

# A History of Dialogue, Part Three: “Coming of Age” in Utah, 1982-1987

Devery S. Anderson

By 1982 *DIALOGUE: A JOURNAL OF MORMON THOUGHT* had been publishing for sixteen years and had operated at both ends of the U.S. under three different editorships. It was born, flourished for several years, then nearly died before recovering somewhat under the care of its first two editorial teams in California. Then, it rebuilt a dedicated readership under a third group near Washington, D.C.<sup>1</sup>

As the Washington team's numbers began to dwindle toward the end of its six-year tenure, those who remained looked westward for a group to replace them. That *Dialogue* would eventually move to Salt Lake City had always been a likely, although reluctantly faced, possibility. Certainly many supporters resided there, and, as the eastern team began to wane, this seemed like an ideal time to make a home for *Dialogue* where so many might give it the nurturing it required. However, long-time supporters knew that moving *Dialogue* close to LDS church headquarters could prove costly for this journal which had maintained its independence for so long. The words of one subscriber were quite clear: "I regret very much the decision to move the office of the journal to Salt Lake City. I am fearful that it may not be successful in resisting the germ of mediocrity that blights most publications coming from the headquarters of the Church."<sup>2</sup> Such fears notwithstanding, and beaming with

---

1. For the story of these earlier editorships, see Devery S. Anderson, "A History of *Dialogue*, Part One: The Early Years, 1965-1971" *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 32, no. 2 (Summer 1999): 15-65, and Anderson, "A History of *Dialogue*, Part Two: Struggle Toward Maturity, 1971-1982" *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 33, no. 2 (Summer 2000): 1-96.

2. Judge John T. Vernieu to Mary L. Bradford, 13 August 1982, Dialogue Foundation Collection, ACCN 385, Manuscripts Division, Special Collections, University of Utah Marriott Library, Salt Lake City.

optimism, the outgoing team arranged a transfer to Utah where *Dialogue* stayed for nearly seventeen years. In time, the journal would celebrate both its twentieth and thirtieth anniversaries in Salt Lake. However, despite efficient operations, the journal managed to ruffle ecclesiastical feathers now and then.

As the 1980s dawned, most Mormon intellectuals could no longer imagine life without the independent forums which had become such an integral part of their lives. Gone were the days when thinkers had to go it alone or when the interaction in small groups such as the "Swearing Elders" of the 1950s had been rare treats for independent-minded Mormons who lived in close proximity to one another.<sup>3</sup> Although these gatherings were intellectual havens for those few involved, many other Mormons of similar bent, lacking such support, eventually fell by the wayside. By the time *Dialogue* had moved to Utah, Mormon intellectuals had become accustomed to the journal, and a new generation was discovering it. Moreover, the offerings had grown. Since the mid-1970s, *Sunstone* magazine had also appealed to many in the *Dialogue* constituency, and in 1981, Mormon scholars founded Signature Books, increasing the number of outlets for Mormon studies that had been nonexistent a decade-and-a-half earlier.<sup>4</sup> As supporters came to take all this for granted—an indication that these enterprises had established permanence—occasional clashes with conservative LDS church leaders still gave supporters reason to take stock now and then. It was this roller coaster journey that best defines *Dialogue's* Utah sojourn.

#### V. 1982-1987: In the "City of the Saints"

*Dialogue's* previous editors have established a tradition of scholarship, literacy, and intellectual inquiry which, we feel, has made unique contributions to Mormon studies. We intend to maintain that tradition.

—Linda K. and L. Jackson Newell to Steven F. Christensen, 12 January 1983

---

3. The Swearing Elders was a group of Mormon academics who met from 1949-1955 at the University of Utah to discuss theology and philosophy. Among their number were Sterling M. McMurrin, Lowell L. Bennion, O. C. Tanner, Richard D. Poll, T. Edgar Lyon, and Brigham D. Madsen. For the story of this unique group, see Thomas A. Blakely, "The Swearing Elders: The First Generation of Modern Mormon Intellectuals," and Richard D. Poll, "The Swearing Elders: Some Reflections—A Response to Thomas Blakely," both in *Sunstone* 10 (October 1985): 8-17.

4. For a history of *Sunstone*, see Lee Warthen, "History of *Sunstone*, Chapter 1: The Scott Kenney Years, 1974-1978," *Sunstone* 22 (June 1999): 48-61; Lavina Fielding Anderson, "History of *Sunstone*, Chapter 2: Dreams, Dollars, and Dr. Pepper: Allen Roberts-Peggy Fletcher Years," *Sunstone* (May 2000): 44-54; John Sillito, "A 'Most Outrageously Ambitious Project': *The Sunstone Review*, 1981-1984," *Sunstone* (April 2002): 46-55; Martha Sonntag Bradley, "Theological Discussion or Support Group? A History of *Sunstone* Symposiums," *Sunstone* (July 2002): 33-44. More articles on the history of *Sunstone*, bringing the story to the present, will be forthcoming.

I feel that the journal has finally arrived as a fully professional enterprise on a solid financial footing and reliable publication schedule. The quality of the work, furthermore, has remained high and even improved. You've all done just a magnificent job!

—Armand L. Mauss to Linda King Newell, 14 January 1987

In the spring of 1981, Mary Bradford, *Dialogue* editor since 1976, began making preparations to step down from her post. She and her team in Washington, D.C. had worked from the Bradford basement in Arlington, Virginia, for six years. When Bradford began looking for a replacement, nobody on her local staff had the time or inclination to take over the editorship. Given this, she reasoned, the time was right for moving *Dialogue* to Utah. Certainly, among all of the readers and supporters in Salt Lake City or thereabouts, a new team was just waiting to be formed. With this in mind, Bradford and her executive committee made plans to complete a transition by June 1982.<sup>5</sup>

Bradford's first move toward the transfer came in November 1981, when she awoke one morning thinking of Fred Esplin, a Utah supporter and *Dialogue* board member: "It had occurred to me that he had the right talents for finding our successors by the deadline we had set for ourselves." Bradford asked Esplin to put together a transition and finance team consisting of *Dialogue* board members and readers. Esplin responded by doing just that, with the promise that his group would find a successor by the following February.<sup>6</sup>

By late November, the transition team had met twice and accumulated a list of twenty-five potential candidates for the position. Committee members were assigned specific candidates to contact and discuss their interest and abilities.<sup>7</sup>

Three candidates stood out: Linda King Newell, a writer and histo-

---

5. Mary L. Bradford to the members of the transition/finance team, 13 April 1982, *Dialogue* Collection.

6. Ibid. Those recruited to the transition/marketing team included: Douglas D. Alder, Thomas G. Alexander, Leonard J. Arrington, Maureen Ursenbach Beecher, James L. Clayton, Richard J. Cummings, Jill Mulvay Derr, William E. Dibble, Eugene England, Fred C. Esplin, James L. Farmer, Peggy Fletcher, Bruce Jensen, Clifton Holt Jolley, Randall A. Mackey, Val D. and Maryann Olsen McMurray, Frank McEntire, Allen D. Roberts, Annette Rogers, Gene A. Sessions, George D. Smith, and Paul Swenson (typed copy of "The Transition/Finance/Marketing Team," in *Dialogue* Collection).

7. Those on the initial list of possible candidates were: Dean L. May, Douglas D. Alder, Richard W. Sadler, Levi S. Peterson, Davis Bitton, D. Michael Quinn, L. Jackson Newell, Linda King Newell, Maureen Ursenbach Beecher, Ronald W. Walker, David J. Whittaker, Linda P. Wilcox, Carol Cornwall Madsen, Rebecca Cornwall, Dixie Snow Huefner, Gary James Bergera, Scott G. Kenney, Allen D. Roberts, Lavina Fielding Anderson, Sharon Lee Swenson, Linda Sillitoe, Phyllis Barber, Kent E. Robson, F. Ross Peterson, and Shirlene Pope ("Dialogue Transition Team Meeting, 29 November 1981, Minutes," *Dialogue* Collection).

rian; her husband, L. Jackson Newell, dean of liberal education at the University of Utah; and Lavina Fielding Anderson, former associate editor of the official LDS magazine, the *Ensign*. Committee members approached them individually to determine their interest in taking over the journal. When Maureen Ursenbach Beecher invited Anderson to take the position, Anderson refused outright. Her reasoning was simple: she was busy with her toddler son and wanted to continue to devote her free time to him. Also, she had recently been fired from her position with the *Ensign* for giving a copy of a "delivery text" general conference sermon to *Sunstone*. "[I] felt that this was not a good credential for *Dialogue*." She had also recently begun her own business, Editing Inc., and wanted to be able to focus on building it. "In essence [in accepting the *Dialogue* editorship] I would be postponing any personal career plans for at least five years." Beecher tried unsuccessfully over the next few weeks to persuade Anderson to reconsider, but her answer remained the same.<sup>8</sup>

When Richard and Julie Cummings informally invited Linda and Jack Newell to take over the editorship, they were flattered, but declined. They too, had very good reasons: Jack was awaiting news concerning his possible promotion to full professor at the University of Utah, and Linda was recovering from a recent surgery. However, Linda's most pressing issue was completing her biography of Emma Hale Smith, wife of Mormonism's founder. This project, co-authored with Valeen Tippetts Avery, had been in progress since 1975 and was under contract with Doubleday.<sup>9</sup>

Several months later, however, the Newells received a phone call from Fred Esplin and Randall Mackey, who arranged to meet with them at their home. It was a Sunday, remembers Linda. "They both had suits on, coming two by two like a couple of missionaries."<sup>10</sup> Esplin recalls a similar scene, noting that he and Mackey "set out like a couple of missionaries to 'convert' the Newells."<sup>11</sup> The committee had made up their minds. According to Linda, once inside the Newell home "they 'called' us to be the editors. They said that they had made the decision and that

---

8. Lavina Fielding Anderson to Devery S. Anderson, 5 March 2001. For more on her firing from the *Ensign*, see Lavina Fielding Anderson, "The LDS Intellectual Community and Church Leadership: A Contemporary Chronology," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 26, no. 1 (Spring 1993): 15-17.

9. Lavina Fielding Anderson, "Reflections from Within: A Conversation with Linda King Newell and L. Jackson Newell," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 20, no. 4 (Winter 1987): 19; Linda King and L. Jackson Newell interview, conducted by Devery S. Anderson, 3 November 1994, Salt Lake City. The book referred to was published during the Newells' tenure with *Dialogue*. See Linda King Newell and Valeen Tippetts Avery, *Mormon Enigma: Emma Hale Smith* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1984). The University of Illinois Press released a second edition of the book in 1994.

10. Newell interview.

11. Fred C. Esplin to Devery S. Anderson, 2 March 2001.



we were it." Although Esplin and Mackey left that evening without a commitment, they received a promise from Linda and Jack that they would think it over.<sup>12</sup>

Indeed, the Newells' situation had changed since they had originally been approached, and as a result, they were willing to give the invitation some serious thought. Jack had received his promotion and felt he was now in a position to try something new. For Linda, work on the Emma Smith manuscript was nearing completion.<sup>13</sup> Taking a week to think it over, the couple spent the evenings walking around the streets of their neighborhood, pondering every aspect. A major concern for both was the well-being of their four children, ranging from elementary to high school age. Linda had not been working outside the home; the work involved in managing *Dialogue* would change that, possibly to full-time.<sup>14</sup>

After much deliberation, the Newells agreed to accept the editorship. When Mary Bradford interviewed them on 21 February 1982, the Newells expressed their willingness to serve if Lavina Fielding Anderson would join the team as associate editor.<sup>15</sup> When Linda approached Anderson about this condition, she agreed to come on board in that capacity. Anderson, who often enlisted the Newell children to babysit her young son, had known Linda for several years, and in 1979 had invited her and Valeen Avery to publish an article about Emma Smith in the *Ensign*.<sup>16</sup>

After Bradford returned to Virginia and met with her staff, she wrote the Newells on 18 March 1982 to formally offer them the positions, with "the full approbation of my executive committee here." One problem remained, however. Taking charge of *Dialogue* before the end of the summer would be difficult for the Newells because they had already planned a lengthy family vacation for that summer. But as Bradford explained to Anderson, she (Bradford) could not keep the journal past June: "I am

---

12. Newell interview.

13. Ibid. Later, however, after submitting to Doubleday what they thought was a completed manuscript, the authors learned their job was by no means over. In a letter to Mary Bradford, Linda writes: "By the way, I think I told you that *Emma* is back in our lap. They [the publisher] want us to cut 340 pages—that's a third! It's like killing one of your children" (Linda King Newell to Mary L. Bradford, 29 August 1982, *Dialogue* Collection). As a result, the book would not be published for two more years, appearing in October 1984.

14. Newell interview.

15. Fred Esplin to transition team members, 13 February 1982, *Dialogue* Collection; Mary L. Bradford, "Famous Last Words, or Through the Correspondence Files," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 15, no. 2 (Summer 1982): 20; Anderson, "Reflections from Within," 20.

16. Anderson to Anderson, 5 March 2001. The article became Valeen Tippetts Avery and Linda King Newell, "The Elect Lady: Emma Hale Smith," *Ensign* 9 (September 1979): 64-67. It was the first article on Emma Smith to ever appear in an official church publication.

afraid in talking with my crew here, that if you don't take it, I will be sitting here doing it alone. My secretary is quitting the middle of April. Alice [Pottmyer] is leaving in May. I am sure Lester [Bush] will stick by me, but with all my children and their friends at home for the summer, I am afraid it would just have to slide." Bradford suggested the answer might lie in *Dialogue's* Washington, D.C. BYU intern, Julie Randall.<sup>17</sup> Randall, who had agreed to move back to Utah, was anxious to work with the new team and help them get established.<sup>18</sup> Bradford writes, "She knows most of the process now, is very efficient and nice to work with, and could get the office going until Linda comes in."<sup>19</sup> Even with this promise, the Newells were hesitant to agree on a June takeover. However, Bradford began sending boxes of *Dialogue* files and manuscripts to Salt Lake, forcing an earlier than preferred transition. The remaining supplies came with Bradford as she returned to Utah in May 1983 to attend Mormon History Association meetings in Ogden.<sup>20</sup> Jack recalls: "It was not a smooth or happy transition for us, much as we admired and soon came to love Mary Bradford."<sup>21</sup> Thus, the Newells officially began their tenure on 1 June 1982.

#### "THIS IS THE RIGHT PLACE"

The Newells' appointment as co-editors of *Dialogue* was announced in their Salt Lake ward. "I have no idea what this is about," said the bishopric counselor to the congregation, "but if Jack and Linda have anything to do with it, then it must be something good."<sup>22</sup>

The Newells had subscribed to *Dialogue* from its inception, having first read about the venture in *Time* magazine in 1966.<sup>23</sup> As they read

17. Mary L. Bradford to Lavina Fielding Anderson, 10 March 1982, *Dialogue* Collection. Alice Pottmyer had served Bradford as her publications editor while Lester Bush had served as associate editor.

18. Julie Randall Aldous to Devery S. Anderson, 19 December 2001.

19. Bradford to Anderson, 10 March 1982. In addition to the hectic schedule due to their family vacation, the Newells' summer was also a busy one because of a large number of house guests. As Linda Newell explained to Mary Bradford: "Jack figured out our guest occupancy this August—we had 23 house guests who stayed an average of three nights each. . . I don't know what we would have done without Julie, but she has just about gone under, too" (Newell to Bradford, 29 August 1982).

Julie Randall Aldous recalls her contribution in helping with the transition as "passing on basic information to keep the journal on schedule & making sure it was in the hands of those who cared about it as well" (Aldous to Anderson).

20. L. Jackson Newell and Linda King Newell to Devery S. Anderson, 18 February 2002; Anderson to Anderson, 5 March 2001.

21. Newell and Newell to Anderson, 18 February 2002.

22. Newell interview.

23. Anderson, "Reflections from Within," 19. See "For Unruffled Believers," *Time* 88 (26 August 1966): 59.

these early issues, their reactions were typical of others who were discovering the journal. Linda explains: "It just really filled a need. I think it was largely responsible for keeping us in the church at that time."<sup>24</sup> Linda, who grew up attending church meetings without her parents, and Jack, a convert to Mormonism as a young man, had lived and served in several LDS wards before moving to Salt Lake in 1974. Neither had ever worked with *Dialogue* prior to their editorship although Jack had published an essay in the journal in 1980.<sup>25</sup>

To help ease the transition, Mary Bradford, Lester Bush, and Alice Pottmyer had prepared a *Dialogue Idiot Book* for the Salt Lake team in order to answer questions and provide complete instructions for producing an issue of the journal.<sup>26</sup> However, Anderson found they still had to learn by trial and error: "As the saying goes, 'When you idiot-proof something, someone will always come along and invent a better idiot.'" Anderson remembers that Julie Randall, the transplanted intern from Bradford's team, saved the day early on. "We would have been floundering a lot longer than we did" had it not been for her. "Julie staffed the office, answered phone queries, explained procedures, and was incredibly and unfailingly pleasant and cheerful. Walking into the office was like stepping into sunlight."<sup>27</sup>

The Newells immediately began to establish an executive committee after accepting the editorship, and the combined talents of the various members helped immensely in covering all of the bases. In addition to the Newells and Anderson, transition team leaders Fred Esplin and Randall Mackey joined the committee. Also, former *Sunstone* editor Allen Roberts was soon added to the team.<sup>28</sup> For the next five-and-a-half years, this executive committee met every other Tuesday evening in the Newell home. Roberts recalls the contributions of the committee members:

The important thing is that the new executive committee rallied around the Newells from the first and worked hard to get *Dialogue* off on the right foot from the first issue on. Although the Newells were not experienced at [journal] publishing, Lavina and I were. Moreover, Fred Esplin was experienced

---

24. Newell interview.

25. Newell and Newell to Anderson, 18 February 2002; Anderson, "Reflections from Within," 19. For Jack's article, see L. Jackson Newell, "Personal Conscience and Priesthood Authority," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 13, no. 4 (Winter 1980): 81-87.

26. This thirty-two-page guide was divided into three sections. Lester Bush wrote the first section, on obtaining manuscripts and organization of issues; Mary Bradford wrote the second section, on editing manuscripts; Alice Pottmyer contributed the third section on subscriptions, publication, and promotion. Bush also provided outlines for several upcoming issues (see *The Dialogue Idiot Book*, typescript, a copy in my possession).

27. Anderson to Anderson, 5 March 2001.

28. Roberts had co-edited *Sunstone* along with Peggy Fletcher in the late 1970s. For the story of their joint editorship, see Anderson, "History of *Sunstone* Chapter 2," 44-54.

and competent at keeping the books and giving good business advice, and Randall Mackey had previous experience with meeting the foundation's legal requirements. Thus the Newells were surrounded by experience. More importantly, the executive committee's chemistry was good and everyone was enthusiastic and worked diligently. This executive committee was one of the finest groups I have ever worked with.<sup>29</sup>

When the Newells had first contemplated taking over the editorship, one of their foremost concerns was where to house *Dialogue*. Linda recalls: "We decided we did not want it in our basement like Mary Bradford had done in Virginia. For the sake of our children and for our own psychic well-being, it had to be somewhere else."<sup>30</sup> Thanks to Allen Roberts, they secured office space quickly. Roberts had asked his friend and neighbor, C. Dean Larsen, for free space in the Boston Building, of which Larsen was part owner. He was happy to provide it.<sup>31</sup> Lavina Fielding Anderson recalls that the two-room setup, located in downtown Salt Lake City, was at first in "pretty sorry shape although it had wonderful, large, south-facing windows. We had no storage shelves, one battered desk—things like that. Not even a waste basket."<sup>32</sup> The team soon joined together in painting the office, and in an effort to make it function effectively, the Newells sent a letter to subscribers asking for donations in the form of crucial office items.<sup>33</sup> Several supporters responded, and soon the needed supplies and furniture made their way to the office. As indicated in a letter to one such donor, the Newells were grateful for the response: "We would like to thank you for the very generous donation of a desk to *Dialogue*. Just as we were beginning to wonder where our associate editor would work, you came through with the desk."<sup>34</sup> On 28 July 1982, the *Dialogue* team hosted an open house in the new office, inviting all subscribers to attend.<sup>35</sup>

The office provided very little extra space, and back issues of *Dialogue* had to be stored elsewhere. Linda explained the temporary solution to Mary Bradford: "The truck load of back issues arrived yesterday and [they] are stored in a neighbor's basement. I don't know if she can take the rest of them when they come but we will see. Once we get them sorted and

---

29. Allen D. Roberts to Devery S. Anderson, 20 February 2001.

30. Newell interview.

31. Allen D. Roberts to Devery S. Anderson, 25 October 2001.

32. Anderson to Anderson, 5 March 2001.

33. Aldous to Anderson; Linda King Newell and L. Jackson Newell to *Dialogue* Readers, 23 June 1982, *Dialogue* Collection.

34. Linda King Newell and L. Jackson Newell to Ray Phillips, 12 August 1982, *Dialogue* Collection. That same day the Newells also sent a letter of thanks to supporter Gordon Wakefield for his gift of a typewriter.

35. Newell and Newell to *Dialogue* Readers, 23 June 1982.

in some order on shelves we will be able to see how many more we can store there.”<sup>36</sup> Twenty years later, Linda remembers that “there were literally tons of back issues that we unpacked and placed on steel shelves that we bought and bolted together. It was a physically as well as mentally demanding task to relocate *Dialogue* in a new city. But volunteers just crawled out of the woodwork to help us.”<sup>37</sup> One in particular was G. Kevin Jones, a dynamic young government lawyer packed with enthusiasm for *Dialogue*. After he burst into the Newells’ lives at the open house, they put him in charge of new subscriptions. In that capacity he manned the *Dialogue* table at nearly every Sunstone Symposium and at the annual Mormon History Association meetings. Linda recalls that one executive committee member commented on his proficiency, “He almost sold *me* a subscription and I’m a charter subscriber!” *Dialogue*’s steady increase in readership was due in no small part to Kevin. He had enormous health problems during those years, but still worked hard on behalf of the journal on many fronts—always with praise, encouragement, and sound advice.<sup>38</sup>

Seven months after moving into the Boston Building, *Dialogue* was forced to move when another tenant decided to expand. Again, Roberts was instrumental in securing space, and as before it came free of charge. The new office would be housed in a building owned by Roberts’s business partner, Wally Cooper, the same building where the firm Wallace N. Cooper, Architects and Associates, operated.<sup>39</sup> In addition to office space, this new arrangement allowed *Dialogue* use of the firm’s word processor, photocopy machine (at a small cost per page), conference room, and basement for storage space. In return, *Dialogue* would pay for custodial services for the building and answer phone calls during the secretary’s lunch hour.<sup>40</sup> Fred Esplin, writing to Cooper to confirm the arrange-

---

36. Newell to Bradford, 29 August 1982.

37. Newell and Newell to Anderson, 18 February 2002.

38. Linda King Newell to Devery S. Anderson, 13 September 2002.

39. The Cooper building had been built around 1916 and was originally the home of Heystek Grocery. It later served as a laundromat before Cooper purchased and renovated it. Roberts recalls: “The interior was pretty well trashed and the front facade had been covered with pink concrete block. It was in every respect an ugly and forlorn building. We found an old tax photo and used it to restore the exterior to its original appearance.” Roberts received his architectural license in 1984, mid-way through the Newells’ tenure, and the firm became Cooper/Roberts Architects at that time (Roberts to Anderson, 31 January 2002).

40. Fred C. Esplin to Wallace N. Cooper II, 18 January 1983, *Dialogue* Collection; Allen D. Roberts to Devery S. Anderson, 31 January 2002. Julie Randall Aldous remembers “answering the phones for the architects when their secretary went to lunch. That was sometimes a frustration because I didn’t know what was going on in their office and couldn’t be very helpful. Their offices were upstairs (except for the receptionist desk inside the front door). *Dialogue*’s offices were at the back of the building—past the receptionist desk and down the hall” (Aldous to Anderson).

ments, also promised to respect Roberts's work schedule: "We are aware of the importance of not infringing on Allen Roberts's time during the normal business day and will confine any *Dialogue* business he is part of to the lunch hour or after work."<sup>41</sup> After *Dialogue* moved to the new office in early February, 1983, Roberts did his best to keep Esplin's promise. "Linda and I, and sometimes other staff members, would often have lunch and talk through *Dialogue* concerns, but I never found *Dialogue* to be a major distraction to my architectural work."<sup>42</sup> The following year, Randall described a happy setting to a former member of Bradford's staff: "If only you could see that *Dialogue* is now run from a very pleasant, professional office, you'd be amazed. . . . Linda Newell is in the office most of the time; Lavina works out of her home. . . . Everyone works hard and tries to keep on schedule."<sup>43</sup> Randall recently added: "We didn't have that much interaction [with the architects], and I can't recall any friction."<sup>44</sup>

#### EARLY ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The Newells decided to make some structural changes in their editorial board. While Bradford's board had included thirty-one members, the Newells announced they would have a much smaller board: "The new editorial board will number only twelve people, serving staggered, three-year terms. Our aim is to work closely with each member of the board of editors, encourage them to play a much more active role in advising us about the journal and seeking manuscripts for consideration."<sup>45</sup> The Newells found success with this change, yet later modified it somewhat, as Linda recently noted. "We wanted a working editorial board behind us, not an honorary society. . . . [Twelve] is a magic number in Mormonism, of course, but was just a convenient number to us. As time went along, we added a few more members to gain strengths or perspectives we discovered our original group lacked."<sup>46</sup>

Since Jack was busy in a full-time position at the University of Utah, he and Linda agreed that Linda would carry the majority of the *Dialogue* workload. Jack recalls: "From the beginning, the idea was that Linda would manage the day-to-day operation on a part-time salary, and I would join with her on evenings and weekends to share the policy and

---

41. Esplin to Cooper, 18 January 1983.

42. Roberts to Anderson, 25 October 2001.

43. Julie Randall to Sandy B. Straubhaar, 5 September 1984, *Dialogue* Collection.

44. Aldous to Anderson.

45. Linda King Newell and L. Jackson Newell to Former Members of the Board of Editors, 30 August 1982, *Dialogue* Collection.

46. Newell and Newell to Anderson, 18 February 2002.

decision making responsibilities."<sup>47</sup> Yet Linda's *Dialogue* duties became a full-time job, which she divided between the office and home: "I wasn't at the office forty hours a week. I'd go in during the morning and tried to be back by the time the kids got home from school—although I didn't always make it. But I never went home without a bag full of stuff to work on when I got there." Still, Linda is quick to acknowledge Jack's crucial role: "I would call Jack several times daily. We'd also talk about *Dialogue* at night and in the morning, and I relied very heavily on his judgement and advice, and so I felt like [the] decisions I made were joint decisions. I think we worked very well as a team." Jack provides more detail on their work relationship, adding that "we shared the reading of manuscripts for serious consideration, public contacts, and talking to the press. . . . We also shared chairing of the meetings of the *Dialogue* editorial team. We thrashed out all of the tough decisions at great length together."<sup>48</sup> Randall, looking back, sums it up nicely: "Jack and Linda were hard-working, well-grounded, bright, caring people. I was amazed at how much they could accomplish—Jack as a dean & teacher at the University, Linda trying to finish her Emma Smith biography, working at the *Dialogue* office, and taking care of their family."<sup>49</sup>

Other office staff proved essential to a smooth production. In addition to the members of the executive committee, Annie Brewer, a friend of the Newells, came on board as an office assistant while working on her master's degree at the University of Utah. At *Dialogue*, she worked closely with Randall for two years and, as Linda describes it, became "a pleasant part of our office life."<sup>50</sup> Brewer's brother, Daniel Maryon, later worked with the team in the same capacity for four years. "Dan was wonderful," remembers Linda. "He carried a huge load. He was very reliable, he was there when he was supposed to be, he worked hard, and he was pleasant to work with." And with the addition of other volunteers, "the desks were usually always occupied with someone."<sup>51</sup>

---

47. Ibid.

48. Newell interview.

49. Aldous to Anderson.

50. Linda King Newell and L. Jackson Newell to Devery S. Anderson, 9 September 2002.

51. Newell interview. Maryon, who went on to work for Word Perfect, could no doubt credit *Dialogue* with important training that played a role in his future. Linda Newell explains: "We set up the computer program, and when he first came to *Dialogue* he didn't know how to use a computer. We paid for him to learn, after which he set up our whole system for renewal cycles. He had someone [Linda's sister, Charlene King Kotuku] who would call people after we had sent them all of the renewal notices. He took care of all of the mailings as well as other nitty gritty work, which allowed us to concentrate on working with the authors, the manuscripts, and other types of correspondence" (Ibid.).

Susette Fletcher Green also offered to help after attending the *Dialogue* open house in July 1982. Soon she became what Lavina Fielding Anderson describes as her "right hand," as part of the editorial staff, and later as an additional associate editor. "Susette was in a class by herself. From the very first, she had a special interest in the technical parts of editing that was pretty unusual. She was very hard-working, very consistent, and serious about deadlines while being so pleasant to work with and talk to."<sup>52</sup> After her official hiring as a second associate editor in September 1985, she and Anderson began to split the \$6,500 annual salary provided. "You obviously won't get rich in this position," wrote Linda.<sup>53</sup> And considering the number of hours involved, Anderson adds, "It probably came out to about 25 cents an hour, but it definitely was the thought that counted."<sup>54</sup>

Julie Randall stayed on as an editorial assistant until moving to Oregon in 1984 and was the only full-time paid staff member beside Linda.<sup>55</sup> In addition to her various office duties, she did proofreading and editing, and sent manuscripts to the members of the editorial board as needed. She also ran errands, which included "shuttling manuscripts and galleys to and from" the typesetter.<sup>56</sup> After her departure, she was replaced for a time by Lisa Aston. Linda Thatcher, who served as book review editor, is also remembered for her dedication to *Dialogue*. Linda describes her as a "quiet worker who did her job without fanfare or prodding."<sup>57</sup>

At the time *Dialogue* transferred to Utah, the Newells were happy to report that the journal was "debt free and with a substantial file of good manuscripts to publish."<sup>58</sup> The Washington team had, in fact, already accepted papers and made tentative plans for the four issues of volume fifteen, as well as the spring issue of volume sixteen even though the Salt Lake team would do final editing on all but the Spring 1982 issue.<sup>59</sup> That issue, bearing the imprint of the Washington, D.C. team, was not released until mid-summer.<sup>60</sup>

---

52. Anderson to Anderson, 5 March 2001.

53. Linda King Newell to Susette Fletcher Green, 3 September 1985, *Dialogue* Collection.

54. Anderson to Anderson, 5 March 2001.

55. In 1985, Linda Newell revealed to one potential author that, of *Dialogue's* \$126,000 annual budget, "about \$40,500 of that pays the salary of two full and three part-time employees" (Linda King Newell to Ernest Pulsipher, 9 May 1985, *Dialogue* Collection). At one point, Randall Mackey tried to cut Julie Randall's hours in order to save on costs, but Linda insisted she remain full-time (Aldous to Anderson).

56. Aldous to Anderson.

57. Newell to Anderson.

58. Linda King Newell and L. Jackson Newell to Judge John T. Vernieu, 9 August 1982, *Dialogue* Collection.

59. "The *Dialogue* Transfer Timetable," undated, *Dialogue* Collection, and *Dialogue* *Idiot Book*, 25-29.

60. Newell and Newell to Vernieu.



The Newells kept Bradford's and Bush's original plan, with a few exceptions. For example, a planned issue responding to anti-Mormon arguments, slated for the fall of 1982, was dropped during the transition, according to Bush, because "two of the five principle [sic] papers have fallen through—despite 1½ years of reassurances."<sup>61</sup> One essay for the proposed issue, Marvin S. Hill's "The First Vision Controversy: A Critique and Reconciliation" did appear in Summer 1982, summarizing the various theses advanced to defend or dismiss Joseph Smith's 1820 theophany. Hill's fresh look at the evidence raised the level of discourse in what is considered a classic study. An essay by BYU anthropologist John Sorenson, titled "Digging into the Book of Mormon," originally scheduled for the Summer 1982 issue, was also pulled by the author. Sorenson later published a two-part series with the same title in the *Ensign* in 1984 (discussed later).<sup>62</sup>

The Newells' first official issue (Summer 1982), released in late September, contained departing essays by Mary Bradford and Lester Bush.<sup>63</sup> The following issue (Fall 1982) included an introduction by the Newells. Their essay, "Ongoing Dialogue," spelled out their philosophy and the purpose of the journal: "There are many who believe that faith and scholarship are at cross purposes. We believe this view is flawed." Instead, they declared: "Faith provides ideals by which believers navigate their course. Scholarship, by contrast, helps us to measure our progress with some objectivity. Both are essential to thoughtful people and to the church. Scholarship and faith do different things, but we believe they may both be found in the service of legitimate religion."<sup>64</sup>

Trouble with the typesetter turned the production of their first issue into a "nightmare," as Linda described it.<sup>65</sup> Nearly two decades later, that memory is still clear in Lavina Fielding Anderson's mind: "We had a very unsatisfactory experience with that typesetter. Each batch of corrections we asked for produced new errors. I remember at one point (this was when slicks had wax stripes on the back that acted as glue) we had so may layers of corrections pasted down that the press complained that it couldn't get all the page in focus at one time." To avoid further disas-

---

61. *Dialogue Idiot Book*, 25.

62. See John L. Sorenson, "Digging into the Book of Mormon: Our Changing Understanding of Ancient America and its Scripture," *Ensign* 14 (September 1984): 27-36, and *Ensign* 14 (October 1984): 12-22.

63. See Mary L. Bradford, "Famous Last Words, or Through the Correspondence Files," and Lester E. Bush, Jr., "Valedictory," both in *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 15, no. 2 (Summer 1982): 11-30.

64. L. Jackson Newell and Linda King Newell, "Ongoing Dialogue," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 15, no. 3 (Autumn 1982): 12.

65. Linda King Newell to Lester E. Bush, 5 October 1982, *Dialogue* Collection.

ter, the team switched to Don Henriksen, a hot-lead artist formerly employed by the University of Utah Press. "Don was a real artist and wonderful to work with because his standards were so high. He used to say that he could tell if he'd hit the wrong key because the rhythm of the slug falling into the slot would be wrong."<sup>66</sup>

To keep any typesetter, of course, the Dialogue Foundation had to have money to pay him. *Dialogue* had always depended on raising funds, and this would not change in Salt Lake. The first fund-raising attempt under the Newells came in August at the 1982 Sunstone Theological Symposium. Linda Newell wrote Mary Bradford of their success there: "We did well on both the sale of back issues and subscriptions."<sup>67</sup> They also raised money through their annual Christmas fund-raiser, four months later. Through this mass mailing, they secured 203 new subscriptions, fifty-nine gift subscriptions, and received three renewals. The drive, which cost \$3,264 in printing, postage, and labor, brought in a total of \$5,279—a profit of \$2,015.<sup>68</sup> More importantly, regular donors, such as O. C. Tanner, continued to give generously. Tanner, assuring Linda Newell that he was "aware of the struggle to keep a magazine going," enclosed a check for \$2,500. "While I do not wish to be bound by a promise, I have completed instructions here that I should send \$1,000 each year."<sup>69</sup> The *Dialogue* prizes, which had been awarded annually for the best articles and poetry published in the journal, had long been supported by grants provided by the Silver Foundation. In July 1983, Linda thanked the Silvers for their most recent check for \$1,000. Three months later, however, Cherry Silver informed the Newells that the 1983 gift would be the last donated for that purpose, as Harold F. Silver, beneficiary of the Foundation, had decided to limit grants for educational purposes only.<sup>70</sup> Thereafter, it became necessary to adjust the *Dialogue* budget in other ways to continue to fund the awards.

Fund-raising seemed easier now, and Roberts remembers other benefits of being in Utah: "It was handy to have the typesetter, proofreaders, graphic designer, press, binder, staff, and several board members near by. . . . It was also convenient to have easy access to so many Utah authors

---

66. Anderson to Anderson, 5 March 2001. See also Anderson, "Reflections from Within," 21.

67. Newell to Bradford, 29 August 1982.

68. "1982 Christmas Mailer Income and Expense Summary," undated, *Dialogue* Collection.

69. O. C. Tanner to Linda King Newell, 9 December 1982, *Dialogue* Collection. Tanner continued to give generously to *Dialogue*, later donating \$4,000 in 1984 alone (Obert C. Tanner to Linda King and L. Jackson Newell, 12 November 1984, *Dialogue* Collection).

70. Linda King Newell to Barnard and Cherry Silver, 1 July 1983; Cherry Silver to Linda King Newell, 18 October 1983, both in *Dialogue* Collection; Cherry Silver to Devery S. Anderson, 25 June 2002.

and reviewers, as well as the Salt Lake Sunstone Symposium, Mormon History Association, Association for Mormon Letters, and related gatherings." Roberts also acknowledges that proximity to church headquarters allowed for "intangible, symbolic value to having *Dialogue* in the very shadows of the church center where it can have its finger constantly on the church's pulse and be immediately aware of important LDS developments."<sup>71</sup>

While the *Dialogue* team began to enjoy these advantages of moving to Salt Lake, it experienced its share of disadvantages as well. One downside was being in the middle of the Mormon rumor mill. "It was probably the most distasteful part of the job," remembers Linda. "People assumed that, since we were at *Dialogue*, we would be able to confirm or deny any kind of rumor about the church. So people would often call with the rumors and it became quite tiresome." Early on the executive committee made a decision never to pass on any of the rumors that would come their way. Too often, when someone passes on a rumor, "they give it its genesis."<sup>72</sup> Sometimes, however, these rumors had substance.

#### THE PETERSEN "INQUISITION"

One disturbing story that made its way into the *Dialogue* office in April 1983 understandably sent a chill through the Mormon intellectual community. During an executive committee meeting, someone announced "that several authors have been called in for worthiness interviews because of an unidentified General Authority letter." With no details beyond that, the committee decided to take no action for the moment, but agreed to "monitor [the] situation closely and console authors who have been confronted. We want to avoid rumors and bad publicity."<sup>73</sup> More information came forth by the next meeting of the committee ten days later. Linda Newell reported that "a serious problem may be developing because seven people have been called in by their stake presidents based on a call from a General Authority. If this continues some of the long-term effects could seriously impair *Dialogue's* growth. Gossip could decrease subscriptions. Fear of losing one's temple recommend might discourage new people from writing for *Dialogue*." The committee also learned at this meeting that the general authority behind the investigations was Apostle Mark E. Petersen.<sup>74</sup>

---

71. Roberts to Anderson, 25 October 2001.

72. Newell interview.

73. "Dialogue Executive Committee Meeting Minutes," 26 April 1983, *Dialogue* Collection.

74. "Minutes, Dialogue Meeting, Friday, 6 May 1983; 4:15—6:00," *Dialogue* Collection.

The committee debated how to respond. One idea raised was to write a letter to Petersen, but this was rejected immediately. Another possibility was a "campaign to inform the public about *Dialogue* and defuse rumors that it is an anti-Mormon publication." The committee worried that this approach could also backfire: "It is possible that this would be considered a challenge to Church leaders and would direct more negative attention to us."<sup>75</sup>

Soon the news spread that at least fourteen scholars from around the U.S. had been called in to their local leaders, including not only writers who had published in *Dialogue*, but also those who had written for *Sunstone* and the *Seventh East Press* (an independent BYU newspaper founded in 1981, and only recently defunct). Working with Roy W. Doxey, head of Church Correlation, Petersen identified authors whom he found troublesome and sent their names to their local church leaders. These leaders, in turn, would grill them about their worthiness, faithfulness, and their writing.<sup>76</sup> While some of the writers found the interviews painless, even pleasant, others felt "beaten up."<sup>77</sup> Among those called in were Lester Bush, Armand L. Mauss, Gary James Bergera, Sissy Warner, David John Buerger, Peggy Fletcher, Scott Faulring, Edward Ashment, Jeffrey Keller, Richard Sherlock, and "three BYU professors," including historians Thomas G. Alexander and Marvin S. Hill.<sup>78</sup> In many of these cases, local leaders told writers to "write faith promoting stories or their church membership will be in jeopardy." Gary Bergera, who had earlier written for *Dialogue*, was told by his stake president that "what I had written [in the *Seventh East Press*] was anti-Mormon because it wasn't uplifting."<sup>79</sup>

Soon the scope widened, and the Newells found that they, as editors of *Dialogue*, were also being investigated. According to Linda:

A church authority called our bishop, who was out of town, and got the first counselor in the bishopric instead. The next Sunday, when our family went to church, he greeted us on the steps. "Okay, Linda, he said, I want to know

---

75. Ibid.

76. Robert Gottlieb and Peter Wiley, *America's Saints: The Rise of Mormon Power* (New York: Putnam, 1984), 249.

77. Armand L. Mauss telephone interview, 28 November 1994, conducted by Devery S. Anderson.

78. Sources for the names of those investigated by Petersen are Anderson, "LDS Intellectual Community and Church Leadership," 20-21; Dawn Tracy, "LDS Leader's Challenge Y Professor's Faith," *Provo Daily Herald*, 25 May 1983, 3; and David John Buerger diary, 27 May 1983, box 1, folder 7, David John Buerger Papers, Ms 622, box 1, folder 7, Manuscripts Division, Special Collections, Marriott Library.

79. Dawn Tracy, "LDS Bishops Want 'Faith-Promoting' Articles," *Provo Daily Herald*, 22 May 1983, 3.

what General Board you are being called to serve on!" Truly puzzled, I asked what he was talking about. "Oh, I got a phone call from someone high up who wanted to know if you and Jack were members in good standing. Under his breath he asked someone in the background to hand him 'the file on Linda Newell.' He wanted to know if you and Jack were the same couple that edit *Dialogue*. So I'm sure they are about to call you to some lofty responsibility." We laughed, knowing what the call was really about.<sup>80</sup>

The counselor told the Newells he had given the caller a positive report. Linda recalls: "This brought to my attention how differently we were viewed by those who knew us and those who didn't. Jack was the second counselor in the bishopric at the time." The phone call ended the investigation of the Newells, and they were never asked to speak with their local leaders. The incident did, however, alert the Newells to the fact that the church was keeping a file on them.<sup>81</sup>

Another editor, Peggy Fletcher of *Sunstone*, had a similar experience. Her bishop also received a telephone call from someone at church headquarters inquiring about her, which led the bishop at first to assume that an important calling was in the works. He assured the caller that Fletcher was a member in good standing. After the bishop informed Fletcher of the phone call, however, she sought an appointment with First Presidency Counselor Gordon B. Hinckley to discuss the investigation and its impact on her and the writers involved.<sup>82</sup> At the time, Hinckley was the only functioning member of the presidency.<sup>83</sup>

The meeting occurred on 17 May 1983. During their meeting, Fletcher asked Hinckley if the church had taken an official position against writing for such publications as *Dialogue* and *Sunstone*. Hinckley denied that it had, but said the Twelve may have approved such a policy without his knowledge. Hinckley also told Fletcher that the matter "is between you and Mark Petersen; there is nothing I can do about it." Concerned about the possibility of bad publicity over the incident, however, Hinckley seemed anxious to keep the matter from appearing in the national press. After Fletcher made it known that *Newsweek*, *Time* and other national publications were aware of the story, she offered to do whatever she could to keep anything from appearing in the press and expressed

---

80. Newell and Newell to Anderson, 18 February 2002.

81. Ibid.

82. Peggy Fletcher Stack telephone interview, conducted by Devery S. Anderson, 24 June 2002.

83. George Boyd, a brother-in-law of church president Spencer W. Kimball, visited the ailing prophet the following fall and described him as "pretty much incoherent—can't recognize people, etc." First Counselor Marion G. Romney "is in much worse condition," described by Boyd as "senile." See Buerger diary, 13 November 1983, Buerger Papers, box 1, folder 8.

her hope that Hinckley could use his influence to put an end to the investigations. David Buerger, who was aware of the Hinckley-Fletcher meeting, wrote in his diary that evening that, "my impression is that the visit was not very fruitful."<sup>84</sup>

With local media aware of the details, the story "finally hit the fan." Linda explained to a concerned subscriber that "we have, with the help of Peggy, kept it out of the press for nearly a month," but had finally decided to issue a statement "when we knew it was ready to get out."<sup>85</sup> In a press release, the Newells stated: "We are aware that some Mormon scholars have recently been questioned by (LDS) church authorities about their research, some of which has been published in *Dialogue*. . . . We are gravely concerned that the faith of any Latter-day Saint would be questioned on the basis of his or her commitment to legitimate scholarship."<sup>86</sup> Stories about the investigations appeared in Utah newspapers between 22 and 26 May 1983.<sup>87</sup>

On Thursday, 26 May, Fletcher told Linda she had heard that Hinckley did address the apostles regarding the investigations. Linda passed the news on to Buerger: "Hinckley said that the intellectuals are to be LEFT ALONE; that they are a valuable asset in the Church, and free inquiry is needed as well. Hinckley specifically noted that Sterling McMurrin and *Dialogue* were to be left alone."<sup>88</sup> A year later, Fletcher spoke with Buerger directly, giving him the same details that she had earlier given to Linda.<sup>89</sup> Today, as then, Fletcher maintains that she received this information from a reliable source "close to the Twelve."<sup>90</sup>

Apparently the Apostles listened. One month later, Linda reported the investigations had stopped and added that "Whatever he [Hinckley] said, it seems to have diffused the issue and things have returned to normal. Whatever that means!"<sup>91</sup> However, the press maintained an

84. Buerger diary, 17 May 1983, Buerger Papers, box 1, folder 7; Buerger diary, 24 May 1984, Buerger Papers, box 1 folder 9.

85. Linda Newell to Marjorie Whitman, 23 May 1983, *Dialogue* Collection.

86. Tracy, "LDS Bishops Want 'Faith-Promoting' Articles," 3.

87. In addition to the articles quoted in notes 77 and 78, above, see "Mormon Editors Told to Promote Faith," *Ogden Standard Examiner*, 23 May 1983, 2A; "LDS Church Telling Editors to Use Only 'Faith Promoting' Stories?" *Salt Lake Tribune*, 23 May 1983, 10A; "Several LDS Writers Say Officials Caution Them to Promote the Faith," *Deseret News* 23 May 1983, 2B; "Editor Upset over Efforts to Silence Scholars," *Ogden Standard Examiner* 26 May 1983, 1B; Connie Thornton, "Y Historians, Writers Claim No Pressures from LDS Authorities," *The Daily Universe*, 26 May 1983, 1; "Mormon Brethren Silencing Scholars," *Salt Lake Tribune* 26 May 1983, 4B. See also "Current Events," *Utah Holiday* 12 (August 1983): 77.

88. Buerger diary, 26 May 1983, Buerger Papers, box 1, folder 7.

89. Buerger diary, 24 May 1984.

90. Stack telephone interview. Stack remained at *Sunstone* until 1986. Since November 1991 she has been a religion writer at the *Salt Lake Tribune*.

91. Linda Newell to Jolene Rockwood, 23 June 1983, *Dialogue* Collection.

interest in the story. Linda detailed in amazement the length one reporter went to in order to obtain more information about the controversy:

I'd have to say she is persistent. We were having dinner with Jack's aunt and uncle in Martinez, California (we were there a total of two hours). To find us, she had to call the *Dialogue* office [which] gave her Jack's office number. Jack's secretary told her we were visiting my brother in Sacramento. She called there and got the name and number of the friend we were staying with in San Francisco and found out where we were having dinner.

However, Linda explained, "we told her we had nothing to add to our earlier statement—poor thing."<sup>92</sup>

A year later, after the *Los Angeles Times* had mentioned the Petersen probe in an article about *Sunstone*, Jack Newell explained to the religion editor who wrote the story that it was both *Dialogue* and *Sunstone* that helped quiet the affair: "I think the decision to stop the inquisitorial campaign was a product of our having brought it into public view, and *Sunstone's* private appeals to LDS authorities. It was an unspoken division of labor."<sup>93</sup>

Before the Petersen controversy occurred, the Newells had already resolved "that we would not be intimidated." They were committed to publishing scholarship based on responsible research, "and our task was to make sure that it *was* responsible scholarship."<sup>94</sup> Yet some authors *were* intimidated. Saddened that throughout their tenure even non-controversial articles were pulled from publication by fearful authors, Linda observed: "The Church's intimidation of writers has done nothing but polarize a certain type of writer that we tried to nurture—the true believer; the one that writes out of their faith."<sup>95</sup>

#### DAVID BUERGER AND THE SECOND ANOINTING

This determination to remain unintimidated was put to the test during the Petersen investigations. In 1981, *Dialogue* had published a letter to the editor from a stake patriarch in Washington state suggesting "it would be interesting to have one of your historian-type writers do a piece on 'second anointings'—what they were, qualifications for selection, and why they have disappeared from current temple ceremonies." Prompted by this letter, writer David Buerger began research on this

---

92. Linda King Newell to Mary L. Bradford, 29 July 1983, *Dialogue* Collection.

93. L. Jackson Newell to John Dart, 5 September 1984, *Dialogue* Collection. See John Dart, "Dedicated Group of Intellectuals Makes Some Headway in Being Accepted by Mormon Church's Conservatives," *Los Angeles Times*, 1 September 1984, 4-5.

94. Newell interview.

95. *Ibid.*

very topic and planned to submit the essay for publication in *Dialogue*.<sup>96</sup> The article was published in the Spring 1983 issue as "'The Fulness of the Priesthood': The Second Anointing in Latter-day Saint Theology and Practice."<sup>97</sup> It was an early version of this essay which had led to Buerger's trouble with Petersen.

In early 1982, Buerger had completed a draft of his paper and submitted it to the Washington team for consideration. However, after BYU history professor and *Dialogue* board member D. Michael Quinn responded with ten pages of recommendations, Buerger felt he needed to make major revisions to the article and spent August 1982 doing so. Buerger submitted his revised essay to the new team in Salt Lake City on 7 September 1982.<sup>98</sup> Still, the executive committee had some remaining concerns, as pointed out by Lavina Fielding Anderson in a letter to Buerger:

So far the only reservation anyone has is the possible impropriety of describing the actual process of the anointing in such detail. We would have reservations about describing the existing endowment in such detail and that's something on the staff we're just going to have to hassle through and see how important we think it is and how willing we are to justify the decision. I think it should be there. But of course I also think the endowment could be discussed in much greater detail than current standards allow.<sup>99</sup>

The editors next sent the paper to former *Dialogue* associate editor Lester Bush (who now served on the editorial board) for "reorganiza-

---

96. Ken Earl, "Second Anointings Anyone?," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 14, no. 1 (Spring 1981): 7. After the Buerger article was eventually published, Armand Mauss introduced Earl, then president of the California Oakland Mission, to Buerger in Oakland after Mauss had spoken at a fireside. Earl told Buerger, "I've read your second anointing article several times and really enjoyed it." Buerger subsequently recorded in his diary: "I was really taken back to hear this (Earl was in his sixties, etc.). But later I discovered that Earl was the patriarch from Washington who had written to *Dialogue* several years ago encouraging them to get one of their 'historian types' to do an article on the second anointing, and it was Earl's letter which got me thinking and prompted to take on the project. What a small world." (Buerger diary, 6 September 1983, Buerger Papers, box 1, folder 8).

97. Buerger, who would publish two essays in *Dialogue* on temple ordinances (the second discussed later in this essay), expanded his research and later published it in book form. See David John Buerger, *The Mysteries of Godliness: A History of Temple Worship* (San Francisco: Smith Research Associates, 1994).

98. David John Buerger to *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* Editorial Office, 1 August 1982; David John Buerger to Lester E. Bush, 7 September 1982, both in Buerger Papers, box 3, folder 14.

99. Lavina Fielding Anderson to David John Buerger, 28 September 1982, *Dialogue* Collection.



tional editing."<sup>100</sup> The revised essay was reviewed by Quinn and also given to Anthony Hutchinson, formerly of the Washington team.<sup>101</sup>

Fully aware that the topic was sensitive, Buerger also gave a draft of his essay to Richard Hunter, the son of Apostle Howard W. Hunter. The younger Hunter seemed fascinated with Buerger's research, and the two men held many conversations about it. After a telephone conversation on 22 October 1981, Buerger recorded that Hunter "doesn't know if the doctrine is a secret. The main question raised was 'why don't we know about this ordinance; why aren't we told more about it? When [and] how do I find out more?' He wants to pass it by his dad. I said ok."<sup>102</sup> Later, after revising the paper, Buerger gave a copy to Richard, who then gave it to his apostle father. Richard Hunter reported the apostle's reaction to Buerger, who recorded the following in his journal: "When asked his opinion regarding the publication of my paper on 2A's [second anointings], Howard didn't know whether it was appropriate or not to do it. He wasn't opposed to the idea, but he didn't condone it either. Richard was careful [to explain] that I was not trying to 'air dirty laundry'; that I am a faithful member of the Church, etc."<sup>103</sup> Buerger himself had sent the apostle an early draft of his paper in November 1981, asking for "his views on the propriety of publication." Although Apostle Hunter was later willing to express his opinion to his son, he never replied directly to Buerger.<sup>104</sup>

It soon became obvious that Hunter had given the paper to at least two of his colleagues. In early April 1983, as part of his investigation into writers, Mark E. Petersen contacted Buerger's stake president, Owen P. Jacobsen, during the church's General Conference in Salt Lake City. "Petersen indicated that he was 'concerned' about me, and the possible negative impact my writing might have among some members. He also made reference to my upcoming paper on the second anointing."<sup>105</sup>

---

100. David John Buerger to Lester E. Bush, 5 October 1982, Buerger Papers, box 3, folder 14.

101. D. Michael Quinn to David John Buerger, 18 November 1982; David John Buerger to Lavina Fielding Anderson, 29 March 1983, both in Buerger Papers, box 1, folder 14. Quinn, who was a BYU professor at the time, chose not to be acknowledged for his critique and suggestions. Buerger wrote to associate editor Anderson: "Overall, I'm very pleased with the outcome of this paper. I feel it was a true team effort on the part of yourself, Lester, Tony, and Michael. I'm sorry Mike won't allow me to publicly thank him for his significant contribution" (Buerger to Anderson, 29 March 1983).

102. Buerger diary, 22 October 1981, Buerger Papers, box 1, folder 5.

103. Buerger diary, 8 December 1982, Buerger Papers, box 1, folder 6.

104. David John Buerger to Lavina Fielding Anderson, 9 December 1982, Buerger Papers, box 3, folder 20; David John Buerger to Scott Dunn, 30 July 1983, Buerger Papers, box 1, folder 7.

105. Buerger diary, 10 April 1983, Buerger Papers, box 2, folder 7.

Buerger, at the suggestion of Jacobsen, wrote a letter to Petersen explaining his beliefs and reassuring the apostle of his faithfulness.<sup>106</sup>

Six weeks later, on 15 May 1983, during a church-wide satellite broadcast, Apostle Boyd K. Packer made vague references to Buerger and his yet unpublished article. After first noting that "The sacred ordinances of the Temple are now held up to open ridicule by enemies of the Church [an obvious reference to the anti-Mormon film, *The Godmakers*, which had been released in late 1982<sup>107</sup>], Packer said:

Some foolish members take license from this and in an effort to defend the Church have been led to say more than is wise. Some, out of curiosity or claiming their interest is only academic or intellectual, presume to speak or to write about sacred ordinances.

In their speaking and writing they sometimes wade the muddy paths of opposition and apostasy. Then without changing their boots, they seek to push open the doors of the temple and stride into those hallowed precincts to discuss the sacred ordinances.

In doing so they assume an authority that is not theirs. Do not be drawn to them.

Packer then made reference to the content of Buerger's letter to Petersen, in which Buerger had defended his motivation for writing on the controversial topic: "They say that they love the Church and that, in their own way, they are protecting it. They would do well to heed the voice of the Almighty as He commanded Moses: 'Put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground' (Ex. 3:5)."<sup>108</sup>

The next day, Lavina Fielding Anderson told Buerger that "Linda

---

106. Buerger makes reference to this letter in "Press Release From David John Buerger to *The Provo Herald*," 21 May 1983, Buerger Papers, box 9, folder 12.

107. Released by Jeremiah Films in 1982, *The Godmakers* was the brainchild of J. Edward Decker, a former Mormon and director of Ex-Mormons for Jesus. A book by the same name followed. See Ed Decker and Dave Hunt, *The Godmakers* (Eugene, Oregon: Harvest House Publishers, 1984). The film was shown widely throughout 1983 and 1984, and two sequels were later produced: *The Temple of the Godmakers* in 1984, and *The Godmakers II* in 1992. For a thorough rebuttal to the book, see Gilbert W. Scharffs, *The Truth about "The Godmakers"* (Salt Lake City: Publishers Press, 1986). For some of the questionable tactics used in producing the film, see Robert L. and Rosemary Brown, *They Lie in Wait to Deceive, Volume 4* (Mesa, Arizona: Brownsworth Publishing, 1995). The film was also critiqued at the Salt Lake Sunstone Symposium on 23 August 1984 and the remarks of the panelists were published in *Dialogue*. See the following, under the general heading, "The Godmakers Examined": Randall L. Mackey "Introduction"; Sharon Lee Swenson, "Does the Camera Lie? A Structural Analysis of *The Godmakers*"; Allen D. Roberts, "The Godmakers: A Content Analysis"; and Donald A. Eagle, "One Community's Reaction to *The Godmakers*," all in *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 18, no. 2 (Summer 1985): 14-39.

108. Boyd K. Packer, "Come, All Ye Sons of God," from an address delivered 15 May 1983 at a church-wide fireside commemorating the restoration of the priesthood, *Ensign*

Newell's phone has been ringing off the hook this morning." Calls from former editors of *Dialogue* expressed the fear that Packer's remarks may result in the Newells' excommunication if Buerger's essay were to appear. Buerger adds: "Lavina said that until this time, half of the staff believed no one would bother to read the article, and the other half weren't worried about any repercussions. Jack and Linda are now thinking that it might be wise to delay publication. . . and not let it come out on the heels of Packer's talk." The Newells left the decision to Buerger, but quickly prepared an article to take its place should Buerger decide to withdraw his essay. The typeset issue was set to go to "blue line" (the final proofing stage before printing) in two days.<sup>109</sup>

The staff met on 17 May to discuss further strategy. "The executive committee wants to meet and be of 'one mind' in backing me on this deal," Buerger writes, "(even if it means everyone's excommunication)."<sup>110</sup> Several changes were suggested, including the elimination of the words "evolution" and "evolutionary" in exchange for "progressive" and "changing," so as to avoid "unnecessary ill feelings from more conservative readers."<sup>111</sup> Buerger later wrote, "Many of us across the U.S. (from Gene England, Mary Bradford, and Lester Bush in Washington to Bob Rees in L. A.) were on the phone continually for the next several days ironing out phraseology and content."<sup>112</sup> Jack clearly remembers the days following the Packer speech as the executive committee debated what to do next:

Some of us were prepared to proceed as planned, while others saw their membership as too valuable to risk. We met far into the night that week, and it was cathartic. I was determined that legitimate scholarship could not be suppressed, and argued that we should proceed after (1) being absolutely certain that our information was unimpeachable (plentiful and double-

---

13 (August 1983): 68-69. The following fall, Packer spoke at Buerger's stake conference and seemed to refer briefly to Buerger: "We've got people talking—in the Church—about the Temple ceremonies. . . . Some things are sacred. Now all the intellectual inquiry in the world isn't going to unravel them. It will lead to confusion, will lead to mischief, and as the days unfold, those who have the central faith will be all right. Those who do not will march through life with some semblance of activity in the Church, but it will be the case—and it's easy to prophesy this—parents eat the sour grapes that their children's teeth are set on; or, 'I will visit the iniquities of the parents upon the children unto the fourth generation.' Sometimes I mourn over those who attempt to steady the ark to make sure the Church is running right" (Boyd K. Packer, remarks made on Saturday, 12 November 1983, in the Saratoga California Stake Center, 7:00-9:00pm; adult session of stake conference. Notes made by David John Buerger, Buerger Papers, box 9, folder 9).

109. Buerger diary, 16 May 1983, Buerger Papers, box 1, folder 7; Buerger to Dunn.

110. Buerger diary, 17 May 1983.

111. Ibid.

112. Buerger to Dunn.

checked footnotes) and (2) removing any direct references to information that temple-going members vow to keep sacred. . . . Some considered taking their names off the editorial executive committee and resigning from the staff. But in the end, everyone chose to stick together and to do what we thought was the right thing. We scoured the manuscript one last time the following week, then published it. I have seldom seen such courage, or felt greater affection for a group of people, than I did as I looked around our living room before we parted that night. I will savor that night of agony and ultimate resolve as long as I live. I will always be honored to call each person there my friend.<sup>113</sup>

Buerger was not happy with many of the changes made to his essay, yet acquiesced, being "assured that those guiding the publication of my article are doing their best to react in as mature a manner as possible in the current emergency."<sup>114</sup> The issue, containing the last minute changes, went to press and was ready for subscribers by early June.

There was more controversy ahead, however. On 3 June, Linda Newell phoned Buerger with the news that Mormon scholar Andrew F. Ehat was going to sue *Dialogue* for publishing the Buerger essay. Buerger wrote in his diary that "apparently he's very upset, and is claiming that I 'stole' the article from him, which is, of course, absurd. . . . Linda said the 4,000 copies of the issue are in the *Dialogue* office, and she thinks the authors' copies were mailed today. They will mail everything on Monday; she's concerned that Andy might try to have an injunction slapped on them to stop the shipment of the journals."<sup>115</sup>

There is no question that Ehat had researched extensively on the subject. The previous year, he had completed his master's thesis at BYU dealing with temple ordinances.<sup>116</sup> Early in Buerger's research, Lavina Fielding Anderson had asked Buerger about his sources, expressing concern about any uncredited use of Ehat's research or that of another writer, Lisle Brown. "We want to be absolutely fair about giving credit where credit is due, and wanted to raise the question about the research history. Should there be an acknowledgment? Was there collaboration or sharing of sources early on? etc."<sup>117</sup> Buerger responded that "all of my

113. Newell and Newell to Anderson, 18 February 2002.

114. Buerger diary, 16 May 1983, Buerger Papers, box 1, folder 7.

115. Buerger diary, 3 June 1983, Buerger Papers, box 1, folder 7.

116. See Andrew F. Ehat, *Joseph Smith's Introduction of Temple Ordinances and the 1844 Mormon Succession Crisis*, master's thesis, Brigham Young University, 1982.

117. Lavina Fielding Anderson to David John Buerger, 9 July 1982, Buerger Papers, box 3, folder 14. The Lisle Brown article referred to here had been submitted for publication to *BYU Studies* in the mid-1970s, but was rejected. The paper was then shared quite extensively in manuscript form without Brown's permission. However, in 1995 he placed an authorized version on the internet. See Lisle G. Brown, "The Holy Order in Nauvoo," currently available online at <[www.lds-mormon.com/holyordr.shtml](http://www.lds-mormon.com/holyordr.shtml)>. See also Lisle G.

research was done independent of Ehat," although he later acknowledged that he, Ehat, and others had exchanged some materials.<sup>118</sup>

However, Ehat had known well in advance of Buerger's plans to publish the essay and had been asked early on by the Newells to critique the manuscript. He had been given Buerger's early draft, and Linda mailed him the revised copy in September 1982. In mid-October, Ehat promised to send his critique to the *Dialogue* office, but failed to do so. In late December, Linda Newell again asked Ehat for his critique and again he failed to send it. However, on 27 May, Ehat called and expressed his view that the essay—now at press—should not be published, claiming that he had "114 objections to the text and 48 to the notes." However, it was too late to stop publication. Linda said, "I would certainly have checked them out before we published it had he sent them when he said he would last winter. . . . I told him it was too late for changes; we had edited it carefully and had probably caught many of his objections. Anything further would have to come in a letter to the editor. He would not tell me any of his specific objections over the phone."<sup>119</sup>

Ehat's attorney, Gordon Madsen, called the Newells and read a letter from Ehat stating the objections: "He told Gordon he could read it to me, but I was not to have a copy."<sup>120</sup> Madsen, however, convinced Ehat that the lawsuit would not hold up in court and that he would need to find a different attorney should he insist on pressing charges.<sup>121</sup> This put an end to the threats.

After subscribers finally received their copies of the Spring 1983 issue, as hoped for, things quieted down. Perhaps Hinckley's influence in ending the Petersen probe halted any disciplinary action that might have been taken against Buerger or others involved in publishing the essay. Indeed, no further discussion nor any action aimed at the article came from church headquarters. The following year Buerger's research received validation at the annual meeting of the Mormon History Association where the essay won the 1983 MHA award for best article. However, in 1987 (as discussed later), there would be *deja vu* for Buerger, the Newells, and the *Dialogue* executive committee just before the Newell tenure came to a close.

---

Brown, "Temple Ordinances as Administered in Nauvoo, Illinois, 1840-1846, *Research Report: A Bi-monthly Publication of the Southwest Center for Religious Research*, Mesa, Arizona 1 (March/April 1990): 1-21, and Lisle G. Brown, "The Sacred Departments for Temple Work in Nauvoo: The Assembly Room and the Council Chamber," *BYU Studies* 19 (Spring 1979): 360-74.

118. Buerger diary, 3 June 1983; Notes on Andy Ehat/David Buerger," 14 May 1984, *Dialogue* Collection.

119. "Notes on Andy Ehat/David Buerger."

120. *Ibid.*

121. Buerger diary, 3 June 1983.

## DIALOGUE BEYOND ITS PAGES

Many of *Dialogue's* essays had been recognized for the contributions they had made to a greater understanding of Mormon history, doctrine, and culture. Therefore, a "Best of *Dialogue*" volume was an idea that had been discussed toward the end of Mary Bradford's tenure.<sup>122</sup> In 1982, University of Utah Press editor Trudy McMurrin began contemplating a series of books along these lines, an idea which had also been on the minds of the Salt Lake team. Lester Bush and Armand Mauss had already compiled a manuscript of *Dialogue's* past articles dealing with the issue of priesthood denial to African males and had submitted it for consideration to both the University of Utah Press and Signature Books. At the May 1982 meeting of the Mormon History Association, they discussed "the possibility of a series of three or so (perhaps more) books to commemorate on the scholarly level the twentieth anniversary of the journal."<sup>123</sup> Mauss and the Newells were excited about publishing through the university press (according to Jack, because "the University of Utah press provides the best combination of scholarly review and distribution") and began making arrangements with McMurrin. Despite McMurrin's high hopes for the book, however, her departure from the University of Utah Press during the planning stages ended interest in the project there.<sup>124</sup> Although disappointed, the Newells turned to Signature Books where there were certainly some benefits. Steven F. Christensen, a Salt Lake businessman with strong ties to the Mormon intellectual community, had already donated \$5,000 to that press to encourage the Bush-Mauss volume as a Signature-*Dialogue* collaboration.<sup>125</sup> The finished project, *Neither White nor Black: Mormon Scholars Confront the Race Issue in a Universal Church*, appeared in June 1984 with a foreword written by Jack Newell.<sup>126</sup> Linda recalls: "The decision to publish the book came easily. All of our back issues with articles about Africans in the church had sold out—or nearly so. The priesthood issue had just recently been resolved, and people wanted to know what led up to the change in church policy and practice."<sup>127</sup> Jack wrote the director of Signature Books upon the vol-

---

122. Minutes of the "Dialogue Promotional Meeting," 24 October 1981, *Dialogue* Collection.

123. Trudy McMurrin to "The Editors," 17 March 1983, *Dialogue* Collection.

124. L. Jackson Newell to Armand L. Mauss and Lester E. Bush, 13 January 1983; Armand L. Mauss to Linda King Newell, 25 February 1983; L. Jackson Newell to Trudy A. McMurrin, 28 April 1983; L. Jackson Newell to Scott Kenney, 29 April 1983, all in *Dialogue* Collection; Newell and Newell to Anderson, 9 September 2002.

125. Scott Kenney to *Dialogue*, 28 January 1983, *Dialogue* Collection.

126. See Lester E. Bush, Jr., and Armand L. Mauss, eds., *Neither White nor Black: Mormon Scholars Confront the Race Issue in a Universal Church* (Midvale, Utah: Signature Books, 1984).

127. Newell and Newell to Anderson, 18 February 2002.

ume's release: "We must do everything we can, both *Dialogue* and Signature Books, to maximize sales and justify the time and money you have invested in the project. If this volume sells well, we should certainly explore the possibility of similar collections on other major themes."<sup>128</sup>

A second volume followed three years later. *Personal Voices: A Celebration of Dialogue* was edited by Mary L. Bradford and also published by Signature Books.<sup>129</sup> It featured twenty-four personal essays which had appeared in *Dialogue* over the years. Linda describes *Personal Voices* as "an effort to perpetuate the distribution of the most-frequently demanded essays from back issues of *Dialogue*."<sup>130</sup> The foreword, written by the Newells, states:

The personal essay is a hallowed form of writing, combining as it does the process of personal development with that of public expression. In Mormonism, as elsewhere, it has become the means by which many of us have sought to understand and clarify our struggle to reconcile some of the fundamental dichotomies of life: faith and reason, loyalty and conscience, innate spirituality and institutional religion. Personal essays are at once dialogues with ourselves, dialogues with the issues we face, and dialogues with kindred spirits who struggle along the same road as we.<sup>131</sup>

The two volumes appeared as partial fulfillment of the original goal to produce a "Best of *Dialogue*" series. Certainly the groundbreaking research in *Neither White nor Black* and the introspection that fills *Personal Voices* represent the best of *Dialogue* and what *Dialogue* does best: celebrating the intellectual and spiritual as important components in the quest of the thinking Latter-day Saint.

#### A DEBATE ABOUT PROPRIETY

Although no one could doubt the contribution *Dialogue* essays had made to serious Mormon scholarship throughout the years, some readers complained that the editors sometimes used poor judgment in their decisions. In 1985, a debate about judgment and responsibility resulted in several exchanges between *Dialogue*'s editors and some scholars associated with the Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies (FARMS).<sup>132</sup> Earlier that year, Mormon scholar George D. Smith had

---

128. Jack Newell to Scott Kenney, 22 June 1984, *Dialogue* Collection.

129. See Mary L. Bradford, ed., *Personal Voices: A Celebration of Dialogue* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1987).

130. Newell and Newell to Anderson, 18 February 2002.

131. L. Jackson Newell and Linda King Newell, "Foreword," in Bradford, *Personal Voices*, un-paginated.

132. FARMS was founded in November 1979 by John W. Welch, an attorney then living in Los Angeles. Its purpose was to coordinate and make available scholarly research on

published an article in *Dialogue* about B. H. Roberts, a member of the LDS First Council of Seventy from 1888 until his death in 1933. The essay, "'Is There Any Way to Escape These Difficulties?': The Book of Mormon Studies of B. H. Roberts," chronicled Roberts's attempts to deal with many difficult questions about the authenticity of the Book of Mormon posed to the church in a 1921 letter from James F. Couch, a non-Mormon.<sup>133</sup> Roberts had been asked to respond to Couch's questions and by the end of the year had produced a 141-page manuscript he titled "Book of Mormon Difficulties." He presented his report to President Heber J. Grant and other general authorities in early 1922 but "was quite disappointed" that they had little interest in seeking conclusive answers to what Roberts considered important questions.<sup>134</sup> This led Roberts to a more intense study, and in 1923 he completed a second manuscript, the 291-page "A Book of Mormon Study." Here, he examined Ethan Smith's 1825 *View of the Hebrews*<sup>135</sup> as a possible source for many Book of Mormon ideas, and explored the possibility of Joseph Smith having written the book himself based on available materials and prevalent ideas. Roberts's two manuscripts remained unpublished until 1985.<sup>136</sup>

In his paper, Smith summarized Roberts's two studies and the relevancy of the questions he raised. Smith also addressed what to him was

---

the Book of Mormon. The organization moved to Provo in 1980 and became affiliated with Brigham Young University in 1997. It has published numerous papers and books on scriptural research, as well as pertinent reprints from several publications, including *Dialogue*. Since 1989 it has published the *FARMS Review of Books* and, beginning in 1992, the *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies*.

133. Couch's questions were originally sent to Apostle James E. Talmage by Couch's associate in Washington D.C., William E. Riter. Talmage then passed them on to Roberts. Since Riter prefaced Couch's questions by identifying him only as "Mr. Couch," his exact identity remained unknown until recently discovered by Richard F. Keeler. See Keeler, "Mr. Couch and Elder Roberts," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 29, no. 2 (Summer 1996): 141-147.

134. George D. Smith, "'Is There Any Way to Escape These Difficulties?': The Book of Mormon Studies of B. H. Roberts," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 17, no. 2 (Summer 1984): 98. Just prior to the appearance of this essay, Smith had published elsewhere on the subject. See George D. Smith, "Joseph Smith and the Book of Mormon," *Free Inquiry* 4 (Winter 1983/1984): 20-31. This article was reprinted in Robert Basil, Mary Beth Gehrman, and Tim Madigan, eds., *On the Barricades: Religion and Free Inquiry in Conflict* (Buffalo, N.Y.: Prometheus Books, 1989).

135. See Ethan Smith, *View of the Hebrews; or the Tribes of Israel in America* (Poultney, VT: Smith & Shute, 1823). A second edition appeared in 1825. In 1996, Brigham Young University republished the second edition, edited by Charles D. Tate, Jr., through its Religious Studies Center.

136. Roberts's manuscripts were published the year following the appearance of Smith's essay. See B. H. Roberts, *Studies of the Book of Mormon*, edited and with an introduction by Brigham D. Madsen (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1985). A second edition was published by Signature Books in Salt Lake City in 1992.



a dilemma for modern Mormon apologists: In promoting a hypothesis which limited Book of Mormon lands to Mesoamerica, apologists must dismiss the declarations of Joseph Smith himself.<sup>137</sup> The paper also addressed the issue of Roberts's possible loss of faith in the Book of Mormon as a result of his 1921-1923 studies, citing evidence on both sides of this question, but not drawing a definite conclusion.<sup>138</sup>

Prior to publication, the Newells sent a copy of Smith's essay to FARMS president John W. Welch. Welch objected to publication of the paper, as he recalls, because he felt Roberts's questions were outdated

---

137. See Smith, "'Is There Any Way to Escape These Difficulties?'," 104. Mormon anthropologist John L. Sorenson, in his monumental work, *An Ancient American Setting for the Book of Mormon* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book; Provo, Utah: Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies, 1985), 1-2, insists that Joseph Smith's views on Book of Mormon geography were not presented as revelation, and are therefore irrelevant. However, he does not address the specific statements of Joseph Smith regarding Indian origins as cited by George Smith. Elsewhere, Sorenson provides a summary of the various hypotheses presented throughout the years that have sought to map the Book of Mormon. See John L. Sorenson, *The Geography of Book of Mormon Events: A Source Book* (Provo, Utah: Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies, 1990, revised, 1992). For Sorenson's most recent work on Book of Mormon geography, which bases distances and locations of sites strictly on statements within the Book of Mormon itself, see *Mormon's Map* (Provo, Utah: Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies, 2000).

138. See Smith, "'Is There Any Way to Escape These Difficulties?'," 111. The state of Roberts's faith in the Book of Mormon from 1921 until his death has been debated by modern scholars. See Truman G. Madsen, "B. H. Roberts after Fifty Years: Still Witnessing to the Book of Mormon," *BYU Studies* 19 (Summer 1979): 427-45; Madson U. Sowell, "Defending the Keystone: The Comparative Method Reexamined," and George D. Smith, "Defending the Keystone: Book of Mormon Difficulties," both in *Sunstone* 6 (May-June 1981): 44-54; Truman G. Madsen and John W. Welch, "Did B. H. Roberts Lose Faith in the Book of Mormon?" (Provo, Utah: Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies, 1985); John W. Welch, "Finding Answers to B. H. Roberts's Questions," (Provo, Utah: Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies, 1985); John W. Welch, Spencer J. Palmer, and William L. Knecht, "An Unparallel: Ethan Smith and View of the Hebrews; Substitute for Inspiration?" (Provo, Utah: Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies, ca. 1985); John W. Welch, "New B. H. Roberts Book Lacks Insight of His Testimony," *Church News* (December 15, 1985), 11; John W. Welch, "B. H. Roberts: Seeker After Truth," *Ensign* 16 (March 1986): 56-62; Brigham D. Madsen, "B. H. Roberts's Studies of the Book of Mormon," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 26 (Fall 1993): 77-86; Brigham D. Madsen, "Reflections of LDS Disbelief in the Book of Mormon as History," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 30 (Fall 1997): 87-97; George D. Smith, "B. H. Roberts: Book of Mormon Apologist and Skeptic," in Dan Vogel and Brent Lee Metcalf, eds., *American Apocrypha: Essays on the Book of Mormon* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 2002), 123-155. See also James R. Spencer, "The Disappointment of B. H. Roberts: Five Questions that Forced a Mormon General Authority to Abandon the Book of Mormon," (Boise: Through the Maze, 1991). In response to Spencer, see Daniel C. Peterson, "Yet More Abuse of B. H. Roberts," *FARMS Review of Books* 9:1, 1997: 69-86. For an examination of Roberts's and his earliest writings on the Book of Mormon, see Davis Bitton, "B. H. Roberts and Book of Mormon Scholarship, Early Twentieth Century: Age of Transition," *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies* 8:2, (1999): 60-69.

and would soon be answered by anthropologist John L. Sorenson in his long-awaited book, *An Ancient American Setting for the Book of Mormon*. "My only caution to the editors of *Dialogue* was that George and they might want to wait to see John's work before jumping off into print, since good dialogue presupposes good data."<sup>139</sup> However, the *Dialogue* team saw enough merit to the paper to proceed with publication. Linda Newell responded to Welch on 10 May 1984: "Although you have expressed your opinion that we should not publish George Smith's piece, I hope your view of *Dialogue*, Jack, and me does not rest on this one article. It has indeed been a complicated issue and one for which we could see no solution that made everyone (or even anyone) happy." She added that "*Dialogue*, as an open forum can and should provide an outlet for a variety of views. We, as you know, welcome and encourage yours."<sup>140</sup>

After the essay appeared, there was little reaction from *Dialogue* readers, and published letters to the editor are silent about it. However, it appears that some concern began to develop at church headquarters. On 3 July 1984, Elder Neal A. Maxwell of the Quorum of the Twelve sent a memo to members of the Church Board of Education Executive Committee and the Special Affairs Committee regarding four projects he wished to propose. After suggesting that scholarly articles appear in the *Ensign* dealing with Joseph Smith's First Vision, and that a possible monograph diffusing "the recurring charge that [we] are a cult," be produced, he said:

A third project would concern the Book of Mormon. It could be a response, without being obviously directed thereto, to the recent ramblings of George Smith. The point would be to show the interior consistency of the Book of Mormon along with recent and relevant external evidences, if the latter were desired.

There are a number of B. Y. U. professors who could help in this project, including Professor John Sorenson.<sup>141</sup>

Two months later, the first of a two-part series on the Book of Mormon by Sorenson titled "Digging into the Book of Mormon," appeared in the *Ensign*, in September, and concluded the following month (referred to earlier; see note 60). Smith, who had become aware of the Maxwell memo, wrote a letter to the editors of *Dialogue* (published Summer 1985) in which he referred to it and announced that Sorenson's work had "apparently served as this [Maxwell's intended] 'rebuttal'" to problems of

139. John W. Welch to Devery S. Anderson, 26 June 2002.

140. Linda King Newell to John W. Welch, 10 May 1984, *Dialogue* Collection.

141. Elder Neal A. Maxwell to members of the Church Board of Education Executive Committee and the Special Affairs Committee, 3 July 1984, copy in my possession.

Book of Mormon geography and Indian populations that Smith had addressed in his writings.<sup>142</sup>

After Smith's letter appeared in the journal, both he and *Dialogue* came under attack—Smith, for his assumptions about the motive behind Sorenson's essays, and *Dialogue* for providing Smith a forum for making his claims. The most vocal critic was Robert F. Smith, a FARMS researcher and volunteer, as well as a long-time *Dialogue* supporter.<sup>143</sup> He wrote Lavina Fielding Anderson on 16 July 1985: "Surely you knew as a former employee of the *Ensign* that any 3 July 1984 memo (such as George claims exists) would hardly be early enough to cause the preparation and correlation of an article for a magazine which would be rolling off the presses a month-and-a-half later!" He reminded Anderson that Sorenson, as well as the *Ensign* staff of which Anderson had been a part, had for years tried to publish Sorenson's thesis on Book of Mormon geography in that magazine, but were met with resistance by one vocal general authority (identified elsewhere as Mark E. Petersen). He also reminded Anderson that she had, in fact, edited a similar Sorenson article for publication in *Dialogue* (which, in the end, Sorenson had pulled when it appeared that clearance for the *Ensign* may have finally been forthcoming. That hope, however, had been a false alarm).<sup>144</sup>

Sorenson himself has no recollection of the Maxwell memo and insists that neither it nor George Smith's essay played a role in his articles finally appearing in the fall of 1984. However, the scene he describes reflects the spirit of Maxwell's proposal and raises the possibility that Sorenson may not have been privy to its actual content or existence yet may have been asked at that time to carry out its Book of Mormon agenda:

At a certain point in time (in 1984) I was asked, with a handful of other BYU people and some general authorities, to discuss certain writing projects that might be speeded up to counter the "beating" (a word used at the time) that the Book of Mormon was taking without any responses having been made

---

142. George D. Smith, "Indians Not 'Lamanites'?", letter to the editor, *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 18, no. 2 (Summer 1985): 5.

143. Robert Smith had written one of the earliest preliminary reports published by FARMS and has continued to publish with the organization. See Robert F. Smith, "'It Came to Pass' in the Bible and the Book of Mormon," (Provo, Utah: Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies, 1980), Smith, "The Doctrine of the Resurrection as Taught in the Book of Mormon," (Provo, Utah: Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies, 1991), and Smith, "Book of Mormon Event Structure: The Ancient Near East," *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies* 5, no. 2 (1996): 98-147. Welch speaks of Smith as one of the earliest of the scholars and volunteers who helped the fledgling organization. See "FARMS through the Years, Part 1: A Conversation with John Welch and John Sorenson," *Insights: A Window on the Ancient World* (November 1999): 3.

144. Robert F. Smith to Lavina Fielding Anderson, 16 July 1985, *Dialogue* Collection.

up to that point in time. But that concern went far beyond looking at particular critics like [George] Smith. Soon I for my part was asked to prepare two articles for the *Ensign* that would convey the tone of what my longer series was intended to do. I very hastily wrote the two "Digging" articles, which appeared in the Fall of 1984 prior to the 1985 Book of Mormon curriculum year.<sup>145</sup>

That Sorenson "hastily" prepared the articles indicates that Maxwell's proposal may have served as the catalyst after all. However, neither the *Dialogue* team, George Smith, nor Robert Smith could have known for sure. Responding to Robert Smith's complaints, Anderson wrote: "Of course, at *Dialogue* there were major and protracted discussions on the [George Smith] letter itself, on running it, and on its final form that lasted, to my memory, three months, and the objections that you raised were all considered."<sup>146</sup> Since Robert Smith had not seen the memo, he was unaware that Maxwell had specifically suggested Sorenson as a possible respondent to George Smith's "ramblings." Therefore, George Smith was certainly correct that his essay had created some talk at church headquarters, whether or not the appearance of Sorenson's essay less than two months later was related.

Anderson encouraged Robert Smith to submit for publication the criticisms contained in his six-page letter. However, he had already made it clear that his critique was out of his concern for the future reputation of *Dialogue* and not for publication. He did send copies of his letter to the Newells, George Smith, and Richard S. Van Wagoner, a Mormon historian and personal friend.<sup>147</sup>

In the minds of the letter's recipients, the most disturbing part of Robert Smith's letter was its personal attack upon George Smith. Throughout, the letter refers to him as "malicious" and "egotistical" for his assumptions of a church-ordered Sorenson rebuttal. Van Wagoner responded: "My goodness Bob, it is one thing to challenge and criticize a man's ideas, but it is another matter entirely to attack him so personally. I have known both you and George for several years. You are both good, kind, and generous men."<sup>148</sup>

Welch also wrote the Newells to voice his opinion about their decision to publish the George Smith letter, although he avoided *ad hominem* attack. Welch, too, felt that publication of the letter was a poor use of editorial judgement as it allowed Smith an opportunity to "write a 'letter to editors' extolling the virtues of his own article. It certainly struck me as a

---

145. John L. Sorenson to Devery S. Anderson, 31 January 2002.

146. Lavina Fielding Anderson to Robert F. Smith, undated, *Dialogue* Collection.

147. Smith to Anderson, 16 July 1985.

148. Richard S. Van Wagoner to Robert F. Smith, 9 August 1985, *Dialogue* Collection.

'first.'" He continued: "Please know that I support the idea of dialogue, of careful discussion and open investigation. I personally believe, however, that productive discussion is only possible where a referee or moderator (however you think of yourself) acts responsibly."<sup>149</sup> Linda Newell responded: "We did debate whether or not to publish George's letter; there was not complete agreement among the staff on this issue which is often the case. I am only amazed at the extent of the concern it has produced from you and Bob—while neither of you has written a letter for publication. That would certainly air the problem."<sup>150</sup>

The Newells did welcome scholarly debate concerning these or any ideas advanced within *Dialogue*. At Welch's invitation, they had earlier met with him and other BYU faculty on 26 January 1984 for an informal discussion. Following up on the conversation, Jack wrote Welch the day after the meeting: "It was certainly an interested and supportive group. We came away with several ideas that should help us further improve *Dialogue*." He also invited Welch to respond to upcoming comments on the Book of Mormon in *Dialogue* by Sterling M. McMurrin which, like the Smith arguments, Welch also believed to be outdated. "The only way that *Dialogue* can live up to its name is if scholar will meet scholar, or idea will meet idea, within our pages. Once the spring [1984] issue is out, therefore, I urge you to write a response to clarify this issue—either a letter to the editor or a short article. Your role in FARMS makes you a particularly logical person to discuss this issue."<sup>151</sup>

Welch apparently chose to save his arguments for FARMS publications instead, which illustrates a problem long faced by *Dialogue* editors. The Newells, like their predecessors, had tried to encourage more conservative scholars to publish within the journal, contributions that would create balance and provide a means for true dialogue. Beyond that problem, however, the exchange with Robert F. Smith demonstrated how easily disagreement over ideas and issues could become a forum for personal attack. Both sides in such arguments share space within the scholarly arena, making debate over ideas and issues a legitimate and welcome form of discussion. However, in the Mormon arena, both sides also share space within a spiritual community that complicates the issue and adds a degree of emotion otherwise not in play in most discussions of scholarship. "Disagreements in Mormon history and theology seem to be the stuff that keeps the interest level high and new ideas and research forthcoming," concluded Van Wagoner in his response to Robert Smith, "but we are too small in numbers to make intellectual disagreements the

---

149. John W. Welch to Linda K. Newell, 29 August 1985, *Dialogue* Collection.

150. Linda K. Newell to John W. Welch, 5 September 1985, *Dialogue* Collection.

151. L. Jackson Newell to John W. Welch, 27 January 1984, *Dialogue* Collection.

source of personal conflict."<sup>152</sup> Unfortunately, the small divisions begun in private here have only increased over time.

"LET THE CONSEQUENCE FOLLOW"

Although ultimately Mormon scholars could only criticize writers with whom they disagreed, church leaders could respond with discipline instead. One of the longest and best documented articles to appear in *Dialogue* was D. Michael Quinn's study of the continuation of Mormon church-sanctioned polygamy after President Wilford Woodruff issued the 1890 "Manifesto." The essay, "LDS Church Authority and New Plural Marriage: 1890-1904," appeared in the Spring 1985 issue. The subject of the continued, albeit secret, performance of church-approved plural marriages was, in fact, no secret to anti-Mormon critics. Yet it remained virtually unknown to Latter-day Saints in general. To complicate matters, the LDS church had long denied, and continued to deny, that any plural marriages after 1890 had been performed with First Presidency approval. Thus, an empathetic understanding of this complex chapter in Mormon history was long overdue. Quinn's journey with the topic from that of a casual student, to published author, was a long, careful one, and the outcome is full of amazing irony.

Quinn had been researching the subject of authorized polygamy after the Manifesto since the age of seventeen. By the time he left to serve an LDS mission to England in 1963, he had compiled a list of fifty men who married after 1890. His research continued later after he entered the military. His interest continued in 1971, when as a graduate student he studied Mormon diaries for a project directed by assistant church historian Davis Bitton.<sup>153</sup>

In 1979, G. Homer Durham, then managing director of the Church Historical Department, became concerned about questions surrounding post-manifesto polygamy. His unease may have been prompted by an article published on the subject the previous year in the *Utah Historical Quarterly* as well as by knowledge about another one that was forthcoming.<sup>154</sup> Although Quinn had never discussed his research with Durham, two staff members at the Historical Department told Quinn they were aware of his "expertise" in this area and said, "Elder Durham would like

---

152. Van Wagoner to Smith.

153. D. Michael Quinn, telephone interview, 8 January 2002, conducted by Devery S. Anderson.

154. Ibid. For the articles referred to, see Kenneth L. Cannon, II, "Beyond the Manifesto: Polygamous Cohabitation among LDS General Authorities After 1890," *Utah Historical Quarterly* 46 (Winter 1978): 24-36; and Victor W. Jorgensen and B. Carmon Hardy, "The Taylor-Cowley Affair and the Watershed of Mormon History," *Utah Historical Quarterly* 48 (Winter 1980): 4-36.

you to write a memo for him on post-Manifesto polygamy." Quinn agreed, and on 17 January 1979, from memory, wrote a single-spaced, twelve-page summary of his research and also informed Durham of his plans to one day publish his findings. Soon, Durham invited Quinn to discuss the issue with him further.<sup>155</sup>

Prompted by his interview with Durham, Quinn wrote the First Presidency on 19 June 1979 and explained that the *Quarterly* articles would create an environment in which members would be asking many questions. He reasoned that a study was needed to explain the difference between church-sanctioned plural marriage between 1890 and 1904 and the activities of fundamentalists who still continue the practice. Quinn referred the First Presidency to Durham, who had Quinn's summary and could vouch for his extensive knowledge of the subject. He stressed that he was in a position to write an article dealing with these issues and made an appeal for materials that were in their custody. When this letter went unanswered, Quinn wrote a follow-up the next year on 20 May 1980. This also went unanswered. Later, however, Quinn came to believe "that the letters had been waylaid."<sup>156</sup>

On 4 November 1981, Quinn accepted an invitation to speak at a meeting of the BYU chapter of the international history honor society, Phi Alpha Theta. He was specifically asked to address the subject of the writing of Mormon history and to respond to an attack on historians made by Apostle Boyd K. Packer in an address to church educators the previous August. Quinn's speech, "On Being a Mormon Historian," responded not only to the Packer criticisms, but also to public comments made in a similar vein by Apostle Ezra Taft Benson.<sup>157</sup>

---

155. Quinn telephone interview; D. Michael Quinn, "The Rest is History," *Sunstone* 18 (December 1995): 54 and 57, note 28.

156. Quinn telephone interview. Dates of letters to the First Presidency are in Quinn, "The Rest is History," 57, note 28. At a meeting in the Lion House in Salt Lake City of those involved in the multi-volume biographical project on the life of former First Presidency Counselor J. Reuben Clark (Quinn was then writing the second volume), Quinn overheard D. Arthur Haycock, personal secretary to church president Spencer W. Kimball, refer to "people who write to the First Presidency for material," and said "how foolish they are." Quinn believes Haycock intended him to hear this. Quinn's volume on Clark became D. Michael Quinn, *J. Reuben Clark: The Church Years* (Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University Press, 1983). Quinn has recently produced a revised and expanded edition of this biography as *Elder Statesman: A Biography of J. Reuben Clark* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 2002).

157. See Boyd K. Packer, "The Mantle is Far, Far Greater Than the Intellect," *BYU Studies* 21 (Summer 1981): 259-278. See also Ezra Taft Benson, "God's Hand in Our Nation's History," 1976 *Devotional Speeches of the Year: Bicentennial Devotional and Fireside Addresses* (Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University Press, 1977), 295-316; and Benson, *The Gospel Teacher and His Message* (Salt Lake City: Church Educational System, 1976).

On 22 November, Quinn met with First Presidency counselor Gordon B. Hinckley at Hinckley's home to discuss the effects of Quinn's public rebuttal.<sup>158</sup> Soon, however, the conversation turned to Quinn's research into post-Manifesto polygamy, and Hinckley, interested in the details, was surprised when Quinn told him that, besides a few "renegades," new marriages had been performed by and for First Presidency members, apostles, mission presidents, and others. Shocked, but not questioning Quinn's findings, Hinckley said: "I knew these men. I grew up with their children." He then expressed his concerns about church members learning this information. Quinn, however, responded that he believed many already knew, for descendants of those who married polygamously after the Manifesto numbered in the tens of thousands. With unanswered questions behind the statistics, Hinckley was willing to help.<sup>159</sup>

Quinn then mentioned to Hinckley that he had previously sought information from the First Presidency and had followed proper channels in doing so, but Hinckley said he was not aware of these requests. After Quinn expressed his belief that the letters had been waylaid, Hinckley responded: "Well, they won't be waylaid anymore. You have my number."<sup>160</sup> With this reassurance, Quinn wrote Hinckley for permission for the needed materials on 17 February and 15 April 1982. However, Hinckley telephoned Quinn in response, telling him that despite his best efforts, permission could not be granted after all. Disappointed, Quinn nevertheless thanked Hinckley for his help and told him that he would write his article based on the information he had already gathered. "It is up to you," said Hinckley, then added: "Mike, you do what you feel is right. But I want you to know that I did ask."<sup>161</sup>

Quinn then began working diligently to produce a manuscript for submission to *Dialogue*. In the spring of 1982, shortly before the Newells began their editorship, Lester Bush wrote that the essay was "promised but still in process."<sup>162</sup> Quinn continued to work on it for three more years.

By January 1985, with the essay nearing completion, Quinn remained bothered by gaps in his research, and found he still needed information from First Presidency files located at the Historical Depart-

---

158. Quinn telephone interview; 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), 89. Hinckley told Quinn that he had acted inappropriately in criticizing Packer, although he indicated that he understood Quinn's motive when he said, "there are some of the brethren who I wish would never speak publicly" (Quinn telephone interview, 8 January 2002).

159. Quinn telephone interview.

160. *Ibid.*

161. *Ibid.*; Quinn, "On Being a Mormon Historian (and Its Aftermath)," 90; Quinn, "The Rest is History," 54, 57, note 28.

162. *Dialogue Idiot Book*, 27.



ment. Access to these required permission from managing director Durham. Somewhat hopeful, Quinn approached church archivist Glen Rowe and explained that he had written a "long, heavily footnoted article" to be published in *Dialogue* and was in need of these materials. Rowe then left to speak with Durham. When Rowe returned thirty minutes later, "he was shaking his head" in disbelief. Durham had signed the permission slips, even after Rowe told him Quinn needed the material to finalize an article for *Dialogue*. Rowe relayed to Quinn Durham's rationale in honoring Quinn's request: "Mike Quinn has helped us explain other problem areas. I hope he can help us here, because this is a tough one."<sup>163</sup>

The article then went through the editing process at *Dialogue*. Lavina Fielding Anderson, who processed the manuscript, recalls working with Quinn:

I was impressed by his detailed and meticulous research and care in neither overstating nor minimizing. I was exasperated by his unwillingness to call it quits, even as the article moved through typesetting, galleys, and page proofs. At that stage, I finally told him that he absolutely could *not* make any more changes or additions. He did not argue, but the typesetter, Don Henriksen, later told me that Michael appeared at his doorstep with alterations I had rejected, and a hundred dollars."<sup>164</sup>

However, Anderson reported to Julie Randall that there was more to the story:

Don did not accept the \$100. His craftsman's pride was so piqued by the typographical errors that he went back and checked everything. The errors had been corrected and he had enough loose space that he could fit in the three changes—so he did it, if you can believe it!—and charged Mike \$50. And *then*, Mike came back twice more to see if he would make more changes. Fortunately, it was already at the press by then, so Don did not oblige. Linda and I have concluded that this is a trait that makes Mike a great historian.<sup>165</sup>

After the essay appeared, Linda Newell wrote to former *Dialogue* editor Robert Rees that it was "creating a lot of interest but so far, no waves."<sup>166</sup> However, despite Quinn's best efforts to perfect his article, its publication marked the beginning of the end of his career at BYU.

In April 1985, Quinn received a letter from Apostle Dallin H. Oaks,

---

163. Quinn telephone interview; Quinn, "The Rest is History," 55. Durham had given Quinn permission to see these materials just two days before his death by a heart attack on 10 January 1985.

164. Lavina Fielding Anderson, "DNA Mormon: D. Michael Quinn," in John Sillito and Susan Staker, eds., *Mormon Mavericks: Essays on Dissenters* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 2002), 330-331.

165. Lavina Fielding Anderson to Julie Randall, 23 April 1985, *Dialogue* Collection.

166. Linda King Newell to Robert A. Rees, 29 April 1985, *Dialogue* Collection.

who accused him of misleading Durham, his staff, and the First Presidency regarding his research. Quinn responded to Oaks on 10 May, enclosing copies of all of his correspondence between himself, Durham, and the First Presidency, as well as summaries of his conversations with Hinckley. The following month, Quinn called Oaks's secretary, and she confirmed that Oaks had received, and read, Quinn's letter and enclosed materials. Quinn claims, however, that Oaks continued to tell others that he had been less-than-honest in his dealings with Durham and Hinckley.<sup>167</sup> That same month, three members of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles, convinced that Quinn's article amounted to nothing less than "speaking evil of the Lord's anointed," instructed the area president, Elder James M. Paramore, to demand that Quinn's stake president strip Quinn of his temple recommend.<sup>168</sup>

Quinn learned the details of the meeting between his stake presidency and Paramore directly from the stake president. Although expected to be a fifteen-minute meeting in which Paramore would pass on his instructions to the stake presidency, the meeting had lasted for two-and-a-half hours. Quinn's stake leaders came to his defense, telling Paramore that they had read the article—two of them having read it before publication—and "saw nothing in it to justify doing what they were being required to do." Paramore also told the stake presidency to tell Quinn that the decision was a local one, based on their own judgements of the article and Quinn's standing as the result of its publication. The stake president countered that "I am not going to lie to Michael Quinn. If I am going to tell him this, I am going to tell him exactly how this came about." Therefore, he told Quinn the truth, but nevertheless, felt obligated to ask for his temple recommend. Worried that this was a "back door attempt" to fire Quinn from BYU, the stake president instructed him as follows: "If you are asked by any official at BYU if you have a temple recommend, you tell them yes, and do not volunteer that it is in my desk drawer. And when it expires, I will renew it, so that you will always have a valid temple recommend." He also told Quinn that he would not hold a church court, nor attempt to instruct him on how to do his job as a historian.<sup>169</sup>

---

167. Quinn, "The Rest is History," note 28; Quinn telephone interview.

168. Quinn, "On Being a Mormon Historian (and Its Aftermath)," 91. Although Quinn's stake president did not identify the three apostles involved, Quinn said, "If I were guessing, I'd say the three apostles were Elders Packer, Maxwell, and Oaks. The stake president responded: 'That is a very, very good guess' (Quinn telephone interview).

169. Quinn, "On Being a Mormon Historian (and its Aftermath)," 91-92; D. Michael Quinn, "Dilemmas of Feminists & Intellectuals in the Contemporary LDS Church," *Sunstone* 17 (June 1994): 68; "The Church Years: H1Story and the Mormon World View," an interview with D. Michael Quinn, conducted by Martha Sonntag Bradley, 12 August 1995 at the Salt Lake City Sunstone Symposium, tape #371 in my possession; Anderson, "DNA Mormon," 342.

Three months later, Packer grossly misrepresented the contents of the Quinn essay while speaking at a priesthood leadership conference in Salt Lake City. According to notes taken by someone in attendance, Packer declared: "We are in a time when 'magazines' are available which defame and belittle the brethren. Authors are 'scratching out' articles which seek these goals—and some young people are following. . . . These people argue 'if it's true, then say it'—but one doesn't tell another person he's ugly." Later in the conference, he added: "Anyone who interrupts the process of faith, or the seeds of trust in Church leaders (such as calling Wilford Woodruff a liar); anyone who wants to put doubts on the front lawn and then invite the neighbor children over—[voice trembled with emotion, loudly] 'JUST GO AHEAD!'. . . [T]hese shall. . . be cut off [spoken very sharply]." <sup>170</sup>

Yet time has shown that the concerns of Packer and others were unwarranted. In 1991, Quinn reported the feedback he had received from those who had good reason to read the essay: "I [have] heard from a number of these [50,000] descendants [of post-Manifesto plural marriages] who in some cases in a very emotional way said that for years they had been taught and had quietly had to accept the judgement of Church leaders that they were bastards, that they had been born to adulterous relationships after the 1890 Manifesto." <sup>171</sup> Linda Newell reports a similar reaction: "Interestingly, we never got any negative feedback at all. People would say, 'I had a great grandfather who took wives after the Manifesto, and it has always been this deep dark secret that somehow he was an apostate. Now I understand.' Rather than being something that people saw as negative, it really helped them understand their own family histories so much better. . . . No one wrote to us saying that their faith had been shaken or that they were leaving the Church." <sup>172</sup> The popular-

---

170. Notes from Regional Priesthood Conference, Winder Stake Center, 10 August 1985, 8 a.m.-12 noon, given to David John Buerger on 5 October 1985, from an unidentified friend in attendance. Buerger Papers, Box 9, folder 9. In 1986, while serving as Church Historian, John K. Carmack of the First Quorum of Seventy, provided his own insight to Buerger regarding Packer's attitude toward historians: "You really need to know him to understand him. He's a very complex person. He loves the church so much, and is so loyal to it, that he personifies it. When an attack is made on the church, he feels it's an attack on him." Buerger responded that "Packer's self-identification with the church is potentially very dangerous, almost being an Achilles heel to his balanced performance as a general officer. Carmack agreed with this view" ("Interview with John Carmack in his office, LDS Historical Dept., Salt Lake City on November 11, 1986, 10:00-11:15 a.m.," Buerger Papers, box 1, folder 10).

171. D. Michael Quinn, "Plural Marriage After the 1890 Manifesto," speech given in Bluffdale, Utah on 11 August 1991, and at this writing, available at <[www.ldshistory.net/pc/postman.htm](http://www.ldshistory.net/pc/postman.htm)>.

172. Newell interview; see also Anderson, "Reflections from Within," 25.

ity and importance of the article is demonstrated by the fact that the issue sold out shortly after publication. The Newells printed a second run of 1,500 soon after and it, too, sold out. A third printing later published along with the Spring 1986 issue eventually sold out as well.<sup>173</sup>

#### CONTROVERSY AT HOME

Not long after Quinn handed over his temple recommend to his stake president, Linda and Jack Newell were beginning a painful experience of their own. Earlier, on 4 October 1984, *Mormon Enigma: Emma Hale Smith*, written by Linda with Valeen Avery, was finally published and appeared in Utah bookstores. Nine years in the making, and widely anticipated, this first printing sold out after two weeks, forcing a second printing the same week it was released nationally.<sup>174</sup> Expecting high interest from *Dialogue* readers, the Newells pre-ordered 200 copies to be marketed to subscribers at a discount as part of their 1984 Christmas fundraiser. By mid-January 1985, they had sold nearly 150 copies.<sup>175</sup> By the spring of 1985 the book had won the Best Book award from the Mormon History Association and shared in the \$10,000 Evans Biography Award, then administered through BYU and presented to the authors by University President Jeffrey R. Holland.<sup>176</sup> The following October, the John Whitmer Historical Association awarded it its Best Book award also.

However, the celebration was soon interrupted. On Sunday morning, 9 June 1985, Linda received a telephone call from *Dialogue* business manager Fred Esplin, who had learned some distressing news that morning during his bishopric meeting: "The bishop told us he had received word that two 'girls' had written a controversial book about Emma Smith, and we were not to encourage the sale of the book by inviting them to speak in any of our church meetings." Esplin asked his bishop if the book in question was the one co-authored by Linda Newell

173. Linda King Newell to Mary L. Bradford, 13 January 1986, *Dialogue* Collection.

174. Linda King Newell to Charles Turner, 9 November 1984, *Dialogue* Collection. Shortly before the book was published, both authors published essays on Emma Smith in *Dialogue*. See Linda King Newell, "The Emma Smith Lore Reconsidered," and Valeen Tippetts Avery, "Emma Smith Through Her Writings," both in *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 17, no. 3 (Autumn 1984): 87-106.

175. Linda King Newell to Robert Breinholt, 29 August 1984 and 18 January 1985, both in *Dialogue* Collection. At least one man became interested in *Dialogue* after first reading *Mormon Enigma*. He wrote the office, "Since the author of the book (1 of them) is now the editor to *Dialogue*, which I know very little about, I should like to subscribe to it" (Leo Christensen to *Dialogue*, undated, *Dialogue* Collection).

176. Anderson, "LDS Intellectual Community," 25. *Mormon Enigma* shared the Evans award with Richard L. Bushman for his book, *Joseph Smith and the Beginnings of Mormonism* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1984). See "Recipients of Evans Biography Award Named," *BYU Today* 39 (June 1985): 16.

and found the response both humorous and troublesome: "Oh no, I'm sure not. Linda spoke in our ward and did a fine job. There was certainly nothing controversial in what she said. No, it's some woman from Arizona named Avery."<sup>177</sup>

Throughout the day, she received more calls, each from friends who had been given similar instructions in LDS leadership meetings, although the details varied. Finally, Linda telephoned her bishop, who confirmed he had been similarly instructed. She then called her stake president, W. Eugene Hansen, who arranged to meet with her and Jack the following morning.<sup>178</sup>

During the early Monday morning meeting, Linda told Hansen that she "had received a number of phone calls from as far south as Alpine and as far north as Kaysville" on Sunday with reports about a ban on her speaking in LDS meetings. Hansen confirmed that he had been instructed by the Newells' regional representative, Don Ostler, to tell each bishop in the stake that Linda was not to be invited to speak in church meetings. Linda had many questions, foremost of which were: "Why wasn't I informed?" and "Who instigated the ban?" Hansen said he did not know who gave the order, but would do all he could to find out. He also promised to do his best in arranging a meeting between the Newells and those responsible for the ban, "or somebody who could explain it." Linda countered that "I am not interested in talking with someone who can explain it. I want to talk to the person who instigated it." Jack added: "Someone who can explain it is not sufficient. Linda has a right to face whoever it was that started this whole affair."<sup>179</sup>

Throughout the following week, Linda received more calls, from both ends of the country. Rumors were afloat that she and Avery had both been excommunicated or disfellowshipped. Hansen called Linda at the *Dialogue* office on Thursday, 13 June, and arranged to meet with her and Jack again on Friday evening. That night, Hansen apologetically told them that, despite his best efforts, he was the highest official that would consent to meet with them. This, however, was still unacceptable, and Jack insisted once again that "Linda does have a right to face her accusers." Hansen said he would see what he could do, but was not optimistic.<sup>180</sup>

Hansen did stress that the ban only pertained to Linda's speaking on

---

177. Linda King Newell, "Epilogue: The Aftermath of the Biography of Emma Hale Smith," paper presented at the 1992 Pacific Northwest Sunstone Symposium, 23 October 1992, audio tape J976 in my possession.

178. Ibid. W. Eugene Hansen was later called to the First Quorum of Seventy on 1 April 1989 and served until attaining emeritus status on 3 October 1998.

179. Ibid.

180. Ibid.



Editor Linda King Newell: "I don't believe anyone has all the answers; we just deal with the questions in different ways" 1984.



Editor L. Jackson Newell: "We had marvelous rapport and enormous respect for the people we worked with" 1994.



LDS historical topics in general and Emma Smith in particular. She was to remain in full fellowship with the church. However, Hansen noted the irony when Jack said, "So she is free to speak on anything except what she really knows about?" Hansen also said he had learned that the decision came from the First Presidency (of whom second counselor Gordon B. Hinckley was the only functioning member at the time) and the Quorum of the Twelve. Hansen said the reason the speaking prohibition was given was because Linda and Avery had been "using sacrament meeting and other church meetings" to promote sales of their book. Linda immediately countered: "If they had talked to me first I could have told them that Val had never spoken in a sacrament meeting on Emma Smith, and it was my own personal policy not to speak in sacrament meeting after the book was published."<sup>181</sup>

Soon the story made its way to John Dart, a reporter for the *Los Angeles Times*, who called Linda on 18 June for more information. Linda told him they were trying to resolve the situation, and she felt that any public airing of the story would likely jeopardize the outcome. Dart promised to hold off. However, Linda called Hansen to inform him that the press now knew of the story. The following morning, Hansen called back and told Linda to call the office of Apostle Dallin Oaks and arrange a meeting with Oaks and Apostle Neal A. Maxwell through Oaks's secretary. After speaking with Linda and first arranging a meeting for that afternoon, the secretary called back and rescheduled it for Friday. The Newells recognized the fact that this allowed the apostles and Hinckley an opportunity to have their regular Thursday meeting before seeing them.<sup>182</sup>

The two-hour meeting on 21 June with Linda, Jack, Oaks, Maxwell, and Hansen was an informal one, with everyone sitting in chairs away from Oaks's desk. The conversation soon turned to the Newells' concern of not having been informed of the ban. Oaks then provided a copy of a Priesthood Bulletin warning against those who used church meetings to push the sale of products. "This was the basis of the action," he said. Linda assured the apostles that neither she nor Avery had been guilty of this. Oaks explained that there was more to the decision, citing the fact that many people had written to church headquarters inquiring to know whether *Mormon Enigma* had been sanctioned by the church. Since the book had been the recipient of two awards—one having been presented at BYU—the ban was their way of clarifying that the book was not church endorsed. However, recognizing the fact that the manner in which the instructions had been given had resulted in damaged reputa-

---

181. Ibid.

182. Ibid.



tions, Maxwell acknowledged that the ban "could have been handled better and [he] said that they were sorry for the way it was carried out."<sup>183</sup>

Oaks explained the decision to order the ban included the fact that "your book represents a non-traditional view of Joseph Smith" and thus may damage the faith of church members who read it. Linda explained that the letters and calls she had received from readers described a positive reaction. Oaks acknowledged that possibility yet maintained that he believed "the weight of the evidence was on the other side."<sup>184</sup> Jack countered that the issue was whether or not the book was an honest and true portrayal of the facts, readers reactions being incidental. When Linda asked whether the two apostles had read the book, Maxwell did not answer and Oaks admitted he had only read portions of it, citing time constraints as the reason. He acknowledged that in what he had read, Linda and Avery had used restraint when discussing aspects of Joseph Smith's life and his relationship with Emma. Apparently, however, it was not enough. After more discussion, Oaks emphasized that, despite his academic background and reputation as a scholar and intellectual, his duty as an apostle meant he had an obligation to "protect what is most unique about the LDS church" and stressed that "if *Mormon Enigma* reveals information that is detrimental to the reputation of Joseph Smith, then it is necessary to try to limit its influence and that of its authors." Jack then spoke of the opposing view of President Hugh B. Brown, who taught that if the church was what it claimed to be, it could withstand rigorous examinations of its doctrine and history without fear. He gave the two apostles photocopies of a Brown address reprinted the previous year in *Dialogue*.<sup>185</sup> Maxwell then expressed an interest in knowing Jack's feelings about the purpose of *Dialogue*, and he and the Newells discussed the possibility of meeting again for that discussion. However, the meeting never took place.<sup>186</sup>

Oaks also expressed concern about repairing the damage to Linda's

---

183. Ibid.

184. Ibid. The following letter is similar to many sent to Linda: "I appreciate your courage in dealing directly with sensitive material and doing so without bias and without malice toward any of the major personalities you bring to the page. What I would really like to let you know is that *Mormon Enigma* was not only an interesting historical work for me, but more importantly even was a faith-building experience to read" (Dian Saderup to Linda King Newell, 10 October 1985, *Dialogue* Collection).

185. Newell, "Epilogue." See Hugh B. Brown, "An Eternal Quest: Freedom of the Mind," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 17, no. 1 (Spring 1984): 77-83.

186. Newell, "Epilogue." Linda believes that Oaks and Maxwell did not schedule a follow-up meeting because of the article by John Dart that was soon published in the *Los Angeles Times*. In her prepared statement for Dart, Linda did make reference to the meeting with the apostles and referred to both by name. The apostles likely assumed that any future

reputation caused by the ban. Jack said rescinding it would be the best way. Oaks responded: "I'm quite sure that wouldn't happen." However, after Linda asked how long the ban would be in place, Oaks said: "It's permanent. But we all know such oral communications expire eventually."<sup>187</sup>

The following Tuesday, 25 June, Dart called Linda once again and told her that he planned to proceed with his story for the *Los Angeles Times*, with or without her help. Linda prepared a three-page statement and sent copies to Oaks and Maxwell, explaining that the story was coming out anyway and this was her way to safeguard herself against being quoted out of context. On Friday, 28 June, local reporter Dawn Tracy also called, and Linda provided her with the same statement. The next day articles appeared in both the *Salt Lake Tribune* and *Los Angeles Times*. Both reporters quoted what to Linda was the most painful part of the whole ordeal: "No one had any explanation as to why, as lifetime church members, neither Val nor I had been informed officially of this decision or been given an opportunity to speak on our own behalf. By not informing us, established church rules of due process were ignored."<sup>188</sup>

While the ban was in force, duties at the *Dialogue* office were regularly interrupted by reporters. "It was hard to get anything done," remembers Linda, although the work went on.<sup>189</sup> Letters of support came from *Dialogue* readers also. "I want to tell you that I shed some tears when I read about the 'gag order' in the paper a few weeks ago," wrote one. "The tragedy and short-sightedness of whatever forces and persons did this are not new to the history of religion, but those of us who believe that the Truth will indeed make us free must mourn in shock nevertheless."<sup>190</sup>

Ten months later however, the ban was lifted after Linda made a final appeal through Hansen. The timing seemed right. She had agreed to appear on a local television program on 25 April 1986 to discuss the upcoming Mormon History Association Meeting to be held in Salt Lake City. Expecting that someone would ask about the ban during the question and answer period, she wanted to provide a positive answer, so she met with Hansen on 13 April 1986 and asked him to do what he could to persuade LDS leaders to lift the ban. He was willing, but said, "Linda,

---

meeting would have been made public as well, which Linda insists would not have happened. "I did not, at any time, 'go to the press,' not on this issue or any other—it is just not our way of functioning. But they came to us" (Newell and Newell to Anderson, 9 September 2002). Linda's motive in preparing the statement for Dart is discussed below.

187. Newell, "Epilogue."

188. Ibid. See Dawn Tracy, "LDS Officials Ban Authors from Lectures on History," *Salt Lake Tribune*, 29 June 1985, 1B and 16B; John Dart, "Mormons Forbid Female Biographers of Smith's Wife to Address Church," *Los Angeles Times*, 29 June 1985, 5.

189. Linda Newell telephone interview, 8 August 1995.

190. Gene Sessions to Linda King Newell, 19 July 1985, *Dialogue* Collection.

you know that the church is not going to announce that they have rescinded this." However, that did not matter to her. "They don't have to," she said. "All they have to do is tell me, because I know the question is going to come up."<sup>191</sup>

The day before the taping of the television program, Hansen called Linda with some good news. She was "no longer under any restrictions any more than any other member of the church." Not only were the Newells elated, but when a reporter asked about the ban, as expected, she was now able to announce it had been lifted. Linda prepared a statement after the program, and news of the rescinding of the ban appeared in every major newspaper in Utah except the *Deseret News*.<sup>192</sup>

Feeling that the LDS Church's June 1985 action to prohibit my co-author and me from speaking on historical subjects in LDS Church meetings was detrimental to all parties concerned, on April 13, I requested through my stake president that Church leaders reconsider their prohibition. Last Thursday, April 24th, he telephoned me with the news that my request had been honored, and that previous restrictions placed on Valeen Avery's and my speaking on Church history at Church sponsored meetings is no longer in effect. I am naturally pleased with this decision. It renews my confidence that leaders and members can reason together when basic differences arise, and provides hope that other independent LDS scholars will be spared the difficulties that Valeen and I have experienced.<sup>193</sup>

Linda, seven years later, described the effect of the episode on her and Avery's family as "incalculable."<sup>194</sup> Also, in spite of the ban being officially lifted, both Linda and Avery have been "blacklisted" ever since, meaning that their work may never be cited in any official LDS publication.<sup>195</sup> Although the controversy tripled sales of *Mormon Enigma* the month after the story of the ban was made public, it was hardly consolation for the pain caused.<sup>196</sup> The irony of the prohibition is fully evidenced in a letter from Linda written five months before the ban began. To a reader who wondered if there had yet been any repercussions, she said: "There has been no 'official church' reaction to the Emma biography.

---

191. Newell, "Epilogue."

192. Ibid. See for example, "Author: LDS Removed Ban on Discussing Research," *Salt Lake Tribune*, 28 April 1986, 2D.

193. Newell, "Epilogue." See also "LDS Removed Ban on Discussing Research." Shortly before the ban was lifted, Jack Newell provided an insightful essay on personal conscience and free agency in light of Linda's speaking prohibition and other instances of LDS disciplinary actions. See L. Jackson Newell, "An Echo from the Foothills: To Marshall the Forces of Reason," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 19, no. 1 (Spring 1986): 26-34.

194. Newell, "Epilogue."

195. Newell to Anderson.

196. Ibid.; Linda King Newell to Don and Teddy Calaway, 11 November 1985, *Dialogue* Collection.

Neither has there been an 'unofficial' reaction. I would not have been surprised had there been a negative reaction but I believe it is the better part of wisdom to let this one go by. The 'official reaction' to *America's Saints* [written by non-Mormon journalists in 1984] caused a lot of publicity and an increase in sales."<sup>197</sup>

#### DIALOGUE AND THE HOFMANN BOMBINGS

Media calls to the *Dialogue* office did not end after the Newell-Avery story became old news, for tragic events in Salt Lake City soon made national headlines. Midway through the speaking ban (and midway through the Newell tenure at *Dialogue*), it became known that Mark Hofmann, who had earned a reputation with both scholars and church leaders as a skilled document collector, was in actuality a talented forger. For years he had sold countless forgeries to collectors as well as to the LDS church. When he feared his scheme was about to be uncovered, Hofmann built pipe bombs and on 15 October 1985 murdered Steven F. Christensen, a local businessman and collector with whom he was in the midst of dealings, and Kathy Sheets, the wife of Christensen's former business partner, Gary Sheets. Although Christensen's murder was motivated by Hofmann's growing fears of being unmasked, the killing of Sheets was meant as a diversion to throw investigators off of the Mormon trail and to create focus on motives involving their troubled business, CFS Financial Corp.

Christensen had purchased Hofmann's much publicized "Salamander Letter" for \$40,000 and donated it to the LDS church.<sup>198</sup> The letter had become well known, and its significance had been much debated within the Mormon history community due to details of Mormon origins it contained very unlike those in the received tradition. Christensen had been a long-time friend and associate of the Mormon intellectual community and was well known by the *Dialogue* team. So was Hofmann. And since Hofman was himself injured by a bomb that accidentally detonated in his car the following day (a bomb he'd intended for an unknown third victim), for a time he was viewed both as a possible suspect and as an unfortunate victim.

197. Linda King Newell to Linda Brooksby, 3 January 1985, *Dialogue* Collection.

198. The "Salamander Letter" was supposed to have been written on 23 October 1830 by Book of Mormon witness Martin Harris to W. W. Phelps, who later joined the Mormon church himself. In the letter, Harris, describing Joseph Smith's attempts to acquire the gold plates containing the Book of Mormon, says that an "old spirit," transforming himself into a "white salamander," struck Smith three times and forbade him to take the plates, referred to in the letter as the "gold bible." This, of course, differs dramatically from the traditional, authorized version of the story.

Jack Newell had been teaching a class at the University of Utah when he heard the news of the bombings, and he came home as soon as he could to check on the safety of his family. After Hofmann fell victim to the third bomb, it seemed clear that someone was targeting those involved with Hofmann's business dealings, thus creating fear among many even indirectly related. Jack recalls, "We took special precautions to lock the house and leave lights on that night, but we chose not to take the kind offers of several friends and neighbors to take refuge at their homes."<sup>199</sup>

The Newell's concerns were echoed by others involved in Mormon history and acquainted with Hofmann and Christensen. Not long before the murders, Linda and Hofmann had met for lunch. Linda was interested in Hofmann's supposed find of a collection once belonging to early LDS apostle William McLellin, thinking it might contain letters from Emma Smith (in fact, it was trouble over his "sale" of this "McLellin Collection" to the LDS church through Christensen that led Hofmann to murder). Hofmann, in turn, was interested in speaking with Linda to find out more about a woman Linda had encountered at Mormon gatherings in Montana where the woman had spoken, claiming to be a descendant of Joseph and Emma Smith and to own a trunk containing many valuable letters and diaries written by Emma. In reality, this woman owned no such materials and had confessed as much to the FBI. The conversation, as Linda remembers it, was deeply ironic: "I [told Mark] that I believed at one point that she was going to try to forge the documents," recalls Linda. "I asked, 'Do you think someone could actually forge an entire collection?' Mark considered my question for a moment then shook his head. 'Naw,' he said, 'the technology for detecting forgeries today is so precise that anyone would be a fool to try.'"<sup>200</sup>

Although the focus of the investigation soon centered on Hofmann, those who knew him refused to believe he was guilty. "Still no arrests. It is anyone's guess," wrote Linda to historian Jan Shipps three weeks after the bombings. "The case against Mark Hofmann is not firm at all or they surely would have charged him by now."<sup>201</sup> That same day she wrote another inquirer: "The incident has shaken us all—these are people we knew and liked. Salt Lake has reporters everywhere and most of them have no understanding of the Church at all. They end up calling Jack or me for background material so our lives have been very much interrupted."<sup>202</sup>

---

199. Newell and Newell to Anderson, 18 February 2002.

200. Newell and Newell to Anderson, 9 September 2002.

201. Linda King Newell to Jan Shipps, 5 November 1985, *Dialogue* Collection.

202. Linda King Newell to Uwe Drews, 5 November 1985, *Dialogue* Collection.

On 4 February 1986, after months of investigation, Hofmann was finally charged with two counts of murder and twenty-three counts of theft and fraud. Nearly a year later, he plead guilty to two second-degree murder charges and two counts of fraud. All other charges were dismissed as part of a plea bargain. He was sentenced to one prison term of five years to life, and three other terms of one-to-fifteen years in the Utah State Penitentiary.<sup>203</sup>

As the investigation uncovered surprising details, *Dialogue* executive committee member Allen Roberts and Utah writer Linda Sillitoe began researching a book on the case. It had, from the beginning, become a dominant part of each *Dialogue* executive committee meeting, and later Roberts regularly shared his research at these meetings in the Newell home.<sup>204</sup> Shortly before their book was published, Roberts and Sillitoe each published portions of their Hofmann research in *Dialogue*.<sup>205</sup>

Hofmann's confession and sentencing might have solved the crime, but historians and collectors were still on alert, since many unidentified forgeries remained at large.<sup>206</sup> The Newells thus took extra care to check questionable sources in submitted manuscripts. *Dialogue* had already

203. Several books have appeared dealing with the Hofmann case. See Linda Sillitoe and Allen Roberts, *Salamander: The Story of the Mormon Forgery Murders* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1988, second edition, 1989); Robert Lindsey, *A Gathering of Saints: A True Story of Money, Murder and Deceit* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1988); and Richard E. Turley, Jr., *Victims: The LDS Church and the Mark Hofmann Case* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1992). Another work, however, prone to sensationalism, is Steven W. Naifeh and Gregory White Smith, *The Mormon Murders: A Story of Greed, Forgery, Deceit and Death* (New York: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1988). From an anti-Mormon perspective, see Jerald Tanner, *Tracking the White Salamander: The Story of Mark Hofmann, Murder and Forged Mormon Documents* (Salt Lake City: Utah Lighthouse Ministry, 1986, second and third editions, 1987). A recent work focusing on Hofmann's forgery of an Emily Dickinson poem is Simon Worrall, *The Poet and the Murderer: A True Story of Literary Crime and the Art of Forgery* (New York: Penguin Putnam, 2002).

204. Newell and Newell to Anderson, 9 September 2002.

205. See Allen D. Roberts, "The Truth is the Most Important Thing": The New Mormon History according to Mark Hofmann," and Linda Sillitoe, "The Successful Marketing of the Holy Grail," both in *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 20, no. 4 (Winter 1987): 87-104.

206. The 1986 Mormon History Association meeting in Salt Lake City addressed Mormon document dealing in light of the unfolding Hofmann forgery-murder case. *Dialogue* published the remarks made at the panel discussion. See the following articles under the general heading, "The Document Diggers and Their Discoveries: A Panel": Cheryl L. May, "The Context"; Allen D. Roberts, "The Hofmann Case: Six Issues"; Jeffery O. Johnson, "The Damage Done: An Archivist's View"; James B. Allen, "The Documents: A Historian's Approach"; and Richard P. Howard, "Revisionist History and the Document Diggers." Not part of the panel, but responding to the issues presented was Curt Bench, "Document Dealing: A Dealer's Response" All of these essays are in *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 19, no. 4 (Winter 1986): 44-76.

been affected by a Hofmann forgery. D. Michael Quinn's essay, "Joseph Smith III's 1844 Blessing and the Mormons of Utah," (Summer 1982) had relied heavily on a purported find by Hofmann from 1981. After historian Dan Vogel submitted an essay based on obscure nineteenth-century letters discussing Mormonism, Linda wrote to Princeton University where the documents were housed in order to determine their authenticity. "This is just a precautionary measure on our part. Since the documents Mark Hofmann forged were exposed this past year we are cautious about 'new' finds." Jean F. Preston of the library responded that while there was no way to prove it, "it seems to me extremely unlikely that they were 'planted' there, in a folder of 1831-1833 correspondence."<sup>207</sup>

In November, just weeks after the bombings, church President Spencer W. Kimball, ailing since 1981, died. His death increased an already active press in Salt Lake City, and as before reporters searched out the Newells for comment. Three months later Linda wrote of the hectic year that had just passed: "The speaking ban, the bombings, and President Kimball's death have focused an incredible amount of media attention on Salt Lake this past nine months. . . . I think between the two of us, we have talked with about forty reporters ranging from the *New York Times* to the *Sacramento Bee*." Despite the personal pain and local tragedy that caught the media's attention, the Newells found their dealings with the press to be a growing experience. Linda wrote at the time: "We have learned a lot and feel it is important that a variety of views be available to them. Mormons are so often stereotyped and many reporters we talked with were delighted to find someone whose opinions don't seem 'canned.'"<sup>208</sup> Nearly a decade later, Linda added: "I think we played an important role, as the press would go to the church spokesman and get an answer that didn't deal with the issues, and then they would go to anti-Mormons and get vitriolic responses. They saw Jack and me as people whom they could call and who would discuss the issues with them. They knew they could get a straight, candid answer from us."<sup>209</sup>

---

207. Linda King Newell to Rare Books and Manuscripts Division, Princeton University, 23 June 1987; Jean F. Preston to Linda King Newell, 22 July 1987, both in *Dialogue* Collection. The letters were written to the Reverend Ancil Beach and deposited in the Hubbel Papers at Princeton's library. Vogel's essay, "An Account of Early Mormonism," was eventually rejected by the Newells, according to Vogel, because it made reference to well-known Mormon critic Wesley P. Walters (statement of Dan Vogel to Devery S. Anderson, 8 August 2002, Salt Lake City). The letters were later published in Dan Vogel, ed., *Early Mormon Documents, Volume III* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 2000), 11-16.

208. Linda King Newell to Alma and Kay Blair, 11 February 1986, *Dialogue* Collection.

209. Newell interview.

## PERCEPTIONS OF DIALOGUE

The Newells not only dealt with inquiries from reporters during their five and a half years with *Dialogue*, but they also often found cause to defend or at least explain the nature and purpose of the journal, and they would often deal directly with readers and others who were objecting to *Dialogue's* content, inquiring to know more about the LDS church, or hoping *Dialogue* would help with their own anti-Mormon agenda. For example, Linda followed up a telephone call from one man questioning Mormonism's claims:

I gathered from our conversation that you are fairly familiar with some of the anti-Mormon material. I would also encourage you to look within the Church for your answers. I really don't have any patience with those who make it their life's work to destroy another's faith—particularly in the name of Christ.

The anti-Mormon arguments are not unfamiliar to a lot of people who are in the Church and who give to and take from that experience in constructive and good ways. I don't believe anyone has all the answers; we just deal with the questions in different ways.<sup>210</sup>

One new subscriber, upset with the content of the first issue she received, wrote: "I feel very strongly that *Dialogue* magazine 'sails under false colors.' I subscribed thinking it to be the best of Mormon writing and scholarly thought. Finding it to be very anti-Mormon, I would like to cancel my subscription."<sup>211</sup> To this, Jack responded:

I have served as a counselor in the Bishopric of my ward or in the Young Men's Presidency, since assuming the editorship of *Dialogue*. Other numbers of our six-member executive committee are currently serving in bishoprics or are stake missionaries. All are faithful, active Latter-day Saints. Articles in *Dialogue* are written by a wide range of people, but the vast majority of them are devoted to the LDS Church. Either way, the articles are chosen for their potential to help us think and improve.<sup>212</sup>

However, recognizing the concept of "milk before meat," some letters to *Dialogue* were dealt with differently. Dan Maryon wrote to a non-Mormon:

---

210. Linda King Newell to Caine Alder, 13 June 1984, *Dialogue* Collection.

211. Mrs. Monte J. Wight to *Dialogue*, undated, *Dialogue* Collection. Although this letter is undated, the date of the response from *Dialogue* (also cited, see following footnote) would indicate that the Summer 1984 issue was the most recent, and was likely the issue which disillusioned this reader. Featured in this issue was D. Michael Quinn, "From Sacred Grove to Sacral Power Structure," Lawrence Foster, "Career Apostates: Reflections on the Works of Jerald and Sandra Tanner," Blake T. Ostler, "The Mormon Concept of God," and Smith, "'Is There Any Way to Escape These Difficulties?'"

212. L. Jackson Newell to Mrs. Monte J. Wight, 5 September 1984, *Dialogue* Collection.



If you are interested in the Latter-day Saint Church in general, *Dialogue* may not be the best place to start. Our journal is edited by and for members of the faith who want to bring aspects of their intellectual and spiritual life together, and so assumes that readers are already familiar with the Church and its beliefs. The views expressed in our journal are independent, and often question LDS assumptions. . . . If you would like to begin with basics, the Church's public communications or missionary services might be of more interest.<sup>213</sup>

To another reader, Linda wrote:

In response to your questions, haven't we "suffered the wrath of our Bishop or Stake President" because *Dialogue* sometimes publishes "dissenting opinion, contrary to the opinions of the Church authorities," no one on any level of the Church has ever "come down on" us. Jack and I live and serve happily in our ward in Salt Lake. He just recently served in the bishopric and I in the Relief Society presidency. Jack is now the scout master.

We have found both liberals and conservatives in each of the places we have lived, but we have also always found common ground in serving the needs of the members rather than using those differences to divide. The Church needs all of us.<sup>214</sup>

However, for those whose church and *Dialogue* experience were more extensive and intertwined, their assessment of the role of the journal often echoed the vision of the original founders. As one letter to the *Dialogue* staff declared: "Your devoted service continues to provide a lifeline during times of discouragement. But also, from the first issue in 1966, *Dialogue* has been a constant source of spiritual and intellectual nourishment too. As converts of almost 30 years ago, *Dialogue* has represented for us the Gospel at its finest."<sup>215</sup>

#### THE "UNFETTERED FAITHFUL"

Answering such inquiries had been routine for every *Dialogue* team, and the time was long overdue to find out just who had been supporting *Dialogue* for nearly two decades. Why did they read it, and what kept them subscribing? Where did they stand with Mormonism generally? Linda explains: "We thought it important, if the facts backed up our hunch, to let people know that we were a responsible crowd. The Petersen and Packer pressures on members were taking a toll on our efforts to expand circulation, and we thought facts about existing readers would encourage potential subscribers to sign up."<sup>216</sup>

213. Daniel Maryon to Daniel Patterson, 6 July 1987, *Dialogue* Collection.

214. Linda King Newell to Michael Johnen, 14 November 1984, *Dialogue* Collection.

215. William and Irene M. Bates to *Dialogue* staff, 15 November 1984, *Dialogue* Collection.

216. Newell and Newell to Anderson, 18 February 2002.

Therefore, the team began making preparations to conduct a reader survey. This had been considered at least as early as May 1983 when sociologist Armand Mauss and Allen Roberts discussed the idea at the Mormon History Association meeting in Omaha, Nebraska. Mauss followed up on their conversation by sending examples from the code book of the National Science Foundation and the National Opinion Research Corp., and he envisioned a thorough, scientific questionnaire aimed at the *Dialogue* readership.<sup>217</sup> By the following fall, the survey had been finalized by Mauss and the *Dialogue* team. According to Mauss, there were three motivations behind the survey: First, to find out general characteristics of *Dialogue* subscribers (location, income, gender, etc.). Second, to learn of their level of church activity and commitment. Third, to find out if *Dialogue* was meeting their interests and needs.<sup>218</sup>

The four-page, forty-five question survey was mailed to all current and 600 lapsed subscribers in April 1984.<sup>219</sup> By 18 May, 42 percent had been returned; however, the goal was to receive back and evaluate at least 2000 responses.<sup>220</sup> Falling short of this, Julie Randall sent out letters to several supporters the following month asking them to contact subscribers in their locale to encourage them to return the survey.<sup>221</sup>

Eventually, 1800 surveys were returned, with 1,779 judged usable.<sup>222</sup> Once in, Mauss, John Tarjan, Martha Esplin, and several volunteers began the process of evaluating the results. Esplin was responsible for entering, tabulating, and encoding the raw data while Tarjan, then a student at the University of Utah, created the tables used in the published analysis and worked with Mauss on processing the information.<sup>223</sup>

The results, published in the spring 1987 issue, confirmed most suspicions, but offered a few surprises. For example, most subscribers were fairly affluent and averaged between 30 and 60 years of age, with 41

217. Armand L. Mauss to Allen Roberts, 19 May 1983, *Dialogue* Collection.

218. Armand L. Mauss interview, 2 November 2001, conducted by Devery S. Anderson in Salt Lake City, Utah.

219. Armand L. Mauss to L. Jackson Newell, 20 April 1984, *Dialogue* Collection. There is some discrepancy as to the actual number sent. A published report and analysis of the survey says that *Dialogue* sent the questionnaire "to all of its then-2,300 subscribers plus 600 who had let their subscription lapse in the previous year." This would total 2,900. However, a document in the *Dialogue* correspondence gives the number as 3,559 (see Armand L. Mauss, John R. Tarjan, and Martha D. Esplin, "The Unfettered Faithful: An Analysis of the *Dialogue* Subscribers Survey," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 20, no. 1 (Spring 1987): 27, and "Dialogue Survey Follow-Up Phone Call," undated script to be read over the telephone to those who had not returned their surveys, undated, *Dialogue* Collection).

220. "Dialogue Survey Follow-Up Phone Call."

221. See letters written by Julie Randall, dated 15 June 1984, *Dialogue* Collection.

222. Mauss, Tarjan and Esplin, "The Unfettered Faithful," 27.

223. Mauss interview.

percent being under age 40. Also, 94 percent of respondents indicated they were LDS, and 88 percent said they attended church "most" Sundays, with 75 percent attending "every" Sunday. (Mormons in general average only a 50 percent activity rate in the U.S.). When asked what they would do if "faced with a Church policy or program with which he or she does not fully agree," 10 percent said they would "accept it on faith," and 37 percent said they would "go along with the policy after frankly expressing disagreement." Although 62 percent also subscribed to *Sunstone*, an even higher number, 75 percent, also received the *Ensign*. Most readers favored essays in *Dialogue* dealing with history and theology, while only a small minority favored poetry and fiction. Lester Bush's "Mormonism's Negro Doctrine: An Historical Overview" (Spring 1973) was subscribers' favorite article in the journal. Regarding the Book of Mormon, over two-thirds of the respondents also believed it to be an ancient record, while most of the others still believed it to be the word of God, despite questioning its origins.<sup>224</sup> Summarizing the results, Mauss, Tarjan and Esplin wrote:

In short, *Dialogue* subscribers represent a healthy and viable segment of the Mormon religion. Their existence suggests that being simultaneously curious and committed, intellectually alert and actively serving, is a much more common occurrence than the stereotyped divisions into mindless conformers and liberal dissidents. The light shed on "*Dialogue* Mormons" by this survey should quiet the fears of those who see apostasy in curiosity and should hearten those who believe that both the individual and the Church can be strengthened by a serious journal devoted to free and open discussion of the issues that lie at the heart of our religion.<sup>225</sup>

Although, as Linda said, "Our hunches turned out to be pretty accurate," the survey was not enough to educate Mormons in general or to spark substantial interest in the journal beyond those already receiving it. Despite major accomplishments in other areas, the Newells remained frustrated at their inability to significantly add to the subscription base.<sup>226</sup>

#### MAINTAINING SOME TRADITIONS, LOSING OTHERS

The readers' survey made clear what subscribers liked most about *Dialogue*, and the Salt Lake City team did their best to provide it. Although readers in general indicated that poetry and fiction were their

---

224. See the survey results in Mauss, Tarjan, and Esplin, "The Unfettered Faithful," 40-53.

225. *Ibid.*, 40.

226. Newell and Newell to Anderson, 18 February 2002.

least favorite genres, they were important enough for readers who valued them to not only keep them in the journal, but to ensure they were always first-rate. To maintain a high standard in poetry, the Newells worked closely with poetry editor, Michael R. Collings, and staff member Bethany Chaffin for evaluations and recommendations. Both were well thought of in Mormon literary circles. At the end of their tenure, Linda wrote them both: "We do want you to know how indispensable you have been to the journal in the five years you have been reading poetry for us. Your unfailing promptness and incisive comments have been so helpful in our wading through the many poems that have been submitted, and we feel good about the selections we have published."<sup>227</sup> Over sixty-five poems were included in the journal between 1982 and 1987.

Nearly twenty short stories were selected and published during the Newell tenure. Fiction too had a large enough audience that Lavina Fielding Anderson could assure one reader, "We're very interested in beating the bushes for more good fiction."<sup>228</sup> Yet, some of the published fiction stirred controversy. Neal C. Chandler's short story, "Roger Across the Looking Glass" (Spring 1984) included a sexual theme involving intercourse between a married couple. While there were complaints by readers, according to Anderson: "The story was well written. The sexual scene was the crux and could not be taken out."<sup>229</sup> Another story that some readers found offensive, even blasphemous, was Levi Peterson's, "The Third Nephite" (Winter 1986), which took a humorous look at the Book of Mormon account of the "Three Nephites." One couple complained of "the foul language and the frequent use of the name of Deity" and threatened to cancel their subscription should similar stories appear in the future.<sup>230</sup> Peterson apologized to the readers who were bothered by the story, but reminded them: "My piece is a fiction, not a sermon or a theological treatise. I hoped it would seem funny. Comedy almost always exaggerates and distorts reality."<sup>231</sup> Today, Jack Newell defends the decision made years ago to publish these two stories: "Neal and Levi are among the best our culture has produced. Their works should be cele-

---

227. Separate letters of Linda King Newell to Michael R. Collings and Bethany Chaffin, 18 June 1987, *Dialogue* Collection.

228. Lavina Fielding Anderson to Harlow Clark, 31 January 1986, *Dialogue* Collection.

229. Lavina Fielding Anderson telephone interview, 2 December 1994, conducted by Devery S. Anderson

230. Herman and Maude Fielding, "Disappointed in 'Nephite,'" letter to the editor, *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 20, no. 2 (Summer 1987): 5. Ironically this letter is from the parents of *Dialogue* associate editor Lavina Fielding Anderson. For another reader complaint, see Joseph B. Romney, "Dialogue It Is Not," letter to the editor, *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 20, no. 4 (Winter 1987): 7-8.

231. Levi S. Peterson, "Peterson Responds," letter to the editor, *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 20, no. 4 (Winter 1987): 8.

brated, and we were proud to be agents in getting their words and ideas into wide circulation. These decisions were our easiest and most pleasant."<sup>232</sup> Peterson's story won second place for fiction in the 1986 *Dialogue* writing awards.

The Newells also published a few theme issues. The first, on church administration (Winter 1982), was originally planned by the Washington team. David J. Whittaker had collected the essays and wrote the introduction, but it was left to the Newells to choose among them. Knowing from experience the added stress of theme issues—working with a guest editor, weeding out the weakest essays, and using extra caution to avoid redundancy—outgoing associate editor Lester Bush assured the Newells that "[t]his will be your real baptism."<sup>233</sup>

Another theme issue, on war and peace, appeared the following year (Winter 1984). Six essays were featured, including D. Michael Quinn's "The Mormon Church and the Spanish-American War: An End to Selective Pacifism."<sup>234</sup> Some readers complained that the issue was not well balanced and accused the editors of a liberal bias toward pacifism.<sup>235</sup> However, Linda assured one reader that they did solicit and, in fact, received many papers from conservative writers: "However, the arguments presented in all but one of those papers were so poorly researched and presented that we decided not to use them rather than present inadequately argued essays. The one essay we felt was well-reasoned and researched was *very* poorly written so we sent it back for a re-write. The author never returned the manuscript to us even after several reminders."<sup>236</sup>

---

232. Newell and Newell to Anderson, 18 February 2002.

233. *The Dialogue Idiot Book*, 28. In addition to the Whittaker introduction, this issue (*Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 15, no. 4 [Winter 1982]), featured: Jill Mulvay Derr and C. Brooklyn Derr, "Outside the Mormon Hierarchy: Alternative Aspects of Institutional Power"; Thomas G. Alexander, "'To Maintain Harmony': Adjusting to External and Internal Stress, 1890-1930"; Jessie L. Embry, "Grain Storage: The Balance of Power Between Priesthood Authority and Relief Society Autonomy"; Dennis L. Lythgoe, "Battling the Bureaucracy: Building a Mormon Chapel"; Garth N. Jones, "Spreading the Gospel in Indonesia: Organizational Obstacles and Opportunities"; Richard J. Cummings, "Quintessential Mormonism: Literal-Mindedness as a Way of Life"; and Dale Beecher, "The Office of Bishop."

234. The other essays in this issue, *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 17, no. 4 (Winter 1984), were: Ira Chernus, "Mythology and Nuclear Strategy"; John F. Kane, "Some Reflections on the American Catholic Bishops' Peace Pastoral"; Paul Bock, "The Ethics of Deterrence"; Kent E. Robson, "The Magnitude of the Nuclear Arms Race"; and Pierre Blais, "The Enduring Paradox: Mormon Attitudes Toward War and Peace."

235. See, for example, the following published letters to the editor: Richard H. Hart, "Peace at Any Price," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 18, no. 2 (Summer 1985): 4; Richard D. Terry, "Soviet Apologist?"; and Kenneth Taylor, "Blaise Nonsense," both in *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 18, no. 3 (Fall 1985): 7-10.

236. Linda King Newell to Gregory S. Hill, 3 July 1985, *Dialogue* Collection.

One issue in particular stands out as a gift of love, having been underwritten by G. Eugene and Dora England, parents of *Dialogue* founder Eugene England. Their forty-year labor among Native Americans prompted them to donate \$13,400 to help produce a special issue "to increase understanding of the history of Mormon responses to the 'Lamanites.'"<sup>237</sup> In planning the issue, the Newells promised the Englands, "We will do everything possible to assure that the volume contains the finest writing and scholarship obtainable on the subject."<sup>238</sup> When it appeared two-and-a-half years later (Winter 1985), the issue contained nine articles and one personal essay.<sup>239</sup> Guest-edited by David Whittaker, it also included tributes to President Spencer W. Kimball, whose death had occurred earlier that year. The Kimball essays fit well in this particular issue, as the deceased prophet had, as an apostle, worked closely with Native Americans and then later encouraged church programs on their behalf. The essays remembering Kimball marked the fourth time *Dialogue* had paid tribute to a church president after his passing.<sup>240</sup>

Other issues published during the Newell tenure carried articles long-remembered for their historical or contemporary significance. Same-sex attraction was discussed through personal narrative in the anonymously written "New Friends" (Spring 1986) and from the perspective of a psychiatrist (Summer 1987) in R. Jan Stout's "Sin and Sexuality: Psychobiology and the Development of Homosexuality." Two discussions on women and priesthood appeared in 1984 and 1985. The first (Autumn 1984) was a response to the recent RLDS revelation authorizing ordination of women, and the second (Fall 1985) addressed the priesthood issue from an LDS woman's perspective.<sup>241</sup>

237. Introduction to Eugene England, "'Lamanites' and the Spirit of the Lord," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 18, no. 4 (Winter 1986): 25.

238. Linda King Newell to Mr. and Mrs. G. Eugene England, 19 August 1983, *Dialogue* Collection.

239. This issue, *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 18, no. 4 (Winter 1986), included: Eugene England, "'Lamanites' and the Spirit of the Lord"; David J. Whittaker, "Mormons and Native Americans: A Historical and Bibliographical Introduction"; Keith Parry, "Joseph Smith and the Clash of Sacred Cultures"; Stanley B. Kimball, "The Captivity Narrative on Mormon Trails, 1846-1865"; Lawrence G. Coates, "The Mormons and the Ghost Dance"; Ronald Dennis, "Captain Dan Jones and the Welch Indians"; J. Neil Birch, "Helen John: The Beginnings of Indian Placement"; Chief Dan George, "My People, the Indians"; P. Jane Hafen, "'Great Spirit Listen': The American Indian in Mormon Music"; and Lacey Harris, "To Be Native American—and Mormon".

240. See Leonard J. Arrington, "Spencer W. Kimball, Apostle of Love"; James N. Kimball, "The Vast Landscape of His Heart"; and Edward L. Kimball, "Spencer W. Kimball: A Man for his Times," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 18, no. 4 (Winter 1986).

241. See Paul M. Edwards, "RLDS Priesthood: Structure and Process"; L. Madelon Brunson, "Stranger in a Strange Land: A Personal Response to the 1984 Document"; and Jill Mulvay Derr, "An Endowment of Power: The LDS Tradition," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon*

Another important article was Davis Bitton's account of the rise and fall of Leonard Arrington's church-appointed history division, titled "Ten Years in Camelot: A Personal Memoir" (Autumn 1983). Bitton had served as assistant church historian under Arrington from 1972-1982. Blake Ostler's informative conversation with Sterling M. McMurrin appeared in the spring 1984 issue. The interview had originally been published in the unofficial BYU newspaper *The Seventh East Press* the previous year, but due to McMurrin's candid remarks about his disbelief in the historicity of the Book of Mormon, university administrators banned the paper from the campus. The *Seventh East Press* folded soon thereafter.<sup>242</sup> Another essay enjoyed by readers was historian Lawrence Foster's, "Career Apostates: Reflections on the Works of Jerald and Sandra Tanner" (Summer 1984). Foster's objectivity as an outsider provided a credible and informative look at the Tanner's methods as professional anti-Mormon writers.

Unfortunately, a valuable *Dialogue* tradition ended near the end of the Newell tenure. Through the labors of Ralph W. Hansen, beginning in 1966, followed by Stephen W. Stathis a decade later, *Dialogue* had regularly sponsored a column featuring comprehensive bibliographies surveying published works on Mormonism called, "Among the Mormons." Stathis had not intended to continue the column after *Dialogue* moved to Utah. However, as he explained to Lavina Fielding Anderson, "for purely selfish reasons [I] chose to hang on." His departure was hastened by differences between himself and Anderson over editorial style, and he completed his final bibliography in January 1986.<sup>243</sup> Even with their disagreements, Anderson was quick to show Stathis her appreciation for his decade of service: "Such scholarly tools are necessary, tedious to do, and never get glamorous awards at professional associations. Your commitment has been most commendable."<sup>244</sup> Stathis was never replaced and the twenty-year feature ended after the winter 1986 issue. Linda recalls that the team did try to continue this column after Stathis's departure, but failed: "We just had a hard time finding anyone who wanted to do it, and it finally slipped through the cracks."<sup>245</sup>

---

*Thought* 17, no. 3 (Autumn 1984): 6-21. See also Melodie Moench Charles, "Scriptural Precedents for Priesthood"; Linda King Newell, "The Historical Relationship of Mormon Women and Priesthood"; and Meg Wheatley-Pesci, "An Expanded Definition of Priesthood? Some Present and Future Consequences," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 18, no. 3 (Fall 1985): 15- 42.

242. See Gary James Bergera and Ronald Priddis, *Brigham Young University: A House of Faith* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1985), 265-266.

243. Stephen W. Stathis to Lavina Fielding Anderson, 28 October 1985, and separate, undated letter, both in *Dialogue* Collection.

244. Lavina Fielding Anderson to Stephen W. Stathis, 22 November 1985, *Dialogue* Collection.

245. Newell and Newell to Anderson, 9 September 2002.

### "A TOUCH OF CLASS"

Toward the end of *Dialogue's* first Salt Lake City sojourn, Eugene England, co-founder of the journal, wrote the Newells. "[Y]ou have for the first time made *Dialogue* a professional operation, not the mainly amateur activity it generally was before. That, in addition to all the fine things you have published, some of them, of course, groundbreaking in every good sense, will be increasingly appreciated over the years."<sup>246</sup> England's assessment was a fulfillment of the vision and high hopes of Mary Bradford when she initially sought a replacement for her team back in 1981.<sup>247</sup>

The Newells would be the first to acknowledge that their accomplishments were the result of a group effort. The team worked well and stayed together for five-and-a-half-years.<sup>248</sup> Office staff and volunteers kept up on the regular duties, which raised the operation to its highest level of effectiveness. "*Dialogue* is professionally run," wrote one author. "Editing is very responsible, correspondence is always promptly answered. Authors know their articles' status quickly. It is nice to deal with a group that is financially responsible. . . that is editorially responsible, and that is managed courteously."<sup>249</sup>

Early on, the Salt Lake team had set several goals for the journal, which Jack explains were "to publish on time, to double the readership, to build a one-year reserve fund, and to do it all with a touch of class." Although publication remained behind schedule their first year, the team did produce five issues within the first twelve months on the job. Eventually, they reached their goal of mailing out issues at the beginning of each quarter.<sup>250</sup> Although they fell short of their subscription goals, by the end of their term in 1987, they had increased the print run of each issue from 3,300 to 5,300, an indication that "more people are reading the journal and therefore considering the ideas of our authors and artists."<sup>251</sup>

Much of the "class" that *Dialogue* had enjoyed was the work of Mormon artists depicted on its covers and displayed beautifully through the design talents of Warren Archer. Linda remembers: "Warren Archer is a superb designer—we could hardly wait to see each issue. We'd pull them out of the boxes when they'd come, and just say, 'Wow!'" It was all

---

246. Eugene England to L. Jackson and Linda King Newell, 23 March 1987, *Dialogue* Collection.

247. Mary L. Bradford to Devery S. Anderson, 21 June 2000.

248. Anderson, "Reflections From Within," 20.

249. Melodie Moench Charles to Linda King Newell, 25 February 1986, *Dialogue* Collection.

250. Anderson, "Reflections From Within," 20.

251. *Ibid.*, 26.



worth it, as Jack explains further: "If we had to spend five percent more to get the right colors for the cover, we felt that this five percent would make one hundred percent difference in product. This, in turn, should easily result in raising an additional five percent because people take pride in the journal and would more likely make contributions to it."<sup>252</sup> Frank McEntire chose the artist to be highlighted in each issue. *Dialogue* continued to benefit from the talents of Archer and McEntire until the journal moved from Utah in 1999.

Such quality, both in the content and aesthetics of the journal, had moved people to act, and at no time in its history had they responded better. "You will be pleased to hear that 1984 was our best year yet in terms of general fund-raising," wrote Linda Newell to George Smith. "Further, the manuscripts that we have accepted for publication, and those that are under consideration, are of very high quality. Many are simply outstanding."<sup>253</sup> Two years later, Linda could report that "Our back issue sales are quite brisk—nearly \$1,000 worth [each] month."<sup>254</sup>

Although the Newells never did raise the cost of a subscription beyond the \$25 price set by the Washington team, this amount was still too much for some who otherwise would have subscribed to the journal. One donor tried to make a difference in a way that not only benefitted *Dialogue*, but also its readers. Linda wrote, "*Dialogue* has a generous donor who each year pays for ten subscriptions which he wants given to those readers for whom the \$25 subscription price is a burden."<sup>255</sup> All donations, of course, were appreciated and allowed the Newells to advance toward their goals. As Linda explained to George Smith, another long-time supporter: "We could not have carried through on our original aim to 'publish *Dialogue* with a touch of class' without the kind assistance you provide. You have helped us to take pride in our work (and by 'us' we mean everyone associated with the journal)."<sup>256</sup> Considering the commitment of the staff, the loyalty of its supporters, and the quality of the work produced, it is no wonder that editorial board member Armand Mauss refers to the Newells' tenure as "*Dialogue's* golden age."<sup>257</sup>

#### TURNING TWENTY

Toward the end of the Newell tenure, *Dialogue* celebrated its twentieth anniversary, but because of its earlier struggles with keeping a regu-

---

252. Newell interview.

253. Linda King Newell to George D. Smith, 8 January 1985, *Dialogue* Collection.

254. Newell to Bradford, 13 January 1986.

255. Linda King Newell to Bonnie Mitchell, 9 July 1985, *Dialogue* Collection.

256. Linda King Newell to George D. Smith, 3 April 1986, *Dialogue* Collection.

257. Mauss interview.

lar publishing schedule, volume twenty, issue one, appeared as Spring 1987, rather than 1986 as it would have otherwise. As part of a year-long celebration, each issue of that volume featured the reminiscences of one of its former editors.<sup>258</sup>

With the adept organization skills of Kevin Jones, the Salt Lake team held an anniversary banquet on 27 August 1987. Former editor Eugene England addressed the gathered supporters, as did Leonard J. Arrington, Lavina Fielding Anderson, and Levi S. Peterson. Their remarks were later published in the journal.<sup>259</sup> Perhaps Arrington's words sum up best what twenty years of sacrifice and hard work had meant for so many:

I know from personal experience that the journal has benefitted my generation and the generation of my students and children. I know for a fact that *Dialogue* has kept many people in the Church and in the culture who might otherwise have dropped out. I have received many letters, even from bishops, stake presidents, and General Authorities, who have expressed their gratitude for *Dialogue* and indicated what it has meant to them or to someone they loved.

I do not agree with every article that has been published in *Dialogue*, nor do I agree with the decision of the editors to publish every article that they have used. But I devoutly believe that the journal serves a worthy purpose. *Dialogue* has helped the spirit of the gospel permeate many circles that otherwise would never have given us the light of day. I say, long live *Dialogue*!<sup>260</sup>

Two other projects undertaken as part of the anniversary were unfortunately delayed or abandoned. For example, the Newells had asked G. Wesley Johnson, one of *Dialogue*'s original founders and co-editors, to write a twenty-year history of the journal to appear in the winter 1987 issue.<sup>261</sup> Johnson accepted with enthusiasm and proposed an additional *Dialogue* Oral History Project which would include interviews with five or so individuals from each of *Dialogue*'s four editorial teams in order to

---

258. See Eugene England, "A Matter of Love': My Life With *Dialogue*," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 20, no. 1 (Spring 1987): 15-24; Robert A. Rees, "Monologues and Dialogues: A Personal Perspective," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 20, no. 2 (Summer 1987): 9-24; Mary L. Bradford, "BIG D/little d: The View from the Basement," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 20, no. 3 (Fall 1987): 13-23; and Anderson, "Reflections from Within," 19-31.

259. See Eugene England, "On Building the Kingdom with *Dialogue*"; Leonard Arrington, "*Dialogue*'s Valuable Service for LDS Intellectuals"; Lavina Fielding Anderson, "To Give the Heart: Some Reflections on *Dialogue*"; and Levi S. Peterson, "A Tribute to *Dialogue*," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 21, no. 2 (Summer 1988): 128-142.

260. Arrington, "*Dialogue*'s Valuable Service for LDS Intellectuals," 136.

261. L. Jackson Newell and Linda King Newell, "*Dialogue*'s Coming of Age," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought*, 20, no. 1 (Spring 1987): 5.

more fully preserve the relevant details of the story. "I think the *Dialogue* Oral History Project should have a rationale of its own and be separated from the article I will write," wrote Johnson in detailing his plans.<sup>262</sup> However, neither project was ever carried out and his essay did not appear, despite the fact that it had been announced to subscribers. Another project begun in 1986 was a twenty-volume index. The original intent was to publish it with the winter 1987 issue.<sup>263</sup> Comprehensive in scope, it was meant to replace the earlier ten-year index published under Mary Bradford in Washington. However, the volume, compiled by Gary Gillum and edited by Daniel Maryon, did not appear until after the Newells had stepped down and a new team was in place.

These setbacks seemed minimal, however, to the real challenge facing the Newells as they tried to publish that final issue of the anniversary year, and the scene was similar to that which had intensified their staff deliberations during the first year of their editorship.

#### MORE BUERGER, MORE ON THE TEMPLE, AND MORE CONTROVERSY

Four-and-a-half years after the appearance of David Buerger's "second anointing" essay, the Newells published his continued research on LDS temple ordinances, "The Development of the Mormon Temple Endowment Ceremony" (Winter 1987). The paper was originally presented at the Sunstone Symposium in Salt Lake City on 21 August 1986, followed by a response from Armand L. Mauss. After listening to the tape of Buerger's presentation, the *Dialogue* staff suggested several revisions to Buerger before he formally submitted the manuscript. Upon receiving it in the fall, the Newells gave copies of the paper, along with Mauss's response, to each member of the staff as well as two outside reviewers.<sup>264</sup>

This paper, like his earlier essay, generated intense discussion within the staff and editorial board during the entire editing process. In its original form, as he compared similarities between the LDS endowment and the Masonic ritual, Buerger included many direct quotations from each ceremony. Some staff members insisted it was improper for *any* material held secret by either the Freemasons or the Mormons to be divulged. Others argued for its inclusion on the grounds that the material had already been published elsewhere, and it was those publications which were being quoted, not the actual ceremonies. Lavina Fielding Anderson says the article was "potentially dangerous to *Dialogue*, but crucially important to publish." However, she sided with those who believed the

---

262. G. Wesley Johnson to Linda King Newell, 13 October 1986, and Johnson to Linda King Newell and L. Jackson Newell, 31 October 1986, both in *Dialogue* Collection.

263. Daniel Maryon to Elaine Kipp, 23 June 1987, *Dialogue* Collection.

264. Minutes of *Dialogue* staff meeting, 9 March 1987, *Dialogue* Collection.

promises of secrecy made by members of either organization should be maintained.<sup>265</sup> So did most of the reviewers. Armand Mauss told Buerger that "some of the opposition to publication came from the most unexpected quarters—from people who had not been active in the church for some time. Clearly there was a lot of emotion involved." Some even threatened to remove their names from the masthead for that issue unless Buerger changed the tone and eliminated all temple language.<sup>266</sup>

Jack Newell, speaking at a *Dialogue* staff meeting, echoed his earlier determination to handle such material responsibly: "Though matters having to do with the temple are both sacred and sensitive, they are not 'off limits' to legitimate scholarship or to the pages of *Dialogue*." Therefore, "if *Dialogue* is to publish work on the temple endowment, we must hold ourselves to impeccable standards—including thoroughness of scholarship and documentation, sensitivity and balance in presentation, and tone that recognizes and respects the sacred meaning of the temple experience among Latter-day Saints."<sup>267</sup>

Yet Buerger and the editorial staff did not see eye-to-eye on how to proceed, which culminated in some misunderstanding due to failed communication. For example, as a final precaution, most staff members wanted to see edited copies of the essay before it was typeset. The Newells initially forgot to provide those, and when they discovered this, immediately withdrew the issue from the typesetter. They also then discovered that the text needed some additional editing. This delay angered Buerger. "I appreciate the fact that you feel this subject [must] be well treated in an article," wrote Buerger to Linda Newell,

and I believe my track record illustrates my efforts to be as fair and complete as possible with every topic I treat. I am extremely displeased, however, after three months, to have received absolutely nothing of substance which details how I might have dealt insufficiently with the subject—particularly given the fact that the paper *was* accepted for publication and *did* go through a review process, and was on the way to the printer.<sup>268</sup>

Linda Newell responded one week later:

This is not an issue of censorship. . . . It is a classic value dilemma, where two equally important values clash—the integrity of scholarship and the personal integrity involved in the taking of covenants. Our staff members are

---

265. Lavina Fielding Anderson, telephone interview, 2 December 1994, conducted by Devery S. Anderson

266. Armand L. Mauss to David John Buerger, 21 February 1987, Buerger Papers, box 4, folder 21.

267. Minutes of *Dialogue* staff meeting, 9 March 1987.

268. David John Buerger to *Dialogue*, 11 May 1983, Buerger Papers, box 4, folder 22.

seasoned readers who value scholarship and an open exchange of ideas. Yet some feel that their participation in publishing explicit temple language, which they have made covenants not to reveal, violates those covenants whether or not it has been published somewhere else or not. No one wished to censor you or to tell you that you cannot publish whatever you want, but they felt it was a personal violation of their covenants to *participate* in a publication of explicit temple language.<sup>269</sup>

To ensure that the essay met *Dialogue* standards, Anderson and her editorial staff had put in over 100 hours editing the manuscript.<sup>270</sup> Everyone on the editorial board read at least one draft; the executive committee each read three to five versions.<sup>271</sup> Linda stressed that they all "worked hard on that manuscript to make it responsible."<sup>272</sup>

When the article was finally ready by early summer, no one was more relieved than Anderson, and she made it clear to Buerger that the ordeal was over. "There have been points in the last few weeks when I never wanted to see it again and was sure that no one would ever want to read it. It's a wonderful essay! I'm delighted and proud that *Dialogue* is going to publish it."<sup>273</sup> All the hard work paid off as evidenced the following June when Buerger was awarded first place in history in the annual *Dialogue* writing awards and received a check for \$300.<sup>274</sup>

The edited version of the Buerger article, although balanced by a response from sociologist Armand Mauss, went over the line in the minds of some church leaders. Speaking at the April 1989 General Conference, Apostle Dallin Oaks said in vague reference to the article:

There are limits at which every faithful Latter-day Saint would draw the line. For example, in my view a person who has made covenants in the holy temple would not make his or her influence available to support or promote a source that publishes or discusses the temple ceremonies, even if other parts of the publication or program are unobjectionable.<sup>275</sup>

Oaks's conference sermon marked the second time Buerger's *Dialogue* writings were criticized by a Mormon apostle to a church-wide

---

269. Linda King Newell to David John Buerger, 18 May 1983, Buerger Papers, box 4, folder 22.

270. Lavina Fielding Anderson to David Buerger, 1 June 1987, Buerger Papers, box 4, folder 23.

271. Anderson telephone interview.

272. Newell interview.

273. Lavina Fielding Anderson to David Buerger, 6 July 1987, Buerger Papers, box 4, folder 23.

274. F. Ross and Mary Kay Peterson to David John Buerger, 1 June 1988, Buerger Papers, box 4, folder 25.

275. Dallin H. Oaks, "Alternate Voices," *Ensign* 19 (May 1989): 29.

audience. As with Packer in 1983, Oaks was unaware of the long process involved in preparing the essay for publication. His speech was what one would have expected from an official church perspective, but it misrepresented the motives behind the *Dialogue* team's decision, which were to provide a forum for greater understanding of the temple ceremony through serious historical analysis.

#### CHANGING HANDS IN UTAH

Having served for over five-and-a-half years by the end of the twentieth year celebration, Jack and Linda were eager to bid farewell as *Dialogue's* editors. A five- or six-year tenure had been a tradition from the beginning, and the Newells were willing to maintain this. Ten months before their official departure, Jack wrote, "The *Dialogue* tradition has been one of five-year editorships, which we think is wholly in keeping with the good of the journal and the mental health of those who edit it!"<sup>276</sup> Besides, Jack had recently begun a five-year appointment as editor of *The Review of Higher Education*, and Linda had begun research on a new book.<sup>277</sup> She was also now serving as general editor of the *Publications in Mormon Studies* project at the University of Utah Press.<sup>278</sup> So local supporters once again formed a search committee and began considering several candidates.

In 1987, F. Ross and Mary Kay Peterson of Logan, Utah, accepted the position. In succeeding the Newells, they became the second husband and wife team to edit the journal. Their acceptance also meant that *Dialogue* would remain in Utah for another season. During the transition, Lavina Fielding Anderson wrote to a friend: "The new team is firmly in place for

---

276. L. Jackson Newell to John P. Cox, 12 November 1986, *Dialogue* Collection.

277. "U Professor is Selected to Edit Journal on Higher Education," *Daily Utah Chronicle* 23 April 1986, 6. Linda's project was a biography of Muriel Hoopes Tu, an American and Quaker who spent most of her life in China before her death in 1986. Linda spent three weeks in China in 1985 doing research and conducting interviews. However, due to her work on three county histories for the Utah Centennial History Project, completion of this biography has been delayed. Linda still hopes to finish the book (Anderson, "Reflections from Within," 31; Newell and Newell to Anderson, 9 September 2002). For more on Linda's work with the Utah Centennial Project, see below.

278. Between 1987 and 1993, the University of Utah Press produced eight volumes as part of this series: Jessie L. Embry, *Mormon Polygamous Families: Life in the Principle* (1987); Davis Bitton and Leonard J. Arrington, *Mormons and Their Historians* (1988); Neal Chandler, *Benediction: A Book of Stories* (1989); Richard L. Jensen and Malcolm R. Thorp, eds., *Mormons in Early Victorian Britain* (1989); Rex Eugene Cooper, *Promises Made to the Fathers: Mormon Covenant Organization* (1990); S. George Ellsworth, ed., *The Journals of Addison Pratt* (1990); David L. Bigler, ed., *The Gold Discovery Journal of Azariah Smith* (1990); Garth L. Mangum and Bruce D. Blumell, *The Mormons' War on Poverty: A History of LDS Welfare 1830-1990* (1993).

the September 1 changeover and they're wonderful people! I couldn't be more pleased. The new editors are Ross and Kay Peterson. . . . Ross is a historian and Kay is a folklorist, and they've been the only Democrats in Cache Valley for so long that they'd be amazed to find themselves in the mainstream."<sup>279</sup> The Newells were not only happy with their chosen successors, but with the timing as well. Jack writes: "We had resolved to get out of their way immediately, and, I think, we succeeded. This was easy because we respected them completely, and because we were weary of church issues, church gossip, and church politics."<sup>280</sup> Neither the Newells nor the rest of their executive committee worried about the future of the journal. They knew that once again, *Dialogue* was in good hands.

As for Linda and Jack Newell, life has remained busy since their "release" in 1987 as co-editors of *Dialogue*. In 1990, Jack stepped down from his sixteen-year post as Dean of Liberal Education at the University of Utah in order to teach and pursue his other scholarly interests. In 1996, Signature Books published his oral history project dealing with the life and thought of distinguished Mormon scholar Sterling McMurrin, *Matters of Conscience*, which appeared shortly after McMurrin's death that same year.<sup>281</sup> Jack says the project "became one of the most delightful experiences of my life." In 1995, the trustees of Deep Springs College (Jack's alma mater) asked him to accept the position of president, and the Newells left Utah and moved to eastern California. Although the appointment was originally set for three years, Jack later chose to take early retirement from the University of Utah after twenty-five years and remain at Deep Springs, which is located on a cattle ranch near Death Valley. Over the past seven years, "we have brought the college back from the brink, rebuilt the entire physical plant (21 buildings), doubled the endowment, and revitalized the mission of this 85-year-old educational treasure." It has been a fulfilling time, as he explains:

I teach a full load now that the rebuilding is complete, steer the place as best I can, and enjoy every element of life in this remote desert wilderness. I am driven by the same passions and principles that guided us through our *Dialogue* years, but I am applying them to very different problems these days. Sustainable agricultural practices and environmental issues have joined educational reform to tap my energies. With Thoreau, I believe we can choose to lead many lives in sequence. I'm at Walden Pond now.<sup>282</sup>

---

279. Lavina Fielding Anderson to Shelley Davies, 6 August 1987, *Dialogue* Collection.

280. Newell and Newell to Anderson, 18 February 2002.

281. See Sterling M. McMurrin and L. Jackson Newell, *Matters of Conscience: Conversations with Sterling M. McMurrin on Philosophy, Education, and Religion* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1996).

282. Newell and Newell to Anderson, 18 February 2002.

Linda also has remained busy. In addition to the project at the University of Utah Press, she produced a second edition of *Mormon Enigma* with Valeen Avery in 1994, and from 1996-1997 served as president of the Mormon History Association. She also authored or co-authored three of a twenty-nine volume series on the history of Utah's counties, commissioned for the celebration of the state centennial in 1996.<sup>283</sup> "Looking back on our tenure," she says, "it was a time of enormous turbulence in Mormon scholarship and Utah life. We steered a pretty steady course through this storm, and tried to stick with our principles from beginning to end. We got issues out on time, we rebuffed every church pressure to dictate or proscribe content, we balanced the budget and built up a good reserve fund, and we had a wonderful time through it all."<sup>284</sup> Both Linda and Jack agree their experience was incredible in large part because of the team they assembled. "We had a marvelous rapport and enormous respect for the people that we worked with," said Jack in 1994.<sup>285</sup> This was echoed recently by Linda: "We have both worked with some extraordinary people throughout our careers, but none better than our *Dialogue* executive committee."<sup>286</sup>

\*\*\*

In contrasting *Dialogue's* founders with the Newells' Salt Lake team, it is clear that an evolution had taken place. A certain naivete required to begin such an undertaking was later replaced by professionalism and reasoned defiance as a means to keep it going. Yet, like most evolutionary jumps, *Dialogue's* adaptations were made in order to ensure its survival and did not reflect any change of content. From its earliest days, *Dialogue* had published groundbreaking, hard-hitting, and controversial articles. What changed, however, were church reactions to it. What once may have raised a few eyebrows or caused minor grumbling at church headquarters, was now prompting investigations, discipline, and public condemnation. With all that *Dialogue* accomplished under the Newells, it is unfortunate that their era is remembered for an unprecedented "disciplining" of modern Mormon scholars.

---

283. See Linda King Newell and Vivian Linford Talbot, *A History of Garfield County* (Salt Lake City: Utah State Historical Society; Garfield County Commission, 1998); Edward Leo Lyman and Linda King Newell, *A History of Millard County* (Salt Lake City: Utah State Historical Society; Millard County Commission, 1999); and Linda King Newell, *A History of Piute County* (Salt Lake City: Utah State Historical Society; Piute County Commission, 1999).

284. Newell and Newell to Anderson, 18 February 2002.

285. Newell interview.

286. *Ibid.*



The situation is ironic. In presenting itself as the world's only true religion, the LDS church *officially* believes its teachings and doctrines will hold up under scrutiny. However, many of its leaders apparently adhere to this belief in theory only. *Dialogue's* founders, successors, and readership, on the other hand, have found many worthwhile, even faith-building discoveries and approaches as they have approached reason with faith and engaged faith with reason. The readers' survey showed that *Dialogue* subscribers were, for the most part, active, believing Latter-day Saints. *Dialogue's* existence should surely be recognized as a sign of Mormonism's strength, despite the occasional discomfort it creates. The journal has endured because it sprang from a culture that was begging to be taken seriously. Perhaps this is what then-First Presidency counselor Gordon B. Hinckley recognized as he spoke briefly with the Newells while mingling among local dignitaries and university faculty at the May 1986 dedication of a fountain in the Tanner Plaza on the University of Utah campus. After conversing briefly about the church, the university, and *Dialogue*, Hinckley said, "Thank you for all the good that you do." A few days later he followed up this conversation with a letter expressing gratitude to the Newells for their visit and closing his letter with the same positive words about their work he had spoken in person.<sup>287</sup>

*Dialogue* would spend another decade in Utah after the Newell tenure, first running smoothly in Logan for five years, and then returning to Salt Lake City for another six. The Newells had left the journal financially healthy, on schedule, and had created a system of office management that their immediate successors were anxious to emulate. Events during the Newell tenure might—and probably should have—signaled a new beginning to the relationship between the journal and the institutional church or, at least, sounded a note of caution to critics within the Mormon hierarchy. Apostle Petersen's investigations and his speaking ban on Linda Newell and Valeen Avery not only caused the two authors unnecessary pain; these actions proved embarrassing to the church when, as was inevitable, news found its way into the press. There is also deep irony in the fact that, while Michael Quinn and Linda Newell were being disciplined for writing honest, albeit uncomfortable, history, Mark Hofmann was being welcomed into the offices of the highest members of the church hierarchy. Within months, Hofmann's role as a forger and murderer would be all over the newspapers, to the embarrassment of church leaders and historians alike. Surely that episode

---

287. Newell interview; Newell and Newell to Anderson, 9 September 2002. Date of the conversation determined through research into the dedication date by Shannon Failner, administrative assistant for Campus Design and Construction at the University of Utah.

should have made clear to everyone how hopelessly difficult and, in fact, dangerous it is to try to “manage” history, no matter how commissioned one feels to do so nor how “right-minded” the motives. And, in fact, it seems clear that in the wake of these events the relationship between *Dialogue* and the church leadership quieted and improved. But if a truce had been called, it would be a temporary one, as the next decade of *Dialogue*’s history would find the journal operating in even more hostile territory. Apparently, more lessons needed to be learned.

To be continued.

*Dialogue Executive Team in 1982*



Clockwise from top left: Randall Mackey, Linda King Newell, Lavina Fielding Anderson, L. Jackson Newell, Fred Esplin