CHALLENGE, CONSTANCY AND CHANGE: SAMPLES OF THE MORMON EXPERIENCE IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

EDITED BY JAMES B. ALLEN

THE TWENTIETH CENTURY: CHALLENGE FOR MORMON HISTORIANS

JAMES B. ALLEN AND RICHARD O. COWAN

This year (1972), the Mormon Church is 142 years old, which means that 71 years of its history, or fully half its life, has taken place in the twentieth century. Its written history, on the other hand, is notably lacking in serious efforts to report or analyze the momentous events of recent years. This, of course, is understandable, for the nineteenth century was certainly more dramatic, at least in terms of the kind of events that fascinate the general reader, than the years since 1901. In the nineteenth century, Mormonism was propelled into the national and even international spotlight as social and political conflict in Ohio, Missouri, Illinois, and Utah attracted unusually wide attention. In addition, through its Far Western colonizing activities Mormonism made an essential contribution to the settlement of the American West which still provides a fascinating and open field for writers of history. It is to be expected, then, that these formative years should provide the setting for most of what has been written on Mormon history.

But the time has come to challenge Mormon historians to pay more attention to the twentieth century, including its most recent years. Traditional historians might multiply reasons for not doing so: all the necessary documents are not yet available; it is impossible to write objectively about individuals while they are still alive; the historian might feel intimidated when writing of the recent past for fear of offending certain influential people who participated in the events in question. The history of one generation must be left to the historians of another, such objectors might say, for contemporary history is at best incomplete and usually tends to be so biased that it is of little permanent value.

On the other hand, Mormon scholars could well ponder the implications of a recent article by the provocative American historian, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.[1] Addressing himself to the urgency of writing contemporary history, Schlesinger made several points especially worthy of consideration here: (1) As the world changes more rapidly in modern times than ever before, what we perceive as the "past" is chronologically much closer to us, as change becomes the function not of decades but of days; (2) the means and volume of communication have intensified, making the sheer bulk of source material on current history already overwhelming; (3) along with these rapid changes, there is a greatly enlarged market for contemporary history as our age has developed "an unprecedented preoccupation with itself" and with all sorts of self-analysis; (4) manuscript collections and other historical sources tend to be opened to scholars sooner than ever before, making the writing of recent history more practicable; (5) at the same time, such documents are not always adequate for historians, for, knowing that they will be open to immediate scrutiny, public figures may well

dilute and distort the written record; (6) in order to improve the record for future historians, the contemporary historian needs more and more to turn to the personal interview. Electronic recording devices make oral history more practical than ever before. Schlesinger recognizes that such interviews could be distorted, but he points out that the interviewer could easily agree that parts or all of the recorded material would be restricted for as long as the individual or family felt necessary, but that this oral history interview would become part of the person's papers and essential to historians of later years; (7) Schlesinger answers the objection that one cannot write "objectively" about current events by observing that even if the historian of the past has wider documentation, the contemporary historian, caught in" 'the passion and action of his time,' offers a perspective that cannot be lightly rejected. It is wholly possible . . . that contemporary writers, trapped as they may be in the emotions of their own age, or in consequence, understand better what is going on than later historians trapped in the emotions of a subsequent age." (8) Finally, he pointedly draws attention to the fact that contemporary history, even if inaccurate, serves the ultimate cause of history by giving the participants an opportunity to set the record straight during their own lifetime. It might even be possible, he suggests with some exaggeration,

> to contend that contemporary history can be more exacting in its standards . . . than the history of the past; for contemporary history involves the writing of history in the face of the only people who can contradict it, that is, the actual participants. Every historian of the past knows at the bottom of his heart how much artifice goes into his reconstructions; how much of his evidence is partial, ambiguous, or hypothetical; and yet how protected he is in speculation because, barring recourse to seances on wet afternoons, no one can say to him nay, except other historians with vulnerable theories of their own. The farther back the historian goes, the more speculative his history becomes.

Many of Schlesinger's observations have direct application to Latter-day Saints: Mormonism is rapidly changing in many ways as it grows larger, more complex, and more world-wide in orientation; the volume of Church publications is increasing by leaps and bounds; Mormons are better educated than ever before, and are intensely interested in the problems of the world around them and how their Church is responding to these problems; and, with the growing number of scholars in many fields willing to devote research time to Mormon studies, historians have a richer field of sources than ever before from which to draw the history of their times. Surely consideration of modern trends and problems by those most familiar with them will be highly valued by later generations of historians.

Some Trends Since 1901

What, then, has happened to Mormonism in the twentieth century that is worth writing about? The answer to that question would fill volumes, but we point here only to a few trends and changes which have taken place and which raise questions of real historical import.

At first glance, the most apparent change in Mormonism is its size. In 1900, total Church membership stood at 264,000. By 1971 it was approximately three million. While this rate of growth is not too surprising, such numbers have

obvious implications as far as Church organization and administration are concerned. One of these is seen in the growth of the number of stakes, the basic units of Church administration. In 1901 there were nearly 50 stakes, but by the end of 1971 there were eleven times that number. Administratively, this has necessitated such things as limiting the number of visits to the stakes by General Authorities, calling Assistants to the Twelve, grouping stakes into regions, and appointing Regional Representatives of the Twelve for the purpose of carrying counsel and instruction. More dramatically, it also has meant a vast burgeoning of building construction, Church communication and publication facilities, and professional services. For historians, the growth in numbers and resulting changes in Church administration provide a fascinating challenge in administrative history. What specific factors resulted in basic changes in or augmentation of Church organization? What role did personalities play in these changes, and how effectively were the changes implemented? What factors remained constant in Church administration? What has been the overall effect of the development of a Church bureaucracy, and how does this administrative structure respond to ever changing needs?

An International Church

Expansion of numbers, organization, and services is not the most important aspect of Mormonism's recent history. More challenging, perhaps, to its traditional programs, and to the traditional socio-political orientation of its members, has been the genuine internationalization of the Church. In 1900 some 84 per cent of all Mormons lived in the Intermountain area of the United States. By 1971 this was reduced to 40 per cent, with approximately 20 per cent of the total living outside the United States or Canada. But statistics do not tell the whole story. During the nineteenth century converts throughout the world were encouraged to emigrate to America, and as late as 1908 the *Millennial Star* declared that "notwithstanding the fact that at present the Church is not encouraging the Saints to emigrate, it is with difficulty that many of them are prevented from doing so."[2] At the same time there was the beginning of a greater sense of world-wide involvement in the Church. In 1901, President Lorenzo Snow emphatically instructed the Church that General Authorities were to pay more attention to the interest of the world, rather than local stakes in Utah.[3] The same year a mission was opened in Japan, and in 1910 the President of the Church was attempting to persuade European Saints not to emigrate but, rather, to remain home at least until they had helped establish the faith more firmly.[4]

In the 1920's the organization of stakes began to push out of the Intermountain area, and by 1958 the Church was able to begin creating stakes throughout the world. Today they may be found in Australia, New Zealand, Germany, Switzerland, Great Britain, Holland, Japan, South Africa, Tonga, Samoa, and in many countries of Latin America.[5]

The implications of this internationalization are profound, and should provide ample grist for the mills of historians and other scholars for years to come. To pose just a few questions: What happens as young American missionaries attempt to preach Mormonism in an entirely different culture? Time was when to preach Mormonism in a foreign land was also to preach the virtues of America and to encourage emigration. With this no longer the case, how

will Mormonism adapt itself to the needs of diverse cultures? How far will American Mormons go in becoming better acquainted with the customs and traditions of other people, and how well will other people come to understand American Mormons, thus helping to create a true world brotherhood within the Church? What about the various auxiliary services of the Church, and particularly its educational program? Are traditional programs being adapted to the needs of non-Americans in such a way that the basic tenets of Mormonism are taught without conflicting with the viable traditions of their own culture, or, are there some areas where cultural conflict is inevitable? More importantly, does the Church in reality fill the needs of people around the globe as mounting pressures of the modern world strike at the very hearts of families, churches, and other institutions?

By 1971 several developments pointed in the direction of a more universal orientation, not only in the minds of Church members but also in Church programs. In education, for example, seminaries served students in 22 countries outside the United States and institutes of religion reached into ten.[6] In addition, thousands of non-Americans were being taught in Church schools in Hawaii, Tahiti, Samoa, Tonga, Fiji, New Zealand, Chile and Mexico. Well could the Church's new Commissioner of Education declare in the General Priesthood Meeting in October, 1970:

> One of the great challenges the Priesthood faces in our time is the internationalization of the Church. This is not an American Church — it is the Church of Jesus Christ, who is the God of all people on this planet, and we must, as the scriptures urge, be as "independent" as possible so that the Kingdom is not too much at the mercy of men and circumstances, or the tides of nationalism, or the mercurial moods abroad about America. . . .
>
> We have, for instance, more members of the Church now in Brazil than in all of the Scandinavian countries combined, plus Holland. We have as many members in Uruguay as in the State of New York where the Church was founded. We have as many in Peru as we do in Missouri where so much Church history was made. . . .
>
> These comparisons are sobering and challenging, not only for the Church Educational System, but for the entire Church. Thus, the transculturalization of curricular materials (which is more than translation) represents one of our greatest challenges. The scriptures urge the Church to speak to men "after the manner of their language," taking their various weaknesses into account that all "might come to understanding."
>
> We want our Church Educational System to respond as much as we can to the special conditions in which our members live.[7]

But the response of Mormonism to its own internationalization is seen in more than its educational program. In ecclesiastical affairs, General Authorities have been assigned specific areas of the world as primary responsibilities, and in August, 1971, a General Conference of the Church was held in Manchester, England. A massive translation and distribution program has developed, which employs carefully selected translators, often on a full-time basis, in many parts of the world. Distribution centers for Church literature have been established in at least ten countries outside America. In Mexico City, for example, a center staffed by two dozen workers prints Spanish-language materials and distributes them throughout Latin America. In addition, a unified Church magazine published in 17 languages selects the most appropriate material from other

Church publications and distributes them throughout the world.[8] In down-to-earth social action, the Church has begun to implement programs for promoting literacy, practical education, and economic development in Latin America, and in 1971, for the first time in its history, the Church began sending medical missionaries to underdeveloped areas where not only lack of economic means but also lack of understanding of basic health information contributed to alarming problems.[9]

With the Church on the verge of becoming a truly international body, it well behooves its historians to take a fresh look at any and all affairs that have international overtones. Three authors in this issue of *Dialogue* have made efforts in this direction. Joseph Dixon is concerned with the problems faced by Mormons in Nazi Germany, and implicitly raises the question as to how far committed Mormons might go in their loyalty to diverse political ideologies. LaMond Tullis examines the problems American Mormons have in attempting to understand their Latin American brothers, and suggests that a Church program which worked in the environment of the American West may not really be suitable for the vastly different social and political realities of South America. Paul Hyer sees ways in which Mormonism can be a great stabilizing influence in the current revolutionary milieu of Asia. In addition, Martin Hickman and Ray Hillam insightfully analyze the attitudes toward international affairs of one of Mormonism's foremost statemen, J. Reuben Clark, Jr. But these essays, thought-provoking as they may be, hardly begin to touch the myriad topics with which historians and other scholars should be concerned as they attempt to tell the story of Mormonism as a world-oriented religion.

The Urban Church

Another trend which characterizes the twentieth century Church is urbanization. The general move toward an urbanized society is well illustrated by what happened in the United States after 1900. At the beginning of the century less than half of the population lived in urban centers, but by 1970 almost three-fourths did.[10] The rapid industrialization of America completely changed its population patterns. Among the Mormons, the change was more dramatic. As late as 1920 some 79 per cent of the Church's stakes had a basically rural orientation. By 1971, the ratio was almost exactly reversed with 79 per cent of the stakes organized in predominantly urban areas.[11] While this does not take into account the missions of the Church (many of which are also urban in their basic population), it is nevertheless a strong indication that the basic social environment of modern-day Mormonism was vastly different in 1971 from that of 1900, and that Mormons may have become even more urbanized than the rest of the population. This seems especially true outside America, where the major Church growth is in the cities.

What effect has urbanization had upon the Mormon church as an organization, as well as upon individual Mormons? Are the basic social attitudes of urban Mormons still "rural" in orientation? To what degree have changes in Church organization and programs been influenced by the pressures of the urban environment? To which environment does the missionary program tend best to adapt? Do Mormons living in the cities tend to remain more or less faithful than their rural brethren? Does the political, economic, and social variety of city life lessen dependence upon the Church, or do city dwellers tend

to look toward the Church for identity and community within a giant, impersonal mass of humanity? The answers to such questions are, of course, the essence of contemporary history, but contemporary historians have, as yet, little data with which to approach them.

The Secular Challenge

Secularization, the process by which people tend to replace traditional spiritual values and religious activities with more worldly and temporal concerns, might well be one of the pitfalls of urbanization. This is not to imply that secularization always accompanies urbanization, or that urbanization is necessary to secularization, for such diverse movements as Darwinism, pragmatism, social reform, and women's liberation might all have secularizing influences on the individual. But city life often provides greater opportunity to rub shoulders with secular thought. How have such trends affected Mormonism? Again, little data is available.

A partial exploration of the problems raised by the increasingly urbanized Church membership and the secular challenge is provided by Armand Mauss in his survey, in this issue, of contemporary social and political attitudes of urban Latter-day Saints. This is a brief study derived from a much larger project which is scheduled to appear in print, here and elsewhere, in the near future. While Professor Mauss' work is heretofore unprecedented in its scope and perhaps both surprising and controversial in its conclusions, it will unquestionably spark a great deal of correlated research and discussion. Social and intellectual historians should begin to find great interest in such studies.

Secularization and Education

One of the most important features of the twentieth century has been Mormonism's growing commitment to education — not just to religious education but also to secular learning. By 1920, the Church had abandoned most of its own secondary schools, known as academies, in favor of more fully supporting public education in the Mountain West where most Church members lived. Only the academy in Mexico was retained. At the same time, the foundation was laid for the vast system of seminaries and institutes of religion, established primarily to support and build the faith of students involved in secular educational activities. By 1971 some 126,000 students were enrolled in various seminary programs throughout the world, in addition to 15,000 in Indian seminaries, and 49,000 in institutes of religion. But as the Church expanded beyond its Mountain West environment, the secular educational needs of its members once again became a matter of concern. Elementary and secondary schools were provided in New Zealand, Samoa, Tonga, Tahiti, and Fiji, and in the 1950's a challenging program was begun to meet the needs of L.D.S. students throughout Latin America. By 1971 the Church was operating a total of 65 elementary and secondary schools in the Pacific islands and in Mexico and Chile. These schools served 13,200 students, and it was projected that with the opening of two new schools in Peru and Bolivia this figure would soon jump to 17,000.[12]

At the college level, even though the Church continues to support Brigham Young University, the Church College of Hawaii, Ricks College, and the L.D.S.

Business College, in recent years there has been no effort to encourage all Mormon students to attend such Church-related institutions. Rather, in 1970 there were approximately 200,000 L.D.S. students in colleges and universities around the world. Only 32,000 of these, or 16 per cent, were enrolled in Church colleges, and enrollment at B.Y.U. was limited to 25,000.[13] The modern emphasis is on the need for Mormon students to support their local institutions. Said a letter issued by the First Presidency in 1970:

> Members of the Church are taxpayers to local, state, and federal governments in America and their equivalents in Canada, and are fully entitled to send their sons and daughters to tax-supported institutions. The influence of the Church members (whether as students or taxpayers) on our public institutions is needed now — more than ever.[14]

At the same time, the Church is aware of the need to examine the direction post-high school education is taking, and to counsel young people wisely. Declared Church Education Commissioner Neal Maxwell in 1970:

> One of the basic reasons for the pursuit of education is to equip oneself with marketable skills. The less advantaged national economies within which many of our members outside America live — and the shifting prospects with regard to where career and job opportunities will be even in America — both suggest that some additional emphasis is needed in the direction of technical education, which bears on a middle group of skills. For some of our young, earning power, job opportunities and satisfaction will be greater, if they pursue the path of technical education in their post-high school years, including paramedical careers. Professional education in medicine, law, nursing, etc., is going to be needed even more than ever, but all of our youth need not be neuro-surgeons, and the youth who becomes a craftsman should feel just as "approved" as his friend who is a microbiologist.[15]

With such a realistic assessment of educational needs in the modern world, there is some indication that even within the Church system increasing emphasis might be placed on technical education, and on the training of teachers to provide such education, especially outside America where it is most urgently needed. The history of all these modern developments provides an important challenge to Mormon historians; it will say much about the nature of Mormonism itself.

With all this emphasis on secular learning, especially at the college level, what is the role of the so-called "intellectual" within the Church? Since most intellectuals are in some way associated with higher education, to what degree does their natural propensity for raising questions and challenging authority affect their contribution to the Church? A brilliant but preliminary discussion of this question was presented by Davis Bitton in an earlier issue of *Dialogue*,[16] but the full history of what intellectuals have done for, or to, the Church has yet to be written. At B.Y.U. greater stress than ever before is being placed upon advanced degrees and upon proven excellence in one's chosen field of study, as demonstrated by scholarly publications and active participation in professional organizations. There seems to be a growing awareness that such excellence in secular fields is not only desirable but necessary to the educational program of the Church, for Mormon students ought to be exposed to the finest scholarship available.

Excellence in secular as well as religious learning, then, has become one of the essential educational objectives of the Church. At the same time, many scholars have suggested that, ironically, this very emphasis could be the source of major challenges to the traditions of the Church, and thus weaken its spiritual foundations. Thomas F. O'Dea suggested in 1957 that the college curriculum itself could be a shattering experience for the tender Mormon youth who has been taught to live by faith and is suddenly thrust into an academic environment that thrives on raising doubts and questions. "The college undergraduate curriculum," he declared, "becomes the first line of danger to Mormonism in its encounter with modern living."[17] But one wonders if this assessment of fifteen years ago should not be reconsidered by some intellectual or social historian. O'Dea assumed that most Mormon youths came from rural, non-secularized backgrounds. With the urbanization of Mormonism, is it possible that Mormon city youth already have such extensive experience with the secular world that college does not present the threat to them that it may have to the less worldly-wise student from the farm? Is it correct to assume that today, with the availability of television, the automobile, and all the other modern means of rapid communications, the rural student is really so different from his city cousin? What surveys do we have, other than statistics on temple marriage, which reveal the basic religious attitudes of the modern breed of college youth? Richard Poll's essay in this issue of *Dialogue* suggests the attitudes of a few students toward a few relevant issues, but the survey has obvious limitations and only tends to tantalize us with a desire for better information.

The Challenges

The internationalization of the Church, its growth in numbers, the trend toward urbanization, the dramatic expansion of educational facilities, and the challenge of secularism all are threads of a dramatic story which is yet to be told: the emergence of Mormonism as a modern world religion. In many ways this story can be as meaningful to the modern-day saint as the fascinating history of earlier years, although it involves vastly different kinds of experiences, for it will help explain to him not only how and why his church came to be what it is today, but also the source of some of his own ideas and attitudes.

The basic research for such contemporary history has barely begun. Who has taken the time critically to analyze and interpret the lives and ideas of prominent Churchmen who have had an impact not only on Mormonism but in the nation or in the world? Very few such studies exist, although examples of what might be done are seen in the article here by Ray Hillam and Martin Hickman on the international philosophy of J. Reuben Clark, Jr., and Thomas G. Alexander's discussion of the political philosophy of Reed Smoot. The impact of Mormons in the arts and humanities, politics, business, and general public affairs throughout the twentieth century still needs considerable attention, as do the general economic activities of the modern Church.

What of the various branches of Mormonism? In this issue of *Dialogue* Barbara Higdon presents a skillful interpretation of the experience of the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints in the twentieth century. More such articles need to be produced concerning not only the Reorganized church but also the various divergent groups that still claim

allegiance to Joseph Smith. Intellectual historians need to study Mormon responses to the various philosophical cross-currents of modern times. And finally, historians ought not to ignore the basic doctrines and teachings of the Church and to examine how well they have fared through Mormonism's modern confrontation with internationalism, urbanism, and secularism.

Who is capable of undertaking the writing of modern Mormon history? It would be wrong to imply that only professional historians should be involved, but it is not wrong mildly to chide these historians (including the present writers) for not paying more attention to the needs of contemporary Church history.

Actually, Mormon historians (including non-Mormons interested in Mormon history) are in a better position today than they have ever been to make some important contributions to our understanding of the Church. One evidence of this is seen in the activities of the Mormon History Association. Since its inception in 1965 this group has accomplished some remarkable things. Each year two or more meetings have been held, usually in connection with one of the major historical associations in America. At least 44 important papers or panels have been presented, and at least 15 have been published. In addition, the Association has made a deliberate effort to promote informal "get-togethers" at all historical conventions, where those with common historical interest share their ideas and experiences, often late into the night. Such "rap" sessions have not only been choice experiences, but have resulted in ideas and contacts that have led to important historical projects. In addition, the Mormon History Association sponsored a special issue of *Dialogue* on Mormon history in August, 1966, as well as this issue on the twentieth century. "The Historians' Corner," which specializes in short articles, notes, and documents of special interest, appears twice annually in *B.Y.U. Studies* and is sent to all association members. A Newsletter keeps members informed of meetings, business, projects, and awards. The association also annually awards prizes for the best book and best article on Mormon history.[18]

The success of the Mormon History Association is only symbolic of the fact that in recent years an impressive body of scholars both in and out of the Church have found Mormon research an area of special interest. But Mormons themselves especially should be urged to write their own history in such a way that it not only demonstrates the necessary scholarly skills but also takes advantage of the special knowledge of Mormon culture that only those who are part of it can best reflect. At B.Y.U. alone there is a distinguished group of Asian scholars who are eminently capable of contributing much to contemporary Mormon history in that part of the world. They know both Asia and traditional Mormonism, and are probably more capable than anyone else in the world of putting the two together in a searching historical analysis. A still larger body of historians, political scientists, linguists, literary specialists and other scholars throughout the Church well understand the cultures of many parts of the world, and would undoubtedly respond favorably to the challenge of examining Mormon history in their areas of specialization. The same thing holds true for all aspects of Mormonism in its contemporary American environment. At the same time, the body of available research materials is becoming ever greater, and the climate for historical research within the Church is becoming increasingly favorable. And it was a great boon for the cause of

history when Leonard J. Arrington, one of Mormonism's foremost scholars and the founding President of the Mormon History Association, was appointed Church Historian in January of this year.

It would be oversimplifying the issue to say that all that was needed was a marshalling of the forces, but the Mormon History Association, and everyone else interested in Mormon history, may well need prodding in the direction of contemporary history. Groups of scholars should be encouraged to study the growth of the Church in various countries and to publish their findings. Librarians should be especially encouraged to collect all available papers and sources pertaining to the twentieth century, and serious consideration might well be given to collecting the oral history of key figures in a variety of contemporary Church programs. In the meantime we can only observe that, despite the impressive general increase in Mormon studies, relatively little of a scholarly nature has been written on the twentieth century. In 1957 Thomas F. O'Dea published *The Mormons*, the last part of which was a challenging analysis of the dilemmas Mormonism faces as it confronts the modern secular world. But the only major books since O'Dea that have attempted to analyze modern Mormonism have been written by popular journalists rather than historical scholars, and none of them is adequate to constitute a history of Mormonism in the twentieth century. These include William J. Whalen, *The Latter-day Saints in the Modern Day World* (1964), Wallace Turner, *The Mormon Establishment* (1966), and Robert Mullen, *The Latter-day Saints: The Mormons Yesterday and Today* (1966). In addition, James B. Allen and Richard O. Cowan in *Mormonism in the Twentieth Century* (Provo, Utah, 1967), provide a very sketchy summary. The most significant scholarly writing has appeared in journals and periodicals, including at times those published by the Church. But all of these, together with a few Masters theses and Ph.D. dissertations, still constitute only a beginning of the effort needed to write the story of modern Mormonism. The articles in this issue of *Dialogue* provide a few further insights, but should also serve to challenge us all toward more serious efforts in this direction.

[1]"On the Writing of Contemporary History," *Atlantic Monthly* (March, 1967), 69-74.

[2]*The Millenial Star*, 70 (1908), 660.

[3]B. H. Roberts, *A Comprehensive History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints* (Salt Lake City: Deseret News Press, 1930), VI, pp. 377-388.

[4]Douglas Dexter Alder, "The German Speaking Migration to Utah, 1850-1950"(Masters thesis, University of Utah, 1959), p. 69, quoting *Journal History of the Church*, August 31, 1959.

[5]See Richard O. Cowan, "Stakes Reflect World-Wide Growth," *The Ensign*, 1 (August, 1971), 15-17.

[6]"Annual Report, Seminaries and Institutes, 1970-71," pp. 4, 12.

[7]Neal A. Maxwell, typescript of address to the General Priesthood Session of the October conference, 1970.

[8]See various reports and comments on the translating and distribution program, such as the address of Bishop Victor L. Brown, *Conference Report* (April, 1971), pp. 35-37; Doyle L. Green, "The Church Sends its Message to the World Through the *Unified Magazine*," *The Improvement Era* (August, 1969); *The Church News*, November 6, 1965; October 29, 1966; December 24, 1966; September 23, 1967; July 27, 1968; May 24, 1969; July 26, 1969.

[9]*The Church News*, July 31, 1971. See also the article by LaMond Tullis in this issue of *Dialogue*.

[10]See U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Historical Statistics of the United States* (Washington, 1969), p. 14; U.S. Bureau of the Census, *1970 Census of Population. General Population Characteristics United States Summary* (Washington, 1972), pp. 292-93. It is instructive to note that since 1950 not only had the percent of Americans living in rural areas gone down, but also the actual number.

[11]We arrived at these very general figures by listing all the stakes of the Church in the years indicated, then determining whether each of them was predominantly rural or urban, according to the location of the wards and branches in that stake. If it seemed that the ratio was about half-and-half, the stake was counted as rural. It is recognized that making the above determination on the basis of stakes may not be wholly accurate, for, especially in earlier years, the size of stakes tended to vary widely. The image is accurate enough, however, to illustrate the general trend.

[12]M. Dallas Burnett, "Education and the Church," *The Ensign*, 1 (May, 1971), 35.

[13]Maxwell, General Priesthood address.

[14]Quoted in *Ibid.*

[15]*Ibid.*

[16]"Anti-Intellectualism in Mormon History," *Dialogue*, 1 (Autumn, 1966), 111-133.

[17]Thomas F. O'Dea, *The Mormons* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957), p. 227.

[18]Davis Bitton, "The Mormon History Association, 1965-1971," Mormon History Association *Newsletter*, January 15, 1972.

Persecution is the first law of society, because it is always easier to suppress criticism than to meet it.

—Howard Mumford Jones