

The Mormon Struggle with Assimilation and Identity: Trends and Developments Since Midcentury¹

Armand L. Mauss

THIS ESSAY IS A SOCIOLOGICAL INTERPRETATION of the major developments in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints since the mid-twentieth century, not a comprehensive history. It is a study in large part of the sociological consequences, whether intended or unintended, of organizational success. I think these developments and consequences occur both at the *official* ecclesiastical level and at the grassroots level of *folk* religion and folk culture. I distinguish between those developments which are more *public* and those which are more *internal* and thus perhaps less noticeable, at least to the outside. Since external or public developments are both better known and less arguable, I shall review these first and rather superficially.

PUBLIC OR EXTERNAL DEVELOPMENTS

I take it that the following developments in the LDS church are well known and scarcely controversial, needing but little special comment from me:

1. *Rapid membership growth, doubling about every fifteen years, from a million members at the end of World War II, to about 9 million now. Certain concomitants of this growth have also been interesting and have had*

1. Of related articles I have published over the past several years, most familiar to *Dialogue* readers is "Assimilation and Ambivalence: The Mormon Reaction to Americanization," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 22 (Spring 1989): 30-67.

"side-consequences" of their own: (a) a reversal of the ratio of member-child baptisms to new converts; that is, earlier most membership growth came from natural increase, but now about three-fourths come from new converts; (b) a redistribution of membership, with no more than a fourth in the U.S. Far West, and about 40 percent now outside of North America altogether, especially in Latin America; (c) the emergence, for the first time in LDS history, of a second generation outside North America (still small, but emerging); (d) within North America, a new appeal of Mormonism in the deep and near South; outside of the Far West, more American converts join each year from the old Confederacy than from any other section of the country; 10 percent of all American Mormons now live in that section of the country, but 20 percent of all American *converts* come from that section; (e) Mormons still comprise only 2-3 percent of all Americans, but the LDS church has become a major American denomination, following in size only the Roman Catholics, the Southern Baptists, the Methodists, and perhaps the Lutherans, depending on how one combines or divides the various Lutheran bodies.²

2. *Rapid material gain as an institution, especially during the past thirty years.* Historian Michael Quinn has found that in 1962 the LDS church was \$30 million in debt, whereas now its assets are counted in the billions. Most of these assets are used for religious and charitable purposes, but they still constitute an enormous economic base on which the church can project future growth and assert present political and economic power of more worldly kinds.³

3. *Rapid upward mobility of American Mormons in socio-economic status (as individuals).* In the 1940s, American Mormons were still predominantly of farming and working-class origins and statuses. By 1990, Mormons ranked after only Episcopalians, Jews, and in a virtual tie with Presbyterians, in various measures of socio-economic status, such as education, occupational prestige, and income. There is evidence, however, that Mormons have not distributed themselves evenly or randomly in their choices of educational major or occupational careers, seeming to favor particularly corporate business, law, medicine, and dentistry. During the same period, Mormons have come to be slightly over-represented in national political offices, both elective and appointive, though not yet to the same degree of over-representation as Jews or Episcopalians.⁴

2. See *LDS Church News*, 10 Apr. 1993, 23, on church growth during the previous decade. See also any recent edition of the *Deseret News Church Almanac*.

3. Richard Robertson (and collaborators), "Mormon, Inc.," *The Arizona Republic*, 30 June-3 July 1991. Quinn's disclosure was made during a presentation on LDS church financial history at the August 1991 Sunstone Symposium, Salt Lake City.

4. For data on the relative SES of Mormons, see W. Clark Roof and William

INTERNAL AND GRASSROOTS DEVELOPMENTS

The external and public developments sketched above have had some interesting internal consequences, both at the official ecclesiastical level and at the "folk" or grassroots level. These internal developments have not been attributable solely to the growth and material improvements just mentioned. They must be understood also as reactions in large part to the "Age of Aquarius," as the 1960s have sometimes been called. In any case, the internal developments can be summed up in the term "retrenchment," some of which has been led and sponsored by church leadership, and some of which has been more spontaneous, taking the form of a kind of grassroots fundamentalism.

None of this would have been predictable at midcentury (and indeed was not predicted by Thomas F. O'Dea in his classic study published at that time).⁵ By the 1950s the LDS church had been deliberately and consciously travelling an assimilationist course in its relationships with the surrounding American society, trying hard to live down the opprobrium of the nineteenth century and to acquire modern American respectability. The external developments just reviewed make it clear that this assimilationist policy worked well. The policy, furthermore, was much in line with the received theoretical wisdom of the sociology of religion, which had always predicted that new religious movements, if they survive, are inexorably assimilated and secularized by their host societies, and this as the very condition of their survival.⁶

Whether on the basis of sociological theory, therefore, or on the basis of observable empirical trends at midcentury, we should have expected the LDS church to continue down the well-worn path of secularization and assimilation made smooth by the Episcopalians, Methodists, Presbyterians, and others. Instead, LDS trends since midcentury have made for a resemblance to Southern Baptists. The church has, that is, deliberately turned partially away from Americanization toward a policy of retrenchment in an apparent effort to stop (or slow down) the erosion of the unique

McKinney, *American Mainline Religion: Its Changing Shape and Future* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1987). On Mormon over-representation in Congress, see James T. Duke and Barry L. Johnson, "Religious Affiliation and Congressional Representation," *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 31 (1992): 324-29.

5. Thomas F. O'Dea, *The Mormons* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957); see especially his glance toward the future in chaps. 9 and 10.

6. For a comparison between this "received theoretical wisdom" and the newly emerging paradigm in the sociology of religion, see R. Stephen Warner, "Work in Progress toward a New Paradigm for the Sociological Study of Religion in the United States," *American Journal of Sociology* 98 (1993): 1044-93. See also chap. 1 of my *Angel and Beehive* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1994) for a discussion of the theoretical implications of the "Mormon anomaly" *vis à vis* traditional sociological theory.

Mormon identity and to re-establish some of its nineteenth-century image as a "peculiar people." As indicated, this retrenchment process has had both official and grassroots manifestations. Let us review the official manifestations first.

OFFICIAL MANIFESTATIONS

1. *Renewed emphasis on the claim to modern revelation.* This can be seen in the rhetoric of general conferences analyzed by sociologists Gordon Shepherd and Gary Shepherd; in the relatively recent additions to the Doctrine and Covenants; in the increased promotion of the Book of Mormon, both inside and outside the church; and in the retroactive "Mormonization" of the King James Bible through the imposition of hermeneutics derived from latter-day scriptures and from the Joseph Smith Translation. It is as though the brethren have been reaffirming to the world that revelation did not cease with nineteenth-century Mormon prophets any more than it did with biblical prophets.⁷

2. *Renewed emphasis on genealogy and temple work.* This development hardly needs much demonstration or substantiation beyond pointing to the ambitious temple-building program of the church (from only eight temples at midcentury to more than fifty now) and to the enormous improvements in both resources and technology represented by the hundreds of computerized stake genealogical libraries around the world (recently renamed "Family History Libraries"). The new temples have a way of making this development seem quite public at times and, indeed, are widely used, both before and after dedication, for public promotional purposes. Yet genealogy and temple work remain little-known aspects of Mormon life to the outside.

3. *Family renewal and retrenchment.* This began in the early 1960s (even before the Age of Aquarius was in full sway) with new Family Home Evening manuals provided each home and the night set aside each week. More recently this motif appears also in the resistance to feminism and in a re-emphasis on the religious aspects of the role of patriarch or father. As

7. See Gordon and Gary Shepherd, *A Kingdom Transformed: Themes in the Development of Mormonism* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1984), for an empirical study of changing emphases in general conference addresses across Mormon history, with particular reference to changes since 1950. For the recent "Mormonization" of the King James Version of the Bible, see Edward H. Ashment, "Making the Scriptures 'Indeed One in Our Hands,'" in Dan Vogel, ed., *The Word of God: Essays on Mormon Scripture* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1990), 237-64; see also Armand L. Mauss and Philip L. Barlow, "Church, Sect, and Scripture: The Protestant Bible and Mormon Sectarian Retrenchment," *Sociological Analysis* 52 (1991): 397-414; and Mauss, *Angel and Beehive*, chaps. 6 and 7.

time has gone on, this aspect of LDS retrenchment has become somewhat contentious, as well-meaning Mormons and their equally well-meaning leaders have sought new ways to adapt traditional LDS values to the moral predicaments presented by the "liberated" American society of the post-1960s.⁸

4. *A tremendous upgrading of the missionary enterprise*, both quantitatively and qualitatively. In quantitative terms, we can observe that the total membership of the LDS church has increased eightfold since 1950, whereas the missionary corps has increased tenfold. About a third of all LDS men between the ages of 19 and 25 serve full-time missions, an appreciable number of young women, and increasing numbers of retired couples. In qualitative terms, we can cite the increased integration of full-time missionary work with local ward friendship networks; the improved language training at various regional training centers; the constant "fine tuning" and "course correcting" of proselyting strategies and tactics; and the little-known but highly sophisticated social science research that is conducted under church auspices and provides the basis for all this training and fine-tuning.

5. *An intensified and worldwide commitment to religious education*. The LDS seminary and institute programs, of course, have their origins early in the century, but they were always limited to Utah and a few other locales with significant Mormon numbers. Beginning in the 1960s, we can see a mushrooming of the seminary and institute programs, both in their extensiveness and in the portion of the church budget which they consume. The Church Education System (CES) now reaches far outside of North America to provide seminary classes in many parts of Europe, Asia, and Latin America. At the same time, the pedagogical philosophy of CES has manifestly changed from one of intellectual exploration and articulation to one of rote memorization and indoctrination.⁹

Now all five of these major developments in the LDS church during the past few decades have in common (a) an overt retrenchment theme; (b) roots in authentic early Mormonism; and (c) the obvious and explicit sponsorship and leadership of the general authorities of the church. It is in that sense that they must be considered both deliberate and official. Yet there is at least one more important development, this one not necessarily

8. In the new *Encyclopedia of Mormonism*, Daniel H. Ludlow, ed., (New York: Macmillan, 1992), see the entries for topics such as Abuse (Spouse and Child), Birth Control, Chastity, Divorce, Family Home Evening, Feminism, Motherhood, Women (Roles of), Men (Roles of), Procreation, and Sexuality. Taken together, these entries display an ambivalent tone, sometimes sounding traditional and sometimes modern.

9. See "Church Educational System" in *Encyclopedia of Mormonism*. For a discussion of the changing nature of CES pedagogy, see chaps. 6, 10, and 11 of my *Angel and Beehive*.

traceable to early Mormon roots, but nevertheless extremely important to the five developments I have just outlined. I speak, of course, of the correlation movement.

Space does not permit a thorough analysis here of this organizational strategy, but I have more to say about it elsewhere, and it has been given some attention by other investigators, as well.¹⁰ Here it will suffice to note that "correlation" for Mormons refers to an organizational philosophy and strategy aimed at the *standardization* of church policies, practices, and curricula all the way down to the local level, and at the centralization, concentration, and penetration of priesthood *control* over all church programs, both vertically and horizontally. "Correlation" thus by its nature carries a strong retrenchment orientation, just as an organizational strategy, insofar as it concentrates and emphasizes *control* as its main objective. When linked with the five programmatic thrusts summarized above, "correlation" has clearly intensified the entire retrenchment motif in modern church life.

Against that background of official, ecclesiastical manifestations of retrenchment, let us turn now to some of the less official "folk" expressions of retrenchment at the grassroots. Here we shall be discussing those more psychological and subcultural developments that have made for a change in the general "feel" or quality of social and religious life in local LDS wards—or at least in most of those found in the western U.S.

FOLK MANIFESTATIONS

Of course, in Mormonism, more so than in most religions, the distinction between "folk" and "official" can be ambiguous, arbitrary, even moot. Mormon "officials," after all, from the local to the general level, are recruited directly from the "folk," without benefit of professional seminary training. In the LDS tradition, this lay ministry has always been regarded as one of the finer features of the religion; and, to be sure, it has had the advantage of involving a large proportion of the membership in leadership callings, primarily at the local ward or stake level, and thus of minimizing the cultural and intellectual gap between clergy and laity common in other religions. However, there are other aspects of the lay leadership tradition in Mormonism that contribute to the spread of folk fundamentalism, and I shall explore some of those aspects a little later. For now I shall simply

10. For a brief overview of the correlation movement, see Peter Wiley, "The Lee Revolution and the Rise of Correlation," *Sunstone* 10 (1):18-22; see also James B. Allen and Glen Leonard, *The Story of the Latter-day Saints* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Co., 1992), chap. 20, and my brief discussion in chap. 6 of *Angel and Beehive*. I understand that Jan Shippy is preparing a thorough study of correlation.

review some of the more important forms in which that folk fundamentalism has expressed itself.¹¹

1. *A neo-orthodox drift in theology.* This development has been the subject of a book by O. Kendall White,¹² who points primarily to three such neo-orthodox expressions: (a) a redefinition of deity in the infinite, incomprehensible terms associated with traditional Christianity, rather than in the more contingent and finite terms used by Joseph Smith in the Nauvoo period; (b) a redefinition of human nature in the pessimistic terms associated with the traditional dogmas of original sin and human depravity, rather than in the more optimistic and perfectible terms found in early Mormonism; and (c) a redefinition of salvation more in terms of grace than of works. The exponents of this neo-orthodoxy identified by White are mostly not priesthood leaders but primarily writers and speakers from the Brigham Young University religion faculty and/or CES, who promote their ideas in books, class lectures, and on the speaker circuit.

2. *An increasing reliance on scriptural literalism and inerrancy.* A standard feature of Protestant fundamentalism, this intellectual style has always been present to some degree in Mormonism as well; yet there is evidence that the tendency has spread and increased in recent decades among Mormons, especially at the folk level, but also in some high places. Harold Christensen and Kenneth Cannon demonstrated a strong trend from the 1930s to the 1970s in fundamentalist thinking among BYU students; Martin Johnson and Phil Mullins more recently have shown a strong convergence between Mormons and Southern Baptists in certain beliefs generally considered as fundamentalist; and Beatty and Walter have done the same in a study of Mormon versus other ecclesiastical leaders. According to the research of an Arizona LDS investigator, even

11. I am using "fundamentalism" here in the sense in which it is usually understood in American religion, rather than in the peculiar Mormon reference to polygynous schismatic sects. My characterization of certain folk traits of Mormons as "fundamentalist" in the ensuing discussion is based on the descriptions of Protestant fundamentalism found, for example, in Nancy T. Ammerman, *Bible Believers: Fundamentalists in the Modern World* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1987), and in George Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980).

12. See O. Kendall White, *Mormon Neo-Orthodoxy: A Crisis Theology* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1987). In his introduction, White indicates that by "neo-orthodoxy" he is actually referring to the fundamentalist strain in Protestantism, but that he deliberately refrained from using "fundamentalism" for fear of confusion with the unique Mormon meaning. A related discussion of the LDS drift toward Protestant fundamentalism will be found in Kent Robson, "Omnis on the Horizon: Are We Copying Protestant Theology?" *Sunstone* 8 (1983): 20-23. A similar observation is made by Richard Poll in "Liahona and Iron Rod Revisited," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 16 (Summer 1983): 69-78.

Mormon *scientists* during the past forty years have shown an increased tendency toward fundamentalism in their personal religious beliefs. Such a tendency would certainly be apparent also to anyone who has attended Sunday school and priesthood classes for as many years as I have and watched the growing resort to literalist interpretations in both lesson materials and class discussions.¹³

This preference for literalism, and the neo-orthodox tendencies above mentioned, have been expressed also by a decline in the earlier Mormon enthusiasm for reconciling science and religion once seen in both the personifications and the writings of leaders like Orson Pratt, B. H. Roberts, John A. Widtsoe, James E. Talmage, and Joseph F. Merrill.¹⁴ Instead, we see gratuitous swipes at intellectuals and evolutionists in CES materials, regular and outspoken condemnations of the theory of organic evolution by prominent apostles, and a strongly literalist inspiration for the footnoting and topical guide imposed on the 1981 editions of LDS scriptures.

3. *Growth of a control and obedience mentality in church leadership styles.* A series of expressions of this mentality have been documented in recent articles by D. Michael Quinn and by Lavina Fielding Anderson.¹⁵ While such accounts are often inadequately corroborated, and thus represent primarily the complainant's viewpoint, they at least indicate the recurrent *perceptions* of church members who have felt imposed upon by "unrighteous dominion." The incidents seem to occur mainly at the grassroots, involving well-meaning but heavy-handed bishops and stake presidents, as well as, sad to say, misguided patriarchal fathers in their own homes.

13. See Kathleen M. Beatty and Oliver Walter, "Mormons and the New Christian Right: Re-evaluating Prospects for Political Coalitions" (paper presented at the annual meetings of the American Political Science Association, Chicago, Sept. 1987); Harold T. Christensen and Kenneth L. Cannon, "The Fundamentalist Emphasis at Brigham Young University, 1935-1973," *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 17 (1978): 53-57; and Martin Johnson and Phil Mullins, "Mormonism: Catholic, Protestant, Different?" *Review of Religious Research* 34 (1992): 51-62. The Arizona scholar in question is Richard T. Wooton, whose longitudinal study of LDS scientists is found in *Saints and Scientists* (Mesa, AZ: EduTech Corp., 1992). See also Richley H. Crapo, "Grass-Roots Deviance from Official Doctrine: A Study of Latter-day Saint (Mormon) Folk-Beliefs," *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 26 (1987): 465-85.

14. For a fine historical account of the changing attitudes toward science among Mormons and their leaders, see Erich Robert Paul, *Science, Religion, and Mormon Cosmology* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1992). His analysis of fundamentalist, anti-scientific elements in CES materials is found in chap. 8.

15. D. Michael Quinn, "On Being a Mormon Historian (and Its Aftermath)," in George D. Smith, ed., *Faithful History: Essays on Writing Mormon History* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1992), 69-111; and Lavina Fielding Anderson, "The LDS Intellectual Community and Church Leadership: A Contemporary Chronology," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 26 (Spring 1993): 7-64.

However, periodic initiatives by individuals and groups among the general authorities in recent years raise the question of whether such a leadership mentality now represents also the collective and official preference of the presiding brethren. I am not yet prepared to conclude that it does. First-hand accounts I have received from close friends and colleagues about their personal conversations with general authorities leave me with the impression that at least some of the efforts at control from the general level in recent years have been quite controversial even among general authorities themselves, as well as among stake and regional leaders. Surely such was the case in the 1983 campaign by Elder Mark E. Petersen against a number of *Dialogue* authors such as myself; and judging from press reports, the more recent "purge" of the "September Six" was also rather a contentious issue, despite the efforts of the brethren to maintain a united front publicly.¹⁶

Until the topmost leadership of the church is once again in the hands of a full and vigorous First Presidency for an extended period, we shall probably not get a very clear idea about the extent of any official and definite change at the general level toward a more controlling leadership posture. Meanwhile, it seems reasonable to observe that when excesses occur in the exercise of priesthood authority, especially at the grassroots, they can be attributed mainly to the following factors: (a) the general retrenchment motif in recent church history, including "correlation," which seems to some to call for a "tighter ship" all around; (b) the folk fundamentalism that has increasingly infused grassroots thinking; and, perhaps most importantly, (c) the ambiguity now existing in the *scope of legitimate authority* for Mormon priesthood leaders. One of the concomitants of the venerable church tradition of a non-professional clergy is that our lay leadership receives very little training or guidance in what demands can legitimately be made upon church members in matters of life-style or intellectual controversy. Aside from the thin *General Handbook of Instructions* (a third of which is taken up with the topic of church discipline!), there is in the LDS tradition no canon law defining the limits of ecclesiastical control or prerogatives over the membership. Ideally the guidance of the Spirit fills this gap, but there remains enormous variation from one priesthood leader to the next in what he regards as a legitimate demand for

16. From the public statements of some general authorities themselves, and from Steve Benson's accounts of his interview with Elders Oaks and Maxwell, it appears that there was a variety of opinions among the presiding brethren over how to deal with those intellectuals who were excommunicated during September 1993, and some differences as well between general authorities and stake presidents. See, for example, *Salt Lake Tribune*, 16 Oct. 1993, B-1, B-2; 25 Oct. 1993, "Commentary"; and Ogden (Utah) *Standard-Examiner*, 23 Oct. 1993, 9A.

conformity, with a lot of room for acting on personal preferences, fundamentalist or otherwise.¹⁷

4. *Susceptibility to fundamentalist "scare scenarios."* In recent years, two kinds of collective mass hysteria have found credence especially among religious fundamentalists in this country: (a) stories of satanic ritual murder, animal mutilation, sexual perversions, etc., and (b) calls by different prophets of millennial survivalism to hole up in remote sanctuaries and prepare for the promised Armageddon of the end times. As recently as the fall of 1992, there was considerable publicity around Utah and the West about an outbreak of millennial survivalism in certain Mormon stakes that provoked action by church leaders. Perhaps ironically, but not without justification, these Mormon survivalists claimed some of their warrant from the 1960s writings of church president Ezra Taft Benson himself. Another indication that church leaders, as well as the folk, might be susceptible to fundamentalist scare scenarios can be seen in the credence which a member of the Presiding Bishopric gave a couple of years ago to stories of satanic child abuse among temple-going Mormons, as recalled by some of their children years after the alleged facts.¹⁸

17. For example, does a bishop or a stake president have the legitimate right to forbid "study groups," in which LDS adults get together in each others' homes to discuss religious books or topics outside of church auspices? If so, under what circumstances or exigencies might they legitimately be forbidden? In the absence of clear and settled church doctrine or gospel principles, is such a priesthood leader entitled to impose, even by implication, his own tastes in theology, music, literature, art, political theory, or sociological theory in his instructions to members under his jurisdiction? Some church members would answer no, but others would say yes, citing the principle of "obedience." Yet such a principle does not exist in the abstract. One is obedient only to a given law, ordinance, or principle.

One is also obedient to the Lord, of course; but nowhere, not even in the temple, do Latter-day Saints commit themselves to obey any church leader, except, obviously, where he calls us to obey a gospel doctrine or principle. It is in that realm of non-doctrine, unsettled doctrine, or folk doctrine that demands for obedience to priesthood leaders become problematic. Sometimes we are asked to "sustain" our leaders, with the erroneous implication that "sustain" is more or less synonymous with "obey." However, when I "sustain" church leaders, either at general conference time or on specific occasions, I mean only that I am concurring in the legitimacy of their calls, with the presumption that the calls were divinely inspired, and that I am committing myself to follow their leadership in every respect that is scripturally and doctrinally sound. I regard *unqualified* obedience to any mortal person as a violation of the principle established by the War in Heaven. As I read the outcome of that struggle, it established the primacy of (free) agency *over* obedience, especially blind obedience.

18. For information on the Mormon millennial survivalists, and the reactions of church leaders to them, see coverage in *Salt Lake Tribune*, 29 Nov. 1992, A1-2, and 2 Dec. 1992, B1. For information on the communication among church leaders about reports of alleged satanic abuses by church members, see *Salt Lake Tribune*, 25 Oct. 1991, *Sunstone* 15 (Nov. 1991): 58, and *Salt Lake City Messenger*, Nov. 1991 and Mar. 1992. For analyses

5. *Exaggerated forms of social conservatism.* This refers, for example, to the continuing preference in folk Mormonism for traditional gender roles. Here, however, the line between "folk" and "official" becomes blurred. President Benson's two 1987 addresses on the proper roles of mothers and fathers (respectively) seemed to give an official stamp to this preference, as did Elder Boy K. Packer's address in October 1993 general conference. The same traditional understanding of gender roles permeates the most recent lesson manuals for the various church auxiliaries. At the same time, however, a rather softened interpretation can be seen in (a) Elder Gordon B. Hinckley's address to regional representatives in early 1988, in which he extolled the worldly accomplishments of several historically important women, apparently as models for LDS young women; and in (b) Elder M. Russell Ballard's address to the October 1993 Relief Society conference, in which he clearly acknowledged the realistic need in the church to accommodate different ways of being a good Mormon woman. Operationally, of course, the large number of women on the church payroll, including many mothers of minor children, seems to undercut any claim to a formal doctrinal or theological church position on this issue, despite the obvious preferences of probably most general authorities. A careful reading of their public statements on the matter, furthermore, gives the clear impression that their chief concern is more one of insuring the adequate care and nurturing of children than the patriarchal control of women. It is thus understandable that their public statements often fall back on the patriarchal traditions of their own generation in discussing family concerns; but in doing so they sometimes use rhetoric that closely resembles the folk fundamentalism of Southern Baptist and sectarian preachers.¹⁹

The same kind of fundamentalism can be seen in the handling of sexual subjects, which at times borders on prudery. See, for example, the analysis

and general debunking of such satanism stories by social scientists, see James T. Richardson et al., eds., *The Satanism Scare* (Nawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter, 1991), and Philip Jenkins, *Intimate Enemies: Moral Panics in Contemporary Britain* (Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter, 1992).

19. On the president's preferences for traditional gender roles, see Ezra Taft Benson, "To the Mothers in Zion," 22 Feb. 1987, and "To the Fathers in Israel," 3 Oct. 1987, both published as pamphlets by the Corporation of the President and widely distributed throughout the church; see discussion of these by Lavina Fielding Anderson in "A Voice from the Past: The Benson Instructions for Parents," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 21 (Winter 1988): 103-13. Elder Packer's address is in the *Ensign* 23 (Nov. 1993): 21-24; Elder Ballard's is in the same issue, 89-93. Elder Hinckley's 1988 address is also in the *Ensign* 18 (Sept. 1988): 8-11. On the instruction of youth in traditional gender roles, see the content analyses of youth lesson manuals in K. S. Gunnell and N. T. Hoffman, "Train up a Child in the Way He Should Go: What are Little Laurels Made of?" *Sunstone* 10 (1985): 34-37, and S. B. Ingelsby, "Priesthood Prescriptions for Women: Aaronic Quorum Lesson Manuals on a Woman's Place," *Sunstone* 10 (1985): 28-33.

by Terence Day of the "erotophobia" in the widely-circulated *Parent's Guide*. Another common fundamentalist theme is the indiscriminant association of modern rock music with satanic impulses, which is exemplified in a popular book by a Mormon musician.²⁰

FACTORS FACILITATING RETRENCHMENT AND FUNDAMENTALISM

So far I have reviewed two major categories of developments in the LDS church since the mid-twentieth century: public or *external* developments through which the church has more or less deliberately presented itself to the world, and *internal* developments not necessarily hidden from the world but experienced mostly by insiders. These internal developments, in turn, I divided into *official* and *folk* categories. I indicated that this official-versus-folk division might be somewhat arbitrary or arguable, given the blurring of the line between the two in a lay ministry like that of the Mormons. The reader might be interested to know, however, that throughout my review of the various expressions of "folk fundamentalism," I used as one implicit standard for "the official" the new *Encyclopedia of Mormonism*, which contains many entries bearing on the issues under discussion.

Space does not permit me to cite the many *Encyclopedia* passages I consulted, but I think an impartial reader would come to the same conclusion that I did, namely that the relevant entries in the encyclopedia do *not* embrace the expressions of fundamentalism that I have outlined, *even though some of these expressions are found in church manuals and in the public statements of church leaders*. Not all of the specifics, of course, are addressed in the *Encyclopedia*, but I think that many readers would be surprised, for example, at the explicit endorsement therein of Joseph Smith's "progressive" teachings about the nature of humanity and deity (as opposed to the "neo-orthodox" teachings); the explicit denial of any official position on organic evolution or the age of the earth; the rejection of blind obedience or of prophetic infallibility; the moderately feminist influences in the selections about Mormon women; and so on. To be sure, the *Encyclopedia* itself carries a disclaimer of official status, but one would have to be extremely naive to believe that it does not reflect the collective approval and consensus of the general authorities of the church.²¹

20. On the ambivalence about sex, even in marriage, see the content analysis of *A Parent's Guide* in Terence L. Day, "A Parent's Guide: Sex Education or Erotophobia?" *Sunstone* 12 (1988): 8-14. For a fundamentalist exhortation on the evils of modern rock music, see Lex DeAzevedo, *Pop Music and Morality* (Salt Lake City: Publisher's Press, 1982).

21. See especially the entries for Reason and Revelation, Following the Brethren,

There can be little doubt about the existence in modern Mormonism of the kinds of folk fundamentalism I have reviewed. The social scientist in me, however, requires that I concede a shortage of evidence on the *prevalence* of that fundamentalism, and on the related question of whether it has, in fact, grown and spread within Mormonism during the past few decades. The evidence that I have reviewed above in passing²² argues, at least obliquely, I think, for an increase in fundamentalism since the 1940s.²³ What explanation can be advanced for this fundamentalism and for its growth?

PSYCHOLOGICAL FACTORS

Part of the explanation is psychological, but much of it is organizational. First a couple of psychological explanations, speculative but theoretically credible:

1. *A deeply felt, but rarely articulated, need to recover an eroded sense of Mormon identity.* The nineteenth-century Mormon distinctiveness and incipient ethnicity so convincingly examined by O'Dea had already eroded a great deal by the time his book appeared in 1957, and the erosion has continued.²⁴ The official retrenchment policies discussed above were, I believe, in large part a reaction by the church leadership to this eroding distinctiveness of Mormons, and a necessary reaction, at that, if the church was not to join mainline Protestantism in the oblivion of total assimilation. Even official retrenchment efforts have not been enough, however, for many individual Mormons and leaders, who find it necessary to seek the psychological security of the most conservative extremes, in order to assure themselves of their own distinctive Mormon identity. In a society which cares little about theological peculiarities, and which has itself increasingly acquired the once distinctive Mormon concerns about wholesome family life and a healthful life-style, the boundary between Mormons and others gets easily blurred without *something* conspicuous.

Obedience, Science and Religion, Creation Accounts, Evolution, Feminism, Women, Roles of, and others. For a review that explains the *de facto* official nature of the *Encyclopedia*, and the close supervision of general authorities in its preparation, see Richard D. Poll's review in *Journal of Mormon History* 18 (Fall 1992): 205-13. See also several reviews of the *Encyclopedia* in *Sunstone* 16/6 (1993), including my own, "Marching Down the Mormon Middle: A Review of the Social Issues in *Encyclopedia of Mormonism*."

22. See, for example, n13.

23. I treat this more thoroughly in *Angel and Beehive*.

24. See my essay, "Mormons as Ethnics: Variable Historical and International Implications of an Appealing Concept," in *The Mormon Presence in Canada*, Brigham Y. Card et al., eds., (Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 1990), 332-52, and chap. 5 in *Angel and Beehive*.

2. *A generalized reaction to the Age of Aquarius (1960s)*, which has called into question many "traditional" beliefs and values about sex, family, and the meaning of "liberation." More than one sociological treatise sees this reaction-psychology as the explanation for the proliferation of the new and intense forms of religious expression during the past two decades or so, that is, as "getting saved from the sixties."²⁵ This mentality has been expressed also by a felt need to "get back to basics" in church teachings and discipline and in a concomitant suspicion of "worldly" liberation movements like feminism. Some of the current efforts to "rein in" LDS scholars can also be understood in this light, I think.

ORGANIZATIONAL FACTORS

Yet organizational changes have been even more important than psychological ones. I have already mentioned the correlation movement, which has served as the main organizational vehicle for retrenchment, and even for the spread of folk fundamentalism, to the extent that the "correlating" has been carried out by church leaders and bureaucrats, some of whom have fundamentalist ideas. There have also been other important organizational developments that have unintentionally fostered the spread of fundamentalism:

1. *The changing occupational backgrounds of the lay leadership.* Before midcentury, the leadership of the church, from the local through the general level, was recruited primarily from among people with farming, blue-collar, and small business backgrounds. Such people were not always enlightened in their attitudes, but they tended to be unpretentious and pragmatic, rather than ideologically focused. Furthermore, until midcentury, there tended to be an enormous amount of interfamily networking, even in Mormon communities outside Utah, so that many of the men and women who were leaders at ward, stake, and even general levels had had small-town or family origins in common with those among whom they served. All of this made for mutual presumptions of church loyalty and for ecclesiastical relationships of a highly familial kind, as bishops, Relief Society presidents, and other leaders rotated back and forth between lay leadership and grassroots.

In contrast, since midcentury recruitment to church leadership, especially for general authorities, has come increasingly from the world of corporate business and finance (including the corporate church bureaucracy itself), from law, from engineering, and from medicine or dentistry, without the liberal sprinkling of scholars and scientists that we once saw

25. See Steven M. Tipton, *Getting Saved from the Sixties: Moral Meaning in Conversion and Cultural Change* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982).

in the likes of Widtsoe, Talmage, and Merrill.²⁶ This change in recruitment base probably reflects changes in occupations of Mormons generally, as well as the need for expertise in business and in law for overseeing the church's enterprises. Yet an unintended concomitant of these new kinds of leaders has been a change in leadership style more akin to what one sees in the corporate world: tight controls up and down the hierarchy; the appearance of monolithic unanimity outside the "boardroom"; compliance without much question from the bottom; a highly rationalized bureaucratic approach to all aspects of governance; material cost/benefit assessments as the basis for decision-making; little tolerance for theoretical abstractions about human behavior; and little knowledge, sophistication, or respect for scholarship, especially in the social sciences. Many of these traits, especially the last, make for easy intellectual resort to scriptural literalism, blind obedience, and other elements of folk fundamentalism.

The rapid growth and geographic mobility of Mormons, furthermore, has meant that even local church leaders might know but little more about their ward and stake members than about their employees. Such increasing social distance has made the arbitrary exercise of authority, or "unrighteous dominion," much easier in the church than it was before mid-century. (After all, it was hard for bishops or stake presidents to become too high-handed when many in the flock could remember them as runny-nosed kids or teenaged trouble-makers!) All of this change has been expressed, according to one telling analysis, in a shift in the very metaphors of church discourse from familial to corporate in nature.²⁷

2. A blurring of the line between "folk" and "official," as LDS men and women (but especially men) are recruited from the grassroots to *de facto* careers in church leadership, without benefit of either the training or the discipline in any kind of canon law that would clarify the nature and scope of their priesthood prerogatives.²⁸ Accordingly, some church leaders bring

26. Frequency distributions for the occupational backgrounds of recently appointed stake presidents, mission presidents, and general authorities have been tabulated from the LDS *Church News* and reported in chap. 6 of *Angel and Beehive*. The contrast is especially striking when we note that during the first four decades of this century, an entire third of those appointed to the Council of the Twelve were men with doctoral degrees and other strong credentials in various fields of science (as contrasted with technology, engineering, law, business, and so on).

27. See John Tarjan, "Heavenly Father or Chairman of the Board? How Organizational Metaphors Can Define and Confine Religious Experience," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 25 (Fall 1992): 36-55; see also and relatedly Warner P. Woodworth, "Brave New Bureaucracy," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 20 (Fall 1987): 25-36.

28. Mormons continue to take some pride in having no "professional" clergy, a claim which is technically correct. However, there has evolved in recent decades a *career* clergy made up of thousands of men who, in effect, have parallel or "secondary" careers in

into office their own fundamentalist preferences in doctrine and leadership style; these are then imposed on folks at the grassroots, many of whom then find it difficult to distinguish what is and is not required of them to accept as loyal church members. This predicament is almost an everyday occurrence in some wards and stakes, but even at the general level the lay priesthood can function as a kind of conduit for the transmission of fundamentalist thinking out of the grassroots and into the top leadership. For example, Elder Bruce R. McConkie's *Mormon Doctrine* (1958), which has become something of a folk classic as an authoritative source of LDS teachings, was originally criticized severely by the First Presidency and the Twelve as permeated with doctrinal errors but was nevertheless later republished after the demise of its principal apostolic critics. Both that book and certain church curriculum materials for which Elder McConkie was ultimately responsible have promoted a fundamentalist line on such matters as the age of the earth, biological evolution, and the origin and nature of the races.²⁹ Elder Packer's public criticisms of the "new" scholarly approach to LDS history, and his unwillingness to accommodate any kind of biological evolutionary theory, have been expressed in terms also highly reminiscent of Protestant fundamentalism.³⁰

Both apostles are examples of influential general authorities who came to office at relatively young ages after education in specialized (as opposed to broad or liberal) disciplines, and after rather limited secular occupational experience. Both have obviously been great and effective stalwarts in the leadership, deeply devoted to their callings and to the church. In personal

which they work their way up the ladder from the local to the regional, or even to the general, level of church leadership. The general authorities alone, which numbered only twenty-five until midcentury, now number more than 100. In addition, there are now numerous men following career paths from bishop to high councilor to stake president (or patriarch) to regional representative (and some eventually to general authority). These careers can easily last twenty years or more, broken only by short periods of "rotation" back to the grassroots. The likelihood and progress of such careers is further enhanced, incidentally, by first having a "primary" career in the ranks of the professional church "civil service" bureaucracy, especially CES.

29. The *Mormon Doctrine* episode, by no means unknown in scholarly circles, is recounted by Paul in *Science, Religion, and Mormon Cosmology*, 179-80, and McConkie's influence on CES manuals is illustrated on pp. 180-84 of the same book. See also David J. Buerger, "Speaking with Authority: The Theological Influence of Elder Bruce R. McConkie," *Sunstone* 10 (1985): 8-13.

30. Elder Packer's attack on historical scholarship is discussed by Quinn, "On Being a Mormon Historian," and one of his most recent public attacks on the theory of evolution (seemingly gratuitous, given that it occurred during a BYU symposium on the Book of Mormon) can be found in his sermon, "The Law and the Light," in M. S. Nyman and C. D. Tate, eds., *The Book of Mormon: Jacob through the Words of Mormon* (Provo, UT: BYU Religious Studies Center, 1990), 1-31.

experience and education, they do not typify all general authorities, but they do happen to exemplify the process by which folk fundamentalism gets disseminated upward into the leadership echelons and then back downward to the folk with an authoritative aura. The process is doubtless even more common at lower echelons throughout the church.

3. *Recurrent turnovers in the First Presidency*, which has been headed by either short-term presidents (for example, Harold B. Lee) or acting presidents (for example, Hugh B. Brown and later Gordon B. Hinckley) during approximately *half* of the years since 1940.³¹ The obvious success of the church in recent decades suggests that such turnover in the First Presidency has not meant a lack of leadership more generally, for as President Hinckley has assured us there is clearly a "back-up system."³² Yet the point here has more to do with the *internal* politics among and between the First Presidency and the Twelve (bodies "equal in authority," according to D&C 107:24). When presidents become aged and incapacitated, the presidency finds itself only a faltering heartbeat away from dissolution. Depending on the apostolic rank of the counselors in the presidency, they might or might not be junior to other apostles in line to succeed the president in the immediate or slightly later future. Meanwhile, if an issue arises among the brethren that is unusual, or is not covered by established policy, a "residual" First Presidency (i.e., the counselors without a lucid president) is in a weakened position to speak for the president. It is also in a weakened position to restrain or prevent controversial initiatives by powerful and assertive individuals or groups among the Twelve, including those of a fundamentalist bent. After all, if the counselors to an incapacitated president are challenged by any or all of the Twelve about the collective will of the First Presidency, a counselor is simply not in a position to declare that will without the backing of the president and prophet himself. Examples of this predicament would include the difficulties during President David O. McKay's final days of (a) reining in the political extremism of Elder Ezra Taft Benson and of (b) achieving satisfactory resolution to the church's racial policies. Another example occurred in 1983 under an incapacitated President Kimball, when Elder Mark E. Petersen, a powerful senior apostle, attempted to restrain a number of LDS scholars, an initiative that did not come to the attention of the First Presidency until it threatened to present

31. If we assume that the final three or four years were essentially non-functional ones for presidents Heber J. Grant, David O. McKay, Spencer W. Kimball, and Ezra Taft Benson, and count as "short-termers" presidents George Albert Smith (5 years), Joseph Fielding Smith, and Harold B. Lee (about 2 years each), then easily half of the time since 1940 the church has been governed by acting and/or "temporary" presidents.

32. See Elder Hinckley's remarks during the October 1992 general conference, *Ensign* 22 (Nov. 1992): 53.

a public relations problem. There is some reason to believe that even the unpleasantness of late 1993—the September excommunications—can be attributed mainly to the initiative of certain apostles, and not to a decision of the First Presidency itself.³³

4. *The change in CES pedagogical philosophy* from one of articulation and reconciliation of LDS teachings with worldly learning to one of indoctrination and rote learning of church teachings and scriptures. I have discussed this issue at greater length elsewhere, and several other publications have done so too, at least by implication. There can be little doubt about the shift in CES from an essentially scholarly and intellectual approach to a simplistic or even anti-intellectual approach to church doctrine and history, even at the college level. Scriptural pedagogy now gives preference to literalism and proof-texting, while the lesson manuals sometimes include overtly fundamentalist ideas. Given the pervasive exposure of Mormon youth, including youthful converts, to the seminary and institute programs, CES must be considered an important contributor to the spread of grassroots fundamentalism in the contemporary LDS church.³⁴

5. *Increased rates of conversion from the Bible Belt.* Earlier in this essay I pointed out that while 10 percent of American Mormons live in the Bible Belt, 20 percent of converts now come from that region, which means that southerners, in a sense, are “over-represented” among LDS American converts. This is simply an expression in Mormonism of the “southernization” that has been observed in American religion more generally. The implication here is, of course, that Mormons recruited from the South are more likely than others to bring a fundamentalist understanding of religion into the church when they join. It is hard to tell which is cause and which is effect here: Has the influx of southern converts brought more folk fundamentalism into Mormonism than it once had, or have the southern

33. The unsuccessful effort to restrain Elder Benson is fairly well known among Mormon old-timers and is recounted in detail by D. Michael Quinn, “Ezra Taft Benson and Mormon Political Conflicts,” *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 26 (Summer 1993): 1-87. The 1983 foray against LDS scholars by Elder Mark E. Petersen is also well known and is recounted by Lavina Fielding Anderson, see n15. Efforts late in President McKay’s administration to resolve the race issue are recounted in my article, “The Fading of the Pharaohs’ Curse,” *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 14 (Autumn 1981): 16-17. Accounts of the discussions and actions of church leaders responsible for the 1993 excommunications are found in, for example, the *Salt Lake Tribune*, 2, 11, 16, 17, 20, 25 Oct. 1993; Ogden, Utah, *Standard-Examiner*, 23 Oct. 1993; and *New York Times*, 19 Sept., 2 Oct. 1993.

34. The change in CES philosophy and curriculum is discussed at some length, with appropriate examples, in *Angel and Beehive*, chap. 6. The cognate change in churchwide manuals and instruction is discussed and illustrated in the same chapter.

converts been attracted by the fundamentalism that was already present and growing? The causal direction probably goes both ways.³⁵

CONCLUSION

Much of what I have had to say in this essay should give comfort and reassurance to Mormons and their leaders: The LDS church during the past fifty years has grown rapidly, has acquired substantial material resources, and has come to enjoy a relatively high degree of public respect as a major religious denomination in the United States (despite a persistent anti-Mormon enterprise). The church has also achieved a presence in at least 140 other countries, with noteworthy numbers in many of them. Clearly the prophets of these latter days have done well, and they are entitled to the respect and appreciation of their followers. Furthermore, whether through inspiration, intuition, or sociological insight, the presiding leaders have made just the kind of "course correction" that modern sociological theory suggests would enhance growth and commitment in the church, namely a turn toward retrenchment to recover some of the lost tension with the surrounding culture.³⁶

Yet that retrenchment motif has had some unintended concomitants, which might be of dubious value, since they have begun to change the internal culture and "feel" of Mormon religious life. One of these, which has received special attention in this essay, has been the spread of folk fundamentalism, sometimes aided and abetted by the teachings and initia-

35. On the "southernization" of American religion more generally (or at least Protestantism), see John Egerton, *The Americanization of Dixie: The Southernization of America* (New York: Harper and Row, 1974); and Mark A. Shibley, "The Southernization of American Religion: Testing a Hypothesis," *Sociological Analysis* 52 (1991): 159-74. Mormon membership and convert figures for the South have been compiled from the recent General Social Surveys of the NORC and are discussed in chap. 10 of *Angel and Beehive*.

36. See the discussion of the "new paradigm" in the sociology of religion by R. Stephen Warner (see n6); see also the summary of contemporary theory about the determinants of growth and commitment in religious movements in *Angel and Beehive*, chap. 1. The benefits of "turning up the tension" with the surrounding American culture, and thereby recovering some distinctiveness or special identity, have apparently been recognized intuitively in many other religions, as well: see, for example, Nancy T. Ammerman, *Baptist Battles* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1990); Frida K. Furman, *Beyond Yiddishkeit: The Struggle for Jewish Identity in a Reform Synagogue* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1987); Dean M. Kelley, *Why Conservative Churches are Growing* (New York: Harper and Row, 1972); Eugene Kennedy, *Tomorrow's Catholics, Yesterday's Church: The Two Cultures of American Catholicism* (New York: Harper and Row, 1988); and John Seidler and Catherine Meyer, *Conflict and Change in the Catholic Church* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1989).

tives of individual church leaders. Another has been the increased bureaucratization, standardization, and centralized control, not only over the organization *per se*, but also over religious discourse, a process that owes more to the corporate business world than to the teachings of the prophet Joseph Smith. If the object of such changes has been to resist the intrusion of the worldly influences that came with American assimilation during the first half of the century, it is ironic that the influences now intruding are simply from different sectors of "the world," namely from sectarian Protestantism and from corporate business.

As we look ahead to the twenty-first century, we can foresee some potential difficulties for a church that aspires to be truly a world church. To the extent that current trends continue, we can expect a cultural and intellectual transformation in at least the American constituency of the LDS church. Converts and lifelong members of a fundamentalist bent will find the church increasingly comfortable, whereas those of a more expansive mentality will find it increasingly uncomfortable. Nor is this simply a matter of formal educational attainment: advanced education is no guarantee against a fundamentalist intellectual style, especially if the education is in business, engineering, medicine, or law. To the extent that the religious culture of American Mormons is thus transformed, it will prove no more attractive or exportable to the world than is good old-fashioned Wasatch-front Mormonism. There is reason to believe that the Mormon convert constituencies are somewhat different in cultures outside North America, and the church has yet to rear and hold a complete second generation anywhere else in the world.

It is going to prove difficult to convert and hold large numbers of non-American church members, especially of the second and later generations, as long as Mormon culture at the grassroots is permeated with American peculiarities, whether these are imported from the Wasatch Front, the Bible Belt, or corporate capitalism.³⁷ The Mormonism of the

37. Examples of Utah and/or American cultural traits that have proved problematic in the transplantation of Mormonism to various parts of the world will be found in R. D. Barney and G. G. Y. Chu, "Differences between Mormon Missionaries' Perceptions and Chinese Natives' Expectations in Intercultural Transactions," *Journal of Social Psychology* 98 (1976): 135-36; Murray Boren, "Worship through Music Nigerian Style," *Sunstone* 5 (1980): 41-43; C. Brooklyn Derr, "Messages from Two Cultures: Mormon Leaders in France, 1985," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 21 (Summer 1988): 98-111; Mark L. Grover, "Religious Accommodation in the Land of Racial Democracy: Mormon Priesthood and Black Brazilians," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 17 (Fall 1984): 23-34; G. M. Haslam, *Clash of Cultures: The Norwegian Experience with Mormonism, 1842-1920* (New York: Peter Lang, 1984); Garth N. Jones, "Expanding LDS Church Abroad: Old Realities Compounded," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 13 (Spring 1980): 8-22 and "Spreading the Gospel in Indonesia: Organizational Obstacles and Opportunities," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 15 (Winter 1982): 79-90; David

twenty-first century, if it is to become a new world religion, will first have to become a *minimal* Mormonism; that is, a religion which can jettison *all* forms of American influence and reduce its message and its way of life to a small number of basic ideas and principles that will, on the one hand, unite Mormons throughout the world but, on the other hand, will leave Mormons everywhere free to adapt those principles to their own respective cultural settings. Then Mormonism, like other world religions, will begin to face the same struggle with "syncretism" everywhere that so far it has faced only in North America. But that is another essay.³⁸

Knowlton, "Missionary, Native, and General Authority Accounts of Bolivian Conversion," *Sunstone* 13 (1989): 14-20, "Missionaries and Terror: The Assassination of Two Elders in Bolivia," *Sunstone* 13 (1989): 10-15, and "Thoughts on Mormonism in Latin America," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 20 (Summer 1992): 58-74; F. Lambert, "Early Morning Seminary in Europe," *Sunstone* 10 (1985): 36-37; Peter Lineham, "The Mormon Message in the Context of Maori Culture," *Journal of Mormon History* 17 (1991): 62-93; Marjorie Newton, "Almost Like Us: The American Socialization of Australian Converts," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 24 (Fall 1991): 9-20; Jiro Numano, "How International is the Church in Japan?" *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 13 (Spring 1980): 85-91; Candadai Seshachari, "Revelation: The Cohesive Element in International Mormonism," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 13 (Winter 1980): 38-46; and F. Lamond Tullis, *Mormons in Mexico: The Dynamics of Faith and Culture* (Logan: Utah State University Press, 1987).

38. Optimistic (but still realistic) discussions of the prospects for the transplantation of Mormonism around the world, representing viewpoints to some extent convergent with my own, will be found in James B. Allen, "On Becoming a Universal Church," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 25 (Spring 1992): 13-36; Edwin B. Firmage, "Restoring the Church: Zion in the Nineteenth and Twenty-First Centuries," *Sunstone* 13: 33-40; Alexander Morrison, *The Dawning of a Brighter Day: The Church in Black Africa* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1990); Spencer J. Palmer, *The Expanding Church* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1978); and F. Lamond Tullis, ed., *Mormonism: A Faith for All Cultures* (Provo, UT: Brigham Young University Press, 1978). There is little doubt that the presiding brethren understand, at least in principle, the need to "minimalize" Mormonism if it is to be successfully exported. See Elder Packer's and President Hinckley's remarks to regional representatives in Mar. 1990, reprinted in *Sunstone* 14 (1990): 28-33. Yet there remain many Utah and American cultural obstacles to realizing this principle in practice. See discussion in *Angel and Beehive*, chap. 12.