

said that the collection was an example of “Mormons talking to Mormons about Mormonism” (Jan Shipps in *Pacific Historical Review* 52 [Feb. 1983]: 118). The implication was that it had little of value for the non-Mormon. Originally, we had intended the essays to speak both to Latter-day Saint and non-Mormon. Clearly, we had not succeeded. In essence, while we had served the faith well by clarifying the issues for Mormons, we had failed to serve it well at the same time because we had not reached non-Mormons.

As I see it, the principal challenge for the intellectual in service to the faith is to speak in a way that can be understood both by church members and by those outside the Church. Because of the problems I mentioned before, that is extremely difficult. In the attempt, we will undoubtedly find ourselves offending and being misunderstood both by members of the Church and by non-members. If, however, we expect to contribute anything in service to the faith from our expertise, we must continue to try.

## Prometheus Hobbled: The Intellectual in Mormondom

*Stanley B. Kimball*

I assume an intellectual is anyone who is guided more by intellect than by emotions — leastways that’s good enough for a country boy like myself.

By Mormon I mean something like “faithful” Mormon, not smarty-pants intellectuals, mere cultural Mormons to whom the faith is not deep and moving. If some of my comments appear critical, I am scoring the faithful Good Guys, those of us who should know better.

I feel very strongly about what too many Mormon intellectuals are doing or, more especially, not doing. Too many of us are too often too timid, too afraid that our faithfulness will be brought into question when we try to place our peculiar gifts on the altar, when we try to act in our service of the faith. *Pusillanimous* is a good description of some of us. We let the bureaucracy walk all over us, and the bureaucracy gets bigger and more powerful every year. Some have been questioned about writing for and associating with certain publications and institutions. I have not been, and that suggests quite eloquently how influential I am.

Instead of being afraid and hesitant in the service of our faith, we should be much more diligently and anxiously “engaged in a good cause,” in making every effort to carry out President Kimball’s absolutely glorious call to greatness entitled “The Gospel Vision of the Arts” which he first made in 1967.<sup>1</sup> We

---

*STANLEY B. KIMBALL, from Farmington, Utah, and currently professor of history at Southern Illinois University, is a certified workaholic who keeps busy publishing books and articles in East European and Mormon history. Old enough to be a grandfather five times, he is historian of the Mormon Pioneer Trail Foundation and was recently released after having served nearly twenty years on the St. Louis Stake High Council.*

<sup>1</sup> Spencer W. Kimball, “The Gospel Vision of the Arts.” *BYU Speeches of the Year* (Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University, 1967); reprinted in *Ensign* 7 (July 1977): 2–5.

said that the collection was an example of “Mormons talking to Mormons about Mormonism” (Jan Shipps in *Pacific Historical Review* 52 [Feb. 1983]: 118). The implication was that it had little of value for the non-Mormon. Originally, we had intended the essays to speak both to Latter-day Saint and non-Mormon. Clearly, we had not succeeded. In essence, while we had served the faith well by clarifying the issues for Mormons, we had failed to serve it well at the same time because we had not reached non-Mormons.

As I see it, the principal challenge for the intellectual in service to the faith is to speak in a way that can be understood both by church members and by those outside the Church. Because of the problems I mentioned before, that is extremely difficult. In the attempt, we will undoubtedly find ourselves offending and being misunderstood both by members of the Church and by non-members. If, however, we expect to contribute anything in service to the faith from our expertise, we must continue to try.

## Prometheus Hobbled: The Intellectual in Mormondom

*Stanley B. Kimball*

I assume an intellectual is anyone who is guided more by intellect than by emotions — leastways that’s good enough for a country boy like myself.

By Mormon I mean something like “faithful” Mormon, not smarty-pants intellectuals, mere cultural Mormons to whom the faith is not deep and moving. If some of my comments appear critical, I am scoring the faithful Good Guys, those of us who should know better.

I feel very strongly about what too many Mormon intellectuals are doing or, more especially, not doing. Too many of us are too often too timid, too afraid that our faithfulness will be brought into question when we try to place our peculiar gifts on the altar, when we try to act in our service of the faith. *Pusillanimous* is a good description of some of us. We let the bureaucracy walk all over us, and the bureaucracy gets bigger and more powerful every year. Some have been questioned about writing for and associating with certain publications and institutions. I have not been, and that suggests quite eloquently how influential I am.

Instead of being afraid and hesitant in the service of our faith, we should be much more diligently and anxiously “engaged in a good cause,” in making every effort to carry out President Kimball’s absolutely glorious call to greatness entitled “The Gospel Vision of the Arts” which he first made in 1967.<sup>1</sup> We

---

*STANLEY B. KIMBALL, from Farmington, Utah, and currently professor of history at Southern Illinois University, is a certified workaholic who keeps busy publishing books and articles in East European and Mormon history. Old enough to be a grandfather five times, he is historian of the Mormon Pioneer Trail Foundation and was recently released after having served nearly twenty years on the St. Louis Stake High Council.*

<sup>1</sup> Spencer W. Kimball, “The Gospel Vision of the Arts.” *BYU Speeches of the Year* (Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University, 1967); reprinted in *Ensign* 7 (July 1977): 2–5.