormon faith and heritage. He was a keen interpreter of its traditions and growth. Karl loved the scriptures and made them a life-long study. Even as literature, they were on a level above Shakespeare. These topics he pursued in papers delivered at the Sunstone symposiums.

Karl was passionate about living in and for the present. At every moment of eternity, the present is here to be dealt with, enjoyed, made meaningful, and celebrated. The future will always be in the future; it is an abstraction. We are confronted eternally with the ongoing now. Do well by the present, and the future will take care of itself. If you wish to be happy, be happy now; don't put it off. A poem, written in 1971, speaks to this:
In a conversation I was always at the edge and agreed with everything that was said. After I had raised four children and had supported my husband in his calling and made it possible for him to be a stake mission president and then a high councilman and after I had washed the diapers and cooked the meals and cleaned the house so that he could be gone and after I lived through my children making their problems my problems until I had no more of my own, I died.

I never talked in church, but if I did, I would take as my text, the scripture that says, "He that loseth his life shall lose it."

If Karl had written the Book of Mormon passage, "Adam fell that man might be, and men are that they might have joy" (2 Ne. 2:25), he would have added, "now, in the present."

Another key to understanding Karl is found in his embrace of the joys of the body. If we are ashamed of the flesh, and of sensuality, and of the pleasures associated with the five senses—if the flesh exists only to be castigated—then why should the material body be resurrected? Let life continue only in the spirit. Therefore, to fully understand Karl, your gaze must always include oil and vinegar, avocados, French bread, and especially sautéed mushrooms and artichokes. He loved to cook and eat. Think of the meal preparation scene in the film Babettes Feast, or the cafe scene in Tom Jones where the juice of a ripe pear ran down Tom's chin.

Just as Karl was a deeply spiritual man, he was a carnal man, the most carnal man I've known. The New Testament records that some who saw Jesus eating and drinking with publicans and sinners falsely accused him of being a winebibber and a glutton. Jesus was an extrovert. In this respect, his lifestyle was almost completely opposite that of John the Baptist, and his disciples occasionally brought this up with him.

Through our eyes, ears, and nose, by taste and touch, we find God manifest in the grandeur of his handiwork. With the aid of the flesh, our spirits can proclaim, "How Great Thou Art!" One of Karl's poems puts this well:

**A Hymn in Praise of Carnality**
(or Confessions of a Reformed Puritan)

I think the flesh must be holy, so alive it is. I will slake a deep thirst in a glacial stream. Holding my mouth against the rocks until my face is numb, then looking up, I feel the sun a purging coal upon my lips.

FINALLY, I speak directly to Karl, who is surely listening: "Karl, I salute you in the name of pluralism!" During our friendship of forty years, when we met or spoke after some absence, we usually greeted one another with that affirmation. We would close our letters and phone calls with, "Metaphysical pluralism is alive and well." By those short expressions, we reconfirmed the conclusions of many deliberations: our mutual conviction, our common faith, our answer to the philosophical question of whether reality is one or many.

Our answer to this question stated our shared position on the nature of God. In other words, does reality consist of one undifferentiated, indivisible entity of which we are merely facets or expressions? Or does reality consist of many separate, individual, independently real entities? Karl and I strongly opted for the latter view. We held the conviction that we are all self-aware, free-moving, independently real entities. We are free to be different, according to our own fashioning, and to be accountable, under the loving, nurturing guidance of a real God. This serious conviction became our humorous form of greeting.

Karl Sandberg was a renaissance man with many attractive facets on the diamond of his soul. He was a man whose many serious convictions were often wrapped in humor. He was a friend whose easy conversation made you say and be your best. I love you, dear friend, as do so many others.

To comment on this essay, or to share your remembrances of Karl, visit our website: <www.sunstoneonline.com>.
CLARA'S BREATH

In the dead night, her silence
wakes as surely as screams.
From the next room, her mother cannot
hear the papery whisper of lungs
so small, the browned air
of cities already coloring
like a child's spilled paint.
The mother resurrects herself, naked
in the moonlight and walks to the left
so as not to creak the wood floor,
not to let the others know how
she spends her nights. A pause
before opening the door, the brief shock
of chill brass lit under touch,
a quick wish for more light,
the calico curtains turned dirty
by the outdoor float of halogen.

All motion has stopped, and time
points in toward the still figure
prone on the bed, blanket
reaching for her arm. The instant
found in dark, the instant edged in light,
here hope is held in the swift
twitch of a child’s breath.
The mother bends, praying herself
into her hands, all power,
all wakefulness, to the rise and fall,
rise and fall of the eggshell chest,
the wet dark mystery within.

—BRANDY MCKENZIE

ODETTE IN BLUE

There was a time when a stranger's eyes
would cause Odette to run
her heart would beat with the increasing
pulse of a tap or cistern
with washers wearing—
no repairing a heart full of spears
no sense remaking Psycho—Hitch did it
best
Odette did it too:
lost someone
wrapped her mind in theatre = black
curtain of despair
let house lights fall to blue
as she practiced placing hands just so;
fingers of china
draped between breasts
as trembling rests
for a lily,

Odette in blue:
like a ghost whose skin cut by light
might bleed the milk of dandelions.

Odette in blue:
the shell of a delicate creature with echoes
full of preverbal sobbing.

Odette in blue:
we knew her by her hands.

—CLAYTON HANSEN
A YEAR OR SO AGO, I got a call and fax from Suzanne Bennett, a program director at the Women's Project and Productions, a small feminist theater group in New York City. She asked if I was interested in reading a play about Mormon women in Southern Utah from the 1850s to the 1890s and, if I should like it, whether I would be on a panel to talk about it. She implied I would find the play offensive. I was certainly interested in reading the play.

Two-Headed was written by prize-winning playwright Julie Jensen, who grew up in Beaver, Utah, and taught playwriting in Las Vegas. In five scenes at ten-year intervals, the play tells the story of two women, Hettie and Lavinia. They are young girls in the first scene, ripe grandmothers in the last. The two women are the only characters on stage, but a major off-stage force is Lavinia's father, who planned the Mountain Meadows Massacre, which has taken place just the day before the play begins. Later, he marries as his second wife his daughter Lavinia's friend Hettie. When Lavinia's father, "the Commander" goes east to preach the restored gospel, he is thrown into an institution for the mentally challenged.

Another strong off-stage character is the girls' friend Jane, on whom Lavinia lavishes passionate devotion. Jane marries Ezra, Hettie's choice for a husband. Still a young woman, Jane is bitten by a rabid animal, and when hydrophobia begins to come on, the girls agree that she must be killed. Hettie smotheres Jane with a pillow. This dramatic incident is taken directly from Julie Jensen's family lore, as are many other details. Then Lavinia, not Hettie, marries the taciturn, widowed Ezra and finds little happiness with him. Later, she becomes less happy when Ezra marries Tess, the daughter of Hettie and "the commander," her own half-sister.

With the Mountain Meadows Massacre and polygamy as background, the two women play out their life-long, tension-filled friendship. Although the title seems to refer to two-headed animals, it also refers to the two women and to the two heads of the nineteenth century Mormon woman, one cynical, outspoken, critical, the other devoted, accepting, making do. A reviewer described the two women as "the rational social-apologist Hettie and the impulsive no-nonsense—at moments, demented—truth monger Lavinia." As played by Lizbeth Mackay and Deirdre O'Connell, the play is "bitingly comic, fiercely stirring," says a promotional blurb.

Two-headed also refers to the attitudes of the Southern Utah people Jensen grew up with. They had public and private heads; some things, such as the Mountain Meadows Massacre and polygamy, they just did not want to talk about. They knew, and they didn't know. They imagined but did not speak their thoughts. The dark past was suppressed. They lived with secrets.

With its double voice, I found the play compelling, so much preferable to the usual flat stereotype, so much more intimate than the usual depiction of the Mormon woman as the inexplicable and dark other, so attrac-
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tive in the way Mormonism is projected as a women's world where the enduring relationships are female with occasional visiting men. I loved the economy of the two characters interacting at ten-year intervals, slowly revealing the story and relationships (like braiding hair, Jensen says) without any heavy-handed exposition and background. I said I would be happy to be on a panel.

Next I had a tentative call from the play's director, Joan Vail Thorne, an elegant Southern woman who teaches theatre at New York University and who had written The Exact Center of the Universe, a play about Southern women which I had seen and admired. She asked if we could meet and if I would answer some questions about Mormon ways so she could work at getting things right. She said she knew Southern women, but she was on less sure ground with Mormons. We met and pleasantly discussed many aspects of Utah life. Just what were garments, and what kind of underwear would these girls wear? They did have to climb a tree. How would these women be dressed? Were the women really cowed and oppressed? How did I think the women should be characterized? We talked on and on. I showed her photographs I had collected for Mormon Sisters: Women in Early Utah and other projects and loaned them to her. The pictures tend to be rather formally posed, but she said how much she valued an occasional hand on a hip or set of the chin and used these details in her direction. The set designer used construction and prop details for the set.

Soon afterwards, I was invited to attend a rehearsal and to answer questions from the cast and the theater staff. The two actresses and a dozen others pelted me with questions, again wide-ranging, historical, problematic, which I tried to answer. Although a staff person had done considerable background research and produced a good informational document, the questions persisted. I commented on the evolving characterizations of the two women: glad that Hettie was made away from the meetinghouse, to bring people together in new ways. These include lectures, outings, musicales, discussions, walking tours, and theater parties. Our most recent drama event had been a group trip to see Joyful Noise. Tim Slover's prize-winning play about Handel's composition of Messiah. I set up a date for a group to attend Two-Headed, advertised it, and began to collect money.

One Sunday afternoon, while the show was in previews, I dropped by the box office to purchase the pre-ordered tickets. While waiting for the man to process the checks and print the tickets, I admired the display in the lobby. My big pictures, their rough edges sliced off, were beneath a clothes line on which were pinned some small items of domestic clothing interspersed with sheets of the printed chronology. Several people in the lobby were reading this background material. I read through it and then pointed out my pictures, looking newly trim, to the man in the box office. At this point a woman I had never met before emerged from the corner. She was short with cropped dark hair, bright eyes, and a broad smile. This was Julie Jensen, the playwright. We immediately struck up a warm conversation. She was pleased with the production and thought that things were going well. She was in town for a couple of weeks while the play, which was scheduled for a month-long run, got established. I said I was bringing a group of Mormons later in the week. Would she be willing to talk to our group afterwards? She enthusiastically agreed. That was Sunday I was invited to the opening performance on Thursday night; I took a friend from Columbia with me. The theater, formerly a church, was filled with lively, supportive friends, drama critics, and regular audience. I watched the familiar scenes, enthralled. The drama had advanced so far from the printed version I had read and from the early rehearsal I had attended. The two actresses played the short hour and fifteen minutes without intermission, marking the passage of time with black-outs, small costume changes, and significant props. The emerging story dripped out slowly, detail by detail, causing occasional gasps from the audience. When it was over, the audience applauded enthusiastically for a long time. Afterward, many of us repaired to the cast party at the nearby 1050 Restaurant & Lounge on Tenth Avenue at Fifty-sixth Street. A pasta supper and free drinks were laid out for those attending. I go to lots of plays, but I seldom get invited to cast parties. This was a modest one, but there were all those New York minor sophisticates in their little black numbers, in the proverbial crowded, dark, noisy, smoke-filled room. A cocktail pianist thundereous in one room and rock music blared in the other for a most disorienting effect. This is one of the real New Yorks, I thought. I met Frances Sternhagen and Celeste Holm at the party.

"Everything has contradictions..."

T

HE next night, Friday, was our ward theater party, and we had about forty people attending. The attendance this night was smaller, less glamorous, but from my point of view, more was at stake. What kind of collision would my ward members, many of them fairly conservative, have when they viewed Mormons portrayed in this unflattering way, against the background of the Massacre, which is virtually never mentioned in our gatherings. Would they be shocked? Horrified? Would they even recog-
nize this as a Mormon story when we are all so used to telling our tale in terms of sacrifice, persecution, heroism? I was both eager to see and rather apprehensive.

In general, the Mormon reaction was positive. People enjoyed the play. One young man later said he was sorry that some of our older couples had had to listen to references to sexual acts. But mostly, the group accepted and enjoyed the play. During the after-play discussion, Julie Jensen noted accurately, and with sympathy, that at the very time of the Massacre, the Mormons were being invaded by the United States army to wrest temporal authority from Brigham Young and that they no longer had a west to retreat to. She said that the Mormons had never done such a thing before or afterwards. The ward group made a real effort to ascertain the accuracy of the details. Julie noted that her information had come from Juanita Brook's book Mountain Meadows Massacre, from much discussion of the incident when she was young, and from her own family history. She also volunteered that some of the more colorful details, such as when Lavina's father kicked away a weeping, bloody child rather than spoil the shine on his boots, were imagined.

For me, the play illustrates the colliding of faithful Mormons with the larger culture, a prime interest of mine. I am always watching how we negotiate that boundary. I have been around for many years of Mormon isolation where we lived bifurcated lives and talked to ourselves. I have watched the negative depictions of Mormons by national voices, where Mormons are those misguided zealots, oppressed and conservative, who smile a lot and mistreat others. I have watched President Hinckley's deft presentation of the Mormon face with his unpretentious integrity. I have dealt with many people, knowing that the thing they say behind my back is that I'm a member of the Church. (Oh, no! I can't believe it! She's never said anything about that.)

I think we must welcome the media attention, and more important, we must become part of the dialogue. We should not shun any depictions of Mormons. We should be there, and we should comment. These depictions are often negative. But we should not emerge just to complain, we should be talking all the time. The growing success of the Mormons is
"I want people to think well of the Church. But I also want us to tell our own story with such candor and honesty that we cannot be dismissed as special pleaders.

I am as two-headed as anyone."

threatening to the greater populace, as it has always been. In the past, when the Mormon group grew too populous and politically powerful, the neighbors raised their guns and drove them away. Now the Church threatens growth and power on a global basis. Sociologist Rodney Stark’s horrifying projection that Church membership might reach 268 million members in this century is pretty frightening. Average citizens are even now alarmed at Mormon growth and enthusiasm. We can certainly expect some negative feedback. For example, it is said that nothing in the history of the town of Hanison, New York, has so united the people as opposition to the Mormon temple.

Julie Jensen’s play is not negative; it is even handed and historically accurate. She notes that the specific of the play is universal. Its themes are “friendship, living with the sins of one’s father, and the way women make accommodations to deal with the reality of their lives.” Jensen has taught play writing at five colleges. She plans to move to Los Angeles soon to be a full-time playwright. She always writes about strong female characters, she says, combining humor with serious topics. She writes short, potent, fast-moving stories. I loved the play. I think the very ambivalence of the views presented, an ambivalence all Mormon women I know display from time to time, is the real truth. Everything has contradictions. How wonderful when the contradictions of the Mormon female experience are turned into art.

Some reviewers found the play alien, with unattractive characters “who have nothing in common, short of the fact that neither woman really has anyone else.” They found the story unfamiliar and virtually meaningless. One encapsulated the story by saying the women live in a “harsh, polygamous society” that in 1857 “perpetrated a brutal massacre, killing 127 people who did not share.
their... religious beliefs." But David DeWitt in the influential New York Times praised Jensen’s script for its "gentle, poetic allure," which was "wonderfully realized." For him, "Ms. Jensen’s two heads make an elegant and meaningful whole."

On the next day, Saturday, the panel discussion, "Private Truths and Public Silences: Women and Mormonism," followed the matinee. Bonnie Anderson, professor of history at Brooklyn College, moderated the panel, which included: Sarah Gordon, a professor at the University of Pennsylvania Law School whose book, The Constitution of Faith: Marriage, Mormonism and the Meaning of Liberty, will soon be published; Barbara Welter, a professor of history at Hunter College who conceptualized the influential "Cult of True Womanhood"; Julie Jensen; and me. Each spoke for a few minutes and then we took questions. I explained why I considered the play right on target from my point of view as a Mormon and as a scholar. The areas I spoke about were ambiguity, violence, and sisterhood. What I remember about my presentation, however, was a single sentence in which I tried to identify myself as knowledgeable, but devoted. In other words, I am devoted despite some knowledge, and I recognize the tension in that. I said, "I think I know all the negative things anyone could say about the Church, and I love it still." Was that a mistake? Should I have been cooler? Was that too close to "my country right or wrong?" The sentence felt right at the time, but if the episode should be repeated, I don’t think I would say it again. Mormons are just too "other" to be publicly espoused, particularly by scholars. Did I automatically lose currency by admitting affection for the faith of my mothers and fathers? Why is it that Blacks and Jews, women and gays, are assumed to be the only people who can speak for their group while Mormons are not trusted to do so?

THE Two-Headed experience was lots of fun for me. As a person who long ago had theatrical ambitions, I got a little closer to grease paint and curtain calls than usual. But the experience was most interesting and valuable to me when I interacted across the Mormon/non-Mormon line and watched myself doing it. I want people to think well of the Church. I also want us to tell our own story with such candor and honesty that we cannot be dismissed as special pleaders. I am as two-headed as anyone.

To comment on this article, or to read comments by others, visit our website: <sunstoneonline.com>.

IMMERSION

Beside the swimming pool’s glancing reflections Brad waits while his companion and Birgitta dress in white. The moist air reeks of chlorine.

Elder Dahl, an older missionary, jokes, "You always know what a missionary is by where he looks when a girl comes out of the water."

Elder Groberg, barefoot, clad in white, pads across the night of the high-ceilinged room. Then Birgitta, with hair the color of wheat, glides across the tile. When she raises a hand to smooth errant tresses, her robe glows like wings. Reflections dance as they descend. Brad’s companion utters the raised-arm prayer, lowers her into the crystal grave for the only birth a man can give.

They drag back to the edge and up the steps while weighted water flows from their clothes. Their white’s so radiant Brad wonders if someone brightened the lights. Sister Andersson wraps Birgitta in a heavy towel, guides her, trailing water, to the dressing room.

Again in heavy coats, they shake hands, walk cobbled streets through the winter night. Elder Groberg’s face seems washed with joy. Brad gauges his way through the darkness, wonders if others noticed the blue flowers scattered under her wet white robe.

—MIKAL LOFGREN
SUNSTONE invites short musings: chatty reports, cultural trend sightings, theological meditations. All lovely things of good report, please share them. <SunstoneUT@aol.com>.

WHAT WERE WE THINKING?

WHEN UTAH’S GOVERNOR RECENTLY PROPOSED to hire his own historian, a brouhaha erupted. Critics said an official, state-paid, governor-appointed historian could not be unbiased. That seemed self-evident. All organizations approve projects to achieve their goals. History for history’s sake is found only in the university.

During a recent visit to the Church Archives, I reflected on the hopeful rise and disillusioning fall of “Camelot,” that brief, shining moment when the Church hired the best and brightest scholars to write official and professional history. But the first harvest of projects included some forbidden apples. Suddenly, we were out of Eden, stunned and sad that our Church could not yet eat the fruits of honest history.

Amazingly, we criticize the Church for foolishly abandoning in-house historians, and then we criticize the governor for foolishly wanting one. Camelot rose and fell on the delusion that there was no fundamental conflict between Church employment and writing good Church history. The Mormon glasnost of open archives and big plans permitted unrealistic beliefs, whether from denial, bad thinking, or naive faith.

The historians were idealistic, the Church leaders were pragmatic. Administrators only fund programs that serve the organization’s agenda, and the Brethren soon concluded that pure history only sometimes did that, and not intentionally, despite explicit directives. Moral: the inevitable demands of organizations mean a historian cannot serve two masters.

If that’s such a no-brainer for the governor, why were we so surprised at the troubles over a professional Church historian? How could it end otherwise? Just what were we thinking?

—P. Q. BLISS

Out of the Best Books

FAMILY PHOTOS

OFTEN WHEN SOMEONE SPEAKS OF THEIR “heritage,” Mormon pioneer or other, they wax romantic, idealizing. It is hard, and therefore rare, to break free from the abstract and imagine individuals with complex personalities and lives specifically lived. Marilyn Bushman-Carlston, 1999 Utah Poet of the Year, has such an imagination. The poems in Cheat Grass (Utah State Poetry Society, 1999) are rich and varied snapshots of her grandparents’ lives—love’s first flushes, quietly joyful homesteading in Santa Clara, Utah, and

Peculiar People

CHARACTERISTICS OF NEW MOTHERS

IN 1995, THE NATIONAL SURVEY of Family Growth interviewed a national sample of about 10,000 women between the ages of 14 and 44. There are some interesting differences and non-differences between LDS and other new mothers. LDS mothers are much more likely to be married when the baby is born, and to nurse the baby. LDS mothers are slightly more likely to be employed outside the home at the time the baby is born. But there is no difference in the percentage of mothers who had used birth control before conception.
family days in tent or house trailer. There is no explicit Mormon content, but what is more Mormon than meditating on Grandma Olive's and Grandpa Vernon's life together through cares and time? In knowing them, we learn how to seek out our own dead in our minds. The poem below snaps in black and white a dry Depression domesticity.

**MOCKINGBIRD**

Photos show the tent in Ivins where the family lived for three years of the Depression. Combed and about thirteen, Beverly is nearly as tall as the four boarded sides. Vernon added the glass windows and door. You can hear the wind tear the cottonwoods, whip the canvas top, see Olive and fourteen-year-old Walter battling it down one night while Vernon is away selling, can hear Shirley praying in the safety of the white sheets.

In another photo, Shirley leans against the iron foot of Walter's bed under the lean-to heaped with willows, the four poles, tree limbs, Red Mountain bared behind. She models sailor pants and a blouse she's sewn. Nearby, a coal stove and Walter, a thumb in his belt, weather clouding his eyes.

Here, Norma and Vernon wear smiles and hats. His tilts back, exposing a vein in his forehead.

Olive is not pictured. I can hear her inside—the slap of the flyswatter, the straw broom scraping the packed dirt floor. Perhaps her soprano “Take me home again, Kathleen,” or KOA on the Atwater Kent radio all the way from Denver. She could be sewing underwear from flour sacks she's bleached, or crocheting the edges of pillowcases.

More likely, she didn't look just right.

—Marilyn Bushman-Carlton

**All-Seeing Eye**

*LAST FALL, THIS PICTURE CIRCULATED AMONG the LDS Internet-linked. The good brother’s obvious affection and respect for Latter-day prophets will provide him missionary opportunities all the days of his life. No doubt his engraven images predate President Hinckley’s recent admonition against tattoos.*

**WEARING YOUR FAITH ON YOUR . . . BACK?**

**Twenty Years Ago in Sunstone**

**A WAY OF ORDERING AND CREATING OUR WORLD**

**IN THE MARCH 1979 ISSUE OF SUNSTONE, JAMES E. Faulconer argued why scripture stands above all other stories humans create to make sense of their world.**

“The Greek, Hindu, or other myths are thus attempts by human beings to order their world. As long as they reflect the structure of the world from the point of view of those who share the myths, they are true. But because they are human creations, creations by those with only limited vision, when the world changes, when such myths are unable to order the world because there are elements of existence of which they cannot take account, when it becomes apparent that the myths in question are expressions of the finite vision of human beings rather than the infinite vision of God, they become false.

“On the other hand, scripture—the myth, if you will, that is always true—provides a concrete focus for the understanding and contemplation of events from the point of view of the Father rather than from the human point of view. The scriptures, like the myths, collect the fragments of human existence into a unity of beginning and end and, unlike myths, provide us with an ‘instantaneous’ perception of the eternal rather than the finite . . .

“They are accounts given, but by the Father, of events which are to be the focal point for an understanding of things.
QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED THE LATTER DAY SAINTS.

Have you committed murder, by shedding innocent blood, or consenting thereto?
Have you betrayed your brethren or sisters in anything?
Have you committed adultery, by having any connection with a woman that was not your wife, or a man that was not your husband?
Have you taken and made use of property not your own, without the consent of the owner?
Have you cut hay where you had no right to, or turned your animals into another person's grain or field, without his knowledge and consent?
Have you lied about or maliciously misrepresented any person or thing?
Have you borrowed anything that you have not returned, or paid for?
Have you borne false witness against your neighbor?
Have you taken the name of the Deity in vain?
Have you covet ed anything not your own?
Have you been intoxicated with strong drink?
Have you found lost property and not returned it to the owner, or used all diligence to do so?
Have you branded an animal that you did not know to be your own?
Have you taken another's horse or mules from the range and rode it, without the owner's consent?
Have you fulfilled your promises in paying your debts, or run into debt without prospect of paying?
Have you taken water to irrigate with, when it belonged to another person at the time you used it?
Do you pay your tithing promptly?
Do you speak against your brethren, or against any principle taught us in the Bible, Book of Mormon, Book of Doctrine and Covenants, Revelations given through Joseph Smith the Prophet and the Presidency of the Church as now organized?
Do you pray in your family night and morning and attend to secret prayer?
Do you wash your body and have your family do so, as often as health and cleanliness require and circumstances will permit?
Do you labor six days and rest, or go to the house of worship, on the seventh?
Do you and your family attend Ward meetings?
Do you preside over your household as a servant of God, and is your family subject to you?
Have you labored diligently and earned faithfully the wages paid you by your employers?
Do you oppress the hireling in his wages?
Have you taken up and converted any stray animal to your own use, or in any manner appropriated one to your benefit, without accounting therefor to the proper authorities?

In answer to the above questions, let all men and women confess to the persons they have injured and make restitution, or satisfaction. And when catechising the people, the Bishops, Teachers, Missionaries and other officers in the Church are not at liberty to pry into sins that are between a person and his or her God, but let such persons confess to the proper authority, that the adversary may not have an opportunity to take advantage of human weaknesses, and thereby destroy souls.
within ourselves. They are about each of us; they are about all of us... 

"Seeing the story in this way, we see the scriptures as a way of ordering and explaining and therefore creating our world."

As The Century Turns...

DO YOU WASH YOUR BODY?

A FORERUNNER OF TODAY'S TEMPLE recommend interview, the list at left was used by Church leaders around the close of the nineteenth century. From today's perspective, many questions are darn funny. They provide glimpses of the hot-issues of a very different, rural Church ("Have you branded an animal that you did not know to be your own?") and hints of influence from the national discussion of social issues ("Do you oppress the hireling in his wages?").

My Creed

PATTERNS OF GOODNESS

I BELIEVE THAT CREEDS ARE AN ABOMINATION, NOT because Joseph Smith 1:19 puts them in a bad light, but because I'm the type of person who's never quite sure what to believe anyway.

1. I believe it would be nice if there were a God, and—if there is one—I believe that we are made in her image. This would mean that God is rather like us, and we are rather like God, a thing infinitely more flattering to us than to God. I realize this is a somewhat tautological and pathetically incomplete way to describe God, but I cannot do anything about it. In any case, it leads me to seek God in the faces and thoughts of my brothers and sisters more than through institutional structures.

2. I believe that if there is a God, we are her creations. Understanding this, we should love ourselves and each other with an infinite love, because we are all members of the same family and have God's endorsement, as our creator, to exist, no matter what the state of our souls. However, if there is no God, we should really love each other because, without the hope of God's merciful intervention, we are all the hope there is in a sometimes cruel universe.

AML WRITING CONTESTS

FICTION

THE ASSOCIATION FOR MORMON LETTERS announces its first Irreantum magazine fiction contest. All entries must relate explicitly or implicitly to Mormon experience in some way. Any fictional form will be considered, including short stories, excerpts from novels, screenplays, and play scripts, from any genre, including literary, mystery, romance, science fiction, fantasy, historical, and horror. Multiple entries by the same author are allowed, and there are no entry fees. No entry may exceed 8,500 words.

PRIZES: First Place—$100; Second Place—$75; Third Place—$50 (unless judges determine entries are of insufficient quality to merit awards). Winners agree to give Irreantum first publication rights.

SUBMITTING: To facilitate blind judging, entries should be submitted with a removable cover sheet with author’s name, address, telephone number, e-mail address, and manuscript title. Author’s name should appear on no other page of the manuscript. All entries should be double-spaced in easily readable type. Entries will not be returned. Submit manuscripts by May 30, 2001, to Irreantum’s fiction editor, Tory Anderson, P. O. Box 445, Levan, Utah 84639.

NOVEL

THE ASSOCIATION FOR MORMON LETTERS is also sponsoring the Marilyn Brown Novel Award Contest for an unpublished novel. Because it is a Mormon Letters contest, no anti-Mormon novels will be accepted.

PRIZE: $1,000 (unless no winner is chosen).

SUBMITTING: All entries should be copied on both sides of the paper and bound with a comb binding (exactly like a book.) No identification should appear on the manuscript, and a sealed envelope containing the title, author, address, phone, and e-mail must accompany the manuscript. In addition, contestants must submit a SASE. All entries must be submitted by July 1, 2001. Address: AML’s Marilyn Brown Novel Award Contest, 125 Hobble Creek Canyon, Springville, Utah 84663.
3. I believe that Joseph Smith was a prophet whenever he said things that were prophetic; and I believe that whenever I say things that are prophetic, I am a prophet, too. Prophets are individuals who are prophetic; they are not simply men whose words we believe because they inherited the title “prophet, seer, and revelator.” I realize that this leaves us with no sure-fire method of knowing what is true, and I am comfortable with that.

4. I believe that whether or not Mormonism is the one true religion, it is a rich source of truth, and for all its faults, I am not sorry I landed in it. Since one of the basic messages of Mormonism is continuing revelation, I believe that the borders of one's personal scriptures are flexible and permeable. We can discard parts of them and include other things we find truthful, including the writings of other cultures such as the Torah, Koran, and Kama Sutra; or other people such as Martin Buber, Alice Walker, a General Authority, or one of the September Six. These borders could be further expanded to embrace an Emily Dickinson poem, a Gary Larsen cartoon, a Chinese fortune straight from the cookie, or a comment by a friend if any of them satisfied the minimum standard of sacred wisdom. My personal scriptures differ from the LDS standard works; nevertheless, it is wonderful to have institutionally designated holy

---

Translated Correctly

"IT IS BETTER . . . TO BE MARRIED THAN TO BE TORTURED"
1 CORINTHIANS 7:1-9

NOW concerning the things whereof ye wrote unto me. It is good for a man not to touch a woman.
2 Nevertheless, to avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband.
3 Let the husband render unto the wife due benevolence: and likewise also the wife unto the husband.
4 The wife hath not power of her own body, but the husband: and likewise also the husband hath not power of his own body, but the wife.
5 Decease ye not one the other, except it be with consent for a time, abstain temporarily to make special opportunity any lack of self-control to put you to the test.
6 But I speak this by permission, than as a command. I wish that all men were as I am. But every man hath his own proper gift from God, one after this manner, and another after that.
7 For I would that all men were even as I myself. But every man hath his own particular gift from God, some one thing and some another. Yet to those who are unmarried or widowed, I say definitely that it is a good thing to remain unattached, as I am. But if they have not the gift of self-control in such matters, by all means let them get married. It is better for them to be married than to be tortured by unsatisfied desire.

II: ANSWERS TO VARIOUS QUESTIONS
A: MARRIAGE AND VIRGINITY

7 Now for the questions about which you wrote. Yes, it is a good thing for a man not to touch a woman; yet to avoid immorality every man should have his own wife and every woman her own husband. • The husband must give to his wife what she has a right to expect, and so too the wife to her husband. • The wife does not have authority over her own body, but the husband does; and in the same way, the husband does not have authority over his own body, but the wife does. • You must not deprive each other, except by mutual consent for a limited time, to leave yourselves free for prayer, and to come together again afterwards; otherwise Satan may take advantage of any lack of self-control to put you to the test. • I am telling you this as a concession, not an order. • I should still like everyone to be as I am myself; but everyone has his own gift from God, one this kind and the next something different.

To the unmarried and to widows I say: it is good for them to stay as they are, like me. But if they cannot exercise self-control, let them marry, since it is better to be married than to be burnt up.
books. These normative core writings bind me to a vital community of seekers. Mormon spiritual journeys differ, but because our leaps of faith are rooted in common texts, no matter how far we travel, our origins link us.

5. I believe there is much corruption within Mormonism; indeed, within organized religion, and certainly where there is no religion. I am rather corrupt myself, and sometimes I enjoy it. Interestingly, when I read the scriptures, the corruption I see in Mormonism is what the ancient prophets lamented about in their religious communities. I find this commonality rather faith promoting. Indeed, a bond Mormons have with other religions and secular societies, past and present, is our mutual corruption. Because of this, I feel a kinship with people of other faiths (or unfaiths); it's a kinship many do not find at all flattering. Nevertheless, when we seek passionately enough, we find patterns of goodness and truth everywhere.

6. I believe that there is a purpose to the tremendous suffering and sin upon the earth because I cannot bear to think otherwise. I depend upon the healing power of Christ as I contemplate the suffering of others and my own inevitable suffering. The image of God as Christ descending to become one with us in corruption and pain is powerful and healing. I embrace it with gratitude and fear—gratitude because of God's love for humans and other creatures; fear because it anticipates the grief and suffering of the world, which I have learned I cannot escape, but must also come to know. In doing so, I believe I am acting as Christ would have, unlocking the image of God within me.

7. I believe that this is the end of my creed.

—SONJA FARNSWORTH

### CyberSaints

**FAITH IN EVERY KEYSTROKE**

On a recent evening, I searched Yahoo's innumerable e-groups for "Mormon" and then spent hours browsing the titles, descriptions, and home pages of the two hundred seventy groups the search generated. From weightlossldsmons to mormonpolygyny to sharingthegospel to starship-zion (a Book of Mormon reading group), it's a diverse and awesome array of supporting, questioning, answering, and sharing about worthy concerns and hopeless dead-ends. In every group description, there's a Mormon earnestness that's more than just passion for a topic but a sense of virtue in organizing the group, of being anxiously engaged sharing tips on PrimaryPage or deciphering headlines on SecretCombinations. The description for the christiantolerance group was itself intolerant; still, the organizer's desire to create for herself a nurturing space in this hostile world is touching:

To join this group you must believe in Jesus Christ. Warning: mistress of this mail group is Mormon. So if you are prejudiced please don't join. I believe we have a right to believe as our hearts dictate. All who believe in Jesus are Christian. We are here to learn from each other, not to put down one another. To uplift and to celebrate our love and belief in Jesus Christ. Remember, you may freely express belief, but you must not push anything on anyone; if so, you will be removed from this group.

The Definitive Introduction for Mormons and Non-Mormons Alike

"A long overdue primer on one of the fastest growing religions in the world . . . This book is eminently fair, well researched and exhaustive . . ." — The New York Times Book Review

Now In Paperback $	ext{HarperSanFrancisco}$

A division of HarperCollinsPublishers

www.harpercollins.com

### AYS

Alliance for Youth Service

"Changing Lives Thru Service"

ALLIANCE FOR YOUTH SERVICE is an LDS non-profit, all-volunteer organization of youth, parents, and leaders.

AYS WORKS IN PARTNERSHIP with existing humanitarian organizations to organize LDS-oriented service sessions

Visit our website <www.ays.org>

Learn more about our summer 2001 service sessions. Spaces still available for our Nicaragua and Guatemala trips!
Blessedly, *StriplingRoadWarriors* meets the quirky motorcycle-riding needs that a lifetime of 100-percent visiting teachers never could, and *Mormonmodecollectors* links the five Mormons in the world who want to “discuss model horses . . . and . . . talk about things that pertain to Latter-day Saints (temple dedications, callings, spiritual experiences, etc.)”

On the other hand, the internet’s democratic nature allows *adam-god* to spread ideas that were wisely jettisoned long ago. (We may yet come to lament the internet’s destabilizing of LDS thought control.)

Thankfully, there is consolation in the popular vote. While the zealous sites are legion, they usually have darn few sub-

---

**Of Good Report**

**TO STAND AS A (POLITICAL) WITNESS**

Stephen L. Carter, author of several books including *The Culture of Disbelief* and *Reflections of an Affirmative Action Baby*, is one of America’s leading conservative voices. In his latest book, *God’s Name in Vain: The Wrongs and Rights of Religion in Politics*, he argues, contrary to the cries of the “cultural elites,” for the legitimate and needed contributions of religious voices in public and political debates.

The infuriating truth of the elite celebration of diversity is that the celebration is limited by a staggering, absolutely staggering, moral arrogance. Our cultural elites believe they have much to teach but nothing to learn. Multiculturalism is the cloak behind which they hide this truth. The true reason school vouchers are ultimately bad in the elite view is that they might give parents—*parents, imagine that!*—too much authority over what their children learn. If parents can choose their children’s education, there is a terrible risk that their children will grow up with ideas radically different from the cultural norm. This genuine diversity would be a threat to elite values and must therefore not be allowed. Sometimes it seems that the point of multiculturalism is to make sure all cultures are basically the same, except, of course, for singing and dancing and sampling exotic food and the occasional recitation of a famous speech.

Yet I would not want to be taken as suggesting that the moral arrogance of the Religious Left is greater than the arrogance of the Religious Right. That competition would, I suspect, be a very close and depressing one. On the right, too, are religious leaders who believe that they already know all the answers, who want no new arguments, who refuse to accept the possibility that traditions other than their own might possess a piece of truth. Of those who get involved in electoral politics, this is particularly true—for politics seems to provoke many faithful believers to remarkable feats of theological certainty, so that they know, for certain, where Jesus stands on the capital gains tax.

Still, the Religious Right’s hopeless efforts to fiddle with the law pale beside the Religious Left’s successful efforts to fiddle with the culture. The Religious Left is not necessarily better than the Religious Right, only smarter . . . and it has cooperated with elite efforts to fix the rules so that nobody else can win. Which is why clergy who endorse political candidates are condemned but clergy who destroy traditional values are lionized. And why the barbed wire on the wall of separation of church and state faces inward, keeping religion imprisoned. And why so many churches have lowered their sights, no longer trying to work in God’s creation, worrying only about filling the seats. And why continued prosperity is so crucial to the culture’s survival, for our nation’s wealth buys off many religionists who might otherwise be sufficiently discontented to try to make things different.

Yet I believe that the religious should rarely opt for coercion (which is all that policy is, no matter who creates it) as a means of awakening a cranky and reluctant world to the higher truth that nearly every religion believes it can teach. The biblical tradition of prophetic witness, being forceful in criticism of the sovereign but doing it from without rather than from within, still seems to me to represent religious activism at its best. Religion, as we have seen, can inspire people to do great things. It can also inspire them to commit great crimes. Those who fear religion, like those who love it, have reasons for their sentiments. . . . which is another reason for religionists who are seized by great ideas to be prayerful in their activism and to proceed with care.

Nevertheless, taking care or not, it is vital to proceed . . . In the end, a religion that believes in its own truth should move as that truth directs. If God calls the believer to witness, then the believer must go into the wilderness and witness.
MORMON INDEX

Number of images of Christ published in the *Ensign* during the year 1971: 5
Number of images of Christ published in the *Ensign* during the year 1999: 119
Percentage of Americans who pray before making major financial decisions: 61
Percentage of Americans who pray every day: 58
Percentage of American adults who attend religious services at least once a week: 47
Amount the Church pays independent contractors to write text for the Tabernacle Choir's weekly Music and the Spoken Word: $325
Amount paid for an 1830 Book of Mormon at a recent Salt Lake auction: $58,000
Amount paid for an 1849 Mormon $20 piece: $55,000
Amounts listed at the auction for Mark Hofmann forgeries: $1,500 to $4,000
Amount paid for a receipt for vegetable soup that was signed by Joseph Smith: $5,000
Percentage of BYU faculty who believe a candidate's academic prominence does not justify overlooking their religious beliefs in hiring: 89
Percentage of BYU faculty who believe they should avoid research that might draw into question LDS Church or university procedures: 66
Percentage of Notre Dame faculty who think they should be free to pursue any idea, even if it questions tenets of faith: 75
Percentage of BYU full-time faculty who are not members of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints: 5
Percentage of those who say they are "very active": 55
Percentage of those who claim to be "somewhat active": 20
Number of current or former Church members who are published writers of works of "speculative fiction," or science fiction: 175
Number of Catholics who are published writers of such works of "speculative fiction": 30
Number of times greater chance that a young, non-Mormon male in Utah will commit suicide than will one who is active LDS: 6
Number of times greater chance that a young, inactive Latter-day Saint male will commit suicide than one who is active: 4
Percentage of Mormon women with two or fewer children who suffer from depression: 28.2
Percentage of Mormon women with three or more children who suffer from depression: 19.4
Percentage of U.S. Latter-day Saints over age thirty who have ever married: 97.5
Percentage of U.S. Catholics over age thirty who have ever married: 88.6
Percentage of U.S. persons over age 30 who claim no religion who have ever married: 81.0
Number of medals won by LDS athletes in the 2000 Summer Olympics in Sydney, Australia: 4
Total number of known LDS athletes to participate in the summer games: 18
Number of LDS temples currently in operation: 100
Number of LDS temples dedicated since Gordon B. Hinckley was ordained as president of the Church: 53
Percentage of Boy Scout units sponsored by Methodists and Mormons: 35
Number of scouts in troops sponsored by the Church: 412,240

FROM THE EDITOR

THE CHURCH FORMERLY KNOWN AS . . .

By Dan Wotherspoon

T

HROUGH A New York Times interview with Apostle Dallin H. Oaks,1 followed by several press releases and a letter from the First Presidency read from sacrament meeting pulpits (see sidebar), The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints announced in February 2001 that it is making a renewed effort to discourage both media and Church members from using the terms "Mormon Church," "LDS Church," or "Latter-day Saints Church." Instead, it hopes to highlight the name Jesus Christ in references to the Church. Accordingly, it suggests that first mentions should include the Church's full name, followed by "The Church of Jesus Christ on second and subsequent references. If a shorter name is needed, it suggests that first mentions should include the Church's full name.

When I first heard this news, I couldn't muster much enthusiasm. Its ring was too familiar: hasn't this been tried again and again? My first discussions with friends often degenerated into one-liners and jokes about the inevitability of it all. The M-word, we were sure, was here to stay. Why would Church leaders waste time and potentially embarrass themselves with one more effort, as Richard and Joan Ostling write in Mormon America, "to make water run uphill"?

Well, since then, I have become excited about it. I've become convinced that this announcement may be heralding a shift in Church self-understanding that, if seen through a long lens, fills me with hope. Much more is going on here than just trying to manage the media or respond to the strain of "Mormons are not Christians."

For those SUNSTONE readers who may not yet be aware of the contents of the announcement and the early buzz it has generated, here are a few more details. First, clearly the leaders' primary concern is with references to the Church, not its members. We are still "Mormons." In his Times interview, Elder Oaks said, "I don't mind being called a Mormon, but I don't want it said that I belong to the Mormon Church." Second, "Mormon" will still be used in proper names such as the Book of Mormon, the Mormon Tabernacle Choir, or as an adjective in expressions such as the "Mormon pioneers." Finally, the term 'Mormonism' is acceptable in describing the combination of doctrine, culture and lifestyle unique to The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

So far, reactions to the announcements from news outlets have been mixed. A Salt Lake Tribune article quotes Norm Goldstein, editor of The Associated Press Stylebook, the word-use guide for most U.S. newspapers: "They've sent us material before on this. We've looked at it, and then decided that since they are still generally known as Mormons, we would stay with Mormon church and then use the full name of the church on second reference." Goldstein adds that AP style changes are usually driven by issues of clarity, and "this doesn't really clarify anything." The article also gives responses from editors of several Utah newspapers and the New York Times to queries about their plans, if any, to change the way they refer to the Church. Their answers ranged from agreements to near-agreements to no longer use "Mormon Church," to waiting to see how it flies elsewhere, to expressing doubt about any change in their paper's policy.

It is safe to guess that ultimately few reporters will choose to use nine or five words to refer to the Church when two will do. Still, some will comply; some stories will give the full name or use the subsequent reference suggestions—and that is all Church leaders can realistically hope for. With the 2002 Winter Olympics coming to Utah in less than a year, and given recent debates about whether Mormons are Christians, this effort will cause some reporters to ask different questions and have in mind a sense of Mormon claims about Jesus Christ.

I

f we grant, and we should, that Church leaders and their advisors are not naive to the ways news organizations work and how Church members refer to themselves and their church, we must look at these announcements in terms other than simply their likelihood for large scale success. No doubt there are definite public relations and Olympics motives in these moves, but I believe we risk missing a huge piece of the puzzle if those are the only issues we focus on. I think much more is afoot than just that.

Jan Shipps has touched on a big portion of what this "more" might be. In an article for Beliefnet.com,2 she interprets these announcements as signaling a dramatic shift in mindset, a change very similar to the rethinking the Saints were forced to make around the turn of the twentieth century when the Church abandoned the practice of plural marriage and their theocratic nation of Deseret. According to Shipps, the earliest Saints understood themselves primarily as "a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people" (1 Peter 2:9). They were called, literally, to be kingdom builders and citizens of a "holy nation." The problem came when this kingdom, protected much of the time by a "mountain curtain," began to crumble. Church members had to invent for themselves a new understanding of what it meant to be "Mormon."

According to Shipps, part of the transition to the new "Mormonism" was shaped by the arrival of the transcontinental railroad and the tourist boom that followed. Suddenly, instead of being "peculiar" as citizens of the kingdom of God, Church members became in many ways the peculiar inhabitants of beautiful, spectacular "Mormon land." Visitors were drawn to Utah for its natural splendor but also became intrigued by tours through the residences of Brigham's many wives and visits to the wonderful Tabernacle and various temples built by the Mormon people. These encounters with others gave birth to Mormonism, in the eyes of the nation and for the Saints themselves, as a culture. "Mormon" began to acquire ethnic dimensions.

With this background, Shipps interprets the announcement of the deliberate distancing of the Church from the M-word as a clear shift at Church headquarters in both direction and self-understanding: "To me, it is yet another step away from the beginnings of Mormonism, from the days when most of the Saints lived in Utah and its environs and when both the church and Mormon culture were embedded in the soil of the Mormon culture region."
I t is understandable that Shipps would read these things through this lens. She and sociologist Rodney Stark have for years been heralds to the non-Mormon world that The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints is emerging as a new world religion. But her analysis prompts me to wonder if this announcement signals that we may actually be ready to truly become a global faith, rather than simply a church that happens to have members all over the world. If so, what an exciting prospect!

Is Shipps’s analysis correct? Is my extension plausible? If so, is the Church as an institution ready to meet this challenge? Are we as Church members ready to begin the new thinking that such a shift would entail? Are we willing to disassemble and reassemble the Church, Utah, and the nation will soon emerge. If they, living out of their belief and faith, we can wear our “M” with our heads high. I do not support the new emphasis on our rich resources for new treasures and emphases in the same way the post-Manifesto Latter-day Saints did? Or do we just want to stand back and mourn how generic our theology has begun to sound in some of the recent interviews and conference addresses President Hinckley and other leaders have given? I think the former. Now, more than ever, is the time for patience and hope. This is a transition time, and there is much yet to be decided, many opportunities for members and friends with good hearts and bright minds to speak up and help the Church be the embracing and good church it can be.

**THE CHURCH YET TO BECOME...**

EVEN as I express my optimism about the possibilities embedded in this potential shift, I really like being a Mormon—culturally, theologically, and in most every other way. I am not embarrassed by our past polygyny nor by those with Mormon heritage who practice it today. I am sorry they have been harassed and made afraid, and I hope new understandings and peaceful relations between them and the Church, Utah, and the nation will soon emerge. If they, living out of their belief system with integrity and faith, are the main reason for the Church distancing itself from the term “Mormon,” I think that is wrong.

I am not embarrassed by past theologies or social experiments that have failed or have proven themselves not to be our tradition’s best efforts. Even as I may question the soundness of mind behind certain decisions, I still trust in the goodness of the hearts that launched them. The reasoning error known as the “fallacy of anachronism” occurs when we reject out of hand or fail to listen to voices and hearts of people from the past because they don’t share all of the same sensibilities we have today. The goodness of a person’s soul is not in question because she taught Adam—God or made strange speculations about the ten tribes or lunar proselytizing, or because a sermon speaks louder about Victorian sensibilities than about things of final importance. Let policy reversals and odd personalities be part of our rich “Mormon” history.

I also really like many of the doctrines that seem to be on the “outs” lately. I love Lorenzo Snow’s little couplet and the animating spirit behind our notions about eternal progression. I’m not sure just how literally to understand the godhood path, but I embrace it as a legitimate part of Mormonism and believe we will yet be able to bring it into the future. I love that our tradition teaches of the existence of “Mother in Heaven” and I have great confidence one day we’ll be able to speak in strong, robust terms about the divine feminine. I love what is uniquely or distinctly Mormon, and I don’t like some of the recent efforts to downplay our beliefs differ from those of mainstream Christianity.

Furthermore, the term “Mormon” has, in my mind, been fully redeemed. Just as Hester Pyrnie took her skirt “A” and transformed it from a badge of shame into a symbol of honor, we can wear our “M” with our heads high. I do not support the new emphasis on Jesus Christ and using the full name of the Church because I no longer want to be Mormon.

I support it because I hope that the shifts and public moves over the past few years may signal that we are ready to sort through and become a Church that can bless the whole planet like never before. I like the idea that these emphases might be the bow wave preceding our transformation into a genuine world religion. I don’t say any of this because I am confident that “only” the gospel as we teach it holds the keys to happiness, salvation, or world peace. I am arguing this because I know the Church is good (or can be very good when at its best).

Some of my friends have suggested that in asking to be called the “Church of Jesus Christ,” Church leaders are really just trying to force-feed the world our claim that we are the Church of Jesus Christ. I’ll leave the status of that assertion without comment, but I will suggest that, regardless of motive, we take this moment as a challenge to become a true church of Jesus Christ. Christological debates, atonement theories, or historicity issues aside, I’ve moved enough simply by Jesus’ integrity and compassion. In this time of transition, that’s what I will focus on. It will serve well as we face the growing pains ahead. And maybe some day, without press releases, we will be known as “the Church of Jesus Christ.”

To comment or to read comments by others, visit www.Sunstoneonline.com.

**NOTES**


2. The full text of the press releases, letters, and suggested ways to reference the Church can be found on the Church’s official website, www.LDS.org. Look in the section, “News Media Resources.”


So often, our piety and preconceived notions prevent us from genuine communion with God. How can we possibly know God if we aren’t open to what God and the possibilities of God are?

**DANCING WITH THE SACRED**

Phyllis Barber

_Shall we dance? Or should I say, “May I have this dance?”_ But first, a poem for you. A poem by Hafiz, a Sufi poet born in the 1300s in Shiraz in southern Persia, rendered by Daniel Ladinsky:

_I have a thousand brilliant lies_  
_For the question:_  
_How are you?_

_I have a thousand brilliant lies_  
_For the question:_  
_What is God?_

_If you think that the Truth can be known_  
_From words,_  
_If you think that the Sun and the Ocean_  
_Can pass through that tiny opening_  
_Called the mouth,_  
_O someone should start laughing!_  
_Someone should start wildly laughing—_  
_Now!_

Even though I attended The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints regularly for forty years, almost never missing a Sunday and serving in administrative, teaching, and music capacities since the age of seven, and even though I’ve borne my testimony countless numbers of times and attended seminary and Brigham Young University, I confess I now speak in a voice which is not purely Mormon, whatever a pure Mormon sounds like.

Possibly, my voice has been corrupted by my love of dancing with everything—people, ideas, sunshine, and sacred cows. Or maybe it has to do with being human. Maybe insatiable curiosity has been the corrupting agent, or maybe it’s the fact of loving to read any and every thing. Or could it be a fatal attraction to mysticism or my fascination with Taoism, Buddhism, Judaism, and the beliefs and practices of native peoples?

And then there’s my love affair with Rumi and Hafiz, thirteenth and fourteenth century Persian poets influenced by Sufism—the inner heart of Islam—and always informed by an ecstatic relationship with God. These poets speak of being so much in love with God that all they can do is forever dance. The ecstasy of their writing speaks across the centuries and fills me with incredible joy—the same joy I’ve felt in spontaneous moments in my life: singing with the Las Vegas Stake Youth Choir in the sixties, introducing the Valley View 8th Ward choir to a Dave Brubeck mass at Christmas-time, joining with the gospel music and the “Hallelujahs” at the African Methodist Episcopal Church in Denver, Colorado, or at the Second Baptist Church in Columbia, Missouri. I can feel God dancing everywhere, all around me. He is not somber or pale or aloof. He moves with the music that’s always playing. He shimmers.

Therefore, rather than speaking with an untainted, well-modulated Mormon voice, I speak as an ecstatic woman who loves music and dancing, who loves abandoning the punitive “shoulds” and engaging with the boundless beauty of God. It courses through my veins, this mainline beauty of God. Direct to the heart. Just as there’s a difference between knowing the definitions of health and having a healthy body, there’s a huge difference between knowing what is sacred and holy and experiencing the divine spark of God that can fill each of our beings if we allow it.
In April 2000, I flew into Miazal, Ecuador, which is located in the rain forest of the Oriente (the Amazon Basin). We flew in a single-engine plane past clouds of gray, volcanic material spewing from the center of the earth into a sky filled with white, insubstantial clouds. Because of torrential rain at our original destination, we were diverted to a military airstrip. After waiting an hour, we finally skidded onto an almost underwater, field-of-grass runway, our plane plowing the mud. Members of the Shuar tribe—a head-hunting tribe until thirty years ago—ran out to greet us.

My six-week journey to Peru, Bolivia, and Ecuador had been undertaken for the purpose of meeting with shamans from the indigenous tribes of the Andes as well as the jungle, to participate with them during their healings, to be taught by their five-thousand-year-old ancient wisdom. Not only are these people knowledgeable about plant wisdom that can help save lives, they also have a knowledge of how to retrieve the lost spirit or fragmented self in ways not practiced or known by contemporary technicians of western medicine.

One night in the jungle, some members of the tribe came to our lodge to demonstrate the old ways of the Shuar people, some of which are continued today, though mainly by those who wish to preserve tradition. Dressed in wrap-around cloth rather than the bare-breasted jungle wear often seen in National Geographic, they showed off some of the tribal customs: how they used to visit their friends’ homes, how they greeted each other with spears and complex choreography and chanting, and how they entertained each other with a brew called chicha made by the Shuar women from manioc root and saliva which they spit into the mixture and allowed to ferment. They carried chicha with them whenever they went for a visit, and they expected us to enjoy with them this sour delicacy, served in a half coconut shell.

After this demonstration, musicians began to play music from the Andes and some of the Shuar came over to ask several members of our group to dance. One caution we’d received was that we weren’t to look into the eyes of the opposite sex as this meant an invitation to passion in the jungle. So, when an older gentleman came to me and asked me to dance, I followed him to the dance floor and concentrated on his feet. When he later asked me to dance a second time, I was getting a bit bored counting his toes, so I thought maybe we could clap hands together or something like that. I tried to get him to...

“Oh,” I said, unable to think of another response, suddenly pulled into a strange vacuum where I wondered if I’d offended in some way.

Only in recent years have these South American shamans consented to interface with North Americans. According to our group leader, the shamans feel that the Land of the Eagle (North America, where the eagle is a bird of prey) and the Land of the Condor (South America, where the condor only eats carrion) have much to teach each other. In the last ten years, they’ve had visions wherein they were told it was time to break the silence and allow an interchange with foreigners. Before that time, they were unwilling to share their ancient knowledge with those outside their tribe. Admittedly, I went to South America with a great respect bordering on reverence for shamans—for their primitive connection to the Divine and for their willingness to share their wisdom.

If I had known who Tonk was before the dance, I would have worried about protocol. I might have done something false or possibly unnatural, like kowtowing, to pay my culturally-expected respects. In truth, had I known his title or position, I would have missed an amazing connection with another human being. I would have let my thoughts, my notions, my expectations of what a shaman is, interfere.

Talking with Tonk through a translator the next day, I told the translator to tell him he is a good dancer. The translator laughed and said, “He was just telling me what a good dancer you are.” I looked at Tonk, (maybe at Tonk’s chin rather than his eyes,) and he smiled back at me.

The habit of being respectful is valuable. It is good and fine to have respect for each other, sensitivity, caring, respect for leaders, elders, traditions. But when do we cross that dangerous line of putting something on a pedestal and making it into a statue that can’t smile, bend, or stretch? Do we truly respect something or someone if we put them above us or in a greater position? Is that false? A pretense? Something we think...
I can feel God dancing everywhere, all around me.  
He is not somber or pale or aloof. He moves with the music  
that’s always playing. He shimmers.

we should do? When do sacred words become stones on the lips because they’ve been repeated so many times that they’ve lost their essence? Do we think about the words and familiar phrases we speak? Do we have our own connection to this customary language, or have we borrowed it for comfort’s sake? How do we keep ourselves from a habitual, unthinking response to the sacred? How can the sacred remain fresh, a new spring from which to draw, full of endless possibilities rather than circumscribed and fenced in?

Hugh Nibley writes that “All systems are ‘go’ for the expanding mind,” and quotes Brigham Young from the Journal of Discourses, “Let us not narrow ourselves up, for the world, with all its variety of useful information and its rich hoard of hidden treasure, is before us; and eternity, with all its sparkling intelligence, lofty aspirations, and unspeakable glories, is before us.”

CONNECTING WITH THE SOURCE
Western and shamanic healing come together in Peru

When I arrived in Cuzco, Peru, a month before my time in Ecuador, I had just finished my menstrual cycle. I was happy to have that behind me. Or so I thought. But every day for the six following days, I bled heavily, unusually heavily. At first I thought it was the change in altitude or problems with menopause, so I disregarded it. But each day the bleeding was heavier, and on the third day, bordering near hemorrhaging, I consulted one of the doctors who was traveling with us. He said it wasn’t unusual with the change in altitude, so once again I disregarded this abnormal reaction of my body.

We were traveling with a Peruvian shaman named Theo Paredes, and on the sixth morning, on the way we left for Machu Picchu, I said something to him as well. He said it was not unusual for women to bleed when they made such drastic changes in locality and altitude. But by the time we got on the train for Machu Picchu, I was forgetting my luggage, my purse, and my traveling companions were picking up after me. By the time we reached the Machu Picchu Pueblo Hotel, I was totally disoriented. I don’t remember how I got to my room, but when I got there, I told my roommate she’d better send for the doctor. I was in trouble.

Luckily, Theo’s sister, Dr. Milagros Paredes, was a gynecologist in Cuzco. Their father had started a medical clinic in Cuzco in the 1940s and had decided to raise one child in the tradition of Western medicine and his other child in the shamanic tradition. Theo, who was Castilian, rather than one of the indigenous people, had been trained in the way of the shaman from the age of eleven. After he and the North American doctor traveling with us had consulted Theo’s sister by telephone, they were instructed to administer a shot to stop the bleeding. But the loss of blood had left me in a very dark place. My brain seemed a window of blank white surrounded by a stark black frame.

Theo decided to give me a healing. After using feathers, agua de florada, which he sprayed on me from his mouth, and other traditional shamanic healing implements, Theo asked me to give him my full name. After I gave it to him, he anointed my head, I’m not sure with what, and then laid his hands on my head and blessed me. “Phyllis Nelson Barber,” he said, then spoke in a different language, one I’d never heard before. But, nonetheless, the words felt familiar.

I felt connected to thousands of years of Spirit being transmitted from the Source to my ailing body. I felt my temporal, biological father with me, the memory of him anointing my head with oil and comforting me with his hands on my head when I had been ill. I felt the Divine Father, too. And an added element: Pachemama—Mother Earth, whom Theo had invoked that day and who he says is our real mother, the one who cares for us above all other mothers and fathers. Any division between the “Heavenly Father” I’d been taught about as a child and Pachemama seemed so very academic and cerebral. I loved that Pachemama had been included. Triply blessed. By the next morning, my strength had returned.

MYSTICAL PLAY
How can we understand something fully if we cannot dance or play with it?

So how does one dance with the sacred? Maybe by looking for the Sacred in unexpected places. Maybe God isn’t always found in special buildings. Maybe God’s not always dressed for church or found through pre-ordained channels. But how can the Divine Presence possibly appear to us when we are blindly fumbling along, not watching for movement in our peripheral vision because of our attachment to notions of who God is and what God looks like?

One day many years ago, after my young children had gone off to school, I felt an overflowing feeling of spirit in my entire body. And then an impulsive thought came to me. “Today, I’m going to dance with God.” I turned on some piano music that has always moved me to the core—Prokofiev’s “Concerto No. 1 for Piano and Orchestra, Op. 10”—and closed my eyes, let the music soak into me, and proceeded to dance in my family
room as if I were dancing with God. I held out my arms as if I had a partner. I felt divine arms wrap around my shoulders. We whirled in an ecstatic trance, and I felt transported to a feeling of oneness where God and I were each other. I felt moved in a rare way. I'd called God in for a dance, and the Divine Presence had come.

Am I speaking of mysticism here—mysticism being the experience of direct communion with ultimate reality, a spiritual union? Even though many of us experience this direct communion in our prayers and meditations, I think the term "mysticism" is an uncomfortable one in today's Mormondom, this possibility of direct and intuitive acquisition of ineffable knowledge without a middle man or spokesman. Joseph Smith definitely qualifies as a mystic, but is there a place for mysticism in the practical reality of today's Mormonism?

I've read accounts of Catholic and Jewish mystics, watched penitentes in purple robes and tall pointed hats in processions of thousands carrying crosses on their backs to ask forgiveness of Christ, and I've wondered about my ability to keep from erecting a wall between myself and the Divine because of the Mormon perception I have of what is true, what is false, and what is Sacred. How many sacred cows stand in my line of vision when I'm trying to see God? Buddhists say, in their enigmatic way, "If you see the Buddha in the road, kill him." Another contemporary saying in some spiritual circles is "Don't mistake the messenger for the message." The finger pointing at the moon is only a finger, after all. It is not the moon, and it seems to me that I was always taught that the Church was established as a vehicle for this earth life, not as an end in itself. The finger is the finger. The moon is the moon. God is God.

In the History of the Church, Joseph Smith says: "I did not like the old man being called up for erring in doctrine. It looks too much like the Methodists, and not like the Latter-day Saints. Methodists have creeds which a man must believe or be asked out of their church. I want the liberty of thinking and believing as I please. It feels so good not to be trammelled."3

How can we understand something if we can't play with it or dance with it or ask questions or turn it around in our hands? To be mystical is to experience a spiritual reality that is neither apparent to the senses nor obvious to the intelligence. It is being open to the surprise of God. The communion with Ultimate Reality.

In his masterpiece, The Varieties of Religious Experience, William James says: "Mystical states are more like states of feeling than like states of intellect. No one can make clear to another who has never had a certain feeling, in what the quality or worth of it consists. One must have musical ears to know the value of a symphony; one must have been in love one's self to understand a lover's state of mind. Lacking the heart or ear, we cannot interpret the musician or the lover.

These comments made me laugh, they made me wince, and they also made me ask questions of my self and the book. Had I moved so far away from Mormonism that I didn't understand it any more? Is a Mormon supposed to think and act in an always-predictable manner? Hadn't I written the stories out of my deep love for The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints and some of its ironies? Had I been too playful with sacred things and sacred ideas? Had I been disrespectful? I hadn't intended either to misrepresent or represent Mormonism, but rather to play with some of the theology, even dance with it.

But what about this dancing with the gospel and this asking questions of the givens? What are the givens? Can a writer or a painter or a sculptor play with Mormon notions? Can she approach scripture as a diadem with many facets? Can she hope to find greater illumination? Dancing. Playing. Approaching the old stories with new eyes, new questions, new possibilities. Why not? Like, what happens, as it did in my story entitled "Dust to Dust," when a rich, rather than poor, person knocks at the door and asks for someone's last dime? How elegant we
That's a good way to kill a person while they're alive—not think they are large enough to surprise us.

are in responding to the poor. How self-sacrificing and noble we can be. But aren't the rich sometimes in need as well? God lives in the souls of all people, rich or poor. Or, what happens, as it did in another of my stories, "Devil Horse," when a man's horse is spooked by the Devil? Isn't it conceivable that a man might want to protect this horse, even baptize him? Or is it irrelevant to think of baptizing an animal? I recall hearing from the pulpit that animals have souls, too.
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ters of my heartsapce, the tears began to flow from me and I surrendered to a total state of feeling. No questions. No analysis. No comparisons of this and that. My feelings have always frightened me because they run so deeply and feel so dangerously vulnerable, but I stood there, openly in front of Alberto and several members of our group, and wept. He blew on my heartsapce slowly with his breath and then tossed the baby feathers into the fire.

God, the Other, Higher Power, the Magnificent, whatever one wishes to call The Divine, attended us that day. Burning in the fire. Rising up out of Alberto Taxo. Encircling my body and bearing witness to my belief that God is in everything everywhere. And that, if we keep our eyes open, we can see God with arms outstretched, calling to us, asking us to put our cares and ultimatums aside and join in the dance.

A benediction from Hafiz:

Start seeing everything as God,
But keep it a secret.
Become like a man who is Awestruck
And Nourished

Listening to a Golden Nightingale
Sing in a beautiful foreign language
While God invisibly nests
Upon its tongue.

Hafiz,
Who can you tell in this world
That when a dog runs up to you
Wagging its ecstatic tail,
You lean down and whisper in its ear,

"Beloved,
I am so glad You are happy to see me.

Beloved,
I am so glad,
So very glad You have come."7

To comment on this essay, or to read comments by others, visit our website: <www.sunstoneonline.com>.

NOTES
6. James, 337.

WHEN THE NUNS CAME INTO TOWN

They always came to town in twos, figuring that woe is to the solitary who if she should fall has none to raise her up.

And when they walked they did not move like you and me in jointed steps and strides but flowed within the cloisters of their robes.

I wonder now, what did they see, I mean as you and I see time in the worn places on the bannister, despair in the stains on wall paper, defeat in the threadbare tie, the curled collar of a gray-white shirt.

Did they see drunkards in the park, stricken flies in the drug store window, the burned-out day dropping ashes on the somber men and women and on children who reverently hissed their greetings on the street?

Perhaps not. Perhaps within the cavern of their veils they saw upon the walls the shadows of these things and thought, this is what we left, this is what we could not grieve for in our leaving.

Perhaps they saw beyond the shadows and the shadowed to the darkest point of their unknowing, guessing that to be loved is not all, guessing that to love is not all, guessing that to love to love is the measure of the soul's grandeur.

—FRANK L. RYAN
THE SILVER PLATES

During the Pioneer Jubilee held 20–24 July 1897, those still alive from the nearly two thousand pioneers who arrived in the Salt Lake Valley the first year gathered on Temple Square for a class of '47 reunion.
A MATTER OF SACRIFICE

When we scaled a Mayan-carved cliff in some long-forgotten canyon, our stalagmite ascent was fortified by flies and streamed with sweat. I wondered what lured men and women to these labs (for I was but a pack mule). Buoyed by brushes and surgeon-like trowels, they unearthed more than jaguar-headed architecture. Beneath the bowels of dirt and dust were relics of children, skewered by shards on stucco-laden floors. I was repulsed like any Western wife to the blood-letting waterfalls of the high priests. They vivisected their victims with obsidian knives; offering their beating hearts to the gods. But I was assured by archaeologists, inured to injustice, that the holy men deciphered their screams and tears as a sign for a healthy, rainy season.

And in the night, when the rains gave birth to a nation of gnats, scientists paid no heed, so rapt were they, to make the stones speak.

—MIKE CATALANO

BURDEN

What shall I do with all these? The spring-bright eves, the smile-thin light from stars, the oneiric moon? Every nailed moment makes me bleed. I gasp for breath, and am woken to the whiteness of bones. No sign of wound. Yet an uneasy fear scallops my loosening skin. Whom shall I show this burden? My six-year-old son, Ritwik, sleeps beside his mother. The quietude teasing, straggling on the fence of my bones. He would not sleep that way any more. And his broken toys would slip into petty history. Is this burden a silent part of my waking to myself? A tendril, winding around me, like silence? Perhaps, the wings of a bird, the crazy eyes of a crafty eagle, the dark shade of a shore of a whirling, reiterating moment, make me believe that there's no burden. And this is perhaps the gap, the burden!

—NIRANJAN MOHANTY
Two alternate worldviews are in contest to lead Mormonism today: the successful, rational, and secular approach of the mechanistic view vs. the fundamentalistic, reactionary, theocentric view.

I prefer, however, the homocentric worldview that was good enough for Joseph Smith.

WORLDS IN COLLISION

By Karl C. Sandberg

MANY IN THE MORMON COMMUNITY FEEL something stirring, and many who experienced Mormonism during the 1940s and '50s feel the ground shifting. But they are unable to say what the changes are, what shape they are taking, or how far they extend. The changes may be cosmetic or they may be structural; they may even be moving toward a redefinition of what it is to be Mormon.

Change is a pain, so let us leave the 1990s and slip in on the back row of a special conference being held in Farmington, Utah, in 1877.

Brother Brigham is urging the Saints not to go tramping through the hills looking for minerals. They should stay home, tend to their fields and flocks, build up the kingdom, and not lose their faith by running after riches. Find a gold mine if you can, he says, but "do you know how to find such a mine? No, you do not. These treasures that are in the earth are carefully watched... they can be removed from place to place according to the good pleasure of Him who made them. He has his messengers at his service, and it is just as easy for an angel to remove the minerals from any part of one of these mountains to another, as it is for you and me to walk up and down this hall."

As evidence, he cites the experience of Orrin Porter Rockwell, who had found a vein of gold in Cottonwood Canyon and then went back to look for it and couldn't find it. And Rockwell is someone who should know how these things work, because he was once with a group of treasure diggers in the Palmyra area who did in fact find a chest buried in the earth, but they could not obtain it—in spite of their efforts, the chest slipped back into the bank of earth, making a rumbling noise as it went.

At this point, if we are of a mind to lean over the pew and whisper to a neighbor that this is not the way geology is taught in the 1990s, we will see that immense changes have already taken place in the Mormon world, and if we are exercised about maintaining an undeviating body of Mormon belief, or a purity of doctrine, as it were, we have come too late for the fair.

D. Michael Quinn had hold of this dissonance when he wrote Early Mormonism and the Magic World View; for he portrays Joseph Smith, his family, and eminent founders of Mormonism, including Oliver Cowdery, Brigham Young, Wilford Woodruff, Heber C. Kimball, and Orson Pratt, as people who participated throughout their lives in various magical practices such as treasure digging and the use of divining rods, seer stones, amulets, astrology, magic parchments, talismans, and healing objects. These leaders of the founding generation of Mormonism thus held a worldview that allowed for the possibility of magic, which is an embarrassment and scandal to many contemporary Mormons because the worldview of subsequent generations changed to something else. Quinn's book created a stir and was vigorously reviewed in the Mormon press. But when the tumult died down and other issues came to the fore, the book's implications were left dangling.

Now, it is precisely these implications that are interesting. Quinn advisedly limited his study to a description of the practice and attitudes in early Mormonism, without relating them to the larger currents of Western culture and without tracing their subsequent development. But if the magical worldview gradually dissipated and passed away, as Quinn says it did, what kind of worldview did it change into, and how does it relate to the larger currents of Western belief? Is the worldview of Mormonism still changing? If so, in what ways and how much? Is Mormonism now, once again, being recast in a new mold? And, by the way, what are we to understand by "worldview"?
These questions help us see with a wider context and think on a deeper level about Mormonism's present tensions and changes. It seems to me that what is going on today in the larger culture and within Mormonism is a collision of worldviews, and the better we understand the competing worldviews the clearer we can see the big picture of changing Mormonism. In the next section, I define worldview and explain how it functions in relation to culture and paradigm. Next, I explore the nature of three ancient worldviews raging in Mormonism today: the homocentric view, the primary worldview of Joseph Smith and the Restoration; the theocentric view, the impulse behind religious fundamentalism; and the mechanistic view, the foundation of American secular society. To understand the implications of adopting each worldview; I provide examples of its applications in history. The goal is to grasp each view's assumptions and consequences so that we can make good sense of the present changes in Mormonism.

PARADIGM, CULTURE, AND WORLDVIEW
The world is never as simple or harmonious as our deepest assumptions tell us it should be.

We can get at the notion of "worldview" by comparing it with two related terms: "paradigm" and "culture."

"Paradigm" was popularized some forty years ago by Thomas S. Kuhn as a means to describe the nature of scientific revolutions. A "paradigm" is an implicit model established by a work so eminent, such as Isaac Newton's Principia Mathematica in the late seventeenth century, that it provides a set of assumptions for further research that determine what kind of questions will be asked and what kind of procedures will be used by others in the field. A paradigm is never total or definitive, but it will nonetheless dominate a field of inquiry until people encounter problems that it cannot solve, at which time there will be a paradigm shift. For example, physics was guided by the paradigm of Newton's work until the end of the nineteenth century. When physics encountered problems for which the Newtonian model did not suffice, there was a paradigm shift as physicists developed new suppositions in the form of quantum mechanics that solved the problems.

"Culture," as commonly used in anthropology, is a more general term than paradigm. It includes all the suppositions by which people organize their society and its work; that is, the rules of what is and is not permitted, how people relate to each other, what is valued, and who does what. These cultural rules are usually unarticulated, invisible, and unexamined. Just as people may be able to use their language without being able to describe its grammar, they live and move within their culture without being able to describe it. Two physicists, one Japanese and one French, for example, might work together and understand each other perfectly well within the same scientific paradigm, but have much different understandings about the social rules and family imperatives dictated by culture.

"Worldview" is on a level still more general than what is contained in paradigm and culture. It grows out of a set of unspoken and initially unidentified assumptions that we absorb unconsciously during childhood and that form the basis of our private and communal logic. Worldview thus consists of the total set of our expectations of how the world will behave and move. From the inside, a worldview appears seamless and inevitable, but it always turns out to contain contradictions, inconsistencies, or inadequacies that appear obvious, even strange or bizarre from the outside. Why will one culture, for example, leave its dead exposed as carrion on a high mountain, another embalm them, another cremate them, and another bury them in the earth in family burial plots? Simply because of the unspoken expectations each has about the long march of the cosmos.

To identify these unspoken assumptions, we have to dig below the surface, which we can do by asking about five aspects of people's expectations:

1. What is seen as the ultimate in the cosmos? What is it that makes the world move? Is it personal or impersonal? One or many?
2. How is humanity seen as relating to the cosmos? What is humanity's place in it; and, for example, how shall we think of the possibility and nature of a future life?
3. How is the world known? On what can the mind rest?
4. What is the source and grounding of moral rules?
5. How shall we think of evil? What forms does it take, and what are its origins and locus?

Three worldviews have been prominent in Western thought since antiquity: the theocentric, the mechanistic, and the homocentric. This triad is not exhaustive, and moreover, these three worldviews are not fixed, static, or hermetically sealed. It is possible to find individuals who exemplify only one of the views almost as a schema, but it is most common to find all three overlapping in individuals or movements in ways that provide a set of inner contradictions, which are not noticed until they work their way to the surface under the press of circumstance. These worldviews can be visualized by means of a Venn diagram, as follows:

The shaded areas represent the times when worldviews collide, and in the light of new conditions their insufficiencies become visible.

Because worldviews are usually imbibed unconsciously along with one's culture, they rarely change within one generation. Newton published his Principia Mathematica in 1647, which became the basis of a mechanistic and deterministic
view of the universe two generations later in the eighteenth century, but Sir Isaac himself was fascinated with the occult sciences and conducted alchemical experiments as late as 1690. When shifts occur, they take place in our deepest assumptions, which consequently dictate what questions we will ask, what we will believe is possible or impossible, what we expect from the world, and what we will accept as evidence. Politically, it was a major shift in consciousness when most of the population in the eighteenth century stopped believing in the divine right of kings and started believing in a social contract (ca. 1760–80), but this change was prepared by an even more fundamental shift in views about God and revelation and the nature and place of man (ca. 1680–1720). The overthrow and change of a system of government is a mere political event; the shifts in worldview and the attendant ways of thinking are the real revolutions.

**THEOCENTRISM**

*Everything in the world is God's doing.*

**HISTORICALLY,** theocentric views have most often been found among peoples claiming direct revelation, notably Islam and certain currents of Judaism and Christianity. Within Christianity, Augustine, Calvin, Luther, and the seventeenth-century Jansenists in France are eminent examples.

One who holds a theocentric worldview has a prominent sense about the majesty, awesomeness, and omnipotence of God. The world derives from divine creation and moves according to the will of God, who intervenes in the world and directs its affairs. Therefore, nothing happens by accident, nothing is random. An example from Islam: During the recent revolution in Iran, a mathematics professor was set to lecture on probability theory and held up a die to illustrate chance and randomness. An Islamic fundamentalist student cried out, “A satanic artifact!” and the professor lost his job and nearly his life. There is no room for probability in a cosmos where God is constantly aware of\(^6\) all things past, present, and future and is ultimately the cause of all that is.  

The world is known through the revelation of God's word, which is immutable, absolute, and definitive. The Koran, for example, consists of the words that God spoke audibly, in the best Arabic. When people with a theocentric view theologize, they tend to interpret scripture literally and to deal in absolutes. Thus, they propose an objective and dogmatic theology that casts the last stone, that asserts unchanging truths and final understandings, and that establishes creeds. Notions of “heresy” and “orthodoxy” require absolutist assumptions that can lay down infallible distinctions between correct and incorrect beliefs. Theocentrism also tends to set up hierarchies, since the one who mediates God's word stands *de facto* in the place of God and is therefore one up. Said Bishop Bossuet in seventeenth-century France: “The heretic is one who has an opinion. That is what the word itself means. And what is it to have an opinion? It is to follow one's own thought and one's personal feelings. But the Catholic is catholic, that is, universal, and without having any personal view, he follows without hesitation that of the Church.”  

It follows that revelation is the grounding for morality; certain actions are right because God has commanded them, and others are wrong because he has forbidden them.

The world exists for God, and therefore people are not ends in themselves, but means. They are dependent on the will of God, who has already decreed, or in any case knows, their fate and future. Thus, the proper stance of humankind is obedience, acceptance, and humility. For Martin Luther, the Renaissance idea of an almost God-like status of humanity perverted the true Christian doctrine that we can appear before God only as beggars for divine grace and mercy. In fact, Luther's last words reportedly were, “We are all beggars, this is true.” John Calvin held a similar view: the true Christian life must be entirely focused on the divine. “There is no part of our life,” he wrote, “and no action so minute that it ought not to be directed to the glory of God. . . . Nothing worse can happen to the human being than not to live for God.”

For both of these reformers, heaven was likewise God-centered and consisted of the contemplation of the essence of God. In seeing God, the blessed are passive while God is fully active. But even in heaven, God maintains his distance, says Calvin, and “our glory will not be as perfect as to allow our vi-
sion to comprehend the Lord completely. . . . There will always be a wide distance between Him and ourselves." Reformation theology held that human creatures could never invade heaven, approach God as a friend, or expect different degrees of intimacy. Said Calvin, "To be in Paradise and live with God is not to speak to each other, but is only to enjoy God, to feel His good will, and to rest in Him." 10

When asked about the presence of evil in the world, the Renaissance theocentrists were hard-pressed, but the hardest did not shrink from taking literally the words in Isaiah: "I am the Lord and there is none else. . . . I make peace, and create evil..." (Isa. 45:6–7). For Calvin, it really was God who hardened Pharaoh's heart (Exo. 7:3).

In the Bible, we have no better example of the theocentric view than the first three chapters of the book of Job. Job is a perfect and upright man, one who does everything he is supposed to do and nothing he is not supposed to do. He acknowledges the Lord in all things—when he prospers, his prosperity comes from the Lord; when he loses his possessions and his children, he acknowledges that it is the Lord's prerogative to take them away. "The Lord giveth and the Lord taketh away, blessed be the name of the Lord" (Job 1:21). When his health fails and he is smitten with constant pain, his wife asks: "Do you still retain your integrity? Curse God and die." But Job answers, "Shall we receive good from the hand of the Lord and not receive evil?" (2:10). For it is God who sends both good and evil. And in all of this, Job sinned not with his lips (1:22); that is, he continued to maintain the theocentric view he had held all of his life.

Job then passes through seven days and seven nights of silence, and when he speaks again, something inside of him has shifted. Death is better than life: "Oh, that my grief were weighed, and my calamity laid in the balances together" (6:2). His three friends, who have not passed through the seven days and seven nights of silence, try to comfort him by repeating incessantly the arguments, even the words that Job himself used to offer to other people, but the words have become meaningless. The rest of the book struggles with the problem of evil, and Job becomes the voice of all those whose calamities and suffering have become larger than their view of what evils are possible. It answers nothing to invoke the presence of Satan as the cause of evil—and no one in the book does—because Satan, the adversary, the putter-to-the-test, operates only with the permission of and within the limits set by the Lord, who therefore still ends up responsible for evil and innocent suffering.

The devil has, as a matter fact, been an embarrassment to theocentric systems whenever they have been pushed to their logical conclusions, which the seventeenth-century Dutch Reformed pastor Balthasar Bekker undertook to do in 1692. 11 Setting out to show that the power popularly attributed to the devil came from false pagan notions that had found their way into Christianity through corrupt Papist practices, he maintained that it was the work of the Reformation to purge them out. 12 Unregenerate humanity was in itself a rich-enough source to account for the evils of the world, without infringing upon God's sovereignty and yielding it to the devil.

**MECHANISM**

Belief in ultimate law breeds optimism in human progress, but it removes "meaning" from the universe.

Although theocentrism has not disappeared from Christianity, and more than eight hundred million Muslims profess it worldwide, it is the mechanistic worldview that is the basis of modern science and that has become dominant in Europe and the United States over the past two hundred fifty years.

Like theocentrism, mechanistic headwaters are in antiquity. We find versions of it in Democritus, a contemporary of Plato (ca. 460–370 B.C.), in Epicurus (341–270 B.C.), and in Lucretius (96–55 B.C.). It was revived in the Renaissance and was the basis for the philosophical materialism of the French Encyclopedists of the eighteenth century (e.g., Diderot, D'Holbach, La Mettrie). 13 Newton's physics was mechanistic and it became the model for all the new sciences (e.g., chemistry, biology, geology). The biological doctrines of Darwin, the social doctrines of Marx, and the psychological doctrines of Freud were all founded upon the suppositions of mechanism.

When we look at the world from a mechanistic perspective, we are most conscious of the ultimacy of the workings of law, and the world looks and acts like a great machine. Its workings are to be grasped, to the extent possible, by experience, experimentation, the accurate description of the elements, and the elaboration of theories that show their connections. The cosmos is regular and moves in patterns of cause and effect. Nature is the same everywhere in all of its parts. If we look at the earth, for example, we see that it changes by slow and regular processes everywhere the same. If we look at cultures or their histories, we see that they move in patterns of cause and effect. If we look at languages, we see that they also change over time according to discernible patterns.

Because it is inert, Nature becomes an object that can be described and manipulated. Knowledge is therefore objective, and science possible. When people view the world as such, they believe, along with René Descartes in Discourse on Method (1637), that we can become the "masters and possessors of nature." Knowledge is possible—the technology of the modern world grows out of a science based on the notion of the world as machine—but ultimate knowledge is hidden from us. 14 True, scientific orthodoxies spring up, but they are never definitive, since their findings and postulates are always open to challenge on the basis of new evidence.

The term "God" is not necessarily banished, but it changes character. What animates the faith of the scientific seeker is not the effort to make contact with a divine, intervening Person, but rather, in the manner of Heisenberg, the effort to penetrate to the "central order," 15 or, as described by Heinz Pagels, to read the "cosmic code." 16 In practical terms, the universe is ultimately impersonal, and the question of heaven is moot, since human beings are not recyclable but biodegradable. Under
these circumstances, prophecy, for example, is not the view of pre-recorded future events intended by and to be brought about by an intervening deity; rather, it's the prediction of the future based on our knowledge of universal cause and effect: "if A, then B."

Since it cannot bridge the gap between what is and what ought to be, a mechanistic worldview is hard put to establish a basis for morality. By its methods, mechanism copies (describes) nature, but I have never encountered a scientist, however mechanistically inclined, who accepts that morality ought to copy nature, where the weak perish simply because they are weak. The mechanistic source of morality may be, for example, in habit and custom (as in Hume), in the pragmatic effects of actions (as in William James), or, as Bronowski posits, in the exercise of the "habit of truth," which implies a code of behavior, but nowhere does morality come forth as an imperative.17

It would seem that a worldview that makes man the "master and possessor of nature" would place man at the center of things, but in fact the opposite came about. True, the mechanistic view has yielded optimism as it has emphasized human reason, as with the eighteenth-century view of the unlimited progress in store for the human race. But, when pushed to its logical conclusions, mechanism has yielded pessimism, deep pessimism, in trying to absorb the belief that the universe is ultimately devoid of personality and does not move with intentionality with regard to us. Mechanism leaves humanity in a universe without prospect. Speaking from this point of view, the French anthropologist Levi-Strauss summed up his career by saying: "the world began without man and will end without him. The institutions, mores, and customs that I have spent my life inventing and understanding are a passing efflorescence in a creation in relation to which they have no meaning except perhaps that they allow humanity to play its role."18 The role of man gives him neither a privileged position or independent place in the scheme of things, nor imposes upon him the duty of opposing or struggling against the general disintegration. Humanity rather looks like a highly developed and perfected machine, contributing to the general movement toward inertia.

Within the mechanistic view, evil is as great a puzzle as it is for theocentrism. It is not against the course of things that some species should flux in and others flux out, that big fish should eat little fish, or that the strong should survive and the weak perish. That destruction should be intentional in an otherwise intentionless universe, or that some people should choose to suffer injustices rather than commit them—these are supreme examples of the strangeness of human beings.

The problem of evil in a mechanistic universe is explored by Albert Camus in his novel The Plague. In the North African city of Oran, the bubonic plague mysteriously breaks out. There is no vaccine against it and no known cure. The city is quarantined: no one can leave except through death. The plague seems to strike randomly and brings its victims to death with no regard for their merits or crimes, striking the innocent child as well as the guilty old. Some respond fatalistically by fasting and pleasures, since within a day they may be dead. Others turn to prayer and religion, assuming that the plague is a chastisement sent by God to turn the people from their sins. Others revolt against the plague by refusing to accept it; realizing they do not understand it and have no power to turn it back, they nonetheless struggle against it, thereby achieving a human dignity in an otherwise meaningless universe. But evil, the plague, is persistent. It recedes and disappears as mysteriously as it came, leaving only the expectation that it will one day break out again.

**HOMOCENTRISM**

The physical world is a microcosm of the spiritual world.

LIKE the previous two worldviews, homocentrism appeared early in antiquity, as in the early Christian Gnostics. Other examples include: the ancient Jewish Kabbala, with its Renaissance Christian counterpart, the alchemists of the medieval period; the Hermeticists and certain Renaissance humanists, such as Paracelsus (the Germanic founder of modern medicine); the eighteenth-century Swedish philosopher and mystic Emanuel Swedenborg; the great German poet Goethe, and various nineteenth-century...
Romantics, such as Victor Hugo and Charles Baudelaire; and in the twentieth century, the current stemming from the Swiss psychologist Carl Jung.

The basis of the homocentric view is the supposition that man is a microcosm. The visible is in the image of the invisible, the material in the image of the spiritual. To illustrate, we might ask, with regard to the Christmas story, what made the Wise Men wise? There must have been ten thousand other people in the Near East who noticed a bright star in the night sky. Why did only three show up in Jerusalem and not ten thousand? Well, the Wise Men were wise because they could read the stars—the earth is thus a microcosm of the heavens—and all the events of the earth are discernible in the configurations of the stars. Not only the earth, but every individual is a microcosm. Anyone who can read deeply enough into the stars can read the hidden secrets of the heavens and the earth and individual lives.

Also important to the homocentric view is the sense that the universe is numinous, that is, alive. There is something out there wiggling. The universe is full of vital energies, unseen beings, or living forces of both good and evil, with which people can connect. Whether the universe be one or many, it is personal, and it acts with purpose and intentionality toward us.

Human beings are, in fact, the center of the intentions of the universe. When Luther looked at humans from a theocentric view, he saw beggars. When the twentieth-century anthropologist Lévi-Strauss looked at them from a mechanistic perspective, he saw a transient and accidental species. When people with a homocentric view look at humans, they see gods in embryo, as expressed by the French philosopher Henri Bergson: "Humankind groans under the weight of the 'progress' it has made.... It is up to us to see if we will simply live or put forth the necessary effort so that our refractory planet will be fulfilled the purpose of the universe, which is a machine for the making of Gods."22

One contemplating the homocentric possibilities of human beings sees the world as a place of contest and choice and is aware of innate human powers and freedom. In contrast, the extremes of both theocentrism and mechanism negate human freedom. A rigorous theocentrism sees mankind as predestined, flawed, and incapable of choosing their future.23 "Mankind is a donkey," said Luther, "and either God or the Devil is in the saddle." A thorough-going mechanism also sees people as predetermined, but by the heavy freight of heredity and environment, and likewise incapable of shaping their future. If they have any freedom, it is from the autonomy they gain through reason. Those in the middle of the homocentric position see the greatest freedom; they see all people as morally capable of all things and potentially partakers of the divine life. Additionally, since it is the individual who is in direct and experiential contact with the unseen forces of the cosmos, homocentrism does not lend itself to ways of authority and hierarchy.

And where do evil and the devil fit in the homocentric view? In the great freedom of the homocentric view, evil is the stuff out of which human growth occurs. At the end of Milton's Paradise Lost (1667), Adam sees that out of evil, God has created greater good (book 12, 470–478). In Goethe's Faust (published in 1832), Faust asks Mephistopheles at one point, "Who are you, anyway?" Mephistopheles answers, "I am that spirit never understood / Who always wills the bad and always works the good" (Faust, part 1, 1335–36). On the other hand, it is only under a homocentric view where we find witchcraft and magic.

Magic and religion suggest different approaches to the powers of the unseen world

Magic, which in the popular version is slight of hand, trickery, or superstition—i.e., a misattribution of cause—depends for its meaning upon the tacit suppositions of one's worldview. In one form, "high magic" is marked by an attempt to see into the workings of nature in order to know the future. In this one aspect, it closely resembles science. But in the definition used by Michael Quinn and modern dictionaries, magic also involves the attempt to control nature by aid of invisible and supernatural beings: there are powers for good with which people may ally themselves and thus rise, and there are evil powers with which they may ally themselves and sink, according to their choice.

Magic thus fits only under a homocentric view that sees the world in contest with evil—genuine evil that has real existence in unseen beings who assert power over the natural world. In the words of Jeffrey Burton Russel: "The essence of the magical world view is belief in a homocentric universe. Man is literally the microcosm reflecting the macrocosm, so that the macrocosm is in turn a projection of man. Hence all things—stars, herbs, stones, metals, planets, the elements and the elemental forces mesh with man, his longings, his lusts, his desires, his fears, and even his physical appearance and health." Every natural object has an influence on some aspect of man's body and psyche, and man's actions can in turn affect the elements. All things are made for and on the model of man. Thus, magic as a doctrine exalts man higher than does science or religion. For man, comets appear (Shakespeare) and spirits serve him (Marlowe's Faustus). "There is nothing so deep or so far away or so great," Russel writes, "that the magician cannot reach out for it, and no force that he cannot hope to compel."24 Moreover, witchcraft, by definition, involves making a personal pact with the devil, whereby individuals on the earth are delegated power to work evil.

These components of the homocentric worldview make it possible to distinguish between a magical and a religious view. Holders of either view believe that symbols are charged with power and are in fact conduits of power. A person holding the magical worldview, however, sees the symbols (whether words, ceremonies, or actions) as working directly on the object in a cause-and-effect relationship, and the agent thus becomes the master of the object. The man urinating in a ditch while chanting a spell is believed to cause the rain. Or the agent may be supernatural—the witch, operating through delegated devilish power, causes the hail to fall on the neighbors...
wheat field, or causes the neighbor’s animals to abort their young. In either case, the change is in the physical world, leaving the agent unchanged.

The root meaning of “religion” is “that which binds together.” We may call “religious,” then, changes that symbols work within the agents to bring them into a cooperating relationship with God. For a Jungian, an example is the Navajo sand painting. A person falls sick with bronchitis and goes to consult the medicine man, who begins to do a sand painting. An unobserved positivist watching the proceedings from a mechanistic world view would assume that the medicine man intends for the sand painting to work directly on the symptoms and would therefore call the painting an example of magic and superstition. Seen from inside the culture, however, the purpose of the sand painting is to bring the individual into harmony with nature so that natural forces may effect the healing. A shot of penicillin, which would alleviate the symptoms but leave the individual unchanged in his or her inner life, is not religious. The sand painting, on the other hand, if it changes and restores the individual to harmony with the larger order, is religious.

In the journals of William Clayton, as he recorded attitudes about the newly established endowment ceremony in Nauvoo, we can see examples of early Mormonism tending toward both the “religious” and the “magical.” For some, the signs and tokens were seen as a unifying principle, making known the correct way to approach God in prayer. Said Apostle George A. Smith in a temple meeting on 21 December 1845, “When we pray to the Lord, we ought to come together clad in proper garments, and when we do, and unite our hearts and hands together, and act as one mind, and the Lord will hear us and answer our prayers.” The value of the garment was in its preparation for prayers, for “if we have our garments upon us at all times, we can at any time offer up the signs.” He said when he and Wilford Woodruff were on a mission in Michigan, they would at every opportunity retire to the wilderness or to an upper room to offer up the signs, and their prayers were always answered. In these examples, the focus seems to be on the change that these symbols brought about in the individuals, and their effect can therefore be described as “religious” and not “magical.”

In contrast, it is apparent that from the beginning, many Saints embraced the notion that the garment of the ceremony had in itself the virtue of being a physical protection. In the meeting just mentioned, George Miller recounted how he was shot at but escaped because he was wearing his garment, while the sentinel next him was killed. Apostle Heber C. Kimball then spoke of how Willard Richards had been protected during the mob raid on Carthage Jail because he had his “robe” on, but Joseph, Hyrum, and John Taylor were not wearing theirs and were “shot to pieces.” John Taylor confirmed that the three were not wearing their robes in the jail, but it was not out of fear. According to a remark by W. W. Phelps, Joseph had lain his robes aside “because of the hot weather.” Apparently others saw greater efficacy in the garment than Joseph did, and the beliefs and practices with regard to it thus seem to have been shaped as much by the followers and disciples as by the initiator. To the extent that the garment itself with its special markings were seen to compel the forces of nature, the view may be described as magical.

The homocentric view can be illustrated by several notions of the Renaissance figure Paracelsus (1493–1541). For Paracelsus, humans cannot speak of God with finality, since God is infinite and therefore deeper than our sounding cord. What we can say is that God is never at rest. “All things whatsoever are restless. . . . God created us as we are and thereby deprived Himself of repose.” We seek God through “Nature,” which is more than the physical manifestations we usually call nature, and more even than its underlying forms. Nature is above all a living force that is forever varying and various, producing new beings and changing old ones, according to time or place. Being alive, Nature thus manifests herself through continual creation of the surprising and the unexpected and overflows the furrows of rational prediction. The center of all of the creative activity of Nature is man, who is the
vessel through which something greater than man makes itself show one part of a sequence of events to one individual and reserve another part of the same sequence to be shown to another individual some six hundred years later. Moreover, humanity is a mess—the "natural man is an enemy to God" and he will remain so unless he lets God take him in hand and give him a new nature (Mosiah 3:19). The Lectures on Faith, which were the doctrinal part of the 1835 Doctrine and Covenants, spoke of God as being omnipotent, omniscient, and eternally unchangeable (lecture 4, especially), all of which seems to tilt the doctrine toward theocentrism.

At the same time, other concepts point to a mechanistic universe. In one of the early revelations of Joseph Smith (1832), the orderliness of a universe moving according to law became prominent: "All kingdoms have a law given; and... there is no space in which there is no kingdom... Unto every kingdom is given a law; and unto every law there are certain bounds also and conditions. All beings who abide not in those conditions are not justified" (D&C 88:36-39). This theme was reiterated in 1843: "There is a law, irrevocably decreed in heaven before the foundations of this world, upon which all blessings are predicated—and when we obtain any blessing from God, it is by obedience to that law upon which it is predicated" (D&C 130:20-21).

Nonetheless, the overwhelming movement of early Mormonism, indeed, until 1890, was toward the elaboration of a homocentric universe. Even in the Book of Mormon, there are notable passages that point toward homocentrism—human beings are a microcosm, that is, beings with a spiritual body in the image of their physical body (Ether 3:16). The earthly is in the image of the spiritual. In his first elaboration of the world's beginnings, Joseph Smith gives the account of two creations: "For I the Lord God created all things, of which I have spoken, and gave them to Adam. For the foundations of this world were laid, and the heavens were given, before they were called by names. . . . All things were before created, but spiritually were they created" (Moses 3:5,7). "Spirit" is not the opposite of matter, as traditional Christianity held, but was rather a more subtle and refined form of matter (D&C 131:7-8).

The homocentric view undergirds the elaboration of the Mormon doctrine of deity, the first stage of which may be seen in the image of God set forth in the Book of Moses. God is the
creator of worlds without number, and the purpose guiding this endless, expanding, continuing creation is the enhancement of his glory. But the glory of God is enhanced only as humankind is enhanced. Humankind is at the center of his concerns: "This is my work and my glory—to bring to pass the immortality and eternal life of man" (Moses 1:39), which follows as a natural elaboration the Book of Mormon saying, "Adam fell that men might be; and men are, that they might have joy" (2 Ne. 2:25).

To see how far early Mormonism departs from the theocentric sovereignty of God, we need to consider the emergence of the Mormon teaching about the nature of humans and their place in the cosmos: "Man was also in the beginning with God. Intelligence, or the light of truth, was not created or made; neither indeed can be" (D&C 93:29). There is in fact in each individual something that was not created and therefore does not owe its existence to God. Gone is the immense difference between God and man, by which people could be no more than beggars: "I will call you my friends" (D&C 93:45).

And how is the devil seen within the Mormon cosmos? Joseph's earliest experiences appear to have been marked by the encounter with the reality of evil. Evil, like good, is a living force in the world to be grappled with, as Joseph recounts in the 1838 account of his first vision: "I was seized upon by some power which entirely overcame me... Thick darkness gathered around me, and it seemed to me for a time as if I were doomed to sudden destruction" (JS—H 2:13). Satan makes war on the Saints (D&C 76:29) by getting them to deny the truth and defy God, but it is people who choose to let themselves be overcome (D&C 76:3). Eventually, Satan will be bound and lose all of his dominions except over the few who become sons of perdition (D&C 76:35). If Satan is to be bound, as all references to the millennial reign indicate (e.g. D&C 84:100, 88:110, 43:31, 45:55), the present order will have to be transformed into something... unimaginable. But for now, the purpose of mortal existence is to put humans to the test, to see "if they will do all things whatsoever the Lord their God shall command them" (Abt. 3:25). Satan is therefore the linchpin of the mortal venture. If there is no Satan, there is no test. If there is no test, there is no growth, no progress. As Goethe once remarked, the world is "a great organ, upon which God plays while the Devil pumps the bellows."

Moreover, Satan is an older brother (a brother gone bad, it is true), and like the other brother, Jesus, he is one of the family. The implication is that human beings contain the potential of both.

And the test is not only to see how people will respond to commands, but to see what they will do on their own amid the evil and the opportunities of the world, "for behold, it is not meet that I should command in all things... for the power is in them, wherein they are agents unto themselves" (D&C 58:26, 28). The power that is in them is such that, given their obedience, they may attain to the priesthood after the order of Enoch, and "everyone being ordained after this order and calling should have power, by faith, to break mountains, to divide the seas, to dry up the waters, to turn them out of their course; to put at defiance the armies of the earth, to break every band, to stand in the presence of God" (Joseph Smith Translation, Gen. 14: 30–31). The eventual destination of the transformations that people go through is godhood itself: "then they shall be gods, because they have all power and the angels are subject unto them" (D&C 132:20). This idea of God is carried to its ultimate expression in the King Follett discourse, which Joseph preached a few weeks before his death: God was once a man and became God through a long series of transformations over time. As man is, God once was. As God is, man may become.

Satan is also a necessary component of magic as it occurs in the Book of Mormon. Although Stephen Robinson, in a vigorous critique of Quinn's book, maintained that "the huge collection of writings and ideas that actually came from the mind and pen of Joseph Smith in 1829 and after, are absolutely barren ground as far as any connection with magic and the occult is concerned," this assertion turns out to be not so. The Book of Mormon is far from bereft of magic, and the narrator of the book shows a worldview that holds magic, witchcraft, and sorcery to be possible. What is interesting is that when magic perse is mentioned, it is condemned as one of the forms of wickedness.

In the book of Alma, for example, we find a condemnation of those who indulged themselves in sorceries, idolatry, idleness, etc. (1:32). In 3 Nephi, in foretelling the great purging of the unrepentant gentiles in the last days, Jesus includes among the practices to be cut out witchcrafts and soothsaying.
When Mormon describes the Nephites sinking into wickedness, he cites as evidence that "there were sorceries and witchcrafts, and magics; and the power of the evil one was wrought upon all the face of the land" (Morm. 1:19). The Nephites began to repent because "no man could keep that power of the evil one which was in the land" (Morm. 2:10). These were treasures that became slippery, not just in the sense that an unattended suitcase in Grand Central Station becomes slippery, but because the magic art and witchcraft moved them about. In short, the narrator in the Book of Mormon appears to believe magic, sorcery, and witchcraft to be real, but he condemns their wicked practice.

How do we know? In Mormonism, there has been a tension from the beginning between revealed knowledge that is transmitted through the hierarchy and the knowledge that comes directly to individuals.

How do we know about the visible world? By taking advantage of all the ways that people have known about the world naturally, about things in the heavens and on the earth, and about the perplexities of nations. What is the character of the word of God? It derives from a revelation to the individual and is authenticated not by an authority out there but rather by the effect in here, by following the light that is in every person in the world, which is the power of God and which, in a sense, is God (D&C 88: 5–15).

**WHEN WORLDVIEWS COLLIDE**

We can understand many changes in the Church as battles between these three worldviews.

If Mormonism was essentially homocentric in its nineteenth-century worldview, how does it stand at the opening of the twenty-first century? The magnitude of the changes that occurred in Mormonism during the decades around 1900 is staggering. Mormonism lost the temporal kingdom, with its economic system, its judicial system, its political system, and its marriage system, it revamped its programs and organizations, it emphasized individual behaviors, and it made major theological readjustments. Nonetheless, the primary question is, did the manner and basis of believing change? If so, in what ways? And were the changes great or little?

I think a clash of the old and the new is signaled in the diaries of John Henry Smith, apostle and counselor in the First Presidency from 1880 to 1911. Two entries note dramatic events that indicate underlying change. His entry for 28 March 1911 notes that Apostle John W. Taylor was excommunicated for "insubordination." John W. Taylor was the last general authority who refused to yield or compromise and abandon plural marriage. He was the tail end of the nineteenth-century notion of the kingdom of God.

President Smith's 11 February 1911 diary entry refers to "some wild ideas" about organic evolution and higher biblical criticism that "are getting into Brigham Young University at Provo." These were the Darwinian ideas of a mechanistic universe in which, as we have seen, there is dismal prospect for the human venture. In spite of substantial historical work, Mormon scholars are still far from understanding how its changes coincided with the Third Great Awakening in American culture, a time when Protestant Christianity encountered modernity in the form of Darwinism, i.e. a mechanistic mode of thought. In response, liberal Protestantism embraced the homocentric social gospel and conservative Protestantism entrenched into fundamentalism, into a theocentric world where God was still in control. This retrenchment was effected by rejecting science and cleaving to the infallibility of the biblical text and its literal interpretation.

As Mormonism moved into the American mainstream in the twentieth century, these two responses were mirrored inside the organization. The adherents of the open-ended, homocentric Mormonism were typified by the works of Seventy B. H. Roberts, and Apostles James E. Talmage, John A. Widtsoe, and Joseph F. Merrill. They made every effort to accommodate all scientific truth within the ample bosom of Mormonism. The most ambitious effort along these lines was Elder B. H. Roberts's *The Truth, the Way, the Life.* The counterpoise was led by Apostle Joseph Fielding Smith. He rejected everything in science that did not coincide with a literal interpretation of the scriptural text, and thus began the LDS re-etchment into the theocentric world view.

But there is more affecting Mormonism than the internal homocentric-theocentric tug-of-war. Throughout the century, the worldview of the larger American society has shifted fundamentally toward a mechanistic view. Newtonian physics...
With its cause-and-effect, deterministic bent informed and undergirded all of the natural and social sciences in their founding and development. Only recently have quantum physics and Jungian psychology started to become major forces in society generally. As a result, most modern Americans and Europeans, including Mormons, have imbibed the premises of Darwin in biology and Freud in psychology, and engage their world primarily through a mechanistic worldview. No wonder the homocentric Joseph Smith sometimes sounds strange to modern ears of Latter-day Saints.

Relatedly, we might ponder to what extent bureaucratization has made the Church look and act like the great machine of the secular society. In creating organizational procedures, to what extent have we adopted the mechanistic ethic of the corporate world.

Nevertheless, as the larger culture became mechanistic, during the last half of the century Mormon theology shifted some toward “neo-orthodoxy,” which ascribes much more to God and much less to man. The prominent teachings of Apostles Joseph Fielding Smith and Bruce R. McConkie emphasized the absolute sovereignty of God and the absolute necessity of a fall in order for there to be a redemption. And in a widely circulated letter, Elder McConkie reproved an esteemed Mormon academic for publicizing Brigham Young’s teachings that God is still progressing in knowledge and for not reflecting only the apostle’s views.

Clearly, the most constant temptation of late has been to abandon the open-ended character of Mormonism and to replace it with an orthodoxy. A prime example is Elder McConkie’s labeling of “seven deadly heresies.” But in an ideal homocentric religion, the canon is never closed, and therefore, neither a dogmatic theology nor a heresy is possible. In light of the thirteenth article of faith’s expansive admonition to believe and hope for all things and to seek anything virtuous, lovely, of good report, or praiseworthy, we would have to understand that the creeds spoken of in Joseph’s First Vision were abominable not because they were false creeds, but simply because they were creeds.

With this essay, I hope to provide a framework to critique change within Mormonism. I close with a personal statement: The homocentric worldview has been a scandal both to the tough-minded empiricist and to the dogmatic theocentrist. It is untidy, fraught with temptations, and stands often in need of correction. Nonetheless, it is the only worldview that leaves the world open-ended and full of prospect, and moreover, it is a prime source of vitality and religious faith. I say, then, let the world be many, and let the scandal thrive.

To comment on this essay, or to read comments by others, visit our website: <www.Sunstoneonline.com>
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MIRRORS

Outside the offices, in the first sky of evening,
stars were letting down hooks to lift some people into the dark,

and in the building next door, a dance studio: one class gone
and another not yet arrived, the teacher, a young woman

with a body like that of a bird, was turning before the wall mirror.
Left hand on the bar, she raised her right leg, keeping it straight
but never rigid, lifting that foot to the level of her shoulder,
and she rotated on the toes of the other foot,
flexing the raised knee as she came around, until she planted softly
the right foot back on the polished floor next to the left, the opposite hand
rising as if to catch a drifting feather—
watching her own reflection in the glass,

with the clean bright satisfaction of what she had already known.
If anyone had ever watched a blue heron fishing in swift water,
stepping high and carefully through the hard current
from one washed-over rock to another, he would see her movement like that,

and later might realize that the dancer had watched two images,
herself in the mirror beside her and herself thrown on the darkness
she believed was pressing alone at the window.

—JAMES OWENS
HE FINISHES WITH A FLOURISH

By Mari E. Jorgensen

W E MUST LOOK SWEET, THE THREE OF US.
We must look like a freaking Hallmark's commer-
cial, Laurel and me and her sister, gathered
around this table in Hogi Yogi with our matching raspberry
yogurt smoothies ("You order for all of us, Chad," Laurel told
me), and Amanda with her grannie get-up on—those poly-
ester shorts she wears hiked up almost to her armpits and her
blue-flowered shirt, white orthopedic shoes and tube socks.
We must make a tender picture, the three of us. I can tell,
because people keep tossing fond smiles our way. I know what
they see: a nice boy and his girlfriend, who is lovely with her
dark hair draped down her back and her nut-colored skin and
chalky blue eyes—the two of us out for a bite to eat with this
sweet handicapped child. (What is the proper term? they are
thinking. I can almost see the words clobbering around behind
their eyes: Down's Syndrome? Mongoloid? Mentally Disabled?)
People think we're adorable. The truth is, though, that I've
never had much of a say when it comes to Laurel's sister. She
just comes as part of the package. What can I do? I could never
let on to Laurel how I feel itchy under the skin whenever
Amanda's around. It would crush her, and I have no desire to

looking, then she nabs the chips and stuffs them in her mouth,
chewing them up into one great wad, her fat tongue working
noisily.

Laurel kisses the air between us. Thank you, she mouths.
Don't mention it, I mouth back, but this makes her eyebrows
curl in confusion because Don't mention it is way too compli-
cated of a message to mouth to someone who doesn't read lips.
After Amanda has polished off all my chips, she folds the
empty bag in half. She folds it again and again until it is a tiny,
slick square. "Do you think Elmer flew away?" she says.

"No, Manda," Laurel says. "He's indoors, remember?"

"Yeah, but he could fit through the window." She's talking
about her pet magpie, which she found wet and huddled on
the kiddie slide in the back yard one day. Her look to Laurel is
fierce. As fierce as a person's look could be from beneath those
fleshy, pink lids of hers.

Laurel heaves a sigh. "Okay, we can go. Chad?"

"Sure. I'm easy." I squash my empty smoothie cup against
the tabletop and hookshot it over my head towards the trash
bin by the door. I miss.

Outside, downtown Salt Lake City is slick with heat. The
sky is a wash of yellow, and the mountains in the west are
backlit—wedges of black against the yellowing sky. Two kids
in backwards baseball caps whiz by on roller blades, calling
each other "pisshead" and "shit-for-brains." At the corner of
Fifth South and West Temple a new Volkswagen Bug pulls up
with a bumper sticker that says, This is the right place—just
not the right place for you, so get the hell out. Brigham Young
would be proud.

"Look," I say. "Manda, look." I like to entertain Laurel's
sister by playing the air sax. I hum a nasally version of "Sat-
urday In the Park" and sway to the beat, squeezing my eyes
shut in my musical rapture. Amanda doesn't even crack a
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E Street. I live on O and Sixth—a whole thirteen blocks away from them. "Wait," I say, grabbing for Laurels elbow. "Hold on. Aren't you going to invite me home with you? I hear your parents are out of town. We could, you know, break into the liquor cabinet and take a champagne bath or something."

Amanda is yanking on Laurels hand, fixed on the idea of going home, but Laurel turns to me and laughs. Her teeth are small and white, her left cheek dimples ever-so-slightly, and the half-moon on her beaded necklace glints in the dying light. She can't keep herself from laughing, I'm so irresistible, but still she presses her palm against my chest when I get too close, shoving me away. "You're like a slobbering rotweiller," she says.

I laugh too.

We both know, however, that this is just me goofing around. This is just a show. She and I are both fully aware that we will not do it until after we're married. And even then we will not do it in a champagne bath because Mormons don't drink. This a part of our religion. A big part. "Don't you think you ought to be getting home now?" Laurel says. She is still trying to push me away, but with Amanda pulling her in the opposite direction she's not having much luck. Her hair smells like Breyers vanilla bean ice cream, exactly.

"Yeah, I guess," I say. "But I was thinking we could get a video, make popcorn, eat licorice whips?"

"You know you need to go home."

"Why?"

"Because. The resistance from Laurel's hand suddenly gives way and she lets me fall against her. "Because," she says into my ear, "you know that no matter how late you stay out your mom will still be dying when you get home."

I must look shocked and dismayed—crushed, even, at her emotional brutality—because then Laurel kisses me hard on the mouth. She lets go of Amanda's hand and kisses me hard, pressing herself so tightly against my chest that I swear I can feel her nipples through her cotton T. "Okay," I say. "I'll go."

I AM crazy about Laurel. I make no bones about it. I am not ashamed to say that I feel about her the same way those sappy guys in romance novels feel about their girlfriends. And even though she and I have only barely graduated from high school, I would marry her tomorrow if she would go for it. But she never would. Laurel has a schedule all worked out. Because we're Mormon, I am supposed to go to college for a year. Then, when I turn nineteen, I'll buy a couple of dark suits from Mr. Mac's (they give discounts to prospective missionaries) have my hair sheared to near stubble (around your ears, two inches above the collar) and go on a mission for the Church. After that, according to Laurel's schedule, I will come home as one of God's triumphant warriors, and then, and only then, when I've gotten another year of college under my belt, she and I can get hitched and live happily ever after.

Don't get me wrong. It's not that I'm against going on a mission. It stirs me to think about what a noble pursuit it will be. Seriously. I can't wait to go to bed with my limbs aching and limp from serving people for fourteen hours straight. It's the way I was raised. My whole life my dad has rousted me out of bed of a Saturday morning to help snow blow some old geezers driveway, or rake their leaves. What can I say? I'm a regular saint. It's just that every time I think about going on my mission and being away from Laurel for twenty-four months straight, I nearly go blind with heartache. I am, as my friends would say, totally whipped.

After Laurel has told me to beat it, I head straight home and let myself into my parents' restored Victorian-style home in the upper Avenues of Salt Lake. Dad bought this house back when he first started to make it big as an international tax attorney, and he must have shelled out a pretty penny for it. It's posh. He's also got an apartment in New York and a flat in Prague. I've never been to either, although he's constantly on my case about it. "No offense," I tell him whenever he bugs me about it.
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tables with my fingers. Louise slaps the backs of my hands. “Don't worry about this,” she says. “You go on up and say goodnight to your mother. Your sisters have left already and your dad's waiting for you.”

“Are you sure?” I say. “Don't be ridiculous.”

“It's never been my intention to be ridiculous.”

“Go.” Louise has the pills gathered up and deposited safely in their container. The catheter bag is cradled in the crook of her arm. “It's what I'm here for.” She straightens up and slaps a wrinkle from the leg of her pink scrub pants with her free hand.

“Okay,” I say. “Thanks.” I turn and start to make my way upstairs, but Louise stops me.

“Chad.” Her voice is only slightly above a whisper, as if I might be susceptible to loud noises because my mother is dying and a certain decibel might make me break down into sobs. “I've been doing this for a long time, nursing cancer patients,” she says. “Sixteen and a half years, to be exact, and after that much time you start to get a feel for... things.”

“Things?” I say. Standing where I am on the fourth stair up, I notice that Louise doesn't look her usual gargantuan self. She is almost petite, in fact—her red hair slicked into a plastic clip, the light filtering through the half-round window above the door and settling onto her cheeks and forehead, making her face seem pale and sort of hollowed out. This is the woman who bathes my mother every morning, strips off her soiled bedclothes, and acts like this whole business of dying is as normal as sending your shirts to the cleaners.

“Okay,” I say. “I just wanted you to know,” she says. “Sixteen and a half years, to be exact, and after that much time you start to get a feel for... things.”

“Son, on behalf of your mother and myself, I would like to ask you to mow the lawn”}

Dad doesn't know this, but my three older sisters and I used to mock him....

“Chad,” her voice is only my shoes? A partial orphan? A freakish brain surgeon, I want to tell Louise, to be able to tangles of blood vessels.

“Son, on behalf of your mother and myself, I would like to ask you to mow the lawn.”

AFTER I have looked in on my mother, who is sleeping, and said goodnight to my bleary-eyed father, I sit in my room and finish the last quarter of a cherry-cream cheese pie while watching M*A*S*H. It's the one where Radar gets honorably released and Clinger and B.J. trash Rosie's bar because they want to go home too.

When it's over, I click off the set and stretch out in my boxer shorts on my bed. I try to fix on the fact that my mother has no liver left to speak of. I attempt to focus on the tragedy of how the cancer has left her face a shrunken shell and how she has lost her blinking reflex and how soon my father will be a widower and I will be a... what do you call someone in my shoes? A partial orphan? A motherless child? I will be sad. But maybe I am too young, or maybe I am too cold or demented or something, because the sadness doesn't sink in right away. Pretty soon I find myself thinking about, instead of my mother's death, my life with Laurel.

I imagine that it is three and half years from now and Laurel and I are together. Not together like we have been ever since the ninth grade, with our school class voting us cutest couple and all that junior high crap. I imagine that we are husband and wife. And I don't just think about the sex. I would be lying if I said I never think about the sex because I am, after all, as hormonal as the next guy. But even more than the sex, I like Laurel. She is almost petite, in fact—her red hair slicked into a plastic clip, the light filtering through the half-round window above the door and settling onto her cheeks and forehead, making her face seem pale and sort of hollowed out. This is the woman who bathes my mother every morning...
My father clears his throat into his fist, as if he's about to give an acceptance speech. "Actually," he says, "I was wondering if you would be so kind as to do me a favor.

My dad doesn't know this, but my three older sisters and I used to mock him. My sister Caroline used to waltz into my room and flop onto my bed and say in this hokey Dad voice, "Son, on behalf of your mother and myself, I would like to ask you to mow the lawn." Now, of course, my sisters wouldn't breathe a word against my dad. Now that they've moved out and have families of their own, they all think the sun rises and sets at my dad's command.

"Shoot," I say.

"Yes, well, I was wondering if it would be possible for you to sit with your mother for a few hours. I'm exhausted, and I feel rather reticent about leaving her alone."

"Sure," I say, scrambling out of my bed sheets. "You could've asked me sooner, you know."

"Yes, well. I wanted to stay with her. But I'm afraid..."

"You're afraid?"

"I'm afraid I can't keep my eyes open a moment longer."


"You're afraid?"

"Yes, well. I wanted..."

After my dad leaves, I sit on my mother's favorite chaise lounge that has been squeezed in next to her bed. I put my hand through the metal railing and stroke her hand. It is a collection of bones and wrinkles, her hand, and my mother herself looks old, old. She is older than most of my friends' parents because I was an "oops baby." That's what my mother calls me—her "oops baby." She was forty-one when she got pregnant with me and was scared silly that I was going to turn out with clubbed feet or have the IQ of a turnip or something. But my mother and I have a quiet chuckle over her dream, and I wonder if I knew what the hell I was talking about.

The cotton nightdress my mother is wearing is draped over her body like a sheet of plastic wrap stretched over a bowl of leftovers. Her cheekbones look like golf balls, since her face is so sunken, and her mouth droops open so that it seems like her face is nothing more than two rows of perfect, white teeth.

This is the way it has been for the past couple of days: My mother goes away somewhere, and then she comes back. Ever since she had a heart attack at the end of last week, which happened, Louise says, because her liver and kidneys have begun to shut down and her bloodstream has built up too much potassium, my mother has drifted in and out of consciousness. One minute she'll be lying here talking to one or the other of us and the next thing we know her eyes will roll back into her head and she will go away somewhere. Spooks the crap out of you. But then after a couple of seconds she comes back and picks right up on whatever it is she was saying before. It's like she wasn't even gone in the first place.

My mother's fingers flutter against my hand. "Chad? Is that you?"

"Hi, Mom. How are you? Can I get you anything?"

"No, no. Where's Dad?"

"In his room. He was beat."

"I can imagine."

It's quiet again for a few minutes and just when I think my mom has drifted off she starts to talk again. "Know what?"

"What?"

"I was dreaming about you just now. I dreamt you were a baby again. You were so cute—all round and pink and bald. And then the next thing I knew you were grown up, like you are now, and you said something I didn't like, so I said, 'Don't speak to me that way, young man. I used to powder your behind.'"

"Really? You've never said that to me."

"I know, but I always planned to."

My mother and I have a quiet chuckle over her dream, and then her breathing gets hard and regular again, so I know she's asleep. Lying back on the chaise lounge with an afghan over my legs, I listen to the rasp of my mother's slow, sharp

This is the woman who bathes my mother every morning, strips off her soiled bedclothes, and acts like this whole business of dying is as normal as sending your shirts to the cleaners.
breathing. I can see why my dad was so frazzled. It's like lis-
dern to see if your own heart is beating. When I finally fall
into a shallow, tortured sleep, I dream that Laurel and I are
married and that she gives birth to a Down's baby. It has
almond-shaped eyes and a fat tongue and sometimes people call
it a mongoloid child. I have to try to kick the crap out of these
people, for honor's sake.

T
HE next day I go to
Laurel and ask her to
run away with me.
It's nothing too drastic, like
eloping to Vegas or shacking
up together or anything like
that, it's just that I want to get
away. "I've got it all worked
out," I say as soon as she opens
the door to her parents' house
and waves me inside. "We can
spend the rest of the summer
down in Moab. I can be a
mountain bike trail guide and
you can waitress. I know the
manager at the Sizzler down
there. Or else you can be a
guide with me. And there's a
trailer park, too. Dirt-cheap.
Wouldn't that be cool?"

I am telling all this to
Laurel's back. She is leading
me down the hallway towards
the back of the house, through
the set of sliding glass doors
that open up to the back yard.

I can see Amanda laughing and playing frisbee with her mini-
ture terrier, Stubby. Laurel doesn't look at me when I tell her
about my Moab idea. She opens the sliding glass door part-
way and says, "You and your harebrained schemes." Then she
steps outside.

"Why? Why is it harebrained?"
Outside, she pours me a Dixie cup full of lemonade from a
Tupperware pitcher she has perched on an upturned crate. "It's
really very practical," I say. "We can still make money for
school this fall. And we wouldn't go until this whole thing with
my mom is over, of course, and by then my dad will have
thrown himself back into his work. Can't you see us kicking
around down there, just the two of us? We'd have to live in
separate trailers with roommates, of course, but I could deal
with that. What do you say?"

Laurel gives me a soft smile and turns to kneel in the mud
of her parents' vegetable garden. She's weeding the tomato
plants. She digs out a couple of weeds, then stops and pos-
ses her trowel in mid-air, as if she is contemplating the pros and
cons of scooping out the next weed. A bee careers near her
head and she waves it away with a flick of her thin wrist.
Finally, she makes a visor with one hand and peers over at

Amanda. "Did you know," she says, "that people with Down's
Syndrome have a fifty percent chance of contracting
leukemia?" She digs up a weed and tosses it aside.

But I'm a little slow on the uptake. I'm mostly clueless as to
the finer points of good relationship skills, because when it
comes to people trying to tell me things and I've got my mind
fixed on something else, I'm a real clod. "No, I didn't know
that," I say, and immediately
I'm back on my Moab idea. I
list all the cool things we
could do while we're down
there, and I keep pushing and
pushing until finally Laurel's
shoulders hunch. And still it
takes me a second to realize
what's going on. But then I
hear her sobs and see her
shoulders trembling and I
nearly fall out of my lawn
chair with shock. I've never
seen Laurel cry before.

I scramble over to her and
kneel beside her in the mud.
"I'm sorry," I say. "I didn't
know that. Please, you're
killing me."

The place where she cries
into my shoulder feels raw,
like an open wound. "It's just
this thing with your mom,"
she says, "and you going away
next year, and Amanda. She's
not going to live forever, you
know, not even as long as your
mom. I could never leave my sister for the whole summer,
Chad. Please don't ask me."

"Okay, okay," I say. "I'm sorry."

As if by radar, Amanda has honed in on the fact that Laurel
is unhappy. I don't know how she does it, since she's nowhere
near us, but this isn't the first time I've seen Amanda
figure out on her own that Laurel is sad. She knows something
is wrong, and she comes barreling towards us. I have to get out
of the way to keep myself from being crushed by her pudgy
body as she throws herself on Laurel. She strokes Laurel's hair
and she says, "There, there." This makes Laurel sob harder.

I have to wonder who Laurel feels sorrier for: herself be-
cause she'll be losing me for two years and probably later
Amanda, or me because I'll be losing my mom, or all three of
us, me, Laurel and Amanda, because here we are in this group
hug that is laced with all sorts of illusions and hopes and
shortcomings.

Laurel's eyes catch mine over Amanda's head: "A weak
heart," she mouths. "That's what it usually is, if it's not
leukemia—a weak heart."

It's a complicated message to mouth to someone, but, amaz-
ingly enough, I understand it all.
My father has called a family meeting. My three sisters, Made-line, Naomi, and Caroline are gathered in my parents’ living room along with their husbands and kids. Louise is here, too, but she’s lurking somewhere out in the kitchen. My mother has asked to be moved down to the sofa, just for this evening, so that everyone can be here together with her. I find it amazing that this frail slip of a person can want anything, has a will of her own to say, Please move me down to the sofa just for this one evening.

Laurel and Amanda are here too. Amanda insists on sitting scrunched up next to my mother, whom she calls “Ma Carolyn.” She’s wearing her grannie get-up again, this time with a new pair of purple-striped tube socks.

There is food—homemade strawberry ice cream that Louise made this afternoon. (“I didn’t even know we owned an ice cream mixer,” my father said when she produced it.) My sisters are cracking jokes about the fact that Dad never lets them eat dessert in the living room when they lived at home. We blather aimlessly, talking about the people across the street who built this monster Arabian-style home out of pink stucco. It’s not very practical, we’re saying, to build a house with a flat roof for patio furniture when you live in Utah. Whatever happened to the neighborhoods Covenants, Laws, and Restrictions? Laurel is clutching my hand so tightly that my palm is running with sweat.

Finally, my father positions himself behind the sofa and places a hand on my mother’s shoulder. The long windows behind him show a sluggish, purple sunset. The air kicks on, and the sofa. It’s way too hokey of a song for the occasion, but what can I do? I go to the street and I both keep our eyes open wide, wide through the whole prayer.

“Thank you,” Mom says when it’s over.

After that, my mother asks me to play the piano. She has always had this dream of her children becoming concert pianists. The poor woman. My sisters would only sit through two and a half years of lessons before calling it quits. I only lasted until my twelfth birthday. Now I wish I hadn’t been so mule-headed because my dying mother wants me to play for her and I only know one song. But what can I do? I go to the Steinway baby grand my father bought as an investment and sit down. I feel slightly ridiculous playing “Send In the Clowns” while my mother lies dying on the sofa. It’s way too hokey of a song for the occasion, but what can I do?

While I’m playing I glance around the room. I think of how my sister Caroline had a stalker when she was sixteen and my dad give my mom a priesthood blessing. It’s part of Dad’s agenda for the evening. Bishop Benton pours a drop of consecrated olive oil onto my mother’s batch of brittle hair and blesses it for the healing of the sick and afflicted. Then it’s Dad’s turn. He covers Mom’s hair with his hands and calls her by name, ushering in the power of the priesthood which he holds to help give comfort to those in need. Everyone is supposed to shut their eyes during the blessing, we all know this, but Amanda and I forget. I’ve seen the general shape of this blessing thing before—my whole life, in fact—and I’ve even had a few of them myself, but somehow this one isn’t registering. Who is this person, this powerful tax attorney who wears Hugo Boss ties and calls the shots in so many parts of his world and yet can stand here covering my mother’s skull with his hands and say to her to take peace and return to that Creator who gave her life? I glance over at Amanda. She and I both keep our eyes open wide, wide through the whole prayer.

“Amanda,” my mother says, “I want you to keep things upbeat,” she says at last.

We all cry some more.

A few minutes later Bishop Benton shows up to help my dad give my mom a priesthood blessing. It’s part of Dad’s
are stabbed by crazed anti-Mormons. And then again maybe everything will be fine and maybe Laurel and I will get married and I will have my music studio at the end of the driveway and I'll play my saxophone in a band. We'll have our salsa garden and our yellow dog and a couple or three great kids. Then perhaps some twenty years down the road I will find myself covering Laurel's skull with my hands and telling her to go quickly, to leave me and her pain behind. And perhaps late one night my son will catch me kneeling in my underwear at the side of her deathbed, my hands clasped in prayer and saying, "I know what you've promised us, that we'll be together in the next life, but I want her now. Do you hear me? I want her with me now."

I've never played "Send In The Clowns" with such gusto before. So what if I quit playing when I was twelve because I thought I would never be any good at it? No one can say I play the one song I do know without gusto. Laurel is watching me carefully, as if I'm showing all the signs of losing it. A couple of my nephews stare, dribbles of dried strawberry ice cream stuck to their faces. I finish the piece with a flourish, a grand flourish for my dying mother's sake, and all the while I am thinking maybe.

Maybe, just maybe, I will be half so lucky in my life as the people in this room with me have been in theirs.

To comment on this article, or to read comments by others, visit our website: <www.Sunstoneonline.com>.

FORTUNE'S CUBE

"...to make or break a fortune
some slaughtered but still warm elephant
lost his big teeth."

He loved to hear the castanets of chance
when rattled in his hands,
and he whistled when blowing across the bones.
Ancient bleached bones.
Sometimes rolled snake-eyes, sometimes rolled sevens,
his pockets were empty, his pockets were full—it all added up to crap.
Ivory dice,
grandpa's legacy, a pauper's estate—
I'm heir at law.

A lifetime of rolls,
Could sell them for a modest gain.
Could play them as grandpa did,
wear custom made suits
or lie in rags down a dark alley.
In one lifetime
he wore both tailorings
and never twiddled his thumbs.

—RICHARD FEIN
The Church has happily enjoyed the light touch the media grants to “model minorities,” but with its tremendous growth the Church is quickly losing its minority status. Will it last through the 2002 Winter Olympics?

SURVEYING THE MORMON IMAGE SINCE 1960

By Jan Shipps

IN 1952, CORONET MAGAZINE, A READER'S DIGEST clone, featured an article titled, “Those Amazing Mormons.” In it, the author, Andrew Hamilton, reviewed the history of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints and portrayed the early Saints as long-suffering heroes and heroines. He described their descendants as hard-working people with all the Boy Scout virtues. In addition, they did not drink alcohol or anything containing caffeine, did not smoke, and consistently refused government assistance because they took care of their own. This article is representative of a positive trend in the Mormon image that started in the 1930s and would eventually supplant the negative image that had been the core of the coverage of the Saints in the U.S. periodical press during Mormonism's first hundred years. Throughout the 1950s, press coverage of the Latter-day Saints remained positive, even laudatory. It was marred mainly by a smattering of references to the continuing practice of plural marriage in Short Creek, Arizona (a practice many readers continued to connect with mainstream Mormonism), and by expressions of concern about the business activities of the LDS church and its incredible wealth (a prelude to the growing focus of the press). By the time the Coronet article appeared, however, the Mormon image was no longer shaped primarily by the print media.

FROM NEGATIVE TO POSITIVE
“More American than the Americans”

TO REVIEW, between 1847 and 1947, the great majority of Latter-day Saints had lived behind a “mountain curtain,” in the Great Basin and along the Pacific, especially in southern California. During that century, the great majority of non-Mormon Americans gained most of their information about Mormons by reading about them or by hearing about them from someone who had read about them, or more rarely, from someone who had traveled through the West, seen Zion, and met a few Saints.

Just as the end of World War II brought change to many areas of American life, it also brought a dramatic change in the opportunities U.S. citizens had to get to know members of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Although it would be decades before LDS wards and stakes would be organized throughout the nation, the end of the war accelerated the Mormon diaspora, as Saints started settling far beyond the boundaries of Utah and the American West. By the 1950s, as a result of this “scattering of the gathering,” people all across the country were beginning to learn about Mormonism firsthand by meeting neighbors, people like themselves who happened to be Mormons.

The post-war period welcomed many significant changes. As soon as the wartime dearth of automobiles was replaced by the availability of reasonably priced new cars, a huge increase in recreational travel carried hordes of tourists to Mormonism’s center place—Utah, and particularly Salt Lake City. And dramatic changes in technology took Mormonism to more Americans. Due to ever-cheaper portable radio sets, and radios becoming standard equipment in automobiles, more than ever before, radio became a natural adjunct to newspapers and magazines as a source of information. In addition, phono-
graphs with either standard or "hi-fi" sound became the rage, and the sale of long-playing records ballooned, including recordings of the Mormon Tabernacle Choir. Above all, the middle decade of the twentieth century saw commercial television rapidly rise as a new communications medium.

In the wake of these developments, the positive image of typical Mormons that emanated from the periodical press was matched by the presence on the national scene of a considerable number of impressive or appealing Mormon personalities. Among them: Pulitzer Prize-winning author and columnist Jack Anderson, movie star Victor Jory, golfer Johnny Miller, swimsuit designer Rose Marie Reid, Michigan governor (and earlier, American Motors president) George Romney, U.S. Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson, and, much later, Donny, Marie, and the rest of the Osmond family.

The sweeping panorama of Mormon images across the century that emerges in a detailed study of American perceptions of the Saints from 1860 to 1960 reveals that the decade of the 1950s was one of pivotal media transition for the Mormons. As the years of that decade passed, attractive aural and visual images slowly started complementing and sometimes replacing the sharply defined and arguably more easily manipulated print portraits of the Saints. This change was rooted in the way American culture was rapidly turning information into a commodity that would become just as important to radio and television as entertainment. Since advertising became an appendage to both, these developments called for image management. That, in turn, made the work of public relations specialists important enough for the acronym "PR" to become part of the language. One consequence of the blurring of the line between news and entertainment, and the dramatic expansion of advertising, was that the content of paid promotions of everything from laundry soap to Latter-day Saints became a sub-genre that would henceforth have to be taken into account in all image studies.

Projecting a flattering Mormon image, which is part of their assignment, the LDS church's Public Communications Division was able to take marvelous advantage of the many new venues to tell the Mormon story. These same communications advances, however, made it impossible for me to base a post-1960 study of perceptions of the Saints entirely on material appearing in the periodical press, as my study of the century before 1960 had been. Yet doing that earlier study had made me acutely conscious of media presentations of the Saints, both print and electronic, so much so that I am able to make the following argument: if you take the electronic media into account, the decade or so between, say, 1963-1964 and 1975-76 forms a unique period in the history of perceptions of the Saints.

At this time, the LDS church had what Americans who embraced the civil rights movement regarded as a retrograde position on race. This position was noted and commented on in the print media, especially Time, Newsweek, the Christian Century, and elite newspapers on the East and West Coasts. But, interestingly, that encumbrance was usually overlooked in radio and television broadcasts. Almost as a reminder that the entire nation had not gone the way of the much-maligned, pot-smoking, flag-burning counterculture, they regularly featured all sorts of images of Mormons as neat, modest, virtuous, family-loving, conservative, and patriotic people. The contrast to the radical Left made the image of the Saints even more appealing than it had been in the '50s, making this a time when at least middle America's perceptions of the Saints would be overwhelmingly positive.

I am convinced that, in fact, the dramatic discrepancy between clean-cut Mormons and scruffy hippies completed the transformation of the Mormon image from the quasi-foreign, somewhat alien likeness that it had in the nineteenth century to the more than 100 percent super-American portrait of the late '60s and early '70s. The situation was such that it became...
looked as if the Latter-day Saints had little reason to anticipate much change in the salutary climate of opinion surrounding them. Many Saints were therefore shocked and appalled at the appearance in the late 1970s and the 1980s of a negative subtext in a surprising number of media presentations of the Saints and their church.

Sometimes that subtext even became text despite everything the Public Communications staff did to provide information to head off negative stories. Several critical 60 Minutes segments, for example, challenged the perpetually benign pictures of the Church and positive depictions of Mormons as Saints almost too perfect to be believed. A number of articles about the new polygamists were published, and documentaries that failed to make much distinction between the LDS church and its schismatic offshoots were aired on network television. The God Makers, a film ridiculing Mormon doctrine, was promoted by conservative Protestants who featured it in special services in many of their churches. And reputable and well-known presses published several handsome books designed to reveal Mormonism’s underside.

One of the traditional ways of disseminating the Mormon image was (and still is) Music and the Spoken Word, the weekly Sunday morning television broadcast from the “historic Tabernacle standing in Temple Square at the foot of the everlasting hills in Salt Lake City.” Typically, along with a well-known Mormon hymn and a classical selection, the weekly Tabernacle Choir broadcasts include performances of some of the American people’s best-loved inspirational music—some of it religious, some not. The spoken word is likewise inspirational, but generally so, with distinctive LDS doctrinal tenets either blurred or altogether missing. The effect is heart-warming, producing admiration for the performers and the people they epitomize. But however much this program elevates the spirit or motivates the observer, it reveals little or nothing about the idiosyncratic LDS doctrines that separate Mormonism from the historic forms of Christianity—Catholic, Protestant, and Orthodox.

It began as a radio broadcast in 1929, and one of the quite obvious aims of this program has always been to present an acceptable image of Mormonism to the nation. But like the images of practically everything else from the mid-twentieth century forward, by 1980, the Mormon image was not
transmitted simply through Tabernacle Choir performances and the publication of engaging articles in the periodical press. It was being attentively shaped by skilled LDS public relations professionals from whose offices issued a steady stream of press releases telling the world about the Church and its members. By 1980, many of these releases diminished the distance between the Latter-day Saints and other religious groups through telling stories of Mormons cooperating with other faith communities to deliver assistance during natural disasters and in times of human need.

Countless other press releases concentrated on LDS success by dealing in one way or another with Church growth: the organization of new Church units (branches, wards, and stakes) all across the nation and in many other parts of the world, the building of new temples, and the crossing of million-member markers.16 At the same time, Mormonism was becoming ever more visible. The LDS church had been practically invisible outside the West as long as LDS missions in the various regions of the United States had been housed in large (usually Victorian) mansions purchased for that purpose. In the mid-twentieth century, however, the Church emerged as part of the nation's religious landscape as LDS stake houses and ward chapels (most of them looking very much alike) were built in cities and towns all across the nation.17 To the surprise of many non-Mormons and the dismay of some, it suddenly seemed that Mormons were everywhere.

More disturbed about these developments than anyone else were members of new or recently revitalized conservative Protestant—evangelical, fundamentalist, and Pentecostal—bodies, a part of Christianity that was also growing rapidly. Leaders of these groups had long considered Mormonism to be one of four indigenous American “cults,” and when it started to outstrip the other three in both visibility and conversions, Mormons started to appear much more dangerous to them than did the Christian Scientists, Jehovah’s Witnesses, and Seventh-Day Adventists.18

What had been happening in the post–World War II era is that Mormons, evangelicals, and conservative Christians were all regarding the nation as a “field white already to harvest.” The problem was that workers from all these bodies were laboring in the same parts of the field. This competitive situation seems to have caused conservative Protestants to regard the success of Latter-day Saints as illegitimate.

One result of this rivalry for religious commitments was that a good market existed for anti-Mormon materials, the most spectacular of which turned out to be the aforementioned God Makers: The Mormon Quest for Godhood. This fifty-six-minute attack film (or video) and book with the same title and content transformed Mormon theology into a science-fiction scenario and accused the Mormons of not being Christian. Produced by Ed Decker and Dave Hunt with the assistance of Jerald and Sandra Tanner and other ex-Mormons, the stated purpose of the project was unmasking the “myth of Mormonism” by revealing everything about the Latter-day Saints “from Family Home Evening through the actual secret temple rituals.”19 The film and the book were both distributed by Utah Missions, Inc. (UMI), publishers of the Utah Evangel (now simply the Evangel), a newsprint periodical devoted to “Exposing Mormonism” by revealing everything about the Latter-day Saints “from Family Home Evening through the actual secret temple rituals.”19 Both the film and text versions of the God Makers were designed to advance UMI’s clearly stated goals of turning Mormons away from Mormonism, “winning them for the Lord,” and keeping potential LDS converts “from being deceived by the militant Mormon proselyting program.”21
HOW JAN SHIPLEYS WAS "CALLED" TO TRANSLATE MORMONISM

SUNSTONE EDITOR PEGGY STACK, née Fletcher, first put into words for me the dilemma the Hofmann story presented to news editors. Many of them soon realized that their crime reporters didn't know enough about Mormonism to cover the story properly, but they were afraid their religion reporters would not be able to satisfactorily describe what was happening because they didn't know enough about crime and about the legal maneuvering that immediately started after Hofmann was charged with murder.

I quickly learned that Peggy was right. I started getting requests from reporters for phone interviews only one day after Hofmann's arrest. This was probably because the University of Illinois Press had issued my Mormonism: The Story of a New Religious Tradition about six months before the Hofmann story broke and because reviews in the New York Times Book Review, the New York Review of Books, and elsewhere made much of my not being a Mormon. Subsequent telephone conversations revealed an abysmal lack of knowledge of Mormonism on the part of many of the journalists assigned to the story. For almost two weeks, I fielded so many calls from reporters all over the United States as well as from radio talk show hosts and television news researchers that several staff members at my university became convinced that I must be "somebody".*

Although most of the reporters who called had been in Salt Lake City long enough to have learned the identity of the first Mormon prophet, the great majority did not "speak Mormon" and needed a translator. Furthermore, most knew so little about the murderer's cultural and religious background and the religious significance of some of the forged items he had produced that I found myself endlessly repeating the introductory lecture on Mormonism that I had prepared for our religious studies department's "Introduction to Religion" courses.**

The calls have continued to come ever since.

DARKER SHADOWS
Revised assaults on Mormonism in the secular arena

These two volumes proved to be the precursors of a series of books that are best characterized as neo-nineteenth-century expose, a kind of expose that deals almost entirely with the secular side of Mormonism. The Mormon Corporate Empire clearly fits into this category. It was written by John Heinerman, a disillusioned Latter-day Saint, and Anson Shupe, a sociologist of good reputation who is best known for his earlier work on the Unification Church (the Moonies).*** With information gained from the public record and investigative reporting that some people regard as "unethical snooping" since sometimes involved misrepresentation on Heinerman's part, this work uses "chapter and verse" evidence to make the argument that the LDS church is first and foremost a money-generating enterprise whose leaders are more concerned about adding to the fabulous wealth of the LDS church than anything else.****

Six years later, Shupe would publish The Darker Side of Virtue: Corruption, Scandal, and the Mormon Empire, a work designed to show that "behind the ideal image promoted by the LDS church, a darker side of Mormonism exists." The dust jacket blurb continues, "The same Mormon ethos that has instilled many positive characteristics in its people has also led to dramatic instances of corruption, scandal, abuse of power, and even murder."*****

But long before Shupe's second work on Mormonism was published, a terrible Mormon tragedy precipitated what I have been calling sub-text into the headlines in both the print and electronic media. The Mark Hofmann saga catapulted the LDS...
The Mark Hofmann forgeries required a convergence of the religious and the secular, and the majority of individuals assigned to cover the story did not "speak Mormon" and needed translators.

church specifically and Mormonism generally into public view in a way that combined accusations about religious illegitimacy and secular mendacity.

While this is not the place to review the well-known Hofmann story, it is the place to point to how his forgeries and plagiarism—the production of spurious early Mormon documents, including the famed "Salamander letter," as well as holograph copies of such documents as Lucy Mack Smith's "Gospel Letter" which had only been available in printed form—and his subsequent murders of Steven Christensen and Kathy Sheets led to a convergence of the religious and the secular in multitudinous accounts of this gripping story. In the early news accounts, what had occurred was described as a secular story of murder and greed in which the protagonist simply happened to be a Mormon. When news organizations sent their crime reporters rather than their religion reporters to Salt Lake City to cover the story, however, those reporters soon realized that there was so much religion mixed up in the story that it could not be adequately covered without considerable familiarity with the LDS system of belief, Mormon history, and those who were writing that history.

The Hofmann story remained in the news long enough for most religion reporters to get a crack at it. It became the basis for five full-length books, three published by trade presses, one published by a university press, and another written and published by Jerald and Sandra Tanner. The first to be published was *Salamander: The Story of the Mormon Forgery Murders*. Written by Linda Sillitoe and Allen Roberts, both Latter-day Saints, this work presents the best balance of the secular and religious dimensions of this awful episode in the recent Mormon past. *A Gathering of Saints: A True Story of Money, Murder, and Deceit* was written by Robert Lindsey, a journalist who worked as a reporter and correspondent for the *New York Times* for twenty years. Well-written, this work reviews the Saints' trek from Iowa and their arrival in the Great Salt Lake Valley and alludes briefly to Mormon history where necessary. But Lindsey's narrative, which was published in 1988 by Simon and Schuster, has a secular cast. *Victims: The LDS Church and the Mark Hofmann Case*, written by the managing director of the LDS church Historical Department, gives more weight to the story's religious aspects than to its legal aspects. The author, Richard E. Turley Jr., was trained as a lawyer, and his account of the legal aspects of the story is clear and precise, but the main purpose of the work was getting in the record the part the Church played in the Hofmann story.

From the standpoint of the credibility of the picture of the Latter-day Saints and almost everything else, by far the worst of this quintet of books is the *Mormon Murders*, a work in which authors Steven Naifeh and Gregory White Smith made an implicit comparison between the forger Mark Hofmann who produced counterfeit documents and the Mormon prophet who produced the Book of Mormon. This widely advertised 1988 alternate Literary Guild selection was published in both hardcover and paperback. Featured in bookstores all across the nation, including airport bookstores where it became a popular choice for travel reading, the *Mormon Murders* not only told the story of Mark Hofmann, but also, according to the *Los Angeles Times* review quoted on the book cover, it contained "a rich trove of details about the deceit, lying, and covering up by top [Mormon] church leaders." Prominently displayed on the back of the Naifeh and Smith book was its authors' claim that Hofmann's forged documents rocked "the very foundation and legitimacy of the Mormon church and its multi-million-dollar empire." Although this claim was mistaken, the tales of intrigue regarding the Church's dealings with Hofmann as he produced one rare document after another, some of them threatening to discredit elements of the canonized story of the Mormon past, delivered a severe—though glancing—blow to the Mormon image.

Though glancing, the blow was fierce enough to spur
damage control, first in the form of a rare press conference in which Gordon B. Hinckley, Dallin H. Oaks, and Hugh W. Pinnock, LDS General Authorities who had met with or had had dealings with Hofmann, made statements and answered questions from dozens of reporters representing both local and national print and electronic media. Second, on 6 August 1987, after Hofmann had confessed and been imprisoned, a one-day, Church-sponsored public conference organized by the Joseph Fielding Smith Institute of Church History was held at Brigham Young University. Its purpose was to clear the air, to get the entire story on the record (including the part played by Dean C. Jessee, a scholar in the employ of the Church, and other Mormon historians in clearing up the mystery of the forged documents), and to assess how Hofmann’s forgeries might affect the way Mormon history would be written in the future.

Richard L. Bushman, author of Joseph Smith and the Beginnings of Mormonism, and I were asked to attend the conference, listen to the proceedings, and, at the end of the day, present our assessments of any enduring impact Hofmann’s plagiarism might have on how the story of Mormon beginnings would be told in the future. To some extent, this was an ironic assignment because the two of us had participated in the opening plenary session of the August 1984 Sunstone Symposium, which had included what may have been the first public allusion to and discussion of the text of the so-called White Salamander letter.35 Steven Christensen had issued a press release almost six months earlier (7 March 1984) acknowledging his ownership of a letter said to be from Martin Harris to William W. Phelps. In that announcement, Christensen described his plans for authentication procedures and a research project he had organized to study the letter and place it in context. But that press release did not give the text of the letter or a description of its contents.

The final speaker at the BYU conference was Dallin Oaks, who took that “opportunity to speak for the record on a number of issues that have been of immense interest to scholars, Church members, and the general public over the last several years.”36 His talk was important because it was the Church’s official answer to charges about alleged suppression of documents; its official explanation of how often and for what reasons Mark Hofmann gained interviews with Gordon B. Hinckley, the ranking member of the First Presidency, and with other Church officials; and an official clarification of which Hofmann documents the Church obtained through gift in contrast to purchases arranged by the Church’s Historical Department. The speech also factually clarified the Church’s role in the aborted effort to purchase the so-called McLellin collection so that it could be given to the Church. Oaks lamented the fact that during the whole Hofmann episode, members of the Church saw “some of the most intense LDS church-bashing since the turn of the century.”

He was absolutely correct about this negative media coverage, even though several writers in the audience who had been struggling for months to present the complicated story as accurately and evenhandedly as possible were outraged by his reference to Church-bashing.

I reviewed the national print media’s coverage of the Hofmann story and found that many reporters made a deliberate effort to convey the information necessary to make the story comprehensible without prejudice. But, in contrast to most of the local Utah coverage, national coverage contained an astonishing amount of innuendo associating Hofmann’s plagiarism with Mormon beginnings.37 Myriad reports alleged secrecy and cover-up on the part of LDS General Authorities, and several writers referred to the way in which a culture that rests on a found scripture is particularly vulnerable to the offerings of con artists.38

1990s: RECLAIMING THE GOLDEN AGE?

HAVING so many full-length books devoted to the Hofmann story gave it a surprisingly long media life. After a while, however, normalcy reasserted itself. The Church continued to grow by leaps and bounds. New temples were announced and built. Latter-day Saints rendered
assistance to people suffering from natural disasters. Attractive Mormons made heartening news in the political, sports, and entertainment arenas. Family values were in the ascendancy on the national agenda, and a positive shine once again appeared on the Mormon image.

Despite the persistent allegations of dissimulation on the part of early Mormon leaders embedded in the *Mormon Murders*, the Mormon image was sufficiently positive not to be smirched too much by the attacks in books written by Anson Shupe and by James Coates. Shupe's *Darker Side of Virtue* related tales of investment scams, rehearsed accusations of child sexual abuse against pillars of the Mormon community, and described a variety of other horrors. Moreover, using a strange and extraordinarily strained argument, Shupe also implied that the LDS church was at least complicit in causing the space shuttle Challenger disaster.

Coates, a reporter for the *Chicago Tribune*, authored *In Mormon Circles: Gentiles, Jack Mormons, and Latter-day Saints*, a book filled with superficial caricature and a surprising number of statements that sound authoritative but are inaccurate, unreliable, distorted, or just plain wrong. The book also contains a lot of material about what the author calls "the core LDS mysteries," provided mainly by Utah Lighthouse Ministry publications and Jerald and Sandra Tanner, as well as information about the new polygamy furnished by members of those groups. Both of these exposes include chapters on the Hoffman episode, but neither adds any new material.

What these books by Shupe and Coates—and similar books and articles—purport to do is reveal hidden truths about Mormonism. They claim to take the lid off LDS conspiracies, which, they contend, need to see the light of day. What they actually do is focus attention on questions of wealth and power, questions that, at base, are secular.

This focus may explain why these works, loaded as they are with scandalous material, seem to have had little discernible impact on the Mormon image in the 1990s, a decade in which the main agenda for media treatment of Saints has been the way Mormonism functions in the religious realm. Mark Silk, former columnist and member of the editorial board of the *Atlanta Constitution* who is now director of the Center for the Study of Religion in Public Life at Trinity College in Hartford, Connecticut, is perhaps right about the media's not being as worldly as most people suppose. In any event, the title of Silk's most recent book, *Unsecular Media*, captures his argument that the media is not a secular wasteland where attention paid to religion focuses on the way it impinges on the secular side of life. The principal coverage of Mormonism in the 1990s would generally suggest that Silk is on to something.

My review of what journalists have considered newsworthy about the Saints in recent years indicates that the topics of greatest interest have nearly all had to do with the religious dimensions of Mormonism. Just think about noteworthy events, occurrences, and happenings, the news of which has made its way out of the "Valley" in the 1990s. Apart from the decision that the 2002 Olympic Games will be held in Utah (and related stories) and the perennial hullabaloo about the continuing practice of plural marriage in Mormon country (about which more below), the principal subjects of national news stories that account for the contours of the modern Mormon image are stories about LDS missionary work; the changing of the wording in LDS temple rituals; the 1993 purge of dissident LDS intellectuals; the Church's activity in locating sites for, building, and dedicating temples; tenure cases at BYU (all of which seem to have religious overtones); the change in the LDS church logo; the baptizing for the dead of Holocaust victims; and the re-enactment of the pioneer trek.

Consideration of how these stories have been covered in both the print and electronic media provides some approximation of present-day perceptions of the Saints. But that approximation comes into sharper focus if it is set against that super-shaper of images in our nation nowadays: the portraits painted on 60 Minutes.

In 1996, the Easter Sunday *60 Minutes* program included a segment on the Latter-day Saints, which featured an extended interview with Church President Gordon B. Hinckley. In August that year, my analysis of this interview was published.
When I reviewed the national print media’s coverage of the Hofmann story, I found that Elder Dallin Oaks was absolutely correct that it had contained “some of the most intense LDS church-bashing since the turn of the century.”

in the Christian Century and reprinted in SUNSTONE. There, I pointed to “what Mike Wallace missed.” Of significance here is what the veteran newsman did not miss. While it is even more obvious to me now than at broadcast time that the recent transformation of Mormonism was almost entirely neglected by 60 Minutes, it is also clearer to me that whatever President Hinckley said, Wallace accepted as gospel. The engaging prophet embraced a narrow concept of the LDS faith and its adherents (sans polygamists), and he was satisfied to inform his audience that Latter-day Saints are attractive people, truly religious, and “not weird.”

In proper 60 Minutes fashion, Wallace tested the not weird assertion by asking President Hinckley questions about the wearing of ritual temple garments. But because the veteran interviewer and his program producer decided to use the words (and pictures) of Steve Young, Orrin Hatch, and Bill Marriott—three attractive, apparently truly religious, and certainly not weird Latter-day Saints who are clearly part of the American mainstream—to explain about the Saints living in a land of funny underwear, his discussion of this idiosyncratic religious practice had the effect of supporting rather than calling into question President Hinckley’s depiction of the Saints.

Rereading the transcript with a different set of analytic glasses allowed me to see that the 60 Minutes image of the Latter-day Saints was essentially a return to the Mormon image of the “golden age” of the ’50s and ’60s. As it happened, this program turned out to be a very public stand from which the LDS church president was able to broadcast his message that Latter-day Saints are ordinary people to whom family and faith mean a lot. But two things are quite different now from what they were thirty years ago.

First, back then the nation’s attention was focused on Vietnam. Thus, religious belief and practice seemed less important than one’s patriotism (or lack of it), one’s stand on war and civil rights, and so on. Second, in the mid-’60s and early ’70s, Latter-day Saints were still a religious minority—Americans, to be sure, but quaint ones. Many, perhaps a minority of the people in the U.S., thought of them as people like the Mennonites, the Moravians, or (as they took care of their own) the Jews. While few Americans continued to think of the Saints as foreign or even as very strange, Mormons were still “other”; however exemplary they might be, they were not quite “us.”

In the mid-twentieth century, the nature of the LDS belief system was not so much an issue for most Americans (fundamentalists, evangelicals, and Pentecostals excepted). What really mattered during that golden age was the obvious reality that Latter-day Saints were sincere about their beliefs.

At the 1998 Sunstone Symposium, two journalism scholars from the University of Iowa presented a very interesting paper describing how the media started constructing the Latter-day Saints as a “model minority” in the middle years of the twentieth century. I am not calling into question what Chiung Hwang Chen and Ethan Yorgason said in their paper. Indeed, I perfectly agree with them that the media did exactly that, particularly in the ’60s and ’70s. Moreover, as these scholars demonstrated, even in many of the presentations of Mormonism in recent years, including the 1997 Time magazine cover story, the Latter-day Saints continue to be set apart as a model minority.

As such, the Saints are mostly admirable; they work hard, have wonderful families, and care for each other. But—and this is a qualifier that is nearly always present in substantial stories about the Saints—their alternative belief system leads not only to novel worship practices but also opens the way for the Church hierarchy to exercise authoritarian oversight over everything from the intellectual lives of Church members to the Church’s vast and, reflecting steadily escalating tithing revenue, expanding business and real estate holdings.

A close reading of the contemporary media picture suggests, however, that this practice of picturing the Saints as a model minority is gradually being superseded. The clearly discernible reason is that the Latter-day Saints no longer live in a self-contained culture, protected from the rest of the world by a mountain barrier. They reside on every continent and in countries all over the globe. Moreover, in the United States, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints is one of the nation’s largest ecclesiastical institutions. While there are still more Catholics, Baptists, Methodists, and Lutherans than Latter-day Saints in the United States, there are more Latter-day Saints now than Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Disciples of Christ, or members of the United Church of Christ; that is, members of churches that historically stood at the very heart of the American Protestant mainstream.

The change becomes very obvious when one consults the
CBS journalist Mike Wallace and President Gordon B. Hinckley in a photo-op for a 1997 60 Minutes segment

Although Mike Wallace gave the Church the protective tolerance that minorities ordinarily receive, the Church is losing its minority status and will face increased media scrutiny.

Lexis-Nexis database (today's version of the Reader's Guide). I discovered this change while preparing an article about the way the mainstream media handled the Southern Baptist Convention held in Salt Lake City in June 1998. I assumed I would be able to save time by calling up Lexis-Nexis references to Latter-day Saints/Mormons/Mormonism in the nation's twenty largest newspapers for the period between 31 May and 30 June 1998 to find out what journalists were saying about the situation. I was wrong. Separating what I describe above as major stories—stories, mostly syndicated, that are reprinted in a large number of newspapers—from local news of Latter-day Saints in every large city in the nation is a tedious task. It is equally difficult to separate the major news stories in regional newspapers. There is simply too much information being published about what local Latter-day Saints are doing (speaking at the Kiwanis Club, coaching Little League teams, winning beauty contests, sitting on school boards, being fined for speeding on the way to church, and so on) for members of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints to retain their status as a "model minority." Unquestionably, Mormonism is rapidly losing the protection of minority religious status.

AS THE CENTURY TURNS

Mormonism is losing its minority status; consequently the media is likely to be less tolerant of evasive statements.

This loss is no small matter. As long as the media set Mormonism apart, the Church's distinctive doctrines could be (and have been) cloaked in what I have come to think of as LDS atonement discourse, a form of conversation and even sermonizing that asserts and emphasizes the critical importance of Christ's dying for humanity without going forward to specify how this atoning act is connected to the "fullness of the gospel." Most especially, atonement discourse fails to link the Atonement to that part of the "plan of salvation" that involves progression toward godhood, a topic President Hinckley and other Mormon leaders have been reluctant to discuss with the media.

Furthermore, as long as the media treated the Saints in holistic fashion, it was not simply divergent doctrines separating Mormonism from traditional Christianity that could be protected with rhetorical barricades. Something as countercultural as the so-called new polygamy, which has been vigor-
ously proscribed by the LDS church but tolerated within the Mormon community, could be shielded, at least partially, from public view. In much the same manner that large extended families sometimes manage to keep pushing a skeleton back into the family closet, as long as the Saints remained a minority, their tacit acceptance of the practice of plural marriage in the LDS culture region did not become a scandal. Renewed practice of plural marriage flourished for decades within the larger LDS community without calling forth much police action or generating widespread media coverage. Even when exposés of this new polygamy appeared in books, magazines, newspapers, and television, successful efforts to distance the Church and its members from those engaging in plural marriage resulted in a diminution of media interest in the subject.

Things may be changing, however. The Church itself has refused to sanction plural marriage for almost a century, of course. But now, a century later, since plural relationships have been tied in certain cases to the victimization of women and children and possible abuse of welfare funds and other governmental resources, what had been tolerable in the Mormon culture region for the past half-century will probably become less acceptable in the future. The government of Utah, whose executive, legislative, and judicial offices are overwhelmingly filled with Latter-day Saints, can be said to reflect LDS culture, and pressure is likely to increase on the state government—and, by extension, the culture—to find some means of dealing with what is increasingly defined as a problem. This is but one indication that the Latter-day Saints no longer have minority religious status and that what goes on within the LDS community is no longer protected from the inquiring minds of the general public.

What happened in the summer of 1997 when the re-enactment of the 1847 Mormon trek became a subject of widespread news coverage is a less obvious but more pregnant indication of the emerging situation in which what Latter-day Saints believe and what they and their leaders say and do is likely to become grist for the media mill. This trek re-enactment was not a Mormon PR ploy or even a Church activity orchestrated by the LDS priesthood and Relief Society. Initiated by trail buffs, many of them non-Mormon, re-enactment fever caught on at the LDS grassroots, giving the event a kind of energy it might otherwise have lacked. For all that, through its Public Affairs Department, the Church took advantage of the trek’s sesquicentennial by creating a professional and extremely attractive CD-ROM file covering both the trek and modern Mormonism. This CD, titled Faith in Every Footstep: 150 Years of Mormon Pioneers, was distributed to the media in much the same manner that news releases are scattered abroad. It generated a great deal of media interest, and, perhaps because of a date hook (24 July was the hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Saints’ entry in the Salt Lake Valley), articles about the re-enactment and the Church appeared in newspapers and magazines all over the country within a brief time. In addition to the print media blitz, the trek and modern Mormonism were covered in substantial radio and television presentations, including segments on the ABC’s World News Tonight and on PBS’s NewsHour with Jim Lehrer.

Since I appeared in both these segments, I was close enough to their preparation to report that in both cases, the producers were very aware of the extent to which, by its very cooperation, the Public Affairs department hoped to shape—not control, shape—the content of these segments. It seems to me, also, that by providing accurate information and access to President Hinckley and other LDS leaders, Public Affairs personnel did so to a considerable extent.

Yet these presentations of the Saints were not shaped as they might have been if the ABC and PBS producers had followed Mike Wallace and been willing to construct the Mormons as a model minority. Aware of the large membership growth of the Church in recent years, neither producer treated the Saints as a religious minority, and that loss of minority religious status deprived the Saints of the protective tolerance that minorities ordinarily receive, especially regarding what they believe. In both segments, an idiosyncratic element of Mormon belief moved to the fore. In the ABC segment, Peggy Weymeyer described Mormonism’s understanding of itself as Christian, but gently called that into question for many viewers by focusing on the LDS belief about eternal progression toward godhood. The NewsHour devoted a considerable proportion of its segment to Gail Houston, a BYU English professor who had answered questions about the Saints’ belief in “heavenly mother” in her classes and the way her willingness to do so figured in her failure to gain tenure. In so doing, the producer (who, in this instance, was also the interviewer) directed attention not only to the LDS acceptance of a female deity but also to the clear preference of the Church authorities for keeping this part of the LDS belief system under wraps. The loss of the protection that minority status afforded is extremely important. On the one hand, the Saints will benefit because the LDS image will inevitably gain nuance if something other than their sincerity is featured. If the real version of their beliefs, rather than a caricatured one, becomes subject to media coverage, Latter-day Saints will no longer be stick figures capable of being captured in cartoons as they were in the nineteenth century. Even the two-dimensional characters of the second half of the twentieth century will no longer serve.

On the other hand, the Saints will have to pay the cost of that change. Just as members of the Roman Catholic community have to live with their church’s position on women’s access to the priesthood, the anti-intellectualism of the Roman Curia, and the church’s silencing of the theologian Hans Küng and the ethicist Charles Curran, so members of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (whether they are called Mormons, Latter-day Saints, or Mormon Christians) will have to defend themselves against—or glory in—being a part of a church in which women have no access to the priesthood, a good portion of the Church leadership adopts an anti-intellectual stance, and some BYU professors will fail to get tenure for theological reasons.

In 1989, President Hinckley told the media that with more than 99 percent of his sheep safely in the fold, where the others are does not really matter. In the 60 Minutes interview,
Because it is proving difficult for many in the media, especially outside the United States, to separate Salt Lake City from the Church, stories such as the Olympic bribery scandal are having a negative effect on LDS perceptions.

he responded to a question about the Mormon practice of plural marriage by saying “that was then; this is now.” Such dismissive statements worked better when the media constructed Mormons as a model minority. As Church membership continues to expand, things like the excommunication of intellectuals, collectively known as the September Six, will become far more significant—and not just to members of the faith. The same is true about Mormonism’s distinctive beliefs, which are bound to receive increased scrutiny.

WELCOMING THE WORLD
Never again will there be a single Mormon image.

Because this change will provide greater subtlety in coverage and image, in the long run it will probably be a blessing to the LDS church and its members. As the change is taking place, however, the Mormon image is less than fixed. What that image will become in the new millennium is by no means clear. Moreover, things are changing so rapidly that as studies in perception go forward, I suspect that soon it will not be legitimate (or even possible) to delineate the Mormon image. Despite the “cookie-cutter effect” of “correlation,” a carefully elaborated program that sets one world-wide standard for LDS belief and behavior, never again is there likely to be a single Mormon image. It is much more probable that along with nuance will come multiple images of the Latter-day Saints.

It is equally likely that these multiple images will be shaped as much by what goes on within Mormonism all across the world as by what occurs in the traditional Mormon culture region. This multiplicity of images is also likely to be viewed in multiple ways. Already, this viewing appears to be happening as a result of the scandal that erupted over strategies used by the Salt Lake Organizing Committee to secure the city’s selection as the site of the 2002 Winter Olympic Games. Despite revelations that the Utah capital is by no means the only city whose representatives employed questionable tactics in efforts to be chosen as an Olympic site, because the story of Olympic influence peddling first came crashing down on the city that is the Mormon center place, the actions of the SLOC were depicted as particularly shocking.49

Even so, this sad story is having a differential impact in Utah and elsewhere in the Intermountain West, the remainder of the United States, and the rest of the world. In the traditional Mormon culture region, the involvement of individual Latter-day Saints in unacceptable (and perhaps illegal) efforts to curry the favor of Olympic Committee members was a prominent feature of the coverage of the scandal, and there was considerable speculation about whether the Church itself might somehow have been involved. But what happened in this instance in the very heart of Mormondom did not become a major Mormon story in the remainder of the nation; there it was a Salt Lake City story, not a Mormon story.

Outside the United States, however, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints and Salt Lake City are so completely identified as the same that efforts to separate these two quite separate entities is proving exceedingly difficult. The motivations of the Saints who were involved were probably more firmly rooted in their desire to improve the city’s economic and civic life than in providing their church with an opportunity to be in the worldwide media spotlight for two full weeks. But in news reports overseas, if attempts to distance the institution (and Mormonism generally) from the actions of individual Church members are being made, they are not keeping this story from reflecting negatively on the LDS church. How the image of the Saints will come across during the games themselves is an open question.

It is clear, however, that the Church’s First Presidency wants to make sure that the institution they lead is not called the Mormon Church. A 23 February 2001 letter placed on the Church’s website instructs the media as well as Church members to use the full name of the Church the first time it is mentioned. Journalists are warned that the Church prefers that not only “Mormon Church,” but also “LDS Church” and “Latter-day Saint Church” not be used. Whether the media will comply with their wishes is uncertain.

What is not in doubt is that, whatever their character, during the 2002 Olympics, images of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints and its members will appear as often on the Internet as in the print and electronic media—the addition of yet another new format. Already such developments are taking place, and they will pose new challenges for researchers trying to figure out what people think about the Saints and what their images are. I made a good-faith effort to analyze what those images were in the print media in the nine-
teenth century and first half of the twentieth and to describe what happened to the Mormon image with the shift from the print medium to the era of print and electronic media. But I had better leave the tracking of LDS images in the new Internet-driven media environment to scholars who are not as superannuated as I am.

To comment on this essay, or to read comments by others, visit our website: <www.Sunstoneonline.com>.

NOTES

1. Andrew Hamilton, "Those Amazing Mormons," Coronet 31 (April, 1952): 26-30. The editors of Coronet decided to publish this article written by a Latter-day Saint even though they received a devastating pre-publication critique from LDS philosopher Sterling McMurrin, then Dean of University College at the University of Utah. The article had been sent to McMurrin for review. His reservations ranged from what he described as inaccuracies in the historical portions of the manuscript to the romanticized picture of contemporary Mormonism it presented. An extended exchange of letters between McMurrin and the Coronet editors is contained in the McMurrin Papers, Special Collections Division, Marriott Library, University of Utah, Salt Lake City.


4. A particular example of promotion paid for by the LDS church that has to be taken into account in any study of the LDS image during this period is the series of eight-page inserts included in the Reader's Digest in the late 1970s and early 1980s. The figure most often cited as the estimated cost for these paid advertisements is $12 million. The extent to which these inserts were image constructions is one of the main points of an extended critique of LDS image-making written by Sunstone editor Peggy Fletcher, "A Light unto the World: Image Building Is Anathema to Christian Living," Sunstone, July 1982, 17-23.


6. "Marketing the Mormon Image: An Interview with Wendell J. Ashton," Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought 10 (spring 1977): 13-20. Initially organized in 1972 as the External Communications Department, the public communications arm of the Church was given the official title Public Communications Department in 1973. Ten years later the department was merged with the Special Affairs Department and renamed Public Communications Special Affairs. In 1991, the department's name was again changed, this time to Public Affairs. (I am grateful to Don LeFevre for this information about what the department worked for has been called over the years.)

7. The "Homefront" series of public announcements for radio and television that were created in the early 1970s and started being broadcast soon thereafter added immeasurably to this perception of the Saints.

8. Although the policy regarding the way members of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints ought to be described by themselves and others was articulated absolutely in the press release that accompanied the adoption in 1995 of a new logo emphasizing the LDS church's understanding of itself as a Christian church, the effort to replace "Mormon" with "Latter-day Saint" goes back at least to the 1960s. Likely, this earlier attempt at nomenclature adjustment was an effort to distance LDS church members from modern polygamists. (Further changes in nomenclature were announced on 23 February 2001. See end of article.)

9. Chief among this group were Jerold and Sandra Tanner who, in the mid-1960s, established the Modern Microfilm Co. (now the Utah Lighthouse Ministry) as an outlet for mimeographed materials, pamphlets, a newsletter, and, eventually, books. Many of their publications include early Mormon documents that make it obvious that the Mormonism of the second half of the twentieth century differs, sometimes dramatically, from the LDS movement in its early years. They have also noted the changes that have been made in the book. Moderate Mormons have published the purported-to-be-secret LDS temple rituals. Generally, the Tanners have been a thorn in the side of the Church as well as a boon to historians of early Mormonism. Their most famous publication is probably Mormonism: Shadow or Reality? In the bookstore they maintain in Salt Lake City, they not only sell their own works, but also the works of others. Like the bookstores' proprietors, many of the authors of the works sold by the Tanners seem interested in making the case that Mormonism is by no means all that it claims to be.

10. A good account of Utah's International Women's Year Convention in 1977 and the Special Affairs Committee organized by the LDS church to oppose ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment is found in Linda Sillitoe, A History of Salt Lake County, Utah Centennial County History Series (Salt Lake City: Utah State Historical Society, 1986), 231-38.

11. Although the interpretation being put forward here might appear to be directly at odds with Dennis L. Lythgoe's picture of a change from a negative image of Mormonism when the 1950s are compared with the 1960s (and beyond), this disagreement is more apparent than real since his analysis was based entirely on the print medium and this one is an effort to go beyond the print media to take the electronic media and the LDS church's paid and unpaid advertising into account.

12. More than once, Mike Wallace or some other 60 Minutes correspondent charged Mormonism with being more concerned about increasing its fabulous wealth than about caring for the members of the LDS community, and Mormon women in Lowell, Wyoming, were once accused of mourning a conspiracy that destroyed the practice of the town's most prominent physician and brought about his imprisonment in the state penitentiary.


14. Jeremiah Films was the producer of this movie/video which was apparently intended for rental or purchase by churches and church groups. Compared to the $7 cost of a book with the same name published in 1989 by Harvest House in Eugene, Oregon, the cost of the film was substantial: the rental fee was $87 and the original cost of a videocassette was $175.

15. Simon and Schuster issued Peter Bart's Thy Kingdom Come in 1981; G.P. Putnam issued Prophet of Blood: The Untold Story of Brigham Young in 1989; William Mann's biographical study of Joseph Smith was issued by Doubleday in 1986; John Mark McElwee's biography of Brigham Young was published by Holt in 1987; and Greg Boyd's biography of Joseph Smith was published by Grand Rapids: Zondervan in 1989.

16. By 1980, church membership that had been less than 1 million at the end of World War II had soared to more than 4.5 million (4,633,000). Since 1945, stakes had been organized for the first time in Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wisconsin. In the nation's capital, a spectacular new Mormon temple had been built. an open house held, and more than three-quarters of a million people attended the open house before the temple was dedicated. During the sesquicentennial year, the Seattle temple was also dedicated.


19. The quotations are from an advertisement for the God Makers.

20. UMI was started in 1954 by John L. Smith, a Southern Baptist minister who had served seventeen years in Utah.


22. The God Makers galvanized a rapid and direct rebuttal in the form of a book, The Truth about the God Makers. This page-by-page, line-by-line response was prepared by Gilbert W. Scharffs, who taught courses at the LDS Institute of Religion adjacent to the University of Utah. Brought out in 1986 by Publishers Press, a Salt Lake City printer, it was not an official Church publication.

shows directed attention to the practice of modern plural marriage with segments featuring the work of investigative journalists who interviewed some of the men and women involved.

25. Beacon Press is a reputable publisher of books on religion. A revised and updated version of this work was published in 1992 as Wealth and Power in American Zion. It was issued by the E. Mellen Press, a reputable but far less visible publisher.

26. In a public exchange that occurred in one of the special seminars on American religion convened by the religious studies department at Indiana University in Bloomington during the 1980–90 academic year, I told Anson Shupe that it seemed to be common knowledge at Salt Lake City that Heinerman had misrepresented himself to gain information. Shupe acknowledged that this had been necessary in some cases. He went on to recount how he and a colleague had earlier misrepresented themselves to find out what they wanted to know about the “Moonies.” Contending that the need for information to expose what is really going on inside a religious community legitimatized the necessity for a researcher to pretend to be someone he/she was not, he used a “higher law” argument to defend such misrepresentation.


28. A local publication, *Indianapolis Woman*, published a profile of me in June 1986 (17–19). Written by Barbara I. Waldsmith, who worked as the editorial assistant for the *Journal of the Early Republic*, then housed at IUPUI, it opened this way: “The telephone rings again as soon as she hangs up the receiver. She answers in half a ring. ‘This is Jan Shupe.’ On the other end of the line might be a reporter for the Indianapolis *Star*, *Time* Newsweek, the Miami Herald, the Christian Science Monitor, or one of a dozen other magazines and newspapers. If there is anything new in the world of Mormonism—and lately there has been a lot—Jan Shupe is the person people are calling.”

29. Over the next decade I kept working on this lecture which I thought of as “An Introduction to the Latter-day Saints.” Eventually it became the basis for the entry on Mormonism in the 1997 edition of the *Encyclopedia Americana*, thirty vols. (Danbury, Conn: Grolier, Inc.) 19: 437–460. This is the entry on Mormonism in the “on-line” version of the *Americana* as well.

30. This work was published in 1988 in Salt Lake City by Signature Books, a publishing house which has gone on to issue many important volumes about Mormon history and Mormonism generally, as well as a few volumes that do not touch on Mormonism directly. Because Signature includes on its list many works that call parts of the canonized version of the LDS story into question, some Latter-day Saints regard it as an anti-Mormon press. I am convinced this is a mistake. I see it as an independent press whose willingness to publish alternative interpretations of the Mormon experience has provided a richer picture of the LDS past than would otherwise be available without it.

31. His book, which was published by the University of Illinois Press in 1992, is set apart from the others by the fact that Turley had access to the journals and other records kept by the members of the Church hierarchy who had dealings with Hoffman during his years as a dealer in (supposed) historical documents.

32. The connection was not lost on reviewers. For example, a blurb on the back of the book quotes a Chicago Tribune review noting the work as “a fine study of detailed police and legal work; of the intricacies of the rare document industry, including the mechanics of forgery; and the development of the Mormon church.”


34. Michael Austin, “Troped by the Mormons: The Persistence of 19th-Century Mormon Stereotypes in Contemporary Detective Fiction” *Sunstone*, Aug., 1998, 51–71, classifies the works under the tragic Hoffman episode by Silbtoe and Roberts, Lindsey, and Neil and Smith as “true-crime novels.” His rationale for doing so is the extent to which the Latter-day Saints in them are “constructed” as nineteenth-century Mormon stereotypes. This classification is very appropriate for *The Mormon Murders*, less appropriate for *A Gathering of Saints*, and not appropriate at all for *Salamander* or for * Victims*.

35. In view of what happened later, it makes sense to put into the record the way that plenary session came about. Since Steven Christensen was a member of the Sunstone Board, Peggy Fletcher, the *Sunstone* editor, had hoped to open the symposium with a session on the Salamander letter somewhat analogous to the opening plenary session of the 1980 meeting of the Mormon History Association in Canandaigua, New York, in which Daniel Buchman had projected the text of Hoffman’s supposed Anthon transcript onto a screen. When Christensen and the scholars assigned to the research project to set the Salamander letter in context agreed that such a session would be premature, Fletcher turned to Richard Bushman, author of *Joseph Smith and the Beginnings of Mormonism*, Valeen Tippetts Avery, a coauthor of *Mormon Enigma*, a new biography of Emma Smith, and me. (My book, *Mormonism: The Story of a New Religious Tradition*, was then still in press, but its publication was imminent.) Organizing the symposium occupied several sessions of the conference, with presentations of twenty-minute presentations in which we would outline any new information about Joseph Smith and Mormon origins we had uncovered or new insights we had gained as we wrote our books.

Although Avery and her coauthor Linda Newell had used several documents Hoffman had produced in the writing of their biography of Emma Smith, Avery made no references to any of them in her presentation. Bushman made oblique allusions to the Salamander letter and an 1825 money-digging agreement, transcripts of both of which were circulating among the historians of Mormonism attending the symposium. His transparent purpose in doing so was warning the Saints who made up most of the audience not to be unduly disturbed by new evidence that was shortly to come forth. Although I made no reference to the Salamander letter in the manuscript of my book, I had access to a transcript of it before my book went to press. In my remarks I said that I had seen only a typescript, but that if the holograph proved genuine, it would likely lead to the same sort of investigation of magic at the beginnings of the Mormon movement that Mormon Smith and others had been doing on the place of magic in the beginnings of Christianity. Since John Dart, a religion reporter for the Los Angeles Times who was attending the Sunstone Symposium that year, had written a book about Christian beginnings, he found my suggestion intriguing. He asked for a copy of my paper and subsequently wrote an article about the session that contained the first major news story alluding directly to the text of the Salamander letter. When Hofmann spoke to me after the session program was over, he asked where I had obtained a transcript of the letter, and he made it very clear to me that he was not pleased that I had mentioned the letter’s content in my remarks.

36. This talk was published in *Erosion*, Oct. 1987, 63–69.

37. The rise of the talk show phenomenon roughly coincided with the murders Hofmann committed. As a result, the Hofmann story became grist for radio talk shows, especially in the West. These were open to the wildest sort of speculation on the actions of the LDS Church in the entire Hofmann episode. While reviewing them for content is impossible, I was at the other end of the phone line on several of these shows. If the questions I was asked were at all typical, much talk-show conversation was animated by an astonishing level of suspicion on the part of those who posed call-in questions regarding conspiracy at the highest levels of the Church designed to keep the ‘truth’ about the Mormon past from coming out.

38. It is not without significance that *Refiner’s Fire*, John Brooks’s study of Mormon beginnings that emphasizes the significance of the occult to early Mormons, was—at least to some extent—generated by the Hofmann episode. Although he said that he came to understand fairly early on that the Salamander letter was a forgery, Brooks, the author of a prize-winning book on American colonial history, once told me that the text of that letter was one of several reasons why he decided to undertake a study of how Mormonism came into existence and why it succeeded. In any event, the final chapter of *Refiner’s Fire* alleges that Mormons are unduly susceptible to scams of various sorts, something that, at least by implication, Brooks connects to a non-rational acceptance of the truth of LDS dogma. See John Brooks, *Refiner’s Fire: The Making of the Mormon Cosmology*. 1644–1844 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

39. The malfunctioning of O-rings that were manufactured by Thiokol Chemical Corporation at its Wasatch Division in Brigham City, Utah, was pinpointed as the cause of the Challenger explosion. Shupe accepted the argument for The MormonEmpire (Buffalo, New York: Prometheus Books, 1991).

40. The malfunctioning of O-rings that were manufactured by Thiokol Chemical Corporation at its Wasatch Division in Brigham City, Utah, was pinpointed as the cause of the Challenger explosion. Shupe accepted the argument for The Mormon Empires series. But Shupe took the argument further, charging, in effect, that the tragedy was the result of a Mormon conspiracy involving Fletcher, Senator Frank E. Moss, chair of the Senate’s Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee; and N. Eldon Tanner, a member of the First Presidency of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

Pointing to an exchange of letters between Fletcher and Moss that his co-author John Heinerman for *The Mormon Corporate Empire* had found in the Moss papers in the Special Collections Division of the Marriott Library at the University of Utah, Shupe said that even though Fletcher knew (or should have known) that using Thiokol’s O-rings would be dangerous, he let the contract for O-rings go to Thiokol because the LDS church wanted business for Utah. Shupe alleged that proof of this sinister conspiracy is found in an exchange of correspondence between Fletcher and Moss, especially a 23 February 1973 letter from Fletcher
as far as helping give the Utah economy a boost. Fletcher also complained to Moss that an unnamed member of the Senator's staff had taken it upon himself to tell Fletcher that he had a "moral if not spiritual obligation" to give the contract to Thirkol since a member of the LDS First Presidency was anxious for the Utah company to have the business. Fletcher asked Moss to tell the staff member that he was out of line in suggesting that a Mormon government bureaucrat's Church membership took precedence over his government responsibilities. Shupe used Fletcher's account of denying help to President Tanner and his asking Senator Moss to warn his staff member off as proof that his church was exerting undue influence on Fletcher.

Heinerman, whose photocopy of the 23 February letter was made with permission, supplied a copy to Shupe. Shupe supports his conviction that he was right about there being a conspiracy with the fact that this particular letter disappeared from the Moss papers. To further support the conspiracy notion, Heinerman informed Shupe that the entry for the Moss-Fletcher correspondence had been expunged from the register of the Moss papers in the Special Collections section of the university's Library. This might well be. But as no specific reference was made to correspondence between Moss and Fletcher in the Register of the Papers of Frank E. Moss which the library published in 1980, this must have involved the removal of some sort of interlaced entry describing the contents of either a box of materials about NASA in the Moss collection or a box of "Miscellaneous Correspondence." In any event, the disappearance of this letter led Shupe to the highly unlikely conclusion that a member of the Special Collections staff at the University of Utah either hid or destroyed the letter to protect the LDS church. Failing to consider the possibility of misfiling after photocopying or some other innocent explanation, Shupe then read the presumed destruction of the letter as evidence of additional conspiracy and asserted that the disappearance of this letter from Fletcher to Moss was, as he said in the Darker Side of Virtue (160) a deliberate effort to purge the public record of "smoking guns pointing to the [Mormon church's] responsibility for the booster rocket scandal."


42. This does not take into account the Salt Lake City Olympic scandal. Since this city was founded by the Latter-day Saints and is best known as the headquarters of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, this has to be counted as a story connected to Mormonism. Yet it has not gained much traction as a religion story. From the national perspective, it seems to fit in with the stories about secular aspects of the city that have been much in the news in recent years, especially accounts of the successes or failures of the Utah Jazz NBA basketball team and reports of skiing at Park City, Alta, Snowbird, and other nearby resorts, as well as stories about the area being an Intermountain Silicon Valley.

43. SUNSTONE used the title I gave to this piece, "What Mike Wallace Missed," but as originally published in the Christian Century, 14-21 Aug. 1996, 784-87, it was called "Mormon Metamorphosis: The Neglected Story."


45. Published on 4 August 1997, this story—now how much expanded—has become the basis of Richard N. Ostling and Joan K. Ostling, Mormon America (San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 1999). Richard Ostling was one of the authors of the Time story.


47. I have talked with many Latter-day Saints, and not just "Sunstone types," who agree that President Hinckley "shocked many Mormons when [during a 1998 interview] he was asked if Mormons really believe God was once a man [and he] replied, 'I wouldn't say that. . . . That gets into some deep theology we don't know very much about.'" San Francisco Chronicle, 6 June 1998, B6. Reprinted in SUNSTONE, Sept. 1997, 66-67.

48. One of the consequences of the presence of these schismatic groups in the Mormon culture region is a heated—and to non-Mormons extremely interesting—debate about whether members of these schismatic groups who accept the Book of Mormon and regard Joseph Smith as the founder of their faith communities deserve to be called what they call themselves, that is, Mormons. See an exchange about this issue between Reed Neil Olsen and Thomas G. Alexander in the "Letters to the Editor" sections of Dialogue 31 (spring 1998): 10-12 and 31 (fall 1998): 11-12. There is a certain irony in all such discussions since Latter-day Saints who argue against allowing the Mormon tent to cover believers who, according to the LDS church, are not orthodox also argue that the Christian tent should cover Latter-day Saints. Yet, according to many traditional Christian bodies, Latter-day Saints are not orthodox Christians. Alexander tries to remove himself from the horns of this dilemma by noting that (1) by practicing plural marriage, which is the defining characteristic of the new polygamists, they are breaking civil law, (2) members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints are no longer permitted to break the civil laws, and (3) the new polygamists should therefore not be regarded as Mormon.

49. It is important to note that minority status afforded a certain amount of protection even in the nineteenth century when LDS belief was often either ridiculed or described as heresy and LDS behavior was described as criminal. As long as they remained behind the "mountain curtain," the Saints parried nearly every accusation with references to Constitutional guarantees of freedom of religion. When the press shifted over from constructing the LDS community as a dangerous minority to constructing it as a model minority, the right to privacy became their protective shield.

50. Utah's Governor Michael Leavitt has tried to make a silk purse out of this particular sow's ear by suggesting that what happened was a blessing in disguise: Latter-day Saints would be able to see to their own defensive shield. As long as they remained behind the "mountain curtain," they would be able to see to their own defensive shield.

51. I have talked with many Latter-day Saints, and not just "Sunstone types," who agree that President Hinckley "shocked many Mormons when [during a 1998 interview] he was asked if Mormons really believe God was once a man [and he] replied, 'I wouldn't say that. . . . That gets into some deep theology we don't know very much about.'" San Francisco Chronicle, 6 June 1998, B6. Reprinted in SUNSTONE, Sept. 1997, 66-67.

52. This does not take into account the Salt Lake City Olympic scandal. Since this city was founded by the Latter-day Saints and is best known as the headquarters of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, this has to be counted as a story connected to Mormonism. Yet it has not gained much traction as a religion story. From the national perspective, it seems to fit in with the stories about secular aspects of the city that have been much in the news in recent years, especially accounts of the successes or failures of the Utah Jazz NBA basketball team and reports of skiing at Park City, Alta, Snowbird, and other nearby resorts, as well as stories about the area being an Intermountain Silicon Valley.

53. SUNSTONE used the title I gave to this piece, "What Mike Wallace Missed," but as originally published in the Christian Century, 14-21 Aug. 1996, 784-87, it was called "Mormon Metamorphosis: The Neglected Story."


55. Published on 4 August 1997, this story—now how much expanded—has become the basis of Richard N. Ostling and Joan K. Ostling, Mormon America (San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 1999). Richard Ostling was one of the authors of the Time story.


57. I have talked with many Latter-day Saints, and not just "Sunstone types," who agree that President Hinckley "shocked many Mormons when [during a 1998 interview] he was asked if Mormons really believe God was once a man [and he] replied, 'I wouldn't say that. . . . That gets into some deep theology we don't know very much about.'" San Francisco Chronicle, 6 June 1998, B6. Reprinted in SUNSTONE, Sept. 1997, 66-67.

58. One of the consequences of the presence of these schismatic groups in the Mormon culture region is a heated—and to non-Mormons extremely interesting—debate about whether members of these schismatic groups who accept the Book of Mormon and regard Joseph Smith as the founder of their faith communities deserve to be called what they call themselves, that is, Mormons. See an exchange about this issue between Reed Neil Olsen and Thomas G. Alexander in the "Letters to the Editor" sections of Dialogue 31 (spring 1998): 10-12 and 31 (fall 1998): 11-12. There is a certain irony in all such discussions since Latter-day Saints who argue against allowing the Mormon tent to cover believers who, according to the LDS church, are not orthodox also argue that the Christian tent should cover Latter-day Saints. Yet, according to many traditional Christian bodies, Latter-day Saints are not orthodox Christians. Alexander tries to remove himself from the horns of this dilemma by noting that (1) by practicing plural marriage, which is the defining characteristic of the new polygamists, they are breaking civil law, (2) members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints are no longer permitted to break the civil laws, and (3) the new polygamists should therefore not be regarded as Mormon.

59. It is important to note that minority status afforded a certain amount of protection even in the nineteenth century when LDS belief was often either ridiculed or described as heresy and LDS behavior was described as criminal. As long as they remained behind the "mountain curtain," the Saints parried nearly every accusation with references to Constitutional guarantees of freedom of religion. When the press shifted over from constructing the LDS community as a dangerous minority to constructing it as a model minority, the right to privacy became their protective shield.

60. Utah's Governor Michael Leavitt has tried to make a silk purse out of this particular sow's ear by suggesting that what happened was a blessing in disguise: Latter-day Saints would be able to see to their own protective shield.
MEDITATIONS ON THE BOOK OF ESTHER

By Michael Austin

Esther confronting King Ahasuerus

Like Esther, I wanted to be judged on my merits without having to deal with the prejudices and misperceptions associated with my religion.

MEDITATIONS ON THE BOOK OF ESTHER

Esther had not shewed her people nor her kindred: for Mordecai had charged her that she should not show it.

—ESTHER 2:10

MY MOST RECENT encounter with the Book of Esther began with a twelfth century Sufi masterpiece and with a significant moral lapse. The Sufi masterpiece, which I teach each semester in my world literature survey, was Fariduddin Attar's Conference of the Birds. Before attempting to make sense of this mystical text, I usually give a brief lecture on the difference between normative religion (based on beliefs, creeds, rituals, and practices) and mystical religion (based on direct, unmediated experience with the divine). The moral lapse occurred the last time that I struggled to explain these concepts to seventy-five barely interested sophomores. As I tried to clarify the crucial distinction between the two, a student asked a question that, although I didn't realize it at the time, I had been dreading for years: "So, would you say that Joseph Smith was a religious mystic?"

The question was completely logical and showed considerable perception; I have often told my students that finding connections between different bodies of knowledge is the way that we make knowledge relevant. But somehow, this logical, perceptive question took me completely by surprise. I stared at the questioner for a moment with a vaguely disapproving grimace, lost my place in the lecture and, for several moments, said nothing. I did not want to answer the question. I suppose that I have always realized that I don't want my students to know that I am a Mormon, but what this question made me realize was that I didn't even want my students to know that I knew anything about Mormons—for fear that they might guess. Unwilling to concede that I understood even the basics of the Joseph Smith story, I gave an answer that I am still ashamed of: "Yes," I said with as much academic detachment as I could muster, "many of the nineteenth-century religious reformers in America incorporated mystical elements into their theologies"—and I quickly changed the subject.

Let me briefly explain why I now consider my behavior during this incident to have been reprehensible. It is not because I feel that I failed in my missionary duties. I do not proselytize my students, and I would consider any teacher who did to be both unethical and unprofessional. Whenever I discuss religion in a classroom, I tell my students up front that I do not care about their souls, only their minds, and that I have no intention of either supporting or opposing any religious position. I also do not feel that I denied my beliefs in the same way that Peter denied Christ at the crucifixion, nor that I rejected some essential part of who I am. We are not obligated to express our religious convictions at all times and in all places; there are plenty of other topics that may properly engage even the most devout. In short, I am not at all concerned that my answer to this student's question made me a bad Mormon.

I do, however, think that my answer made me a bad teacher. I have often thought about the very question the student had asked, and I have what I consider to be a very good answer for it—one that would have greatly helped me illuminate a difficult concept. Had the question concerned Mary Baker Eddy, Ellen G. White, William Miller,
We commit a serious error when we assume our own culture has nothing to offer the rest of the world.

Charles Taze Russell, or any other “nineteenth-century religious reformer,” I would have seized on it instantly and used it as an educational opportunity. However, because the question touched my own religion, in a setting where discussing my religion made me uncomfortable, I forfeited an opportunity to teach one of the very principles I had hoped to make clear that day. My own culture had given me exactly what I needed to make a crucial connection, and I declined to follow through. Had I been a better teacher, I would not have allowed my own discomfort to interfere with the education of my students.

This event drew my thoughts to the Book of Esther, which I also struggle to make relevant in this same World Literature course. Until recently, I have always taught Esther in more or less the same way that I learned it in Sunday School: as the triumph of a faithful woman who risks her life to acknowledge her religion and save her people. When the wicked Haman arranges to have all of the Jews in the country slaughtered, Esther goes to her husband, King Ahasuerus, and acknowledges her Jewish religion, even though there is a decree that anyone who approaches the king in his inner court will be put to death unless the king immediately extends his scepter. The story is the basis for the Jewish holiday of Purim and has played an important role in preserving Jewish identity during centuries of exile. For Christians, and especially for Mormons, the story is usually read as a demonstration of the importance of being a missionary—of standing true to one’s religious convictions and, by so doing, influencing others.

For two reasons, I have now begun to reconsider this common interpretation of Esther. In the first place, the Book of Esther is remarkable among any other book of the Bible for it has no overt references to God nor to the religious aspects of Judaism. It stands in perfect contrast to the Book of Job: Job is a book about God that never mentions Judaism; Esther is a book about Judaism that never mentions God. The author of Esther seems intent on presenting Judaism more as a cultural identity than as a set of religious beliefs, and whatever courage Esther shows seems to stem more from her connection to a minority culture than from her religious beliefs. At the same time, however, I have also become less inclined to see Esther’s final triumph as an act of great courage. The whole story is set up to give her little choice about whether or not to acknowledge her culture: if she does not admit to being Jewish, an entire population will be annihilated. And if she had just told the truth from the start, she could have resolved the whole issue without risking her life to interrupt the King in his inner sanctum. By the time that Esther finally tells the King that she is a Jew, the stakes are so high that any action other than the one she takes would be just short of treacherous.

I now believe that we have more to learn by Esther’s initial failure (at the instigation of her cousin, Mordecai) to acknowledge her cultural background than by her final success in admitting it under dire circumstances. The failure of Esther and Mordecai is something that I understand very well because it has also been my failure. Though members of a minority culture, they succeed by their own merits without anybody knowing that they are Jewish. They realize that many in their society view Jews negatively, and they fear that any open acknowledgement of their religion might jeopardize their high position in the secular world or, at the very least, expose them to ridicule. Esther is not even sure how her own husband will react to her Jewish identity, so, to be on the safe side, she hides it from him—even though we later learn that he not only does not reject her because she is a Jew, but that, for her sake, he protects all of the Jews in his kingdom.

Esther’s predicament is precisely how I have always felt about being a Mormon in the academic world. I vividly recall the embarrassment that I felt when, as a brand-new Ph.D candidate, I had to tell my fellow students that I had gone to school at BYU. When asked the inevitable follow-up question (“So, are you a Mormon?”), I always looked somewhat ashamed, quickly admitted that I was, and added immediately, that I regularly participated in radical symposiums and was likely to be excommunicated at any moment. Like Esther and Mordecai, I just wanted to be judged on my merits without having to deal with the prejudices and misperceptions—and sometimes even the completely accurate perceptions—associated with my religion. My embarrassment persisted. When I first began to write papers and articles on Mormon
themes, I did not add them to my curriculum vitae. When I finally decided that my need for academic credit outweighed my need for personal comfort, I made sure to only write papers in which the word “Mormon” never appeared in the title.

However, I have slowly come to realize that, while I do not feel a strong spiritual responsibility to speak about the religious aspects of my culture, I do feel a strong professional responsibility to address the cultural aspects of my religion. This sense of responsibility derives from my strong belief in the principles of multiculturalism. Though academic multiculturalism has taken its share of (not entirely undeserved) blows in recent culture wars, it remains, at its heart, a sound principle—one that I was converted to in graduate school at BYU and that I still strongly believe in. The basis of this principle is a simple proposition: we, as a society, are genuinely enriched by our diversity. A diverse body of literature, art, and music expands our understanding of beauty and allows us to see important things in new ways; diverse approaches to problems give us a variety of possible solutions to choose from; and a genuine understanding of each other’s cultures and value systems helps us to live together with increased tolerance and respect. This commitment to multiculturalism has brought works by minorities and women and previously colonized peoples to the forefront of the literary and artistic world, and I honestly believe that our society is stronger for it.

The principles of multiculturalism convey two important responsibilities to those of us who accept them. First, we must respect other cultures, especially historically under-represented ones, to do our best to accept them on their own terms, to learn more about them, to avoid judging them by our standards, and to value the contributions that they have all made to our society.

Though important, this premise is too often seen as the beginning and the end of multiculturalism. But the same foundational principles also imply a second responsibility: to share our own culture—as a culture—with others so that it, too, can be accepted on its own terms and so that its strengths can be added to the larger pool of experiences from which our society draws its strength.

It is this second assumption that, in my opinion, elevates multiculturalism from the heavy-handed discourse of retributive victimology that its critics perceive it to be and makes it an ethical principle that no true democracy can long survive without. Nonetheless, I have been quite frankly amazed by the number of progressive, multicultural inclined Mormons I know who are unwilling to accord to their own culture the same consideration that they would give to a village of South American cannibals: to see it as a culture that is just as valid as any other culture; to accept that the mechanisms of that culture usually have a clear and deliberate function that helps to sustain and protect its members; and to realize that it, like any other culture, has something to offer the world when understood and accepted on its own terms rather than criticized by standards that it does not accept.

This is not a call to proselytize. Heaven knows that there are enough Mormons in the world ready to share their religion. But there are actually few Mormons willing to share their culture. Most conservative Mormons aren’t even willing to admit that we have a “culture” out of a suspicion that this would somehow interfere with the Church being true. Most liberal Mormons, on the other hand, spend most of their public lives trying to distance themselves from Mormon culture, seeing it as a nasty conservative intrusion on an otherwise beautiful and progressive gospel. And even those liberal Mormons who embrace Mormon culture almost always end up doing it in SUNSTONE, where nobody but other liberal Mormons will ever notice.

As Christians and as Latter-day Saints, we commit a grave moral error when we reject other cultures or other beliefs by using the all-too familiar reasoning that, since ours is the “only true Church,” we have no need to look elsewhere for anything good or true. Our culture is not everything. Neither is our culture nothing, and we commit an equally serious error when we assume that our own culture has nothing to offer the rest of the world. This position is selfish; it encourages us to distance ourselves from people’s cultures and experiences without offering anything in return. Being a responsible citizen in a multicultural society requires that we both learn about other cultures and that we teach others about our own. It means that we must look for ways to contribute that we, because of our cultural background, are uniquely qualified to make. And it means that we don’t have to feel ashamed that we belong to a culture that, like all cultures, comes with its unique values, perceptions, and practices. This is one of the most important lessons that Mormons, liberals and conservatives alike, can draw from the Book of Esther.

To comment on this article, or to read comments by others, visit our website: <Sunstoneonline.com>

RESURRECTION
when it comes this way
Roman tyranny
prepare the days
vice
weeks
this year
next
however long it takes
centuries
millenias
to liberate
the spikes
descending from the cross
resurrecting
who we are
where we go
and why
the soul’s reborn
in dark of night
when we attack
the Roman flank
drenched
in sweat
drenched
in ecstasy

—BEN WILENSKY
GROWING UP MORMON

ON BEING MORMON AND HUMAN

By Eugene England

We can be committed to our exclusive Mormon faith and also be part of the human experience with God that produces great art.

I grew up feeling that because I was Mormon, I was different from other humans. I was special, even "peculiar," separate, better than they. I sang, "I might be envied by a king, for I am a Mormon boy." And history began in 1820 with Joseph Smith's First Vision.

The little valley in Southern Idaho, where we raised dryland wheat, was completely, unquestionably Mormon, and my life of working on the farm and going to school with my friends, right across from the chapel, then going with the same friends to our Mormon meetings was a seamless, safe whole. Even the programs I listened to each evening, lying on the cold linoleum under the huge Philco radio, easily confirmed my complacent values ("Jack Armstrong, Jack Armstrong, the All-American Boy"). We had our garden and cow and the wheat to grind for flour, so the Great Depression seemed far away, even when unsmiling hoboes made it to our place, far from the railroad, and steadily chopped wood for an hour for a packed lunch. World War II seemed barely to touch us: the Bickmore boy from next door, shot through the chest on Okinawa, coming home to testify he had been saved by God so he could later go on a mission; the regular, front-page maps in the Deseret News marking the quick expansion outward of Germany and Japan and then the slow retreat of evil so the gospel could be taken to the world after the war.

My repeated rounds of uncomplicated work and provincial faith came together as my father took me into the young wheat in the spring to kneel and ask God to bless and protect the crop. He promised the Lord to give it all, beyond our basic needs, to build the Church and kingdom, and I felt assurance of God's approval of that consecration that has never left me.

We moved to Salt Lake City when I was twelve, coming back to the farm in the summers until my late teens, but meanwhile entering a new world. As I studied literature and art and history and science at East High and the University of Utah, I found many humans whose minds and hearts seemed very much like my own--and who often were superior to me in at least some ways. Later, when I went away to Samoa and Boston and California and London, I became united in friendship with people who were completely non-Mormon, merely human, that I recognized as kindred spirits, loved and admired--and became convinced were much better than I was in every way, including faith and righteousness.

I became increasingly perplexed. Was my fundamental loyalty to the lovely, unified truths that had been given by God to Mormon prophets or to the exciting, diverse new ones I was learning from the full range of human experience with God that produces great art.

EUGENE ENGLAND is Writer in Residence at Utah Valley State College. He may be contacted by e-mail at gene.charlotte@ibm.net.
ences, in my Mormon church service, where there was no separation of lay and clergy; ministers and consumers, but all were engaged as equals in struggling and learning to love together.

But was my identity centered in these great and peculiar ideas and practices that, I realized, were available only to the one tenth of one percent of God's children who were Mormons? Or was I mainly human, part of the great congregation of all those God has created and blessed with his saving and ongoing mercy—a God who, even as my own Mormon scriptures testified, had already revealed and was still revealing himself "unto all nations" (2 Ne. 29:12)?

This perplexity came into sharp and disturbing focus when I served, in 1981, as one of the directors of the Brigham Young University Study Abroad Program in London. I quickly began to feel deeply both the division and the connection between being Mormon and being human. Along with my students, I was ravished by the artistic beauty and spiritual devotion produced by the ancient and contemporary human cultures that we were for the first time so intensely studying and experiencing. Similarly, our Mormon heritage became more clear and precious as we visited the sites of the early missions of the apostles to Preston and Manchester and Herefordshire, as we learned of the conversion and emigration of tens of thousands, including many of our own ancestors, and the sacrificial devotion and now burgeoning diversity of the British Church that remained—and as we felt the spirit of the Holy Ghost in our own devotions and conversations.

Sometimes being Mormon and being human seemed in sharp conflict. The utilitarian architecture and bland art reprints of our chapels and temple were overwhelmed by the superior genius and vision of the English perpendicular style at Wells Cathedral and the stained glass glories of Notre Dame and the challenging religious depth of the works of Giotto and Raphael and Michelangelo in Italian churches. Yet as we visited their sparsely attended services, we sometimes felt vastly superior to the Anglican and Lutheran and Catholic state churches, mired in apostate ideas, we thought, and in apathy (not enough members and tithe-payers even to keep the great cathedrals and churches in repair).

I visited the villages in Somerset and Dorset counties where my ancestors had lived. In the ancient parish churches where they had worshiped and some were buried, I imagined again the convictions that had moved my great-grandparents to cut ties of family and land and culture and risk death to go into exile in a desert thousands of miles away. I stood in the fourteenth-century manor house next to the Mormon temple near Lingford, Surrey, and thought of my parents living there for three years in the sixties as president and matron, administering sacred ordinances and organizing hundreds of volunteer workers and teaching thousands of missionaries who came for special sessions.

I went each Sunday to the Hyde Park Ward and saw the congregation gradually deepening and brightening in color as the 1978 revelation giving blacks the priesthood began to produce more and more dark-skinned converts from London and the West Indies and Africa, some who came in flamboyant native dress. I watched lay leaders and teachers working together to overcome barriers of unequal, even antagonistic, education, of stark cultural and language differences, and growing in patience and charity as they helped others do the same. I went home teaching with a man from Lebanon to a family from Jamaica with little English. We gave a priesthood blessing to an extremely sick daughter with words the parents didn't fully understand, then sorrowed with them. One Saturday, as a group of us from Hyde Park Ward got ready to go by rented van to the temple, the reserved English gentleman asked to pray softly said, "Please, Father, help us, as we drive today, not to do anything to hurt anyone else."

In our humanities and history classes, we taught the details of Christian history and architecture and art, then visited the sites and museums throughout England and the Continent and Israel. We stood under the steeple of Salisbury Cathedral and thought of the faith and aspiration that could sustain artisans and tithe-payers through whole lifetimes to lift those tons of stone four hundred feet into the sky. We found a small Orthodox Church on a back street in Moscow and worshiped with a few old women and one young couple as they kept the faith alive, at great cost, under Communism. We stood in the darkened protective alcove of the National Gallery in London, before da Vinci's drawing of St. Anne, the mother of Mary, holding both Mary and Jesus on her lap, her elegant and haunted face looking at and beyond us as her left hand, barely visible, gestures upward—and then, in the Louvre, stood before Da Vinci's final painting, the one he kept with him until death, of John the Baptist looking at and beyond us with the same face as St. Anne's, his right hand gesturing upward in that same supreme symbol of art's ability to point beyond itself. And we stood in the grotto under the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem and looked at the silver star on the floor marking the spot where Jesus was born—according to a tradition going back be-

"I might be envied by a king, for I am a Mormon Boy."

Eugene England as a boy in Idaho.
Our Mormon and Palestinian guides made me increasingly nervous by their too-constant insistence that the sites we visited had "strong tradition" backing their claims: This is "very probably" Rachel's Well; this is "most likely" where Christ suffered in Gethsemane; the Garden Tomb "fits more exactly" the description than the traditional site covered by a Catholic Church—and has been confirmed by "the feelings of modern prophets." But before long, I began to realize that the exactness of the sites was not important; what mattered is that devout Jews and Christians and Muslims (and now Mormons) by the hundreds of thousands had for many hundreds of years come to those sites to express and renew their faith—to kneel and weep by that silver star, as I saw a Catholic priest doing; or leave a candle burning in the grotto at Gethsemane, as a young Mormon girl with us did; or stand on the stairs looking down into the torture pit in the Palace of Caiaphas where Christ may have been hung by his feet during that last night, and suddenly begin singing, with new emotion, an old hymn about following Christ whatever the cost, as a group of Baptists on tour with us did. That was the miracle.

At the end of our term in London, I was able to talk with the students about an enriching paradox—that our experience there could make us more committed to our specific, peculiar, and somewhat exclusive Mormon faith and also, without contradiction, more grateful to, and part of, the great human experience with God that produced the art and buildings and pilgrimages we had been witness to and participated in. Yes, we would continue to feel the tension, would move back and forth between the poles of being mainly Mormon and mainly human, sometimes with anguish. But we now understood with our minds and eyes and hearts that history, even our own religious history, began long before 1820—and could also value the unique movement toward God that began then and that we were part of. We could share the universal impulses and yearnings of the traditions we had studied and give particular creative expression to them through our own. We did not need to wander as strangers and foreigners among the struggling, sometimes backsliding, often stunningly generous people we met in London and Bethlehem and Moscow. We were fellowcitizens with them, fellow saints in the human household of faith.

Cousins

For Alan

I can see again those crooked shelves in that vacant chicken house, trail along behind you into coulees to find buffalo skulls and bits of meteors, believe as you the Smithsonian would stand small beside collections we would gather there.

You led me over rain barrels to the roof of Grandmother's shed, into her attic as she napped. There among the crocks and jars, unfinished saddles, drying bundles from her garden, we were Private I's reading intrigue into yellowed notes.

A dusty hayloft blossomed green, filled with jungle chatter as we soared on slings from the mounds of hay in the cupola above, pigeons stirred and muttered, became restless beasts about to spring from ambush.

We manned log cannons from ruins of an old stone barn. When you named the mossy slough Pacific, I saw the fleet of carriers and landing craft, watched the water turn pink-red with blood and closed my eyes, felt the aftershock of guns.

These days my bookkeeper eyes perceive columns of reality balancing black and white against those technicolor hours when time was a vehicle to ride.

—ELISIE PANKOWSKI
SAINTS MEET THE PRESS

INTERVIEW

A Conversation with Richard N. Ostling

RICHARD N. OSTLING is co-author with his wife, journalist Joan K. Ostling, of Mormon America: The Power and the Promise (HarperCollins, 1999). A long-time observer of Mormonism, he currently is a religion writer for the Associated Press, and before that he was a senior correspondent and religion writer for Time magazine.

Mormon America sketches the contours of Mormonism, past and present, touching on nearly every major theme, practice, unique doctrine, and controversy. Topics range from Church history and history writing, polygamy, and Church efforts to join the American religious mainstream, to analyses of the Church’s “power pyramid,” missions, and temples, to theological notions of forever families and becoming gods. The Ostlings also pay careful attention to questions of Book of Mormon and Book of Abraham historicity, as well as schisms and dissent within the Church, and prospects for 21st century growth and change. Without a doubt, Mormon America is a book to reckon with. It will very likely be the primer on Mormons for thousands of journalists covering the 2002 Winter Olympics in Salt Lake City, as well as the standard one-volume work on Mormonism for many years to come. This interview was conducted by Elbert Peck.

If a non-Mormon read your book and then talked about it with an average Mormon, I suspect the member would feel that by paying so much attention to Church history and controversies, the book doesn’t describe the rich, communal church experienced by millions.

That’s probably the typical response that a devoted Mormon would have to the book. We tried to convey some of the power, intensity, and spiritual dynamic of the faith. That’s one of its important aspects. But we couldn’t give it as much attention as devotional literature would because there were so many other important things that we had to deal with. Because our book tries to cover every significant aspect of LDS culture, we included some of that, but we also had to do some history, some theology, some education, some missions, some everything.

The book is written for a general audience. A lot of the material in it that Mormons would know and would just pass by is very important for the non-Mormon. Who was Joseph Smith? How was revelation received? What are temple garments? How does tithing work? What is tithing settlement? What are the rituals conducted in temples? And so on. That material consumes a good part of the book.

However, the book also has some important material that Mormons generally don’t know. This book was very much written for an “insider” as well as an “outsider” audience. Our observations about the church come from a journalistic stance—stepping back a few paces and looking at the Mormon phenomenon—and we are able to put into an interesting context even things that Mormons already know.

One example would be the advances in missionary work. It’s not news to anybody, Mormon or non-Mormon, that the Church is growing rapidly. However, our book asks, “How effective is this growth really? Are there soft spots in it, and how does it compare with the growth of other religions in the world and in the United States? This is material most Mormons never think about.

While chatting with somebody recently, I pointed out that people often say Mormonism is the fastest-growing church in the country. Actually, the Assemblies of God, based in Springfield, Missouri, sometimes beats the Mormons in annual growth rate.

The significant thing is not that the Assemblies beats the Mormons in growth within the United States, but that worldwide it beats Mormonism five to one in conversions. Churches, or “world missions,” affiliated with the Assemblies of God are approaching thirty million members. There are five million Mormons outside the United States. Yet the Assemblies of God is half as old as the LDS church. What is the difference?

The most obvious difference between Mormon missions and these missions is that the Assemblies churches overseas are totally autonomous and self-governing. They call their own pastors, have indigenous leadership, and decide their policies, education, curriculum, music, and so on at the local level. If I were a missionary strategist in the Church Office Building, I would seriously consider how to hand off missionary strategizing for Brazil to the faithful in Brazil.

Sociologists say the more conservative a religion is, the faster it grows. Is Mormonism too moderate to grow as fast as conservative traditions do?

I don’t think the issue is conservatism. In some ways, Mormonism is conservative, but in other ways it’s radical, or liberal, or whatever one labels it. The key is authority. Islam, Pentecostalism, Mormonism—all have a strong sense of their divine calling. Therefore, they want to spread their messages and convince others to follow them. That is the common denominator of all growing religions. That’s true in the U.S. as well as overseas.

What else would inquiring Mormons find interesting in the book?

The way dissenters have been handled in recent years is known to Mormons who closely follow Church affairs, but the average Latter-day Saint may not be very aware of it. All religions discipline their members; all draw lines. All religions excommunicate certain trouble-makers. But LDS church discipline is unique among the large religions operating in the United States. Most Mormons have not thought about the uniqueness of what occurs, and they should.

Money is always interesting to people. Mormon America tries to get at the economics of Mormonism. We had some inside information and very credible sources. We’re about as close as an outsider is going to get on Church finances.

There are high-ranking and important Mormons who don’t know anything about the Church financial operations. Church leaders release no financial information, and
yet Mormons seem to have no curiosity about it. This is the type of financial control you find in tiny sectarian groups with membership between one hundred and one thousand. For a church as large and important as the LDS church, this level of control is singular and very interesting.

Mormons often tell me that the Catholics operate this way. Not true. Much more open discussion and information on internal operations is available today to the average American Catholic. Currently, the Vatican issues a profit and loss statement every year. Why? They have found it’s a good way to raise more money. Openness gives Catholics confidence. There has been enough financial chicanery in organized religion that a wise investor needs to carefully look at the way money is used.

There’s no evidence of financial abuse in the Church, but if there were, we wouldn’t know. In theory, huge amounts of money could have been sluiced into graft or have been put into well-meaning, but ill-advised, financial plans. The latter is fairly likely. No one will know. Our book at least gives an outline of the amounts.

Mormons want notice, but they are often frustrated when a news story appears. What should we expect from journalists who look at us?

People always find journalists irritating. Sometimes journalists dig up embarrassing facts. That’s part of the frustration. But also they bring a different perspective. In Mormon America, we tried to cover everything pertinent, important, and interesting, but we still left a lot of interesting things on the cutting room floor, including embarrassing things that were off point. We were pretty selective, yet the book is still one-hundred-fifty pages longer than the publisher had planned. Journalists try to take a big-picture look at what they’re covering: what’s important, interesting, surprising, and in this case, what would strike an outsider as remarkable? That’s what we look for.

Journalism is limited. One problem is brevity. An average news story runs eight hundred words. Any topic could use thousands of words and still be comprehensive. Every chapter in Mormon America could be a book in itself. So, selectivity is part of the challenge and frustration; so also is perspective. Even a journalist who belongs to a religious community she or he is writing about will bring to a news story a perspective that is different from devotional or faith-affirming writings. Look at what Episcopalian journalists write about the Episcopal church. It’s often very different from what you’d read in the Episcopal equivalent of the Ensign.

Interestingly, the Hebrew scriptures are often journalistic in nature. In most annals of the ancient world, when kings and kingdoms are described, it’s to strengthen the position of the powers that be. But in the Jewish scriptures, the human race starts with a big mistake by Adam and Eve, and soon the royal family has murder in its very heart. Then Moses receives a great call from God, yet he doesn’t want to accept it. He’s such a problemmatic leader he had to speak through Aaron, and God does not allow him to lead the people of Israel into the promised land. David has so much blood on his hands that he’s not allowed to build the temple; it’s left to Solomon. The prophets regularly denounce not only the individual king but the entire kingdom. The number of anointed kings who were denounced by the prophets of the Lord in the Old Testament is amazing. The Bible is unlike anything else from the ancient world. It’s candid, even brutal, in exposing the unhappy facts of life. It is unafraid to point out human failings, even in the grandest of leaders.

So in one sense, what journalists do is highly scriptural, and honesty does not mean popularity. Still, the role of journalists is not to sympathize. They need to dissect the designs of Providence.

As an outsider, what do you see as Mormonism’s strengths? What areas will trouble the Church as it grows?

The best thing about Mormonism is Mormons, the people. Their healthy psyche, clean living, self-sacrifice, devotion to family and child rearing, and their service to the Church and community are all genuine, unfurcaded, and very much part of the faith. People are the key to Mormon missionary expansion, not cold calls, not going door-to-door. What works is somebody who is seen as a good Joe, a good neighbor. Somebody who helped you out last year when you had an emergency, and now this person invites you to a home meeting.

One of the many reasons we wrote Mormon America is to tell about Mormon ways that could benefit other religions. Just as surely as Mormons could learn from examining the Assemblies of God, the LDS church could benefit from thinking about Mormonism.

For instance, missionary service is crucial for institutional growth. During that transitional time from high school to college to career. During this stage, mainstream Protestant denominations are losing throngs of their own kids. By making severe demands and treating their young people as adults, the LDS church will bind them to the faith. And, of course, in presenting the faith to others, you also teach it to yourself.

Similarly, the LDS priesthood system, which gives every twelve-year-old boy an office and responsibility, is brilliant and has much to do with LDS strength. Long term, an issue will be, how about the women? As an outsider, I do not believe the Primary, Sunday School, and Relief Society track for girls and young women is remotely comparable to the programming available and the responsibilities given to boys and young men.

I also think the LDS church will have trouble reaching African Americans and then holding them once baptized. That will be a continuing missionary challenge. The leadership, including the Church’s top leadership, needs to internationalize.

Even the Catholic Church, which is as tradition-bound as any religion, has totally changed its approach to filling its highest offices in the last generation. It has broken the barrier barring non-Italian popes. Since 1978, papal elections have been from an international field of candidates and, similarly, the college of cardinals is today a thoroughly internationalized body. American-centricism is a weakness of the current Mormon system.

Another interesting question is LDS presidential succession. Appointing the senior apostle as Church president removes politics and is clean and fast. But in this fast-paced age, LDS leadership may have to reexamine that tradition and perhaps shift to a system in which the appointment is not who has been
in office the longest, but who is the best equipped right now to lead the Church. A faithful Mormon would say, “God will see to it that the right person will come through the system of primogeniture.” Theologically, can’t God also operate through the Roman Catholic system, where the question is who is the best qualified? To its benefit, Mormonism often relies on collective leadership. One way would be for the apostles to talk among themselves and take secret ballots. A succession crisis could force the issue.

Another plus is the LDS church’s education system. The seminary and institute programs and Brigham Young University are unique in American religion. No other higher education system strengthens and shapes a religion’s next generation in the way the LDS system does. The United States has no Christian education plan for high schoolers that’s remotely as challenging as what the LDS church expects of its young people. The LDS system fosters commitment to the Church and develops future leadership. Combined with the missionary program, Mormons have a very powerful religious system that other religions need to look at.

On the other hand, some things members think are uniquely Mormon simply are not. The clean-living lifestyle is certainly a plus, but Seventh-day Adventists are almost the same. Some very good studies on religious believers have shown them in general to be physically and psychologically healthier than non-believers. Just being involved in a church is good for the soul—people are happier and more contented. Mormons share such benefits with other groups. Jehovah’s Witnesses have missionary devotion similar to that of Mormons. Both Jehovah’s Witnesses and Christian Scientists have lay leadership.

What about Mormon Theology?

LDS theology was the hardest chapter we had to write. We sweated over it for a host of reasons. There are theological questions that have not been solved in the Church, and it’s just impossible to predict what might come out of this. For instance, I was astonished to find there is a serious debate within the LDS church whether God really is finite or infinite, and whether we can speak of God as omnipresent, omniscient, and omnipotent. Or if Mormons use those terms, are they different from the way they have been understood for the last two thousand years by Jews and Christians? These are important issues the faith will need to address at some point.

Mormonism is now the same age as it believes the ancient Church was when the Great Apostasy took hold—about two centuries old. In the Mormon construction of Christian history, everything fell apart around A.D. 200. But for other Christians, this was when Christianity really began its hard theological work. In the first two centuries, the Christian religion was largely about expansion. From A.D. 200 to 400, Christian leaders realized there was a lot of theological mopping up to be done. They believed Christ was divine, and yet also human. Christians struggled with that very basic question for two hundred years, eventually developing the creeds.

Just as the early Christian Church defined its doctrine as it confronted and excommunicated heretics, that may be precisely what was happening during the 1990s in Mormonism with the excommunications. As the Church grows exponentially, many LDS church authorities feel a need to define official positions, and to hold things together, as surely as the Christian Church did around A.D. 200. The difference is that in the early Catholic period the Christian church’s definition of itself largely revolved around doctrine and scripture. In contrast, in the 1990s, the Mormon self-definition heavily revolved around authority and prerogative.

LDS readers will enjoy reading our chapter, “Are non-Mormons Christians?” I believe the LDS church still has to honestly face that question. Are Roman Catholics, are Southern Baptists, really Christians? Are their churches truly Christian or partially Christian? How should Mormons view them? Do they have any legitimacy in the kingdom of God? This is the precise issue the Roman Catholic Church confronted a generation ago and decided, within limits, that Protestants are Christians. Perhaps not fully and not ideally, and not in full communion with Catholics, but nevertheless, they are Christian sisters and brothers.

In contrast, Mormons are often asked, “Are Mormons Christians?” That is an important question. “Are Baptists Christians?” is an equally important question.

To comment on this article, or to read comments by others, visit our website: Sunstoneonline.com.

DREAMS OF WOLVES

I like to think of the red and the gray, bared teeth and fierce eyes in the darkness where all the light comes from inside them: white fangs, golden irises that burn through the shivering night... rabbits in holes having nightmares of daylight.

Truth is, a hunter tells me, no true wolf lives: all are mingled with the mongrel coyote (which he pronounces Ki-Yoot, and frowns) and the trappers kill them all for a few bucks and thrills.

Dreams of wolves on cold nights of hacksaw wind curl through the wilderness and the real blood, wherever it hides, finds the forest edge again.

—ROBERT PARHAM
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STILL A PUZZLE—THE MYSTERIOUS PLACE OF MORMONISM IN AMERICAN CULTURE

MORMON AMERICA: THE POWER AND THE PROMISE
The beliefs, rituals, business practices, and well-guarded secrets of one of the world's fastest growing and most influential religions

by Richard N. Ostling and Joan K. Ostling
HarperSanFrancisco, 1999
454 pages, $26.00 hardback, $17.00 paperback

Reviewed by Dean L. May

Mormon America compels us as Latter-day Saints to see our Mormonness with our American eyes; something we rarely have to do.

Richard and Joan Ostling have in this book undertaken an enormous task. In four hundred printed pages, they have endeavored to review the one-hundred-fifty year history of the Mormon faith and people. They have described the present Church in some detail, so that nonmember readers can get a sense of its governance and teachings as well as its place and promise among religious societies in America. They have explored virtually every possible question and controversy that has arisen since the time of Joseph Smith.

All this they have done with energy and diligence, meeting and talking to many lay members and leaders of the Church—to the committed, the estranged, and the hostile. They have searched far, wide, and deep for every bit of published material that might throw light on the Mormon issues they feel U.S. readers might want to be enlightened about. Theirs is a very impressive achievement, and this is a highly informative and readable book.

There are, of course, a few outright factual errors that picky academics will boggle at. For example, there were twice as many as the hundred United Orders they say were organized in Utah in the 1870s, and they were not mostly in southern Utah. But, these are minor gaffes, and I doubt that any journalist has ever gone to such pains to explore and explain Mormonism to other Americans, nor has done it so well. I learned much from reading it.

That's the good news. As I read through the book, I had the feeling of being bounced along on a roller coaster, easing comfortably over high passages that seemed accurate, balanced, and fair, and then, often at the ends of chapters, dropping precipitously, rendered queasy by the abruptness of the descent. The content and tone of the more critical, end-of-chapter passages rendered me vaguely uneasy and left a nagging sense of déjà vu.

A few selected passages identify and explain what was bothering me:

- From the preface, "mystery continues to surround their church. Though it is hard to imagine when contemplating this placid valley with its prosperous metropolis, no religion in American history has aroused so much fear and hatred, nor been the object of so much persecution and so much misinformation" (xvi).
- For Mormons, "the concept of truth as ordinarily conceived has lower priority than obedience" (90).
- Mormonism has placed "all areas of human activity within church control, under the all-encompassing authority of ecclesiastical leadership" (92).
- Church finances are surrounded by "a wall of secrecy" (120).
- Mormonism has fostered a "culture of control and personal fealty," and "Mormon micromanagement extends into all sorts of ward business that other hierarchical churches leave up to the local clergy and lay" (155).
- Temple ceremonies are "the most devoutly protected of all the LDS Church's secrets" (192).
- "Anything decided in Mormonism is decided in secret, far away from the eye of the membership, much less the general public and the press" (202).
- The missionary program "operates with military discipline and regimentation" (204).
- The church leaders want a membership "generally highly submissive to ecclesiastical authority, and committed to official orthodoxy as defined by the hierarchy" (237).
- "Some might wonder how an authoritarian and secretive church could maintain appeal within an open democratic culture like that of the United States" (374).

DEAN L. MAY is a professor of history at the University of Utah. A version of this paper was presented as part of a panel at the Salt Lake City 2000 Sunstone Symposium (tape #SLO0-133).
These few passages raise enough issues to quickly fill a volume of Mormon responses. The key question fueling such a reaction is: "Why do such descriptions of the Mormon faith and people by outsiders, some of which seem indisputably on the mark, so unsettle us Latter-day Saints?" I believe the Ostlings put their finger on the problem in the last quoted passage about the mystery of Mormonism's appeal in an open democratic culture.

In fact, we as American Mormons are constantly compelled in our acts of everyday living to mediate between the two cultures that nourish and sustain us: those of liberal, democratic, individualistic America and those of authoritative, communal, Mormondom—what Mormons understand to be the kingdom of God. And these cultures are in their most fundamental premises antithetical to each other—the first tends toward chaotic, narcissistic materialism; the second toward harmonious, mutually responsible, asceticism.

In real life, rarely is a Mormon fully within one camp. But engaged Mormons are most of the time inclined to emulate values in our feelings of what ought to be, the forlorn old hope of the Puritan leader John Winthrop that here in America "every man might have need of other, and from hence they might be all knit more nearly together in the bond of brotherly affection." That "wee must delight in each other...mourn together, always walking before our eyes our Community as members of the same body."

Winthrop warned darkly of those dangers of failure. "But if our hearts shall turn away soe that wee will not obey, but shall be seduced and worshipp...other Gods our pleasures, and profits, and serve them; it is propounded unto vs this day, wee shall surely perish out of the good...Land whether wee passe over this vast Sea to possess it. Therefore let vs choose life,

That wee, and our Seed,

May live; by obeying his voice,

And cleaving to him,

for hee is our life,

and our prosperity!"  

In fact, and in contrast to Winthrop's view, most Americans are to their bones of the liberal democratic persuasion. They not only tolerate and work within that philosophy, but they celebrate the "other Gods, pleasures, and profits" that Winthrop so feared. But, to our pain, we American Mormons are both Mormons and Americans. Wanting to be respected, admired, and loved by others—pretty basic human desires—in some contexts, we are driven by the American pluralistic paradigm; in others, by the Mormon communal paradigm.

So, why does the Ostlings' Mormon America so unsettle us Saints, including some of the Ostlings' Mormon friends and informants who feel their openness and friendship betrayed in this book? Because the book is a critique of Mormonism from a liberal democratic perspective. And being so, it compels us as Mormons at some points to see our Mormonism through our American eyes: something we rarely have to do consciously.

In this regard, we get a sense of déjà vu from the book because it is hardly different from the litany of critiques of Mormonism that go back a century-and-a-half. Americans will always find Mormons disconcerting, for we walk and talk like Americans, but we are not Americans, or rather, we are not American enough; and the issue has nothing to do with flag-waving and patriotism.
he left the settlement that summer to return to Salt Lake City, the men made a gift to him of a thousand dollars' worth of labor they had contributed to the mill. Such devotion to authority was then, and is now, a mystery to most Americans. In the nineteenth century, outsiders could only conclude that Mormons had taken leave of their faculties, were "mesmerized" by some mysterious force that made them slaves and dupes of their church leaders. In the twentieth century, terms such as "brainwashed" or being subjected to "military discipline and regimentation" or "indoctrination" are more common. Whatever the term, for them, something mysterious, incomprehensible, is always at work, turning supposedly open, liberal democratic Americans into perversely unselfish, communal, and loving Saints.

Mormons are different because, at our best, our beliefs and historical experience have helped to form a counterculture that emphasizes harmony, unity, order, clear values, and respect for legitimate authority while de-emphasizing anti-authoritarianism and pursuit of the self and material goods. The very existence of such a society within present-day America is to most Americans an embarrassment, even a reproach, and certainly, as the Ostlings regularly remind us, it is a mystery.

To comment on this article, or to read comments by others, visit our website: <www.sunstoneline.com>.

BOOK REVIEW

TURNING THE TABLES

FAWN MCKAY BRODIE: A BIOGRAPHER'S LIFE
by Newell G. Bringhurst
University of Oklahoma Press, 1999
350 pages, $29.95

Reviewed by Dennis Lythgoe

Fawn Brodie, the controversial biographer of Joseph Smith and others, receives a much kinder treatment than she gave her subjects.

MORMONS who grew up in the 1940s and '50s learned a very bad name they should never say—Fawn Brodie. To most youth, her name was synonymous with Judas Iscariot or Benedict Arnold, but few knew why. By the age of nineteen or twenty, they usually discovered the reason—she was the notorious author of a highly critical biography of Joseph Smith, No Man Knows My History. Published in 1945, it labeled the Mormon prophet a charlatan, an imposter, a devious man who organized and led a church on the strength of his personality. Even though she wrote a literate, carefully researched book, Brodie failed to view Smith as someone with sincere religious convictions, and thus that side of him is conspicuously missing in her portrait. Brodie was excommunicated from the LDS church the following year, but her name was not blotted out. She has lived on as the embodiment of betrayal in the Mormon culture.

If Brodie thought Smith was a charlatan, most loyal Mormons considered Brodie herself to be a traitor to her church and to the illustrious McKay family, which included her father, Thomas E. McKay, who would become an Assistant to the Quorum of the Twelve, and her uncle, David O. McKay, an apostle who later served as president of the Church for nineteen years. Fifty-four years after the publication of No Man Knows My History seems a good time, historically, to take a hard look at Brodie and her techniques, and Newell Bringhurst provides us with valuable perspective.

Bringhurst takes a fascinating look into this previously enigmatic, private, brilliant product of Huntsville, Utah. While Brodie was known for psychobiography, in which she tried to explain the psychological behavior of her subjects, Bringhurst presents a more conventional biography with ample and instructive footnotes.
His style is a bit stiff, and he is often repetitive, but Bringhurst has done a masterful job of gathering and organizing the materials of Brodie's life. He paints a compelling picture of a young girl growing up in a rural community, in a drafty house without indoor plumbing, who became a widely known biographer of five of history's major figures. Without even one degree in history, Brodie literally wrote her way to the top: a senior lecturer at UCLA.

Through some enormously revealing letters, most of them between Brodie and her historical mentor, Dale Morgan, and her favorite uncle, Dean Brimhall, Bringhurst paints a portrait of a gifted, energetic woman but one who was perpetually insecure. While writing the Smith biography, she worried endlessly about the potentially adverse affect on her family, and she showed continuing signs of hostility toward the LDS church and its leaders.

Brodie's letters also reveal her consistent brooding about which book to write next and how it would be evaluated by critics. She is always wondering if the finished product will be any good. Given her propensity to depression, it seems as though she tried to fight her way out of it by writing important books. Bringhurst is just as critical of Brodie's historical method as Brodie was of her subjects' personal morality. For example, Bringhurst tells of a disagreement between Brodie and her cousin Edward about the origin of cobwebs. She asserted they were made from dust, whereas Edward argued they were made by spiders. They bet a root beer on the answer. When Edward consulted a dictionary that proved he was correct, young Fawn stuck with her argument and refused to pay. Bringhurst concludes that "Such stubbornness would manifest itself later as a methodological weakness in Brodie's research and writing," a steadfast refusal to admit error and correct it. This seems a scant bit of evidence to justify such a profound conclusion.

Because Brodie always showed a strong interest in the sexual attitudes and exploits of virtually all her biographical subjects, Bringhurst is naturally interested in Brodie's feelings in this area. Unfortunately, this is one of the weakest areas of the book. For Bringhurst resorts almost entirely to hearsay evidence in suggesting that Brodie and her husband, Bernard, may have had sexual problems of their own. Although Bringhurst assumes that she overcame such difficulties through psychoanalysis, the evidence for both is so scant as to be quite suspect.

In his critique of her historical methods, Bringhurst also highlights one of the most ominous Brodie statements. In a letter to Morgan upon completion of the manuscript, she wrote: "I finally succeeded in putting five bullets in the prophet." Although this may at first glance seem to be a colorful way for a biographer to indicate the completion of her story, it clearly reveals a woman obsessed with distaste for her subject, a heavily biased biographer who was unable to view Joseph Smith with balance and professional detachment. Bringhurst's publisher deserves a rap on the knuckles for allowing many errors to go uncorrected in this biography. In an era of spell-check, it is unforgivable for an editor to overlook a dozen or more misspellings. There is also an over-use of several words or phrases, such as "the young collegian" and "the City of Big Shoulders," and an inconsistency as to whether the subject of the book is referred to as "Fawn" or "Brodie."

Nevertheless, Bringhurst has produced a credible and important book. Some LDS readers may long for deeper explanation and more analysis of Brodie as both lapsed Mormon and prolific biographer. At least one chapter devoted to the aura that Brodie has held over the Mormon culture for the past half century would also have been a welcome addition. Brodie was a woman of such complexity that she is worthy of even more pages.

To comment on this article, or to read comments by others, visit our website: <www.Sunstoneonline.com>.

PICTURE IMPERFECT
(after a painting by Henri Rousseau)

Given the eyes' fondness
for taking images in, for tumbling them
like clothes in a dryer
until the brain retrieves them
and tries them on,
given the tongue's urge to repeat
what the synapses say, like gossip
working its way through a small town's telephone wires,
given any explanation for what gets caught
inside the skull, I'm inclined
to take a quick step outside of myself,
admire the whole business
as if it were framed
and hanging in the Louvre.
Then again, what if the world is perfect
but I'm all wrong,
just a pale nude figure on a chair,
a menagerie looking on
as if the human form
is nature's experiment with abstraction.
I don't know how to make this
any clearer, I keep all my problems
like pickles in a jar,
and if for an instant the light is right
I think that I think I can see.

—DAVID FEELA
PROPOSITION 22 DOMINATES CALIFORNIA WARDS’ ATTENTION, DIVIDES MEMBERS

ON 7 MARCH 2000, California voters endorsed, 61.4 percent to 38.6 percent, a ballot measure designed to prevent the state from recognizing same-sex marriages that might, at some future date, be performed in other states. The measure, Proposition 22—also known as the “Knight Initiative,” for the legislator who sponsored it—received overwhelming support from California Mormons, who received explicit direction from Church leaders not only to vote “YES,” but to donate money (specific amounts were suggested in some cases), and to spend large amounts of time canvassing voters both by phone and door-to-door. Although church members who supported the initiative took opposition to their stance in stride, the nearly year-long drive toward election day brought intense media scrutiny of the Church’s actions, placed strain on gay Mormons and their family members, and in some cases divided wards and neighborhoods as the topic increasingly came to dominate church meetings and members’ attention.

THE ROAD TO CALIFORNIA

CHURCH leaders brought their anti-gay marriage campaign to California following highly publicized financial contributions to similar efforts in Hawaii and Alaska. Dubbed by leaders a “moral” rather than “political” issue, official support for anti-gay legislation brings to mind, as many observers have noted, the Church’s anti-ERA drive in the
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"If there be any Mormon millionaire who objects to this union, let him write out his check now or forever hold his peace."
1970s and early 1980s. In some ways, the new campaign might be classed as an extension of the earlier crusade, since much of the official church rhetoric surrounding the ERA focused on a perceived threat that the amendment would open doors to gay civil rights and erode "traditional" marriage in other ways.

Some religious leaders, such as Archbishop Mark Shirlau of the Ecumenical Catholic Church, pleaded with LDS leaders to reconsider their position on the initiative. However, as sociologist Kendall White pointed out in a November 1999 paper before the Society for the Scientific Study of Religion, the campaign actually had an ecumenical result of sorts, furthering the Church's alliances with segments of the Religious Right that historically have considered Mormons to be non-Christian.

Unlike the campaigns in Hawaii and Alaska, to which Church headquarters in Salt Lake City made lump-sum contributions of $600,000 and $500,000 dollars respectively, the drive to endorse Proposition 22 in California entailed rallying members to raise funds themselves and to volunteer time campaigning. Such activities are again reminiscent of the anti-ERA movement but, unlike that drive, were publicly acknowledged to a much greater degree, at least following the first signs of media coverage.

Much of the institutional groundwork for the anti-gay movement within the Church (leaders prefer the term "pro-family" to "anti-gay") is provided by "The Family: A Proclamation to the World," the 1995 document in which church leaders affirmed Mormonism's belief that the patriarchal nuclear family reflects God's design for gender and sex roles. The document specifically asserts the existence of traditional male and female roles and includes an injunction against homosexuality. But in combining efforts with other conservative religious groups, the Church has by default embraced a national movement that bases its legal justification for opposing gay marriage on precedents set by nineteenth-century anti-polygamy Supreme Court decisions. Critics of the Church's stance pointed to this irony in editorials throughout the debates. "Mormonism has never spoken with one voice on marriage," wrote Rick Fernandez, Public Relations Director for Affirmation: Gay and Lesbian Mormons. "An official newspaper of the Church [in the nineteenth century] instructed Mormons that '[t]he one-wife system not only degenerates the human family, both physically and intellectually, but it is entirely incompatible with philosophical notions of immortality; it is a lure to temptation, and has always proved a curse to a people."

Femandez also compared the Church's recent endorsement of anti-gay legislation as an unfortunate imitation of persecution early church members received for their unconventional marital practices.

"Mormonism has never spoken with one voice on marriage."
—RICK FERNANDEZ

PRIVATE, THEN PUBLIC, INVOLVEMENT

PROPOSITION 22 was placed on the ballot by Republican state senator Pete Knight after he had unsuccessfully attempted, for several years, to pass similar legislation as a bill. (During the course of the campaign, Knight, who has been criticized by opponents as racist, sexist, and homophobic, was accused of his own gay son of being motivated in this initiative by personal prejudice against his lifestyle.) Church involvement began in May 1999 when a letter signed by the North America West Area Presidency called on California church
members to "do all you can by donating your means and time" in support of the Knight initiative. Later that month, a follow-up letter by Elder Douglas L. Callister, informed them that efforts should not use church property, letterhead, or general announcements in church meetings. (See sidebar for both letters.) These instructions to leaders were not widely reported in the media until July, when the San Francisco Examiner began an investigation of LDS backing for the proposition. The newspaper quoted a Church spokesman as saying that although the message to local church members should be considered as "inspired and coming from the Lord," members would still have the "option" to vote against the measure without threat of church discipline. The Examiner's coverage led San Francisco Supervisor Mark Leno to request an investigation of the Church's tax-exempt status, questioning whether a charitable organization such as the Mormon church can ask its members for their money as well as their support of a political campaign. In Salt Lake, the Church-owned Deseret News responded with an editorial calling Leno's "invocation" of the IRS "Nixonesque" and a threat to free religion and free speech.

The predictable cultural divide between Supervisor Leno and the News's editors was soon supplanted by equally potent di-
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**FIRST LETTER FROM NORTH AMERICA WEST AREA PRESIDENCY TO CALIFORNIA LATTER-DAY SAINTS**

May 11, 1999

To: Area Authority Seventies, Stake Presidents, Mission Presidents, Bishops, Branch Presidents, and all Church Members in California

Instruction from the First Presidency:

Preserving Traditional Marriage

On March 7, 2000, Californians will vote to affirm the union of one man and one woman as the only form of marriage that will be legally recognized in California.

This traditional marriage initiative provides a clear and significant moral choice. The Church's position on this issue is unequivocal. On February 1, 1994, the First Presidency wrote to all priesthood leaders:

"The principles of the gospel and the sacred responsibilities given us require that The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints oppose any efforts to give legal authorization to marriages between persons of the same gender."

Therefore, we ask you to do all you can by donating your means and time to assure a successful vote. Marriage between a man and a woman is ordained of God, and is essential to His eternal plan. It is imperative for us to give our best effort to preserve what our Father in Heaven has put in place.

A broad-based coalition is being formed to work for passage of the traditional marriage initiative. As details about the coalition become available, we will provide you with information on how you might become involved. We thank you for your attention to this vital matter and pray the Lord's richest blessings to be with you.

Sincerely yours,

NORTH AMERICA WEST AREA PRESIDENCY

John B. Dickson
John M. Madsen
Cecil O. Samuelson

---

**LETTER FROM ELDER DOUGLAS L. CALLISTER (AREA AUTHORITY) TO CALIFORNIA STAKE PRESIDENTS**

May 20, 1999

To the Stake Presidents in California

Dear Brethren:

We are grateful for your willingness to support the request of the First Presidency that we assist in every proper way to assure passage of the Traditional Marriage Initiative on the March, 2000 California ballot. This letter contains further instructions in connection with the raising of support funds as follows:

I have been asked to supervise the raising of the funds. I will be assisted by Elders Merrill Higham and Floyd Packard. Within a few days one of us will contact you.

In every instance the contribution of a Church member will be voluntary and in his capacity as a private citizen. No undue pressure of any type should be applied.

No fundraising may take place on Church property, through use of Church letterhead, or by virtue of general announcements in Church meetings.

An education process will be required so that those approached will understand this is a moral issue, rather than political, fully justifying the support of LDS families.

All checks should be made payable to "Defense of Marriage Committee" and mailed to Post Office Box 10637, Glendale, CA 91209-3637. We will keep appropriate accounting records and make these available to you for your individual stake. For each donor, we need the name, address, and occupation. Please advise the donors that contributions are not tax-deductible.

We are pleased to accept contributions from any donor, whether or not a member of the Church. There is no limit on the amount of contribution, although any donor who contributes $10,000 or more must file a simple campaign report. (I can help with this.) We may also accept checks from businesses.

Experience shows that it is generally more successful to begin with the more affluent members, suggesting an appropriate contribution and thereafter extend the invitation to those of lesser means. We desire that as many as possible be invited to contribute in order to increase the awareness of the Initiative and develop a personal attachment to the project. Many of these members will be asked to provide telephone and other grass roots efforts near election time.

Our objective is to raise this money in 60-90 days.

We recognize that this is a large assignment. It is evidence of our continuing commitment to traditional families as the fundamental unit of society. Thank you for this and boundless other service you so faithfully offer.

Sincerely,

Elder Douglas L. Callister
visions within LDS congregations. Those affected most directly were gay church members—many of whom are active in their wards and stakes—and their friends and family members. Mormon-related e-mail discussion groups soon filled with complaints from liberal Latter-day Saints that the Church was exercising undue influence. Rumors circulated—soon confirmed by anti-Knight initiative priesthood leaders privy to discussions in stake leadership meetings—that various church leaders were asking wards and stakes to set specific fundraising goals.

Although Elder Lance B. Wickman, member of the Second Quorum of Seventy and general counsel for the Church, told National Public Radio in early August that requests for specific dollar amounts were against Church policy, the same news broadcast cited letters from stake presidents asking for specific amounts ranging from $30 to $250. Individual members reported being told by their leaders that their wards had been given specific “assessments,” and others said their leaders had mentioned a desired average donation of $250 per family. In an Orange County stake, as well as in others throughout the state, members of the stake presidency visited selected families and asked for donations of $500 dollars. One Los Angeles church member reported in August to the Salt Lake Tribune that a letter from local church leaders suggested donations, tailored to each member’s assumed income, from $1,200 to $10,000. “I just feel they have pushed it too hard,” the member complained.

A solicitation letter from a singles’ ward bishopric in the Long Beach East stake indicated that the coalition supporting the proposition hoped to raise thirty million dollars: four million coming from California Mormons; $30,000 from their stake, and $5,000 from their ward. The letter requested $15 from full-time students, $30 from full-time workers, and indicated that a donor had agreed to match the ward’s fundraising up to $2,500. When Newsweek first covered Mormon involvement in August 1999, the brief report quoted an unnamed local church leader who believed the requests for specific amounts were “beyond the bounds” of appropriate church involvement.

Despite church leaders’ initial instructions not to spend church meeting time on the campaign, by June, some members reported discussion of the initiative in wards.
ward meetings or private interviews with bishops at which couples were invited to donate to the fundraising efforts. Following the October 1999 General Conference, during which President Hinckley forcefully defended the Church's participation in the campaign, reports of meeting time and buildings being used to further the "Yes on 22" effort increased dramatically. Church leaders released a video on the issue. Featuring Elders Neal A. Maxwell, Russell M. Ballard, and Richard G. Scott, the video was initially to be shown in combined Relief Society and Priesthood meetings, but was later redirected toward separate fireside meetings in members' homes. By late October, reports circulated that in some areas church callings were being issued for ward and stake coordinators for the campaign; each ward in California was asked to meet a goal of fifty volunteers working to support the measure. Some stakes held youth firesides to enlist teens. The pro-Knight coalition even advertised in a December issue of BYU's Daily Universe a credit-bearing internship available to students willing to spend their winter semester canvassing in California.

By January 2000, when the North America West Area Presidency issued another letter encouraging members to "redouble their efforts" in support of the initiative, discussion of the issue was, by many accounts, the dominant subject of church meetings. Some members reported that bishops were instructing entire wards to report to stake centers on Saturdays to walk precincts; others indicated that in certain cases, ward leaders would call from the pulpit the names of specific families and instruct them to report for campaign activities; some reported special meetings following the three-hour block on Sundays to focus on the measure's progress. Members distributed hundreds of lawn signs at church meetings and used ward phone and e-mail lists to pepper one another with reminders of campaign activities. In one Orange County ward, the

\begin{center}
\textbf{GAY MORMON SUICIDES MOURNED IN PROP'S WAKE}
\end{center}
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\textbf{ONLY DAYS} after responding to a BYU Daily Universe letter that compared homosexuality to pedophilia, bestiality, and Satanism, Stuart Matis, a 32-year-old returned missionary from Santa Clara, California, shot himself on the steps of a local LDS stake center. Although Matis's family members and some friends were quick to distance his death from the Church's ardent campaign in California for Proposition 22, the issue had clearly haunted Matis for months. He had written a 12-page letter to a cousin explaining his opposition to the church's stance, which he called "anti-family," and he worried that gay Mormon children exposed to anti-gay rhetoric surrounding the ballot initiative would be emotionally scarred. Matis's death, widely publicized in local, electronic, and eventually national media (in Newsweek) was followed by two other suicides of young gay Mormon men, D. J. Thompson, of Arizona, and Clay Whitmer, of the San Francisco bay area. Whitmer had become friends with Matis while the two had served as missionaries in Italy in the late 1980s. An interfaith memorial service for Matis and Thompson, featuring the Salt Lake Men's Choir and friends of the deceased, was held 19 March at the Cathedral Church of St. Mark (Episcopal) in Salt Lake City. At a separate memorial service held by Matis's family, Robert A. Rees, Stuart's former bishop, explained that although Matis had become "increasingly comfortable being truly and openly gay" in the months leading to his death, "he had difficulty holding on to these [positive] feelings in the face of lifelong messages that told him such feelings were not only wrong, but that he was evil for having them." He apparently believed he had been given a choice between living as a Mormon and living true to himself, but it was not one he could bring himself to make, despite the support of family and friends.

What follows are excerpts from Matis's letter to a cousin, widely distributed on the Internet, explaining his opposition to the Church's activism on Proposition 22:

Dear _____,

It was great to hear from you. So, you want to have my opinions regarding the Knight Initiative? At the outset, I'll tell you that the events surrounding this initiative have been painfully difficult for me to endure. Last July, I read online that the Church had instructed the Bishops to read a letter imploring the members to give of their time and money to support this initiative. I almost went into a panic attack. I cried for hours in my room, and I could do very little to console the grief of hearing this news... In July, I realized that I was going to have to endure viewing millions of dollars of television ads designed with one intention in mind: [to] raise fear against gay and lesbian Californians. What is worse is that this fear campaign has been orchestrated by my own friends....

If there is anything consistent in any anti-gay debate, it is the superfluous use of platitudes and bumper sticker slogans. The debate in support of the Knight Initiative is no different. The slogan that is repeatedly used is that the Church Initiative is needed to protect families (the Church uses "defend the institution of the family"). ... The problem is that this issue has been framed as a false dilemma and too many members and supporters of Knight have been snookered into believing it. The false dilemma is that either one is pro-homosexuality or pro-family. This, of course, is false. I am gay. I hate to sound redundant, but whether I remain celibate or find a partner, the net effect on families is zero....

Ironically, the Church's positions on homosexuality have actually been anti-family. Several decades ago it was church policy...
bishops stood at the corner of the parking lot (technically not on church grounds) and handed out “Yes on 22” signs as cars left the ward parking lot after Sunday meetings.

DIVIDED RESPONSE

SUPPORT among Latter-day Saints was high but not universal. Dozens of active church members who opposed the proposition sought consolation and voiced indignation over public e-mail lists to like-minded members who opposed the proposition and voiced indignation over public e-mail list to like-minded

In another act of protest, Salt Lake gay activist Kathy Worthington, herself a former Mormon, organized a mass withdrawal of members from the Church that, at this writing, numbers 275 people. Although church officials hastened to explain to reporters that members would not be punished for failing to support the proposition, news accounts reported that many such Mormons were afraid to give reporters their names. In at least one well-publicized case, church members Alan and Yvette Hansen of Tracy, California, were placed on “informal probation” by their bishop after they wrote to their local newspaper opposing the Church’s stance. The Hansens, who also received threatening phone calls responding to the “No on Prop. 22” sign posted in their yard, reported that several church members quietly congratulated them for their public stance.

In Salt Lake, following the initial waves of publicity on the issue, the Gay and Lesbian Political Action Committee of Utah, calling the Knight Initiative an “attack on gay and lesbian families,” held a press conference to advocate marriage as a cure for one’s homosexuality. This inevitably resulted in many broken marriages and families. The Church also postulated that men became gay because of a doting mother and an absent father. This inevitably cast blame on the grieving parents. The Church’s positions and outspoken frankness on this issue have nurtured a climate that is hostile for young gay Mormons. Kids have been thrown out of homes under the guise of Christian love. Brothers and sisters have broken off contact from their gay brothers and sisters. I recently read the letter of a brother in Salt Lake City who had to send his son far away from home to a private high school because he was constantly tormented in Salt Lake high schools and by his neighbors. Unfortunately, the promotion of the Knight Initiative will only worsen an already polluted environment. Homophobia is a disease that destroys families. Unfortunately, the Church’s rhetoric and actions will only continue to nurture this disease.

Straight members have absolutely no idea what it is like to grow up gay in this Church. It is a life of constant torment, self-hatred and internalized homophobia. Imagine the young gay boy frightened to death to divulge his secret pain to his dad because he witnesses his dad stomping around the neighborhood placing up Knight signs. Imagine the young gay girl who listens to her mother profess her love for her as she writes a check to chapel halls. These members know the intent of their children’s pain. They have nowhere to go but to lay [sic] on their floors curled in a ball and weep themselves to sleep.

The Church’s involvement in the Knight Initiative will only add to the great pain suffered by these young gay Mormons. This is a fear-based, divisive, galvanizing movement. Members who don’t even vote in presidential elections now put signs on their lawns and march around the neighborhood like precinct workers. On the night of March 7th, many California couples will retire to their beds thrilled that they helped pass the Knight Initiative. What they don’t realize is that in the next room, their son or daughter is lying in bed crying and could very well one day be a victim of society’s homophobia. The Knight Initiative will certainly save no family. It is codified hatred. It is anti-family, antimorality, and it is wrong.

This is precisely why you will not see a church member who has a gay son or daughter placing signs on his or her lawn. These members will not be walking around their neighborhoods. These members will ache every time a gay debate ensues in the chapel halls. These members know the intent of their children’s hearts. They know the goodness of their spirit. They see the goodness in their children’s gay friends. They see and experience homophobia on a personal basis, and they collectively mourn the Church’s involvement in the Knight Initiative. I wish that I could shout this message from the rooftops, but alas, I sit alone in my room typing, wondering what will happen next . . . .

Take care.

Warmly,

Stuart

“As I type this letter, there are surely boys and girls on their calloused knees imploring God to free them from this pain.”

SUNSTONE
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LETTER FROM NORTH AMERICA WEST AREA PRESIDENCY TO CALIFORNIA CHURCH LEADERS

11 January 2000

To: All Stake Presidents and Bishops in California, to be read in sacrament meeting Sunday, January 16.

Dear Brethren:

The First Presidency and Quorum of the Twelve have solemnly proclaimed that marriage between a man and a woman is ordained of God (The Family: a Proclamation to the World). On March 7, members of the Church in California will have the unique opportunity to promote a measure that will help maintain and strengthen the family as the fundamental unit of society.

By voting YES and urging family and friends to vote YES on Proposition 22, which limits legally sanctioned marriage in California to a man and a woman, the divinely established institution of marriage will be protected.

President Gordon B. Hinckley stated in the October 1999 General Conference, "Some portray legalization of so-called same-sex marriage as a civil right. This is not a matter of civil rights; it is a matter of morality. . . . nevertheless, . . . our opposition to legalize same-sex marriage should never be interpreted as justification for hatred, intolerance, or abuse of those who profess homosexual tendencies. . . ."

"I commend those of our membership who have voluntarily joined with other like-minded people to defend the sanctity of traditional marriage. As part of a coalition that embraces those of other faiths, you are giving substantially of your means. You are contributing your time and talents in a cause that in some quarters may not be politically correct but which nevertheless lies at the heart of the Lord's eternal plan for His children."

We express our gratitude to you who have already given unstintingly of your time and means to this effort. Now with only 45 days remaining until voters go to the polls, we urge all members to redouble their efforts in this noble cause. We would greatly appreciate it if all would continue contacting friends and neighbors as directed by the local coordinator about this issue, and distribute, as well as put on your own lawns, the provided yard signs.

Please be sure that you are eligible and registered to vote, assist others to do the same, and help in other ways as election time nears.

Sincerely,

North America West Area Presidency
John B. Dickson
William Bradford
Richard H. Winkel
In February 2001, the Church issued official statements emphasizing the use of the full name of the Church and asking media and members to no longer refer to it as the “Mormon Church” (see page 28 for more details). Pat Bagley and Cal Grondahl, just had to react.
2000 SUNSTONE SYMPOSIUM
2–5 AUGUST, SALT LAKE MARRIOTT HOTEL
CASSETTE RECORDINGS

Prices: 1–2 tapes = $8.00 ea.; 3–5 tapes = $7.50 ea.; 6 or more tapes = $7.00 ea. Purchase seven tapes for $49, and get an eighth plus an 8-cassette binder FREE!

Use order form at right, or call 801/355-5926 for credit card orders.

The numbers refer to the session numbers in the 2000 Sunstone Symposium program. Contact Sunstone (801/355-5926) to receive a free copy of the final program, which has detailed abstracts of each session.

POPULAR TAPES

001. PIANOS & DRUMS: TAKING THE GOSPEL GLOBAL, WHAT’S UNIVERSAL? WHAT’S CULTURAL? LESSONS FROM AFRICA
Panel: Bernard Ch. Silva, Paul Clark, Gretchen Clark, Homer Lobar, Norman Bangerter, Hollis Johnson

164. BUILDING SUCCESSFUL RELATIONSHIPS BASED ON EQUALITY
Renée Carlson

172. THE AGONY AND ECSTASY OF GETTING THE NEW CONFERENCE CENTER ORGAN AND ACOUSTICS JUST RIGHT. AND P.S., THE WALNUT PODIUM, TOO
Paul Fetzer

173. THE SMOKE STILL LINGERS: THE MARK HOFMANN AFFAIR FIFTEEN YEARS LATER
Panel: Steve Mayfield, Brent Ashworth, George Stephenson

181. MORMONISM ON THE BIG SCREEN: FROM SECT TO DENOMINATION
Panel: Dan Wotherspoon, Brian Birch, Elaine Englehardt, Mary Ellen Robertson, Scott Kenney

191. MORMONISM ON THE BIG SCREEN: WHAT TO MAKE OF RICHARD DUTCHER’S MOTION PICTURE SUCCESS, GOD’S ARMY?
Panel: Troy Williams, Geoff Pingree, Barbara Bannom, Tim Sloyer, Richard Dutcher

224. RELATIVE STRANGERS: BLOOD, ADOPTION, AND ETERNAL DESTINY
Panel: Carolyn Campbell, Shari Thornock, Jill Ekstrom, Darlene Dineen, Kellie Forbes, Shawna Bradley

265. GEORGE Q. CANNON: CONTROVERSIAL ECONOMIC INNOVATOR DURING THE DEPRESSION OF THE 1890S
Edward Leo Lyman

291. GROWING UP MORMON IN THE 1890S
Clauer L. Bushman

326. REMEMBERING THE GAY SUICIDES
Panel: Jay Bell, Robert Rees, David Hardy, Carla Hardy, Judd Hardy

333. UNDERSTANDING MORMONISM’S SEALED BOOK: DIGGING IN CUMORAH: RECLAIMING BOOK OF MORMON NARRATIVES
Panel: Brent Metcalf, Blake T. Ostler, Kevin Christensen, Mark D. Thomas

334. SHOULDCHEURSESSEEK FORGIVENESS?
Panel: Robert A. Rees, Rev. Carolyn Tanner Irish, Rev. Rodger Russell, Owen Cummings

352. EVIL AMONG US: THE TEXAS MORMON MISSIONARY MURDERS
Ken Driggs

391. PILLARS OF MY FAITH
Kim Batten, Carol Lynne Pearson

C. Jess Grosebeck

112. WHAT I MEAN WHEN I SAY AN “OPEN APPROACH” MORMONISM IS IDEAL SUNSTONE STRIVES FOR: A MEMOIR
Elbert Eugene Peck

122. A DIFFERENT (YET STILL FIRME?) FOUNDATION: ACTIVISTIC ETHICS WITHIN A FINITISTIC THEOLOGY
Kim McCall

132. IS EVIL NECESSARY?: GOOD, EVIL, SIN, AND THE NATURE OF REALITY
Janice Allred

133. ETHERAL SPIRITS AND THE NECESSITY OF CONTINGENCY
Benjamin Huff

134. THE ACADEMIC STUDY OF RELIGION: PROSPECTS AND PERILS
Panel: Dan Witherstrop, Brian Birch, Elaine Englehardt, Eugene England, Mary Ellen Robertson, Scott Kenney

151. ENCONTES Y AHORA, THEN AND NOW: A LOOK AT THE NEW SPANISH HYMNAL
John-Charles Duffy, Hugo Olazar, resp.

153. DNA ON THE WITNESS STAND
Panel: Dan Witherstrop, Brian Birch, Elaine Englehardt, Eugene England, Mary Ellen Robertson, Scott Kenney

161. MORMON PUBLISHING IN THE 1990’S: FROM THE SIRLY TO THE SUBLIME
Greg Kofford, Tom Kimball

171. DNA ON THE WITNESS STAND
D. Jeffery Mildrum

174. LITTLE MORMON MAGAZINES: SINKING, SWIMMING, AND TRENDING WATER
Panel: Lavina Fielding Anderson, Tony Anderson, Chris Bigelow, and Tessa Santiago

181. MORMON PUBLISHING IN THE 90’S: FROM THE SIRLY TO THE SUBLIME
Greg Kofford, Tom Kimball

C. Jess Grosebeck

201. WHAT I MEAN WHEN I SAY AN “OPEN APPROACH” MORMONISM IS IDEAL SUNSTONE STRIVES FOR: A MEMOIR
Elbert Eugene Peck

211. CALCULATED RISK: THE QUEST FOR FREEDOM AND DIVERSITY IN UTAH
Panel: Dan Witherstrop, Brian Birch, Elaine Englehardt, Eugene England, Mary Ellen Robertson, Scott Kenney

212. SPIRITUALITY AND THE ARTS: MUSIC, BOOKS, AND MOVIES THAT HAVE ENRICHED MY SOUL AND RELIGIOUS WORLD VIEW
Panel: Scott Sorenson, Jane England

221. THE DECAY OF THE SIXTIES: THE EARLY STRENGTHS IN THE RLDS SHIFT FROM SFC TO SEDUMINATION
William D. Russell

224. GOD IS LIGHT, SOMEWHERE IN TIME AND EVERYWHERE TRANSCENDING TIME
B. Grant Bishop, Scott Denhalter, resp.

225. AN HISTORICAL INTERPRETATION OF CONTEMPORARY LDS ATTITUDES CONCERNING THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION
Tim Reid, Duane Jeffery, resp.

231. POLITICS OF ZION
Brian Brinton, Richard Sherlock

232. ABOVE THE AMERICAN RENAISSANCE?: COULD JOSEPH SMITH HAVE WRITTEN THE BOOK OF MORMON?
Robert A. Rees, Mark D. Thomas, resp.

233. WE WANT TO PUT YOUR IDEAS INTO PRINT: A HOW-TO GUIDE FOR PUBLISHING WITH THE MORMON PRESS

236. PERUSING THE DECALOGUE
Lew W. Wallace

241. TEN COMMANDMENTS OF MORMON HUMOR
Edgar C. Snow (available only on videotape for $10 plus mailing)

244. THURLE GLADYS: THE CHANGING FACE OF MORMON DIVERSITY
Paul Swanson

255. WENDY AND THE LOST GIRLS
Karin Anderson England, Nadine Hansen, resp.

261. LUCY’S MEMOIR: A FAMILY TREE
Brian H. Sturk, Lavina Fielding Anderson

262. ORSON SCOTT CARD AND THE ONTOLOGY OF REDEMPTION
Bill Martin, Dan Wotherspoon, resp.

263. “A PRIEST FOREVER ACCORDING TO THE ORDER OF MELCHIZEDEK?”, THE UNDERSTANDING OF PRIESTHOOD IN THE RLDS AND CATHOLIC TRADITIONS WITH PARTICULAR FOCUS ON THE APPROPRIATION OF BIBLICAL IMAGERY
Fr. Jordan Lenaghan, Gregory A. Prince, resp.

264. FROM CAMP OF ISRAEL TO GOOD NEIGHBORS: STAGES OF GROWTH IN ORGANIZATIONS
John Tarjan
LOVING THE SINNER, HATING THE SIN: AN INTERFAITH PANEL ON DEALING WITH THE PENITENT

A TRIBUTE TO ARTHUR HENRY KING, 1910-2000: SCHOLAR, POET, MENTOR, FRIEND
Panel: Karen Marguerite Moloney, Fred Pinnegar, Giles Florence, Eugene England

TOWARD A NEW MORMON CULTURAL STUDIES, OR, TEN BOOKS I WISH SOMEONE (ELSE) WOULD WRITE
Panel: Bryan Waterman, Stacy Burton, Gary James Bergens, Mark Bremson

MULTIPLY AND REPLENISH—IF YOU WANT TO: THE 1999 LDS CHURCH BIRTH CONTROL POLICY IN PERSPECTIVE
Maxine Hanks, resp. by Kerrie Galloway, Rebecca Chandler

THEOLOGY AND CHRISTOLOGY THROUGH THE LENS OF A LITTLE COUPLE
Rex Sears, Mark Gustavson, resp.

DANCING WITH THE SACRED
Phyllis Barber

DAVID MCKAY AND THE "TWIN SISTERS": FREE AGENCY AND TOLERANCE
Gregory A. Prince, Stan Larson, resp.

LABORING IN THE FIELD: LOOKING FOR GOD IN MY PROFESSION
Panel: Julie Nicholas, Julie Cummings, James Lyons

SUB-ORDINATION: MORMON WOMEN'S HISTORICAL RELATIONSHIP WITH SPIRITUAL GIFTS AND PRIESTHOOD AUTHORITY
Mary Ellen Robertson

THE REAL OLYMPICS SCANDAL
Ron Molten, Rob Bishop, resp.

ARE WE LATTER-DAY PSYCHIATRISTS: RESOURCES IN MORMONISM FOR AFFIRMING THE PARANORMAL
Dan Wotherspoon, Paul Montclair, resp.

LAUGHING WITH THE SINNERS: THE EMERGENCE OF MORMON CULT MOVIES
Hugo Olaz, Matthew Workman

MORMONISM AND CHRISTIANITY, OR ARE CHRISTIANS MORMON?
Bill Martin

MY CREED: WRITING ONE'S PERSONAL ARTICLE OF FAITH
Panel: Marilyn Bushman-Carlton, Julie Cummings, Emily Butcher, Kim Walters, Ardel Broodber

FOND FAREWELL TO AN IRREVERENT SEMINARIAN: TRIBUTE TO AND REMINISCENCES OF PETER C. APPLEBY (CLARE TO HIS FRIENDS)
Panel: Rex Sears, Mark Gustavson

BODIES, PARTS, AND PERSONS: IMAGE AND IDENTITY IN WOMEN'S LIVES
Panel: Camille Bixler, Katherine Alired, Lucinda Bittman, Lauren Florence

ETERNAL FAMILY FEUD: THE ALTERNATE VOICES GAMESHOW SHOWDOWN

PRELUDE TO "DEFENSE OF MARRIAGE" CAMPAIGN: CIVIL DISCRIMINATION AGAINST FEARED OR DESPISED MINORITIES
D. Michael Quinn

WHAT DOES GOD WRITE IN HIS FRANKLIN PLANNER? THE PARADOXES OF PROVIDENCE, PROPHECY, AND PETITIONARY PRAYER
R. Dennis Potter, Ron Bishop, resp.

THE WALLS LEFT STANDING: STORIES FROM MY EAST GERMAN JOURNAL
Rebecca Chandler

JOSEPH SMITH AS PUBLIC SPEAKER
Richard N. Armstrong
"MORAL COURAGE ENOUGH"

By Eliza Roxcy Snow

The Personal Writings of Eliza Roxcy Snow, edited by Maureen Ursenbach Beecher, has recently been released in a new edition as part of the "Life Writings of Frontier Women" series from Utah State University Press. This excerpt is from the closing address Snow read to her Nauvoo school class on 17 March 1843. Her class, taught in the large second-story room in Joseph Smith's red-brick store, consisted of thirty-seven "young scholars," ages four to seventeen, including four Smiths, five Whitneys, two Partridges, and three Knights, among others.

BEFORE RELINQUISHING my care, I wish again to impress your minds with the importance of scholarly pursuits. Altho' they may appear of little consequence in themselves; they form the laws of civilization, literature and refinement; therefore let not your early life be trifled away on nonsensical objects; but in all your pursuits, have a wise reference to the future.

Let your thoughts be elevated...and study to make yourselves useful. By early habit you will accustom yourselves to blend the useful with the agreeable in such a manner as that the every-day duties of life will be pleasurable; and that course of life which proposes the most usefulness, will conduct most to your individual happiness by contributing most to the happiness of others. How much better—how much nobler the principle of habituating yourselves to derive pleasure by contributing to the happiness of those around you, than to seek it in the indulgence of that little selfishness of feeling which extends no farther, and has no other object than mere personal gratification?

Endeavor to cultivate sufficient independence of mind, that you will dare to do right—that will inspire you with moral courage enough to stem the tide of evil example, realizing that the eyes of the great God are continually upon you, and let his approbation be esteemed the richest reward, regardless of the frowns and the smiles of the vain & unprincipled, who would fain lead you from the paths of rectitude...

Do not overestimate the merit of your own actions, and console your feelings with the idea that the eyes of Him who judgeth righteously are upon you...

The human mind possesses an adhesive quality—it is apt to adhere to, and contract a likeness to that with which it comes most in contact, or with which it is most conversant; therefore it is all important that you should be wise in the choice of your particular associates—Let the good—the honest and the upright constitute the society in which you familiarize your thoughts and feelings, at the same time, be courteous and affable to all...

Court the society of the aged who have trod the path of life before you—these who have accumulated wisdom by length of years and practical experience. Listen respectfully to their instructions, and profit by their counsels. Never treat them with that arrogance and insolence which too much characterizes the manners of the present age. Honor them as they honor God—look up to them with reverence and treat them with kindness and affection, reflecting that, should you arrive to their years, how gratifying it will be to yourselves to see the children and youth, look up to you with respectful attention, and leaning upon you as the guardians of their virtues, and the protectors and supporters of their morals, like the tender twig sheltering itself beneath the spreading umbrage of the sturdy and inflexible oak...

With the most earnest desires for your present & eternal welfare, praying God in the name of Jesus Christ that you may be blest with the richest of heaven's blessings—that you may be preserved from the evils that are in the world, and be of that number who, having the harps of God, shall sing the song of Moses and the Lamb and inherit the glory of the celestial kingdom, I bid you all, an affectionate farewell!
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Sojourner in the Promised Land is the product of an ingenious creator, a discoverer and inventor of illuminating conceptual categories, and a thorough scholar.

—PHILIP BARLOW

Jan Shipps’s personal and professional narrative of her lifelong career as a student of Mormonism is the most sensitive, nuanced, intelligent, and informative account by a non-Mormon scholar we have.

—HOWARD R. LAMAR

Publisher’s Price: $34.95
Sunstone Price: $31.45

Order now!
Copies available at the Sunstone mercantile
<www.sunstoneonline.com>

University of Illinois Press. Hardcover. 400 pages.