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We originally planned to print a smaller special Centennial Lectures issue as a supplement to the regular summer issue on the history of the Church. But too few acceptable manuscripts on the history of the Church in Nauvoo came in to make a separate number. The result was an Editorial Board decision to make the Centennial Lectures number a double issue in one and let it be the regular Summer 1976 issue. We consequently present here eighteen selected lectures given at Brigham Young University during its Centennial year, April 1975-April 1976.

Our first lecture is President Spencer W. Kimball’s “Second Century Address,” given at the Founder’s Day Convocation on 10 October 1976. Because it sets the theme and challenge of this issue it appears first and all the other lectures follow in the chronology of their presentation.
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Second Century Address

President Spencer W. Kimball

My beloved brothers and sisters:

It was almost precisely eight years ago that I had the privilege of addressing an audience at the Brigham Young University about "Education for Eternity." Some things were said then which I believe, then and now, about the destiny of this unique University. I shall refer to several of those ideas again, combining them with some fresh thoughts and impressions I have concerning Brigham Young University as it enters its second century.

I am grateful to all who made possible the Centennial Celebration for the Brigham Young University, including those who have developed the history of this University in depth. A centennial observance is appropriate, not only to renew our ties with the past, but also to review and reaffirm our goals for the future. My task is to talk about BYU's second century. Though my comments will focus on the Brigham Young University, it is obvious to all of us here that the University is, in many ways, the center of the Church's Educational System. President McKay described the University as "the hub of the Church educational wheel." Karl G. Maeser described the Brigham Young Academy as "the parent trunk of the great education banyan tree," and later it has been designated as "the flagship." However it is stated, the centrality of this University to the entire system is a very real fact of life. What I say to you, therefore, must take note of things beyond the borders of this campus, but not beyond its influence. We must ever keep firmly in mind the needs of those ever-increasing numbers of LDS youth in other places in North America and in other lands, who cannot attend this University, whose needs are real and who represent, in fact, the majority of LDS college and university students.

In a speech I gave to many of the devoted alumni of this University in the Arizona area, I employed a phrase to describe the Brigham Young University as becoming an "educational Everest." There are many ways in which BYU can tower above other
universities—not simply because of the size of its studentbody or its beautiful campus—but because of the unique light BYU can send forth into the educational world. Your light must have a special glow, for while you will do many things in the programs of this University that are done elsewhere, these same things can and must be done better here than others do them. You will also do some special things here that are left undone by other institutions.

First among these unique features is the fact that education on this campus deliberately and persistently concerns itself with "education for eternity," not just for time. The faculty has a double heritage which they must pass along: the secular knowledge that history has washed to the feet of mankind with the new knowledge brought by scholarly research—but also the vital and revealed truths that have been sent to us from heaven.

This University shares with other universities the hope and the labor involved in rolling back the frontiers of knowledge even further, but we also know through the process of revelation that there are yet "many great and important things" to be given to mankind which will have an intellectual and spiritual impact far beyond what mere men can imagine. Thus, at this University among faculty, students, and administration, there is and must be an excitement and an expectation about the very nature and future of knowledge that underwrites the uniqueness of BYU.

Your double heritage and dual concerns with the secular and the spiritual require you to be "bilingual." As LDS scholars you must speak with authority and excellence to your professional colleagues in the language of scholarship, and you must also be literate in the language of spiritual things. We must be more bilingual, in that sense, to fulfill our promise in the second century of BYU.

BYU is being made even more unique, not because what we are doing is changing, but because of the general abandonment by other universities of their efforts to lift the daily behavior and morality of their students.

From the administration of the BYU in 1967 came this thought:

Brigham Young University has been established by the prophets of God and can be operated only on the highest standards of Christian morality. . . . Students who instigate or participate in riots or open rebellion against the policies of the university cannot expect to remain at the university.

The standards of the Church are understood by students who have been taught these standards in the home and at Church throughout their lives.
First and foremost, we expect BYU students to maintain a single standard of Christian morality. . .

. . . Attendance at BYU is a privilege and not a right, and . . . students who attend must expect to live its standards or forfeit the privilege. 

We have no choice at BYU except to "hold the line" regarding gospel standards and values and to draw men and women from other campuses also—all we can—into this same posture, for people entangled in sin are not free. In this University (that may to some of our critics seem unfree) there will be real individual freedom. Freedom from worldly ideologies and concepts unshackles man far more than he knows. It is the truth that sets men free. BYU, in its second century, must become the last remaining bastion of resistance to the invading ideologies that seek control of curriculum as well as classroom. We do not resist such ideas because we fear them, but because they are false. BYU, in its second century, must continue to resist false fashions in education, staying with those basic principles which have proved right and have guided good men and women and good universities over the centuries. This concept is not new, but in the second hundred years we must do it even better.

When the pressures mount for us to follow the false ways of the world, we hope in the years yet future that those who are part of this University and the Church Educational System will not attempt to counsel the Board of Trustees to follow false ways. We want, through your administration, to receive all your suggestions for making BYU even better. I hope none will presume on the prerogatives of the prophets of God to set the basic direction for this University. No man comes to the demanding position of the Presidency of the Church except his heart and mind are constantly open to the impressions, insights, and revelations of God. No one is more anxious than the Brethren who stand at the head of this Church to receive such guidance as the Lord would give them for the benefit of mankind and for the people of the Church. Thus, it is important to remember what we have in the revelations of the Lord: "And thou shalt not command him who is at thy head, and at the head of the Church" (D&C 28:6). If the governing board has as much loyalty from faculty and students, from administration and staff as we have had in the past, I do not fear for the future!

The Church Board of Education and the Brigham Young University Board of Trustees involve individuals who are committed

---

1Ernest L. Wilkinson, speech delivered at Brigham Young University, July 1967.
to truth as well as to the order of the kingdom. I observed while I was here in 1967 that this institution and its leaders should be like the Twelve as they were left in a very difficult world by the Savior:

... the world hath hated them, because they are not of the world, even as I am not of the world.
I pray not that thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that thou shouldest keep them from evil.
They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world. (John 17:14-16)

This University is not of the world any more than the Church is of the world, and it must not be made over in the image of the world.

We hope that our friends, and even our critics, will understand why we must resist anything that would rob BYU of its basic uniqueness in its second century. As the Church’s Commissioner of Education said on the occasion of the inaugural of President Oaks,

Brigham Young University seeks to improve and to “sanctify” itself for the sake of others—not for the praise of the world, but to serve the world better.²

That task will be persisted in. Members of the Church are willing to doubly tax themselves to support the Church’s Educational System, including this University, and we must not merely “ape the world.” We must do special things that would justify the special financial outpouring that supports this University.

As the late President Stephen L. Richards once said, “Brigham Young University will never surrender its spiritual character to a sole concern for scholarship.” BYU will be true to its charter and to such addenda to that charter as are made by living prophets.

I am both hopeful and expectant that out of this University and the Church’s Educational System there will rise brilliant stars in drama, literature, music, sculpture, painting, science, and in all the scholarly graces. This University can be the refining host for many such individuals who will touch men and women the world over long after they have left this campus.

We must be patient, however, in this effort, because just as the City of Enoch took decades to reach its pinnacle of performance in what the Lord described as occurring “in process of time” (Moses 7:21), so the quest for excellence at BYU must also occur “in process of time.”

²Neal A. Maxwell, “Greetings to the President,” Address at the inaugural of President Dallin H. Oaks, 1971.
Ideals are like stars; you will not succeed in touching them with your hands. But like the seafaring man in the desert of waters, you choose them as your guides, and following them you will reach your destiny. ¹

I see even more than was the case nearly a decade ago a widening gap between this University and other universities both in terms of purposes and in terms of directions. Much has happened in the intervening eight years to make that statement justifiable. More and more is being done, as I hoped it would, to have here "the greatest collection of artifacts, records, writings . . . in the world." BYU is moving toward preeminence in many fields, thanks to the generous support of the tithepayers of the Church and the excellent efforts of its faculty and students under the direction of a wise administration.

These changes do not happen free of pain, challenge, and adjustment. Again, harking back, I expressed the hope that the BYU vessel would be kept seaworthy by taking "out all old planks as they decay and put in new and stronger timber in their place," because the Flagship BYU must sail on and on and on. The creative changes in your academic calendar, your willingness to manage your curriculum more wisely, your efforts to improve general education, your interaction of disciplines across traditional departmental lines, and the creation of new research institutes here on this campus—all are evidences that the captain and crew are doing much to keep the BYU vessel seaworthy and sailing. I refer to the centers of research that have been established on this campus, ranging from family and language research on through to research on food, agriculture, and ancient studies. Much more needs to be done, but you must "not run faster or labor more than you have strength and means provided" (D&C 10:4). While the discovery of new knowledge must increase, there must always be a heavy and primary emphasis on transmitting knowledge—on the quality of teaching at BYU. Quality teaching is a tradition never to be abandoned. It includes a quality relationship between faculty and students. Carry these over into BYU's second century! Brigham Young undoubtedly meant both teaching and learning when he said:

Learn everything that the children of men know, and be prepared for the most refined society upon the face of the earth, then improve on this until we are prepared and permitted to enter the society of the blessed—the holy angels, that dwell in the presence of God. ²

¹Carl Schurz, Address delivered at Faneuil Hall, Boston, 18 April 1975.
We must be certain that the lessons are not only taught but are also absorbed and learned. We remember the directive that President John Taylor made to Karl G. Maeser "that no infidels will go forth from this school."

Whatever you do, be choice in your selection of teachers. We do not want infidels to mould the minds of our children. They are a precious charge bestowed upon us by the Lord, and we cannot be too careful in rearing and training them. I would rather have my children taught the simple rudiments of a common education by men of God, and have them under their influence, than have them taught in the most abstruse sciences by men who have not the fear of God in their hearts. . . . We need to pay more attention to educational matters, and do all that we can to procure the services of competent teachers. Some people say, we cannot afford to pay them. You cannot afford not to pay them; you cannot afford not to employ them. We want our children to grow up intelligently, and to walk abreast with the peoples of any nation. God expects us to do it; and therefore I call attention to this matter. I have heard intelligent practical men say, it is quite as cheap to keep a good horse as a poor one, or to raise good stock as inferior animals. And is it not quite as cheap to raise good intelligent children as to rear children in ignorance?5

Thus, we can continue to do as the Prophet Joseph Smith implied that we should when he said: "Man was created to dress the earth, to cultivate his mind, and to glorify God."6

We cannot do these things except we continue, in the second century, to be concerned about the spiritual qualities and abilities of those who teach here. In the book of Mosiah we read,

. . . trust no one to be your teacher nor your minister, except he be a man of God, walking in his ways and keeping his commandments. (Mosiah 23:14)

"I have no fear that the candle lighted in Palestine years ago will ever be put out."7 We must be concerned with the spiritual worthiness, as well as the academic and professional competency, of all those who come here to teach. William Lyon Phelps said:

I thoroughly believe in a university education for both men and women; but I believe a knowledge of the Bible without a college

5JD, 24:168-69
7William R. Inge, source unknown.
course is more valuable than a college course without the Bible.  

Students in the second century must continue to come here to learn. We do not apologize for the importance of students’ searching for eternal companions at the same time that they search the scriptures and search the shelves of libraries for knowledge. President McKay observed on one occasion that “the university is not a dictionary, a dispensary, nor is it a department store. It is more than a storehouse of knowledge and more than a community of scholars. The University life is essentially an exercise in thinking, preparing, and living.”  
We do not want BYU ever to become an educational factory. It must concern itself with not only the dispensing of facts, but with the preparation of its students to take their place in society as thinking, thoughtful, and sensitive individuals who, in paraphrasing the motto of your Centennial, come here dedicated to love of God, pursuit of truth, and service to mankind.  

There are yet other reasons why we must not lose either our moorings or our sense of direction in the second century. We still have before us the remarkable prophecy of John Taylor when he observed,

You will see the day that Zion will be as far ahead of the outside world in everything pertaining to learning of every kind as we are today in regard to religious matters. You mark my words, and write them down, and see if they do not come to pass.  

Surely we cannot refuse that rendezvous with history because so much of what is desperately needed by mankind is bound up in our being willing to contribute to the fulfillment of that prophecy. Others, at times, also seem to have a sensing of what might happen. Charles H. Malik, former president of the United Nations General Assembly, voiced a fervent hope when he said that

one day a great university will arise somewhere ... I hope in America ... to which Christ will return in His full glory and power, a university which will, in the promotion of scientific, intellectual, and artistic excellence, surpass by far even the best secular universities of the present, but which will at the same time enable Christ to bless it and act and feel perfectly at home in it.

---

10JD, 21:100.
Surely BYU can help respond to that call!

By dealing with basic issues and basic problems, we can be effective educationally. Otherwise, we will simply join the multitude who have so often lost their way in dark sunless forests even while working hard. It was Thoreau who said, "There are a thousand hacking at the branches of evil to one who is striking at the root."\textsuperscript{12} We should deal statistically and spiritually with root problems, root issues, and root causes in BYU's second century. We seek to do so, not in arrogance or pride, but in the spirit of service. We must do so with a sense of trembling and urgency because what Edmund Burke said is true: "The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing."\textsuperscript{13}

Learning that includes familiarization with facts must not occur in isolation from concern over our fellowmen. It must occur in the context of a commitment to serve them and to reach out to them.

In many ways the dreams that were once generalized as American dreams have diminished and faded. Some of these dreams have now passed so far as institutional thrust is concerned to The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints and its people for their fulfillment. It was Lord Acton who said on one occasion,

> It was from America that the plain ideas that men ought to mind their business, and that the nation is responsible to Heaven for the acts of the State—ideas long locked in the breast of solitary thinkers, and hidden among Latin folios—burst forth like a conqueror upon the world they were destined to transform, under the title of the Rights of Man . . . and the principle gained ground, that a nation can never abandon its fate to an authority it cannot control.\textsuperscript{14}

Too many universities have given themselves over to such massive federal funding that they should not wonder why they have submitted to an authority they can no longer control. Far too many no longer assume that nations are responsible to heaven for the acts of the state. Far too many now see the Rights of Man as merely access rights to the property and money of others, and not as the rights traditionally thought of as being crucial to our freedom.

It will take just as much sacrifice and dedication to preserve these principles in the second century of BYU, and even more than were required to begin this institution in the first place—when it was once

\textsuperscript{13}Edmund Burke to William Smith, 9 January 1975.
but a grade school, and then an academy supported by a stake of the Church. If we were to abandon our ideals, would there be any left to take up the torch of some of the principles I have attempted to describe?

I am grateful, therefore, that, as President Oaks observed, "There is no anarchy of values at Brigham Young University." There never has been. There never will be. But we also know, as President Joseph Fielding Smith observed in speaking on this campus, that "knowledge comes both by reason and by revelation." We expect the natural unfolding of knowledge to occur as a result of scholarship, but there will always be that added dimension which the Lord can provide when we are qualified to receive and he chooses to speak:

A time to come in which nothing shall be withheld, whether there be one God or many gods, they shall be manifest.

And further,

All thrones and dominions, principalities and powers, shall be revealed and set forth upon all who have endured valiantly for the gospel of Jesus Christ. (D&C 121:28-29)

As the pursuit of excellence continues on this campus, and elsewhere in the Church Educational System, we must remember the great lesson taught to Oliver Cowdery who desired a special outcome—just as we desire a remarkable blessing and outcome for BYU in the second century. Oliver Cowdery wished to be able to translate with ease and without real effort. He was reminded that he erred, in that he "took no thought save it was to ask" (D&C 9:7). We must do more than ask the Lord for excellence. Perspiration must precede inspiration; there must be effort before there is excellence. We must do more than pray for these outcomes at BYU, though we must surely pray. We must take thought. We must make effort. We must be patient. We must be professional. We must be spiritual. Then, in the process of time, this will become the fully anointed University of the Lord about which so much has been spoken in the past.

We can sometimes make concord with others, including scholars who have parallel purposes. By reaching out to the world of scholars, to thoughtful men and women everywhere who share our concerns and at least some of the items on our agendum of action, we can multiply our influence and give hope to others who may assume that they are alone.

In other instances, we must be willing to break with the educational establishment (not foolishly or cavalierly, but thoughtfully and for good reason) in order to find gospel ways to help mankind.
Gospel methodology, concepts, and insights can help us to do what the world cannot do in its own frame of reference. In some ways the Church Educational System, in order to be unique in the years that lie ahead, may have to break with certain patterns of the educational establishment. When the world has lost its way on matters of principle, we have an obligation to point the way. We can, as Brigham Young hoped we would, "be a people of profound learning pertaining to the things of this world," but without being tainted by what he regarded as the "pernicious, atheistic influences" that flood in unless we are watchful. Our scholars, therefore, must be sentries as well as teachers!

We surely cannot give up our concerns with character and conduct without also giving up on mankind. Much misery results from flaws in character, not from failures in technology. We cannot give in to the ways of the world with regard to the realm of art. President Romney brought this to our attention not long ago in a quotation in which Brigham Young said there is "no music in hell." Our art must be the kind which edifies man, which takes into account his immortal nature, and which prepares us for heaven, not hell.

One peak of educational excellence that is highly relevant to the needs of the Church is the realm of language. BYU should become the acknowledged language capital of the world in terms of our academic competency and through the marvelous "laboratory" that sends young men and women forth to service in the mission field. I refer, of course, to the Language Training Mission. There is no reason why this University could not become the place where, perhaps more than anywhere else, the concern for literacy and the teaching of English as a second language is firmly headquartered in terms of unarguable competency as well as deep concern.

I have mentioned only a few areas. There are many others of special concern, with special challenges and opportunities for accomplishment and service in the second century.

We can do much in excellence and, at the same time, emphasize the large scale participation of our students, whether it be in athletics or in academic events. We can bless many and give many experience, while, at the same time, we are developing the few select souls who can take us to new heights of attainment.

It ought to be obvious to you, as it is to me, that some of the things the Lord would have occur in the second century of the BYU are hidden from our immediate view. Until we have climbed the hill just before us, we are not apt to be given a glimpse of what lies beyond. The hills
ahead are higher than we think. This means that accomplishments and further direction must occur in proper order, after we have done our part. We will not be transported from point A to point Z without having to pass through the developmental and demanding experiences of all the points of achievement and all the milestone markers that lie between!

This University will go forward. Its students are idealists who have integrity, who love to work in good causes. These students will not only have a secular training, but will have come to understand what Jesus meant when he said that the key of knowledge, which had been lost by society centuries before, was "the fulness of the scriptures." We understand, as few people do, that education is a part of being about our Father's business and that the scriptures contain the master concepts for mankind.

We know there are those of unrighteous purposes who boast that time is on their side. So it may seem to those of very limited vision. But of those engaged in the Lord's work, it can be truly said, "Eternity is on your side! Those who fight that bright future fight in vain!"

I hasten to add that as the Church grows global and becomes more and more multicultural, a smaller and smaller percentage of all our LDS college-age students will attend BYU, or the Hawaii Campus, or Ricks College, or the LDS Business College. It is a privileged group who are able to come here. We do not intend to neglect the needs of the other Church members wherever they are, but those who do come here have an even greater follow-through responsibility to make certain that the Church's investment in them provides dividends through service and dedication to others as they labor in the Church and in the world elsewhere.

To go to BYU is something special. There were Brethren who had dreams regarding the growth and maturity of Brigham Young University, even to the construction of a temple on the hill they had long called Temple Hill, yet "dreams and prophetic utterances are not self-executing. They are fulfilled usually by righteous and devoted people making the prophecies come true."15

So much of our counsel given to you here today as you begin your second century is the same counsel we give to others in the Church concerning other vital programs—you need to lengthen your stride, quicken your step, and (to use President Tanner's phrase) continue your journey. You are headed in the right direction! Such academic

---
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adjustments as need to be made will be made out of the individual and collective wisdom we find when a dedicated faculty interacts with a wise administration, an inspired governing board, and an appreciative body of students.

I am grateful that the Church can draw upon the expertise that exists here. The pockets of competency that are here will be used by the Church increasingly and in various ways.

We want you to keep free as a university—free of government control, not only for the sake of the University and the Church, but also for the sake of our government. Our government, state and federal, and our people are best served by free colleges and universities, not by institutions that are compliant out of fears over funding.

We look forward to developments in your computer-assisted translation projects and from the Ezra Taft Benson Agriculture and Food Institute. We look forward to more being done in the field of education, in the fine arts, in the J. Reuben Clark Law School, in the Graduate School of Management, and in the realm of human behavior.

We appreciate the effectiveness of the programs here, such as our Indian program with its high rate of completion for Indian students. But we must do better in order to be better, and we must be better for the sake of the world!

As previous First Presidencies have said, and we say again to you, we expect (we do not simply hope) that Brigham Young University will "become a leader among the great universities of the world." To that expectation I would add, "Become a unique university in all of the world!"

May I thank now all those who have made this Centennial Celebration possible and express appreciation to the alumni, students, and friends of the University for the Centennial Carillon Tower which is being given to the University on its one hundredth birthday. Through these lovely bells will sound the great melodies which have motivated the people of the Lord's Church in the past and will lift our hearts and inspire us in the second century—with joy and even greater determination. As I conclude my remarks now, may I offer a brief dedicatory prayer for the Carillon Tower so that all of you might participate in this dedication rather than moving to that site itself.

Our Father in heaven, we are grateful for this, the gift of thy people, the alumni, the faculty, the staff, and the friends of Brigham Young University, for this collection of fifty-two bells in this carillon tower on the campus of this, thy great University.
We are grateful for the faithfulness and craftsmanship of those who constructed the bells, those who have transported them, and those who have placed them into the tower.

Father, we are grateful for the diversity of the bells in their size, versatility, and music-giving tones, for the clavier and the clappers and the magnetic tape and the keyboard, and we ask thee, O Father, to protect this tower, these bells, and all pertaining to them, and we pray that the carillonneur will have the preciseness and the ability to create beautiful music from the bells in this tower.

Father, we thank thee for this institution and what it has meant in the lives of hundreds of thousands of people and their posterity, for the truths they have learned here, for the characters that have been built, for the families which have been strengthened here. Let thy spirit continue to be with the president of this institution and his associates, the faculty, the students, alumni, staff, and friends of this University, and their successors that thy Spirit may always abide here and that stalwarts may emerge from this institution to bring glory to thee and blessings to the people of this world.

Just as these bells will lift the hearts of the hearers when they hear the hymns and anthems played to thy glory, let the morality of the graduates of this University provide the music of hope for the inhabitants of this planet. We ask that all those everywhere who open their ears to hear the sounds of good music will also be more inclined to open their ears to hear the good tidings brought to us by thy Son.

Now, dear Father, let these bells ring sweet music unto thee. Let the everlasting hills take up the sound; let the mountains shout for joy and the valleys cry aloud, and let the seas and dry lands tell the wonders of the Eternal King.

Let the rivers and the brooks flow down with gladness; let the sun, the moon, and the stars sing together and let the whole creation sing the glory of our Redeemer forevermore.

Now, our Father, we dedicate this carillon tower, the bells, the mechanical effects and equipment, and all pertaining to this compound and ask thee that thou wouldst bless it and protect it against all destructive elements. Bless it that it may give us sweet music and that because of it we may love and serve thee even more.

In the name of Jesus Christ. Amen.
Dedicated to love of God, pursuit of truth, service to mankind

CENTENNIAL HYMN

Words and Music by
LORIN F. WHEELWRIGHT

Majestically

1. One hundred years, a moment's time
   In thy eternal day, Yet, like a prologue
   thy eternal day, Yet, like a prologue
   of the stars They shine to light our way; Yet,

2. O, BYU press on, press on, In thy prophetic role; O, lift our eyes to
   thy prophetic role; O, lift our eyes to
   of the stars They shine to light our way; Yet,

3. O, help us gain eternal truth, And pow'r to serve mankind; O, help us give to
   pow'r to serve mankind; O, help us give to
   see the light Of thy eternal goal; O,

4. With excellence we glorify Our loyalty to thee; We pray, O God, to
   We pray, O God, to
   see the light Of thy eternal goal; O,

   of the stars They shine to light our way; Yet,

   lift our eyes to see the light Of thy eternal goal.
   lift our eyes to see the light Of thy eternal goal.

   help us give to Christ, our Lord, Our strength, our might, our mind.
   help us give to Christ, our Lord, Our strength, our might, our mind.

   pray, O God, to know Thy will, To build what ought to be!
   pray, O God, to know Thy will, To build what ought to be!

Copyright 1975 by Brigham Young University
Seven Steps to Greatness

Leonard J. Arrington

With 25,000 full-time students from each of the fifty states and 101 different countries, with 250,000 part-time students; with physical facilities as extensive and beautiful as those of any university in the nation; with an intense commitment to academic excellence and a large corps of faculty peering over the edges of existing knowledge; and with a broad basis of financial support from a large and growing Church and from private philanthropists, Brigham Young University is one of the great institutions of higher learning in the world.

It seems appropriate, at the beginning of this centennial year, to review the paths we've climbed, we and those before us, to reach this prominence. For BYU it has been a steep ascent, better scaled by steps than in a gradual climb. I seem to see seven steps, and in studying this history I have been reminded, as was the psalmist, of the architect who inspired their design: "Thou hast enlarged my steps under me," acknowledged David to his God, "that my feet did not slip" (Psalms 18:36). The steps to BYU's greatness have come about by the blessings of the Lord on the labors of people whose efforts were enduring, often ennobling, and as often humbling.

STEP ONE: REVEALED INSTRUCTIONS

The history of Brigham Young University goes back to Kirtland, Ohio, where in 1831, just fourteen months after the organization of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, the Lord revealed to Joseph Smith, Jr., the importance of educating the Saints for the parts they would play in the Restoration.¹ Envision one of the resulting "Schools of the Prophets" or elders schools—this in Missouri:

¹In preparing this talk I have benefited from reading some preliminary manuscripts of the projected three-volume Brigham Young University: The First One Hundred Years, being prepared under the direction of Ernest L. Wilkinson. I have also benefited from the research and writing of Mrs. Rebecca Cornwall and from the suggestions of Maureen Ursenbach Beecher, Jill Mulvay, Davis Bitton, Richard Jensen, and Christine Croft Waters.
The place of meeting was in the open air, under some tall trees, in a retired place in the wilderness. . . . To attend this school [wrote Parley P. Pratt] I had to travel on foot and sometimes with bare feet . . . about six miles. This I did once a week. . . .

In each forced move of the beleaguered Saints, they tucked into their already full trunks and wagons "every book, map, chart, or diagram that may . . . gain the attention of children, cause them to love to learn to read," and be useful in building Zion. Finally, in their Great Basin Kingdom, they built schools, one in each ward usually, where their children were taught. Joseph Walton went there during the winter of 1858-59 in what he called "the happiest moment of my life."

I had my little Primer under my arm. . . . One of the big boys led me in. . . . The teacher was kind to me and placed me on the long seat by the fire. The books I saw were a dictionary, Bible, Testament, Book of Mormon, Blue back Spelling book, and the Deseret News. The bell was a wagon tire, school seats were made of split logs, and they had one long table sloping on both sides for a writing desk. . . . The floor of this old log house was of dirt, but not dirty. No, it was scrupulously clean, packed down hard. . . .

STEP TWO: THE DUSENBERRY GRADE SCHOOL

While it is true that the territorial legislature established a University of the State of Deseret in 1850, the Saints found it hard to sacrifice some of their peas and carrots, butter, and sheepskins to pay a teacher. Brigham Young scolded them into action, and in the 1860s a renaissance began with the founding of fine private schools taught by well-trained teachers, new converts all, such as John R. Park, Mary and Ida Ione Cook, Karl G. Maeser, all in Salt Lake City; Louis Moench in Brigham City and Ogden; and Warren and Wilson Dusenberry in Provo.

STEP THREE: FOUNDING BRIGHAM YOUNG ACADEMY

But these were elementary schools. For education beyond what was available here, Brigham Young, like others, had to send his sons east, hoping that they would not, as a contemporary put it, "learn what [we] would hardly be able to unteach them all their days."  

---

2Parley P. Pratt, Autobiography (New York: Published for the editor and Proprietor by Russell Brothers, 1874), p. 100.
3Latter-day Saints' Millennial Star, 10 (15 March 1848): 85.
5Thomas L. Kane to Brigham Young, 4 December 1873, MS, Church Archives.
confided in a letter to one of those student sons his better dream:

I hope to see an Academy established in Provo that shall do honour to our Territory, and at which the children of the Latter-day Saints can receive a good education unmixed with the pernicious atheistic influences that are found in so many of the higher schools of the country.  

The dream would soon be realized. By October 1875 the Deed of Trust for Brigham Young Academy had been drawn up and seven trustees selected. It is the date of this Deed of Trust that we celebrate as the beginning of Brigham Young University. It was a notable year. That was the year Alexander Graham Bell first demonstrated his telephone and formed the Bell Telephone Company. That year the first Kentucky Derby was held at Churchill Downs, the first major baseball league was founded, and Mark Twain published The Adventures of Tom Sawyer. Closer to home, it was the year of the founding of the Orderville United Order and the organization of the first Young Men's Mutual Improvement Association. And during this year the first BYA coed eloped, causing her instructor to remark that she had mistakenly put the heart before the course.

Warren Dusenberry was elected first principal of the Academy, but his appointment was temporary. The first permanent principal was Karl G. Maeser. Maeser was born in Saxony, now East Germany, the son of an artist and master painter of Dresden chinaware. After graduation from the public schools in his small town, he was invited to attend the Dresden High School for the gifted, and finally to the Schullenerseminar, where prospective teachers took an intensive curriculum.

His teacher's diploma completed with high honors, Maeser tutored the children of prominent Protestant families, taught a district school, became headmaster of the Budig Institutes, and married the daughter of the principal of that famous school. Hearing of Mormonism, Maeser sent persistent requests to European Church officials who responded by sending William Budge there in 1858, in spite of considerable personal danger. Knowing they would be "scourged from the city" when their conversion became known, the Maesers and another convert family left Germany in 1858 under cover of darkness.

After two detours, one to Scotland and another to the American southern states to preach the gospel, Maeser finally reached Utah in 1860. He entered the picture just as the educational renaissance

\[6\text{Brigham Young to Alfales Young, 20 October 1875, MS, Church Archives.}\]
provoked by Brigham Young was beginning. Teaching in one of the ward schools in Salt Lake City, the German intellectual got his initiation to the life of a territorial schoolmaster. A saw and a mop as standard equipment for a teacher were strange to Maeser, but he adjusted and began to promote not only an enlarged physical structure but also systematic instruction by which elementary schools would feed students into high schools and colleges.

After small successes, large failures, and interruption for another mission, Maeser was teaching in 1873 at the Twentieth Ward Institute in Salt Lake City, which he had made into a competent teacher training school. In April 1876 an explosion at the old Salt Lake Arsenal on the hills north of Salt Lake City shook the whole northern half of the city, causing extensive damage to the Twentieth Ward schoolhouse. Maeser went at once to report the matter. Finding President Young, he said, "As you can see, I will not be able to teach school until the building is repaired." "That is all right," the President answered cheerfully, "I want to give you a mission to teach in the Brigham Young Academy at Provo." The next day Maeser was formally appointed by the Board.

It is doubtful that Maeser realized fully what he had committed himself to do. Arriving at the academy in April of 1876, he found a badly run-down building surrounded by a half-built fence, a sparsely furnished office, "no records, not much system, certainly no regularity, the former principal being so busily engaged with his court duties that school began at any time between 9 and 11 o'clock, and sometimes not at all." He soon learned that the building doubled as an entertainment hall, shaken by round dances on the upper floor while students tried to study downstairs. Only twenty-nine students showed up for Professor Maeser's first term. The first student to register, incidentally, was Reed Smoot, later to serve for thirty years as United States Senator from Utah. Reed was the son of A. O. Smoot who, as stake president, mayor, and chairman of the Board of Trustees, did more than any other person to keep the academy alive during the poorly financed years of the 1880s and 1890s.

Maeser's most formidable challenge was his students. An early student who later distinguished himself as an associate justice of the United States Supreme Court described himself and fellow students then as shoeless, self-sufficient country boys who were careful to wear their hats in the classroom, and, when they weren't in school, were cutting wood, milking cows, carrying swill to the pigs, carrying horses,
plowing fields, hoeing corn, or picking potatoes. One of these country boys who attended the academy in its early years was J. Golden Kimball, destined to become senior president of the First Council of the Seventy of the Church. This six-foot-three-inch lovable beanpole of a man, who had previously been a freighter and mule skinner, received his training from Dr. Maeser; and it is certain that some of his fire, his tolerance, and his conviction, as well as his creative wit and homespun wisdom, are a product of his days at Brigham Young Academy. Zina Huntington Young, another of Maeser’s early students, described the first upperclassmen as “eager, manly, and . . . ignorant.”9 These were the persons the converted German schoolmaster was supposed to turn into saints, gentlemen, and scholars—in that order.

Without question Maeser was well-chosen for the task. On one rare occasion when he was late for class—because they were always penalized when they were late—some of the boys hurried outside to search the neighborhood for a donkey, which they brought back to the classroom and tied to the teacher’s desk. Then they waited in anxious silence. When the professor finally entered the room and saw the newcomer, he turned to the class and dryly remarked in his thick German accent, “I’m happy you chose the smartest student in the class as my replacement.”

Maeser was more interested in students than in ideas, and his work “bore exceptional fruits in character.” A generation of Mormon leaders remembered Brother Maeser as the promoter of their spiritual and civic achievement. “Everyone’s life is an object lesson to others,” Maeser told students. “Don’t be a scrub.”

As good words about the academy got around, more young students enrolled. By the end of Maeser’s administration, Brigham Young Academy included a kindergarten, an elementary school, a high school featuring teacher training and college preparation, and a college department offering either four years in academics or three years normal training.

Dr. Maeser’s basic philosophy became the foundation of the Church’s approach to education: concern for the moral as well as the intellectual well-being of the students. Under Maeser BYA became an institution, with loyalties and alumni, and provided teachers for scores of common schools throughout the West. But Maeser’s indelible contribution was the spiritual architecture of the academy. It was his

9Ibid.
emphasis on practical religion that became a distinctive characteristic of Brigham Young Academy.

STEP FOUR: TOWARD BECOMING A UNIVERSITY

When Benjamin Cluff succeeded Maeser as president of Brigham Young Academy in 1891, he had just returned from the University of Michigan full of enthusiastic, progressive ideas about education. Raised in Provo, Logan, and on the Laie plantation in Hawaii, Cluff received his elementary education solely from his mother. Returning to Utah, he served for a period as a librarian in Coalville and in his nineteenth year walked the sixty-five miles to Provo. There he was introduced to Professor Maeser, who took him by the hand and said, "It is an honor and a pleasure to meet and welcome into our school a young man with an ambition to fit himself for service in God's kingdom. You will be happy here."

Over the next eight years Cluff attended the normal school, served a long mission to Hawaii, and returned to teach at the academy until he was called by President John Taylor to continue his education at the University of Michigan. There he was an outstanding student and a faithful Latter-day Saint. The Benny Cluff who returned from Michigan was thirty-two, eager to share his talents, but easily wounded by people who were leery of the eastern-educated young miracle worker called to take over the academy presidency.

Determined to upgrade the academy to university status, Cluff faced many difficulties. First, everyone wanted a hand in raising the baby: the former principal, the Provo Board of Trustees, the Utah Valley Stake presidency, the General Board of Education in Salt Lake City, the family of Brigham Young, and of course the General Authorities of the Church.

Exactly how to raise this child was unclear—was the academy to become the center of the Church educational system, or was it destined to simply continue as one of the best of the thirty or more stake academies? As a major LDS school, the Academy had to compete with two other Brigham Young schools, Brigham Young College in Logan and LDS College in Salt Lake City. At the same time, the General Board of Education of the Church was finalizing plans to create a new "Church University" in Salt Lake City that would become the center of Church education; BYA was saved from the latter possibility by the Depression of 1893, which ruled out a new institution.

But the depression also left the academy in a precarious condition. No one, not even the Board of Trustees, wanted to share with Cluff the
responsibility of paying the bills. The faculty of the academy was its finance committee; they struggled to secure their own salaries as well as operating expenses for the school. Tuition continued to be paid in kind and teachers were compelled, as one of them wrote, "to make monthly peregrinations with huge wheelbarrows to collect the school fees paid in turnips, molasses, and pumpkins."\(^{10}\)

Assisting Cluff during these years and eventually succeeding him was George H. Brimhall, son of a territorial civic and church leader, man of remarkable energy and tact, and an inspiring teacher—not the scholar that Cluff was but always good for a stimulating five-minute talk in the academy's required chapel service. What Cluff found distasteful Brimhall enjoyed—raising funds. The school's outdoor privies, for instance, were a disgrace to its name and to the community, and Cluff had no success in getting the trustees to finance indoor plumbing. Then Brimhall went to work. He wrote Cluff: "The Board is now in good condition to take into consideration the sewage proposition, as all three of the Salt Lake members were under the necessity of using our outside conveniences before the meeting."\(^{11}\)

Cluff, meanwhile, lengthened class periods from thirty minutes each to an hour, created a Collegiate Department for advanced studies beyond the normal school and high school level, and started a summer school to which he invited national speakers such as John Dewey. Finally, in October 1903—in a meaningful step—Cluff was given permission to change the name of Brigham Young Academy to Brigham Young University.

But what a modest step it was. The new university had only fifty-eight college students, all properly decorated with the mustaches, beards, and whiskers that were customary in those days. Their pride was lifted so much by the "promotion" from college to university that within two years the so-called sorghum lappers from St. George, beet diggers from Spanish Fork, and pea pickers from Driggs had joined to put the large block Y on the mountain and had originated Y Day. It is also said that this was the year a fellow took the first buggy ride with his girl through Rock Canyon, while his roommate started the tradition of escorting his girl home by way of Lovers' Lane along the canal below Maeser Hill. They also began the traditional autumn leaf moonlight hikes, and I'm told it was soon thereafter that the first authentic submarine race was held in Utah Lake.

\(^{10}\)Young Woman's Journal 3 (July 1892):434.  
\(^{11}\)Brimhall Papers, 12 October 1900, MS, BYU Archives.
STEP FIVE: ACCREDITATION

A 1921 statement from the First Presidency suggested that some of the churchwide fears during the Cluff and Brimhall era were being resolved:

After separating ourselves from the world, the world has come to us. . . . We are an integral part of the great world, and whether we desire it or not, we must be influenced by the environment with which we are surrounded.12

A new surge of interest in progressive eastern education demanded a new president with background in the best of the new learning. President Brimhall, who, in spite of poor health and modest academic training, had energetically implemented many of Cluff’s proposals, was asked to resign in favor of Franklin S. Harris. Stepping down, Brimhall manifested an exemplary graciousness: he became the new president’s supporter and emissary and a student counselor of unexpected gentleness.

Franklin Harris as a boy, said his mother, always wanted to study out his problems without help and was well advanced in reading long before he went to school. Having attended BYU under the nationally recognized scientist, John A. Widtsoe, he proceeded to earn a doctorate at Cornell University in New York. As a specialist in agricultural chemistry, Harris had published numerous technical papers and articles in scientific and farm journals and, at the time of his appointment, was director of the Agricultural Experiment Station in Logan.

Coming to BYU with zest and grand plans, he declared in his first speech to the faculty, that “We are the greatest university in the world in embryo.”13 Some faculty members concluded that his sail was too big for his rudder—after all, BYU had only 438 students. Most of them soon decided that Harris’ rudder was big enough. What he wanted most was to see BYU become a respected academic institution. In his time, as through BYU’s history, there was tension between the desire to have the best secular learning that could be obtained and the desire for the type of educational experience that would build testimonies. Harris always contended that rational thought was compatible with spiritual belief and that thorough academics need not weaken healthy religion. The history of BYU during these years demonstrates the soundness of this view.

12Conference Report, April 1922, p. 41.
13Reported by the Y News, 24 October 1923.
Harris concentrated his efforts on obtaining accreditation, for he knew that the standards of accrediting associations were high and that in meeting them the school would become first-rate. Just as important, he was anxious for BYU graduates to be able to gain ready admittance to graduate schools through the nation. He started first with the school library, the "heart of the university," which, in 1921, consisted of less than 20,000 books. By the time Harris left in 1945 there were a quarter of a million volumes.

Harris knew his faculty lacked academic credentials; only one had a Ph.D., and many had no degrees at all. He began to recruit young Mormon graduates of eastern schools, somehow wooing them to BYU despite sacrifices in salary. Teachers grumbled about the low stipends, for many had large families which they could not support without maintaining a farm on the side; but theirs was the kind of necessary sacrifice which built the school. In spite of the continued financial problems of the Church throughout the 1920s, and the feeling of many General Authorities that the Church must close all church schools and settle for an expanded program of religious instruction, Harris accomplished a miracle akin to that of the loaves and the fishes: on a fixed budget he provided for an enrollment that doubled and a faculty that increased by a third.

Due to Harris' efforts in continually tightening enrollment standards and raising graduation requirements to meet national standards, in 1928, BYU, with about 1,400 students, was placed on the "approved list of colleges" of the most prestigious accrediting agency in the United States.

STEP SIX: GRADUATE WORK AND RESEARCH

During Franklin Harris' administration an even more important step in the history of BYU was the inauguration of a Graduate Division, accompanied by the encouragement of research. Harris believed that research made better teachers. Ironically, World War II, while chopping enrollment to 800 students and absconding temporarily with the faculty, gave a boost to the research program. Some firms donated substantial sums to the school for research. While this expansion of research was in process, Harris resigned to take the presidency of Utah State Agricultural College (now Utah State University) in Logan. He was succeeded by Howard S. McDonald, a graduate of the Logan school with a doctorate in educational

14 Franklin S. Harris to Adam S. Bennion, 12 November 1925, Harris Papers, BYU Archives.
administration. Before coming to BYU McDonald had served two years as Salt Lake City Superintendent of Schools where he had, as one Salt Lake teacher said, "led us out of slavery" by fighting for and obtaining greater tax support for schools.15

Arriving in Provo during the final months of World War II, McDonald found a dormant wartime campus dominated by women; but suddenly at war's end it bustled with veterans, some of whom lodged in garages or coal bins for lack of housing. McDonald had administrative problems—every step of every plan had to be channeled through a maze of committees that examined, discussed, modified, and then most likely set it aside for meditation. There even developed a feeling that the university should be phased out entirely, a movement which McDonald countered boldly by continuing Harris' efforts to enlarge the graduate program.

STEP SEVEN: EXPANSION

Graduate study, however, could not become a strong part of BYU's academics until the undergraduate program underwent some restructuring and strengthening. Such an accomplishment was no small endeavor, and the work fell to McDonald's successor, Ernest L. Wilkinson. What an administration his turned out to be! As President Oaks has stated, BYU "would probably still be struggling around the fringes of community college status had it not been for the remarkable and relentless leadership of the Wilkinson Era."

Ernest Wilkinson rose, by dint of hard work, out of "Hell's Half Acre" outside Ogden. His father's industry and his mother's ambition led their son through Weber Academy to BYU, where he edited the school paper and debated on its forensic team. Graduating from his school, Wilkinson studied law at George Washington University in Washington, D.C. Graduating summa cum laude, he finished his education with a Doctor of Jurisprudence degree at Harvard. His career in law took him finally to Washington, D.C., where his reputation as a creative and courageous lawyer solidified. Dr. Wilkinson's was the firm that represented the Ute Indians in a monumental suit over Indian lands, which concluded in a precedent setting $33 million settlement. His Indian clients referred to Wilkinson, who was sometimes exasperated by delays and red tape, as Chief Frantic Bear.

After he became President of BYU in 1951, Chief Frantic Bear took his whirlwind dynamism along with his lawyer's logic and

15Deseret Evening News, 5 September 1944.
thorough preparation to meetings of the Board of Trustees. Appreciating his honesty, respecting his research, recognizing that he heeded their advice, the board, led by President David O. McKay, listened to him. In 1953, the board strengthened Dr. Wilkinson’s authority by naming him chancellor of the entire Church School System.

Dr. Wilkinson created new departments and colleges at BYU, raised faculty salaries to competitive levels, launched a vigorous recruitment program for qualified LDS faculty, encouraged current faculty members to obtain graduate degrees at schools outside Utah, and built a healthy graduate school. The going was not easy. The mere fact of BYU’s staggering increase in enrollment slowed the thorough entrenchment of academic excellence. The rise from 5,200 students in 1950 to 11,600 in 1960, and again to more than 22,000 in 1970, drained the financial resources of the university. Merely to provide classroom and office space required enormous energy and ingenuity.

And there were the spiritual needs of students to be met as well. Even more than the building of the most beautiful campus in America, Dr. Wilkinson was pleased by the organization in the 1950s of student wards and branches. By 1970 there were ten student stakes and more than one hundred wards. Scholastic, social, and spiritual achievement made joint strides, and BYU was coming into its own as a university unique among universities.

CONCLUSION

You graduating today know the history of BYU since 1971. You have seen the end of the Wilkinson era and the beginning of the Oaks administration. Prophecy is not part of the historian’s prerogative, but you can observe as well as I the preparation of our young president; he brings with him a rudder adequate for the size of the ship, and his sails are full for the voyage. BYU will have storms to weather still, some of them the same storms previous presidents encountered.

As a healthy and improving institution, Brigham Young University will face the perennial problem of its identity. Should it be primarily a place of religious and social training, or an institution of intellectual development? Should it produce bright, questioning students who can be made into creative, responsible scholars, or would we prefer obedient students who are thoroughly inculcated with sound, orthodox doctrine? We find ourselves asking, “Why must it be one or the other? Why can’t we have both?” If we smugly contend that they are easily compatible, we’re almost as wrong as if we insist that one
excludes the other. How do we balance these divergent pulls in our personal and collective lives? And how do we resolve the tensions they produce?

That these tensions exist is a sign of health. The Lord has told us that our individual and group history will be a story of our choices. That is why David found himself petitioning the Lord for the very blessings we find ourselves in need of: personal courage to seek truth and the wisdom to apply that truth in righteousness. The Lord said to David:

Wisdom is the principal thing; therefore get wisdom: and with all thy getting get understanding. . . . I have taught thee in the way of wisdom; I have led thee in right paths. When thou goest, thy steps shall not be straitened; and when thou runnest, thou shalt not stumble. Take fast hold of instruction; let her not go: keep her, for she is thy life. (Proverbs 4:7-13; italics added)

David grew in understanding, and he cried to the Lord:

Order my steps in thy word: and let not any iniquity have dominion over me. . . . Make thy face to shine upon thy servant; and teach me thy statutes. . . . Give me understanding, and I shall live. (Psalms 119:133-35, 144)

May this be the prayer of all who here graduate. May the Lord make his light to shine upon you and give you peace is my prayer, in Jesus' name.
Under the Sunbonnets: Mormon Women with Faces

Maureen Ursenbach Beecher

There they all are, listed in an official history of the Church, at dinner in Joseph and Emma Smith’s Nauvoo mansion house: Brothers Wilson Law, Hyrum Smith, John Taylor, Orson Hyde, William Clayton, Shadrach Roundy, Willard Richards, Brigham Young, Heber C. Kimball, George A. Smith—the list is long, and reads like a muster roll of the Nauvoo Legion until the catch phrase at the end: “and ladies.”¹ And ladies. The postscripts of the official histories of the Church. We know they were there, the women. But except for prim Eliza R. Snow driving a team and wagon, or determined Mary Fielding Smith administering to her dying ox, would we recognize them? Whose are the faces under the big-brimmed sunbonnets?

Clarissa Decker Young, her mother Harriet Wheeler Young, and Ellen Sanders Kimball came into the Great Basin with Brigham Young’s first company. Who were they? What role did they play in the first rude settlement while George Brown, William Carter and Shadrach Roundy were damming City Creek and flooding the ground for the seed corn and potato cuttings? Other companies arrived, and with them children. We point with pride to the first school being held that first summer, but who is the young teacher who herded her charges into the sun-hot tent for their lessons?

The Mary Jane Dilworths of our history have been left as faceless as the sunbonnet ladies our grandmothers appliqued on their quilts and embroidered on their pillowslips. Profiled, their bonnet brims hiding the features which could have identified them, the sunbonneted figures were as easy to draw on the quilts as the “and ladies” to add in the history. The sunbonneted pioneer women we represent in our

¹Joseph Smith, History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, ed. B. H. Roberts, 7 vols. (Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1932-51), 5:248.
July 24 celebrations, the ones we parade on floats down Main Street, Salt Lake City, or Center Street, Provo, or State Street, Parowan, or Moab, or Snowflake, Arizona, are stereotypes, just as faceless as the quilt-top ladies. We recognize the bearded Brigham Young beside them; we know the long-haired Porter Rockwell perched behind; we may even identify military Daniel Wells riding horseback alongside. But can we name the women under the sunbonnets? It seems sadly significant that a recent Church publication, attempting to depict Susa Young Gates, used instead a photograph of Mary Alice Cannon Lambert, and no one caught the error until a descendant of that lady wrote to complain.

Turn back the brims on our women's sunbonnets. Face them into the sun. Let us see who they are, one by one, what they did, what they said, what contribution they made to us as a people, to us as individuals.

Take Mary Jane Dilworth, for example, that first schoolmarm in the Valley. Under her sunbonnet is a face just sixteen years old. Baptized in her Pennsylvania birthplace, she had moved with her parents to Nauvoo just in time to be driven onward for the long winter of 1846-47 in Winter Quarters. For some reason Mary Jane came on ahead of her parents; in the long trek across the plains she traveled in the family of William Brinthurst, arriving in the Valley before the first houses were built lining the walls of the Old Fort. Hence the tent-schoolroom. Adapting to the unusual became the usual to Mary Jane: married the next year to Francis Hammond, she left with him three years later, a baby in her arms, for a six-year mission to the Sandwich Islands where she labored alongside her proselytizing husband, teaching school to the natives who soon were calling her "Mother." Mother she was, not just with the honorary title, but in reality, to the child she brought from Utah and to the three children she bore in the Islands. Many Hawaiian native children, four paler-skinned American children, a raft of missionaries, they all knew the face under her sunbonnet.

It is easier for us to generalize about Mormon missionary wives waiting at home than to realize that often they accompanied their husbands. The Nauvoo experience of Louisa Barnes Pratt, for example, is one we most readily accept. Reading her account of her husband Addison's mission call to Tahiti, we feel for all such wives. She wrote:

When it was first announced to me that his mission was to the South Pacific ocean, and for an absence of three years, a weeping spirit came upon me which lasted for three days. I then became calm, and set about preparing his wardrobe for the event. He was often in a thoughtful serious mood.3

Louisa would be left in Nauvoo with their four children, and could not have anticipated the events which would follow her husband’s departure—it was 1843, and before he returned she would know the martyrdom of the Prophet; the cruel haggling of the gentiles; Winter Quarters; the “chills and fever” that plagued the driven Saints; the arduous trek to the Great Basin. She would next see her husband in Utah. But she had no inkling then of all that. The day arrived, inevitably. “The parting scene came,” Louisa wrote in her reminiscence.

The two eldest daughters wept very sorely. We walked with him to the steamboat landing: he carried the youngest child in his arms. . . . He would be absent three years. . . . It was unfortunate at the last as he stepped on to the steamboat the children saw him take his handkerchief from his eyes, they knew he was wiping away his tears, it was too much for them. They commenced weeping; the second daughter was inconsolable, the more we tried to soothe her, the more piteous were her complaints; she was sure her father would never return. . . .4

Of such material we have created our stereotype of the Mormon women, lumping all similar experiences into the same sort of bag, romanticising them into generalizations which eventually become little more than sentimentality. Robbed of her own individual character, the one becomes representative of the many, and the face under the sunbonnet becomes blurred. But read on. Read further in this woman’s reminiscence. Her troubled journey to Utah, maneuvered by dint of her own determination and business acumen; her reunion there with Addison; their plans for a permanent home; and then his second mission call. The stereotype would have her again await patiently his return, the while grubbing for her family. But she recounts how, half despite herself, she confessed to Mary Ann Young, wife to prophet Brigham, that, yes, she would like to follow Addison to

3”Journal of Louisa Barnes Pratt,” *Hearts Throbs of the West*, ed. Kate B. Carter, 12 vols. (Salt Lake City: Daughters of the Utah Pioneers, 1947), 8:189-400. The journal, written by Louisa Pratt herself in her fiftieth year, is based on her own diaries, no longer extant. The published version has been heavily edited, so the quoted segments here come from the original journal, in possession of S. George and Maria Smith Ellsworth, Logan, Utah, p. 108.

4Ibid.
Tahiti. The next conference, April 1850, shortly after her talk with Sister Young, Louisa listened to the mission appointments with both hope and fear: Thomas Tomkins was called to go to the Islands and take with him Addison Pratt's family. Louisa couldn't describe the effect the announcement had on her, but soon she and her children were on their way to Tahiti, where, rather than finding her Addison locked in the admiration of his convert friends, she got word that he was secured in prison on a nearby island. Undaunted, Louisa established her family in the village, planted her little New England dooryard and began teaching the children of the village "civilized" manners along with their English. The story—Addison's release and their eventual return—is a long and exciting one, and certainly not what we, with our generalized view of our pioneer ancestors, would expect.

We have long seen our pioneer foremothers selectively, focusing on only those aspects of their lives we immediately admired. We have made of them unwilling models of the virtues we ourselves would wish to possess, erasing, when we came across them, any traits we chose not to see. We have distorted the women into the molds after which we would wish our own character to be patterned. We have robbed them of their reality, made of them the blue-eyed, clear-complexioned, sweet smiling heroines of our plays, our musicals, and our parade floats. But look closer. Under the sunbonnets there are also the wrinkled faces, the pockmarked ones, the sad and the happy ones, freckled cheeks, defiant eyes, the stained teeth, the kind looks and the scowls. Let us look full face on these women, and discover, one by one, what gave to their lives the richness which flows from their veins into ours, which gives us our heritage.

Diversity is the thing. In what they did, as much as in how they looked, these women were distinctive. They chose—or found themselves locked into—lifestyles as different from each other's as they may seem from ours. We are already accustomed to the image of the frugal mother of early pioneer times, her brood around her, standing in the doorway of the log cabin to greet their father-husband coming home from the field or the mission, the meeting, or the hunt. Of a later generation, but of that familiar devoted spirit, is Abigail Rees Madsen. Her daughter Amy, number seven in this family that reached thirteen children, records how it was for them. Four of the little kids slept widthwise in the second bed in their parents' room. Rousing one

night, Amy heard her father and the oldest son doing something to the big bed. "Mama," she whispered. "Mama's in the other room. Go to sleep," returned the man's voice. Amy was too young to know about birthings, but felt the mixed sense of excitement and anxiety that filled the house the next morning when nurse Annie Tingey announced over the oatmeal that there was a new brother, and the children weren't to go near the front room whence Mama's bed had been moved.

Abbie Madsen's life was full of her thirteen children, children to be given life, to be taught, to be made happy in a world that provided little materially. Evenings around the kitchen table,

Mama would wash a pan of apples and then she'd quarter and core them for us to nibble on while we worked. She was our trusted encyclopedia of knowledge and sayer and explainer of long words—until her day-weariness would catch up with her. We would steal sly glances at her nodding head and drooping eyes as we asked questions. As her train of thought died down she'd give irrational answers that raised a great deal of childish laughter. She'd rouse herself to find out what was going on and then laugh with us and scold us onward.6

Such a sense of total responsibility for so many children left Abbie Madsen little room for her own thoughts. But, as her daughter recorded, there was one portion of her life which was her own:

I learned that Mama was a poet through the lock on the bathroom door. It was locked such a long time one summer afternoon. We wondered if another child was locked inside and had gone to sleep, so we counted the family. All of us were outside the bathroom. Everyone was accounted for but Mama. I timidly knocked . . . "Mama?" Silence. Grace said, "Go use Jensen's privy. Mama must be writing a poem." She was right. When Mama came out she carried a pencil and paper and she had a far-away thoughtful look in her eyes.7

Other women also bore thirteen children. Susa Young Gates, for example, daughter of Brigham Young, mother of singer Emma Lucy Gates Bowen, composer Cecil Gates, and Leah D. Widtsoe. But her life style has little in common with Abbie Madsen's. An early marriage, ending in divorce, left her with two children; a second marriage gave her the rest, but death took most of them in their childhood. Susa and Jacob Gates raised only five to maturity. Susa worked diverse interests into her life style. She attended Brigham Young Academy under

7Ibid., pp. 24-25.
tutelage of Professor Maeser; she served there as instructor in music; she learned and taught "phonography"— shorthand; she traveled to the Sandwich Islands for educational reasons and returned there after her marriage to Gates, as his companion missionary (two of her sons died there); returning, she founded and edited for eleven years the Young Woman's Journal which eventually evolved into the Improvement Era. In the two years, 1892-93, she was appointed to the Board of Trustees of Brigham Young Academy, published a book, recorded the official minutes of each of the forty-one dedicatory sessions of the Salt Lake Temple, and gave birth to two babies. The next year she organized the domestic science department at BYU, founded the Daughters of Utah Pioneers, published another book, and had another baby. She was thirty-eight years old. Susa Young Gates evolved a life style far removed from that of Abigail Rees Madsen.

Abbie Madsen and Susa Gates are not the extremes on a continuum; they are two stars in a random pattern of the whole firmament of women of the Mormon past. Each shines with her own brilliance, giving off her own particular quality of light, but both have a place in the configuration that is our historic past. It will take long study to discover all we need to know about these and the other many women of our past, individually and collectively. The study is not wholly new, but the bulk of the work is ahead of us. The real job, however, goes beyond merely the history of the women. The task facing our historians is to incorporate into their writing of the history of the Church the impact of women on that history. For the women were not in a vacuum, and their lives touched and were touched by the world at large as well as the church and community at home. To see their contribution honestly and fairly is a challenging task of reconstruction and revision. Let me here make one step along the way, touching some of the areas in which women were involved, and seeing who some of them were and how they affected and were affected by the events and circumstances of the Mormon environment.

Women, we know, were involved in education in early Utah. Girls were included with boys in the early schools—where there were schools. But the lives of individual women reveal wide diversity in the educational opportunities in pioneer Utah, diversity not always contingent on year or locale. Here's Rosilpha Stratton Gardner, born

---

in Cedar City in 1854, and raised in Virgin City. A descendant writes that

Her schooling was very limited. They had only one slate, speller and arithmetic, which was used by all the family. They would get soft rocks from the mountain and use for slate pencils. The first book she ever had was made by the teacher and was a shingle with ABCs on one side, and figures on the other. This had to be carefully preserved to be handed down to the next member of the family. To them writing paper was unknown.9

Even at that, Rosilpha was not as deprived as some. Matilda Peterson, in the northern part of the territory, had less opportunity; as a working girl in Ogden, away from her Huntsville home, she made her educational discovery:

After I had been there a few weeks, I received a letter from my brother Waldemer, asking me to write home. I will never forget that first letter I tried to write. My brother . . . knew I had never had a pencil in my hand but I was game. I got a book with letters in and a lead pencil and paper, and started to write. It didn’t look so bad while I was writing, but when I got finished I couldn’t read one word. I rolled it in a little ball and started to cry and was going to put it in the stove. I changed my mind, instead I . . . smoothed it out, and sent it. I thought he would never ask me to write again. Just as quick as my brother could answer, a letter came back. He said he could read every word. . . . He begged me to write again. I wrote again and kept on writing until it looked pretty fair.10

These accounts contrast with the story as we prefer to tell it, of a people hard pressed for life’s staples, sacrificing to build well-equipped schools and hire the best teachers. But that aspect, too, is true. Lucinda Lee, growing up in the San Bernardino colony the Church had established in Southern California, found educational opportunities at home and at school: "My father," she writes, "determined that his children should not be ignorant as well as poor. At the close of his day’s work he patiently taught us, while yet too young to attend the common schools."11 And when Lucinda attended formal school, her mother sacrificed her help at home—Lucinda was the oldest daughter, the one who would normally be expected to carry the bulk of the work load—

10Matilda Peterson, "Reminiscence," microfilm of typescript, p. 4, Church Archives, Historical Department, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City, Utah.
and "kept the older ones in school so resolutely, that I only remember losing half a day in several years." By age twelve, Lucinda was being trained as a teacher, and from then on, she writes, "I was a pupil no more." Not that her studies diminished: as a teacher she wrote, "I found myself under the necessity of applying myself to my books or acknowledging myself vanquished by some industrious boy or girl." But Lucinda found stumbling blocks placed in her way: when she applied to a gentleman teacher for permission to learn algebra he replied that "it would be wasted time for me to ever study it, because I already had more learning than was necessary for a good housekeeper, wife, and mother which was a woman's only proper place on earth." To his credit, the gentleman later commended Lucinda for her accomplishments as scholar and teacher.

Annie Clark, growing up in Farmington, had even further chances at education:

It was arranged that my brother, Charles, and I should go to the Brigham Young Academy to study the subject of religion. Other subjects were studied, too, but shining through them all was "the glorious light of the Gospel," which subject was taught by Brother Maeser. I had but one regret, that being a girl, I could not go on a mission, as girls now do [she was writing in 1939], to preach these wonderful truths he had impressed upon us.13

And further still, as the years passed, were the educational opportunities afforded Alice Louise Reynolds. Karl G. Maeser had retired from Brigham Young Academy and its new president, Benjamin Cluff, suggested to Alice Louise—when, at the age of nineteen, she was teaching school in Nephi—that she go east to the University of Michigan and prepare herself to teach in a department of literature which she would establish at the Provo university.14 This was 1892, and Brother Maeser's feeling that women should not teach at the higher levels anything but the domestic arts was being superseded by policies more cognizant of women's abilities.

It must be realized that the educational picture for women in the Church, the whole scene of advancement opportunities for them, changed as the world picture changed. More significantly, in Zion women's opportunities changed as the needs of the growing economy changed. In the first two decades, up to the mid-1860s, the most basic

12Ibid., p. 4.
necessity governed everyone. There was little time for involvement in the inklings of "the movement" which were seeping into Zion from Seneca Falls and the eastern women's organizations. For Mormon women, as for Mormon men, there was a kingdom being built, and so long as everything got done, no one cared who did it. No one was concerned about who held the plough, who directed the irrigation water, who carried the adobes, who took charge of the children. Men and women were in this thing together, and in the particularly Mormon blend of pragmatism and tradition, sex roles merged and everything got done. A look through conference talks of those first decades shows Church leaders, Brigham Young especially, repeating one basic message to the sisters: obey your husbands and work in harmony with them (and their other wives) for the building of the kingdom.

But in the mid-1860s circumstances changed. A new theme emerged in the official statements, soon to be reflected in the occupations of the women. Brigham Young realized that, now the ship of Zion was firmly launched, she needed all hands on deck for the voyage into a safe and more sophisticated economic harbor. Modern technology, necessary to the burgeoning economy, required specialized skills, and, realized Brigham Young, women could learn these skills as well as men. Women would still have tasks suited to their "finer natures," but the variety permitted would widen their sphere far beyond their homes and fields. One of the first of those opportunities came with the telegraph in 1866. Telegraphers skilled in the Morse code were needed for the new lines which were then spanning Utah. Many students of the code, called on "missions" to learn the trade, were women—girls, more accurately.

Three of those were childhood friends from Nephi. Just fifteen years old when their calls came, they learned the code together during the summer of 1867, and were immediately placed in charge of offices in Nephi, Mona, and Fountain Green, all Central Utah towns. Before they were parted, with girlish romanticism, they chose coquettish code names for each other, names that were to stay with them long years later: Mary Ellen Love, pleasant but rather plain, became "Estelle"; Elizabeth Parks was "Belle"; and English-born Elizabeth Claridge, "Lizette." Over the wires, during off hours, flew notes from one to another of the three, closing the distances that their assignments had put between them. The girls matured. Mary Ellen (Estelle) married and moved north to Dry Creek, present-day Lehi, at the same time that gold was being mined up nearby Little Cottonwood Canyon. There her
skill at telegraphy was again useful to the growing economy, and an office of the Deseret Telegraph was established in her home. Several months passed, and then the wires carried her call for help: the impending birth of her first child would take her from her post. Elizabeth Claridge (Lizette) traveled the several days from Nephi to fill in during the confinement. The birthing was worse than expected, and even with Lizette there, the office finally closed down to spare the mother the torment of having to listen to the incessant clicking of the key. There were, after all, considerations which transcended hard-nosed business.\textsuperscript{15}

The baby was safely delivered, and Estelle soon returned to her transmitter, transcribing in elusive dots and dashes over the noises of the baby on her lap. Lizette went on to the telegraph office in St. George, where she took up again an interrupted courtship with a young man, a discontented farmer-turned-railroader. At that time her telegrapher's wages made her richer than he, but after their marriage the tables turned—he was Alfred McCune, later a multimillionaire who eventually built for his wife the splendid McCune mansion which still stands on upper Main Street in Salt Lake City.

The opportunities for women kept widening. By 1869 President Young was taunting the "big, fat, lubberly fellows" whom he found clerking in stores, handing out calicoes and measuring ribbons. "I would rather see the ladies do it," he said, and added that some women were already just as good accountants as men, and that men might better go to raising sheep, wheat, or cattle.\textsuperscript{16} He boasted that the University of Deseret was offering classes in business skills to females as well as to males, preparing the girls to be "book keepers, accountants, clerks, cashiers, tellers, payers, telegraphic operators, reporters, and fill other branches of employment suited to their sex."\textsuperscript{17} Within a few years of this time women were establishing and running their own stores and cooperatives, and when President Young offered the Salt Lake ladies some male assistance in setting up their Women's Commission Store, an enterprise which grew to some proportions, the ladies politely ignored his generosity. A most terse letter in the Church Archives reveals Eliza R. Snow's impatience with one of President

\textsuperscript{15}Communication of Early Utah (Salt Lake City: Daughters of the Utah Pioneers, 1936), pp. 11, 12; Susa Amelia Young Gates, Memorial to Elizabeth Claridge McCune: Missionary, Philanthropist, Architect (Salt Lake City: Privately published, 1924), pp. 24-25 and passim.


\textsuperscript{17}Brigham Young, General Epistle, January-February 1868, p. 25, Brigham Young Circular Letters, Church Archives.
Young's underlings in his dealings with the women's store. The man had the temerity to dispute the percentage agreed upon between Sister Snow and President Young as commission on goods from his woolen mills. Apologizing to the President (her husband) for disturbing him with the matter while he was sick abed, Eliza clarified the situation in formal business terms, and then concluded that "Although we are novices in the mercantile business, we are not green enough for that kind of management." ¹⁸ And, wifelike, signed the letter, "With love, Eliza R. Snow."

The decade of the 1870s saw the beginning of professional opportunity for women in Utah. Suffrage had introduced them into the public concerns, and when in 1872 Georgie Snow was admitted to the bar as the first qualified Utah woman lawyer she was welcomed by her male colleagues.¹⁹ Her training had consisted of "reading law" in her father's law office for three years, and her bar examination was a fifteen-minute impromptu interrogation conducted by an ad hoc committee while Judge McKean and the court waited to pronounce her admission. The whole examination would have been foregone, in fact, were it not for the court's fear that if she were admitted unexamined, a precedent would be set for the young men who followed to expect that same privilege.

Women in professional medicine followed the women lawyers during that same decade. Midwives, called and set apart by Church leaders had long been the chief medical practitioners, but finally President Young brought into consideration his awareness of the midwives' inadequacies, his distrust of the gentile male doctors practicing then, and his sense of propriety which demanded that women be attended by women doctors, with the result that he called for women to study medicine in eastern universities and then return to Zion to practice and instruct there. The experiences of Romania B. Pratt Penrose, the first Utah woman to earn her MD, and Ellis Shipp, who followed her, have a blend of the comic and the pathetic. Home after her first year in a New York medical college, Romania Pratt found herself with no money to return.²⁰ Brigham Young looks to Eliza R. Snow: raise some money for her, he suggests. And the Relief Society comes through, enabling Romania to leave again her five

¹⁸ Eliza R. Snow to Brigham Young, 10 February 1877, holograph, Brigham Young Papers, Church Archives.
¹⁹ "Ladies Admitted to the Utah Bar," Deseret News Weekly, 25 September 1872. Phoebe W. Couzins, a practicing lawyer from St. Louis, was admitted at the same time.
children and complete her work in general practice as well as a specialization in eye and ear. Ellis Shipp, with whom Romania shared for a short time her room at Philadelphia Woman’s Medical College, had the same sort of difficulty returning for her second year. Imagine either of these ladies (Ellis especially, since she returned to school pregnant), facing their dissection lab. One student described how it must have seemed to ladies of Victorian sensibilities:

The sight of eight stark, staring bodies, every age and color, stretched upon as many tables, was not reassuring to say the least. A stifled scream might have been heard, and there were some pale faces, and clinging to each other for support, [and] highly perfumed handkerchiefs held assiduously to the noses of the more sensitive.

Returning to Salt Lake City, both doctors not only established practices, but conducted classes in nursing and obstetrics for their sisters. One such, Sarah Indaetta Young Vance, reports her experiences in taking a course in midwifery. She and her husband were moving from cold Colorado back to their warmer holdings in Arizona, and stopped briefly to attend conference in Salt Lake City. Sarah was torn “to stay and fulfill that dearest of my childhood ambitions when I desired above all else to be a doctor like my father when I grew up.” She enrolled in a class under Dr. Shipp. Her husband took the older boys back to Arizona, but left with Sarah her two younger sons, ages six and four, and a baby.

I rented a room [Sarah writes] across the hall from the doctor under whom I studied. You can just imagine what a time I had with those three lively country boys in the city. I would lock them into the room while I attended my classes. No sooner was I gone than out through the window would go Leslie and Bert leaving the baby alone. . . . Of course they got themselves into all kinds of little troubles.

She tells of Leslie’s snapping a newsboy’s job, of Bert’s picking up chewing gum off the street, of their being beat up by the big boys, but none of it seemed serious enough to interfere with their mother’s studies. “They never did anything bad,” she concludes. “They were just mischievous boys.” Six months and a diploma later, Sarah returned to

---

21Ellis Shipp Musser, ed., The Early Autobiography and Diary of Ellis Reynolds Shipp, MD (Salt Lake City: Privately published, 1962), p. 239 and passim.
22Waters, “Romania Pratt Penrose,” p. 6, cites “Cactus” in Young Woman’s Journal 2 (October 1890):44.
Arizona, set apart and blessed by Apostle Abraham Cannon to fulfill her callings as midwife and mother to her own twelve children.

Whether we call it child neglect, or view it as accommodation, this experience of Sarah Vance does suggest what may have been true in other cases: that husbands and family were often required to be supportive of mothers in their desire to work for the common good, as wives were of husbands in their calls to fill assignments for the Church and community. The evidence of cooperation continued into this century, when Jane Manning Skolfied entered medical training in Denver, where she and her family were living. Her latest child was still tiny, so her twelve-year-old daughter missed a year of school in order to see to things at home, and as long as the baby was still nursing, took it on streetcar or bicycle to the college so "Dr. Jane" could give its noon-time meal. The studies which will measure in the historical context the effects on the society of these choices and the sacrifices they demanded have not been made, but reading the biographies of some of the women themselves suggests that the return far surpassed the cost.

When woman's rights debates raged during the last century, Eliza R. Snow, speaking for the women and the Church, proclaimed loudly that nowhere in the world had women more rights than here in Zion. She may have been right. The demands of kingdom building, the needs of an isolated people, the social and family circumstances, polygamy among them, were conducive to encouraging the Mormon women of the last century in expanding their abilities and extending their influence. Progress, personal and collective, hinged on their taking hold of the opportunities which their circumstances placed before them. And from their leaders they had encouragement.

For it was in 1879 that Eliza Snow, then general president of the Relief Society, told a meeting of women in Sevier County to take off their sunbonnets. Her reference is specific more than metaphoric: she wanted the women to leave off the rough garb of the pioneer life in favor of the finer appearance which their skill could produce. The minute-taker in the ward Relief Society quotes Sister Snow as saying that "she had a great objection to sun bonnets," and that "she would be glad when she visited us again to see the sun bonnet changed to home made hats." Prosaic though the injunction be, there is a metaphor there for us: women could not progress without change, and changing

26 Glenwood Ward, Sevier Stake, Ward Relief Society Minutes 1873-1888, 26 May 1879, Church Archives.
sunbonnets for hats, homemade though they be, represented progress. Home industry was a challenge for those women, but it was not their only challenge. There would be for them other things to accomplish, and the later emancipation from silk raising, grain storage, and homemade hats would mean emancipation into whatever other challenges the new society would offer. The new generation, woman by woman, family by family, would have to face those challenges.

There they are, then, some of the women of Mormonism's past. Diverse, disparate, often having in common no more than their connection, weak or strong, with the restored gospel. There's Emma Batchelor Lee running the ferry across the Colorado, giving birth to her sixth child with no one but her own young son to help. 27 Or Ellen Woodward Fuller, "Aunt Ellen" to both the Pine, Arizona, Mormons and the nearby Indians, at eighty-one years still running her general store and mail order house. 28 And Mary Morgan Rees, distressed over her husband's call to take another wife, walking from Brigham City to Salt Lake to confer with the President on the matter, and in such a rush that she declines that offer of a ride in a neighbor's wagon with a curt, "No, thanks. I'm in a hurry!" 29 And Martha Cragun Cox, having missed the regular examination because of the death of her baby, pleading for certification as a schoolteacher in Nevada because the poverty-stricken Saints on the Muddy need her services. 30 Our archives are bulging with their stories, their observations, their lives. We can learn to know them. We can look at them, and discover who we are.

29Amelia Madsen Beecher, "Reminiscence," p. 3.
30Martha Cragun Cox, "Reminiscence," holograph, pp. 144-46, Church Archives.
A BYU for Zion

Chauncey C. Riddle

President Tanner, brothers and sisters, friends of Brigham Young University: I wish first to extend special congratulations to all who graduate this day. I hope that you are educated in addition to being graduated. By educated I mean having the ability to think clearly, to make proper discriminations and judgments, to understand what you believe and remember. Education begins with memorization; but if that is also the end, true education has not been attained.

The story is told of the great physicist Michael Pupin that he once was engaged in lecturing about the country. His chauffeur would drive him to a location and listen to the lecture. At the last stand, he said to Pupin, "Dr. Pupin, I have heard your lecture at least fifteen times, and I believe I could give it myself. No one here is likely to know you personally, so why don't you be the chauffeur and I'll give the lecture?"

Being a bit of an adventurer himself, Pupin went along with the idea. The chauffeur turned out to be a good showman. He delivered the lecture word perfect, and with a flair. At the conclusion he said, "We have just enough time left for one question. Is there one?"

After a moment, a man arose and asked a rather pointed question about the lecture. The pretender was a showman yet. He thanked the questioner, then said, "The question is sufficiently elementary that I will call upon my chauffeur to answer it for you." I guess the moral of the story is that if you are not educated, be sure you have a chauffeur who is.

Something very special about you who are graduating today is that you are centennial graduates, products of the one-hundredth year of this institution. The Centennial celebration is a great time to look back, to gain appreciation of the sacrifice, sweat, and tears which have enabled BYU to come to its hundredth year. It is also a time to look forward. With good reason, we can expect that the second century will be greater than the first.
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The reason for the difference is the progress of the Church, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. The stone which was cut out of the mountain without hands is rolling forth to fill the whole earth. What a thrill it is to see the Church moving in majesty and power, yet with grace, as it fulfills the prophecies! The Church is preparing the world for the Second Coming of our Lord and Savior.

As I understand the scriptures, two great works crown that preparation. The first is missionary work. The gospel must go forth to every nation, kindred, tongue, and people with joyful greeting to invite every soul to the supper of the Lamb. I hope that each of us is supporting President Kimball in our prayers, asking that the doors of the nations will be opened and that we shall be ready when they do open. I hope that each of us is doing all he can to field that hundred thousand missionaries. Then we can lift our sights to the one hundred forty and four thousand high priests who will sweep the earth with righteousness, as with a flood.

Glorious and great as the missionary work is, there is another preparation for the Savior which is equally necessary. It is the establishment of Zion again on the earth, on this continent. How fortunate you and I are to be living in the days of its establishment! Many righteous men, prophets of old, longed to see Zion. Though they personally were worthy of being part of Zion, their contemporaries would not be persuaded to it. Our friend, the prophet Isaiah, saw it clearly in vision and rejoiced:

Awake, awake, put on thy strength, O Zion; put on thy beautiful garments, O Jerusalem, the holy city: for henceforth there shall no more come into thee the uncircumcised and the unclean.

Shake thyself from the dust; arise, and sit down, O Jerusalem; loose thyself from the bands of thy neck, O captive daughter of Zion.

How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace, that bringeth good tidings of good, that publisheth salvation; that saith unto Zion, Thy God reigneth!

Thy watchmen shall lift up the voice; with the voice together shall they sing: for they shall see eye to eye, when the Lord shall bring again Zion.

Break forth into joy, sing together, ye waste places of Jerusalem: for the Lord hath comforted his people, he hath redeemed Jerusalem. (Isaiah 52:1-2, 7-9)

For Zion is a people who are pure in heart. They have not only entered in at the strait gate but have pursued the narrow way to its end. Through their faith in Christ, they overcome all things, beginning with each individual self. The Lord crowns their faithful obedience to
him by purifying them. They then have one heart and one mind. They
dwell in righteousness, and there is no poor person among them.
Because they have made his path strait, the Lord himself comes to
dwell with them. "Blessed are all the pure in heart, for they shall see
God" (3 Nephi 12:8).

Zion is the pavilion of the Lord. It is his dwelling place. But he
cannot come to it in the days of wrath and disobedience, except to burn.
In his mercy he waits until the stakes are strong and the pavilion is
fully erected and ready, worthy of its king. The great opportunity you
and I have is to support the authorities of the Church, to carry out the
programs, to magnify our callings so that the work of the holy
priesthood will be complete. Then the earth will not be utterly wasted
at his coming.

As I hope you can see, I rejoice with Isaiah and with you at the
prospect of Zion's again being established upon the earth. But that is
background. My message today is really about Brigham Young
University. The question I ponder is, What kind of an institution must
BYU be to be fully acceptable to the Lord as part of Zion? Now I do not
suppose that Zion needs BYU; it could be established without this
institution. But BYU is part of the Church Education System. If it does
not grow and increase in glory as the Church will, that would be a
calamity. But a great and glorious BYU could well be a great
contributor to the beauty of Zion.

What would this university need to be, to be part of Zion? I do not
pretend to see the whole picture, but I believe I see some of it. May I
share with you six factors which I personally believe would help qualify
this university to be part of Zion. Each of them is noteworthy in at least
two respects. Each factor is a reflection of what I understand every
individual must do personally to qualify to be part of Zion, and each
would make this institution quite unlike the model universities which
the world today esteems. I present these six points not that you should
believe me, but that you might compare them with your own image of
the BYU of the future.

NUMBER ONE: DEPENDENCE UPON THE SAVIOR

I understand the law of the celestial kingdom to be faith in the Lord
Jesus Christ. Without faith it is impossible to please God, for
whatsoever is not of faith is sin. Truly this is a counsel of perfection.
We are commanded to become perfect, even as Christ is. He is
perfectly obedient to his Father, and through his grace we may become
perfectly obedient to him, if we so desire. I understand that the real
importance of the fact that we have free agency is that we are free to become like our Lord and Master, with the full weight of his omnipotence and omniscience as the guarantee of that freedom. If we choose to be fully obedient to him, he will make it possible.

Faith in Christ is to hear the word of Christ, to believe, and to obey that word. Nephi of old counseled his people who had accepted the gospel as follows:

For the gate by which ye should enter is repentance and baptism by water; and then cometh a remission of your sins by fire and by the Holy Ghost.

And then are ye in this straight and narrow path which leads to eternal life; yea, ye have entered in by the gate. . . . And now, my beloved brethren, after ye have gotten into this straight and narrow path, I would ask if all is done? Behold, I say unto you, Nay; for ye have not come thus far save it were by the word of Christ with unshaken faith in him, relying wholly upon the merits of him who is mighty to save.

Wherefore, ye must press forward with a steadfastness in Christ, having a perfect brightness of hope, and a love of God and of all men. Wherefore; if ye shall press forward, feasting upon the word of Christ, and endure to the end, behold, thus saith the Father: Ye shall have eternal life. (2 Nephi 31: 17-20)

Moroni tells us in similar language how home teaching was done in those ancient days:

And none were received unto baptism save they took upon them the name of Christ, having a determination to serve him to the end.

And after they had been received unto baptism, and were wrought upon and cleansed by the power of the Holy Ghost, they were numbered among the people of the church of Christ; and their names were taken, that they might be remembered and nourished by the good word of God, to keep them in the right way, to keep them continually watchful unto prayer, relying alone upon the merits of Christ, who was the author and the finisher of their faith. (Moroni 6:3-4)

In our own time the Savior has said it thusly:

And I now give unto you a commandment to beware concerning yourselves, to give diligent heed to the words of eternal life.

For you shall live by every word that proceedeth forth from the mouth of God.

For the word of the Lord is truth, and whatsoever is truth is light, and whatsoever is light is Spirit, even the Spirit of Jesus Christ.
And the Spirit giveth light to every man that cometh into the world; and the Spirit enlighteneth every man through the world, that hearkeneth to the voice of the Spirit. And every one that hearkeneth to the voice of the Spirit cometh unto God, even the Father. (D&C 84:43-47)

As applied to Zion in the latter days, the Savior makes the same point in the following words:

That through my providence, notwithstanding the tribulation which shall descend upon you, that the church may stand independent above all other creatures beneath the celestial world. (D&C 78:14)

Faith in Christ enables us to become independent of the world because we labor solely under him and depend upon his merits. As applied to BYU, this dependence would mean that the word of the Lord would be the most treasured possession we would have. Faith would find guidelines, and errors would be detected by revelations. The words of the living prophets would be esteemed above the words of any other living men.

NUMBER TWO: MORALITY, THE KEY TO KNOWLEDGE

Morality is another term for faithfulness. To be moral in the restored gospel is to obey the Savior in all things. Why obey him in all things? Because he is a God of righteousness. He does not command whim, but only that which is righteous according to a standard that is above him. I understand that righteousness is to bless others. Only in Christ do men know how to bless others, and only from him can they receive the power to bless others sufficiently to meet the needs of mankind, for the Savior is the sole fountain of righteousness. Those who hunger and thirst after righteousness are his sheep. They hearken to his voice and come unto him that he might fill them with the Holy Ghost.

Those who obey his commandments are thus moral. Being moral, they can then be trusted with great knowledge, for they will not abuse it. They will use it only to further the cause of righteousness in the earth. The Savior makes this promise:

For thus saith the Lord—I, the Lord, am merciful and gracious unto those who fear me, and delight to honor those who serve me in righteousness and in truth unto the end.

Great shall be their reward and eternal shall be their glory.
And to them will I reveal all mysteries, yea, all the hidden mysteries of my kingdom from days of old, and for ages to come,
will I make known unto them the good pleasure of my will concerning all things pertaining to my kingdom.

Yea, even the wonders of eternity shall they know, and things to come will I show them, even the things of many generations. And their wisdom shall be great, and their understanding reach to heaven; and before them the wisdom of the wise shall perish, and the understanding of the prudent shall come to naught.

For by my Spirit will I enlighten them, and by my power will I make known unto them the secrets of my will—yea, even those things which eye has not seen, nor ear heard, nor yet entered into the heart of man. (D&C 76:5-10)

Does this mean that faculty and students at BYU will cease to read books and journals? Will all scientific investigation cease? Will all creation become a waiting for God to reveal? Not at all. All efforts to learn will increase, but they will then all be fruitful. For reading shall be done with discernment, and the reading of error will often be an occasion for a revelation of truth. Experiments will be conceived in revelation to capture insights of truth which will flash into well-disciplined, cultivated, and informed minds. Artistic creation will spring forth from the bosom that hungers to edify and will find physical embodiment through persons skillful in all useful endeavors. The glory of man will not then be the pretense to create or discover. The glory will be given to the Father of lights as men humbly seek to embody his will in material things of this earth, even as it is done in heaven. Morality will be the key to knowledge, to creation, to every success.

The world would say that this process should be reversed. It is said by them that it is knowledge which leads to morality. There is a strong and irrational tradition in the world that the learned man is more likely to be moral than the unlearned. It is true that we must first know the will of the Lord before we can be faithful to him. But the world says that worldly knowledge is that which creates faith. I call holding that idea irrational because it does not stand up when put to the test of experience. The Savior has shown how he feels about the idea by choosing fishermen and farm boys to be his prophets. Not that the learning of the world is bad of itself. It is just that as it is usually acquired, it tends to block faith in Christ, which is morality. Jacob carefully noted that in that familiar passage which rankles those who would like to make worldly knowledge the basis for being a good person. He says:

And whoso knocketh, to him will he open; and the wise, and the learned, and they that are rich, who are puffed up because of
their learning, and their wisdom, and their riches—yea, they are they whom he despiseth; and save they shall cast these things away, and consider themselves fools before God, and come down in the depths of humility, he will not open unto them.

But the things of the wise and the prudent shall be hid from them forever—yea, that happiness which is prepared for the saints.
(2 Nephi 9:42-43)

I surmise that when all who are part of BYU become strong in obeying as well as in receiving the word of Christ, knowledge of all things in heaven and earth will flow unto them freely. Then indeed BYU will be the most proficient educational institution on the earth.

May I comment on what many persons see as an annoying provinciality of BYU: the dress and grooming standard. I see that standard as an invitation on the part of the living prophets to the children of light to please the Savior, that he might shower light and truth upon their heads. But if we do not search out the source—if we "hem and haw" over skirt and hair lengths—how can we be taught and trusted with the riches of eternity? Those who have the wit to make compliance with the standards-of-grooming part of faith in Christ, and who add to that small beginning of morality honesty, diligence, chastity, responsibility—they are they who reap wisdom and great treasures of knowledge, even hidden treasures.

NUMBER THREE: CONCERN FOR THE POOR

The crown of morality is charity, the pure love of Christ. Those who love Christ reflect his love to others who are less fortunate than they. Whereas people of the world concern themselves with those who have more wealth, talent, prestige, or athletic ability, true servants of Christ care about those who have less. When the covenant servants of the Lord do not care for the poor, the Lord punishes and chastises them as when he allowed the members of the Church to be driven out of Jackson County, Missouri, in 1833. One of the glories of Zion is that therein love has triumphed over natural differences. All who are Zion become equal in earthly things and then become one in the Savior because of their love for him.

We are told in the Doctrine and Covenants:

I, the Lord, stretched out the heavens, and built the earth, my very handiwork; and all things therein are mine.
And it is my purpose to provide for my saints, for all things are mine.
But it must needs be done in mine own way; and behold this is the way that I, the Lord, have decreed to provide for my saints, that the poor shall be exalted, in that the rich are made low.
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For the earth is full, and there is enough and to spare; yea, I prepared all things, and have given unto the children of men to be agents unto themselves.

Therefore, if any man shall take of the abundance which I have made, and impart not his portion, according to the law of my gospel, unto the poor and the needy, he shall, with the wicked, lift up his eyes in hell, being in torment. (D&C 104:14-18)

Hell is one of the names which can appropriately be applied to this natural world. It is a kingdom ruled over and tormented by Satan, where lies, immorality, and unfaithfulness abound. But this world can be improved upon if we will employ the Lord’s way. If we love, if we obey the Lord, and if we share, we need not lift our eyes in hell, either now or after death; a celestial kingdom can be established right in the midst of hell, a kingdom called Zion.

How will BYU care for the poor? Its primary mission is not to the physically or the spiritually or the emotionally poor. Its direct mission is to those who are poor in knowledge and ability. To make them rich answers the ends of its creation. To be clear about how this might be done, let us analyze the nature of a true helping relationship, which charity, or caring, must be.

Real help must have its source in superiority. This is not necessarily total superiority, but the one who helps must have more knowledge, more skill, more power, or more resource—more of something than the one helped. For the lesser to help the greater is not help but servitude. Then, the person who has the superiority must place himself in a position of inferiority; he must become the servant of the one being helped. This means that neither the agency nor the integrity of the person being helped is breached. With the graciousness of true nobility, the helper extends succor which is freely and gratefully received. Help given against the will of the receiver is not real help; it is domination. The test of true help is this: does it leave the person helped better able to meet his problems, other things being equal?

For BYU to help those who are poor in knowledge and ability, the faculty here must have a towering superiority in those things, which it can and will have through dependence upon the Savior and hardworking, diligent obedience to him. Then those who teach must become the servants of those whom they would instruct. They must not teach by domination, but rather in the pattern set by the Savior for righteous dominion:

No power or influence can or ought to be maintained by virtue of the priesthood, only by persuasion, by long-suffering, by gentleness and meekness, and by love unfeigned;
By kindness, and pure knowledge, which shall greatly enlarge the soul without hypocrisy, and without guile. (D&C 121:41-42)

Not all the prerogatives of priesthood authority are appropriate to teaching, but the ones here mentioned certainly are.

Will a teacher who seeks to be a servant of both Christ and his students disdain to prepare? Will he be unconcerned about the personal problems of his students which keep them from learning? Will he cover up when an error or a lacuna in his material is pointed out? Will he grade on the curve as if his students were so many random manikins? Will he resist instruction from his superiors as to how he might better serve? No, he will rejoice in the opportunity he has to make his friends, his students, rich like unto himself in knowledge and ability.

What of students in this system? Will they not feel the gift of love and light and seek to absorb all the knowledge and attain all the ability they can? Will they not seek learning outside class requirements as well as in? Will they not share with fellow students, helping those who are poorer than themselves in ability to learn in order that their classmates might take full advantage of the instruction given? Yes, they will do all these good things and more, for they, too, love the Master.

NUMBER FOUR: EMPHASIS ON DOING

One of the lamentable debilities the world has suffered from for millenia is the supposition that knowing is more important than doing, understanding than performance. Knowing is taken to be an end in itself.

This mistake is reflected theologically in the notion of the world that the end of all is to behold the face of God, the "beatific vision." I understand that the reason for that goal, grand as it is, is for a further end. To be the kind of person who could have that blessing, then to have it would make a man a great blessing to his fellow beings. This is to say that such a one would then turn to the poor to lift them up, be they poor in any of the ways one can be poor. This difference between knowing and doing is also reflected in the change, which I understand was requested by President Kimball, in the song I Am a Child of God. Instead of singing, "Teach me all that I must know," we sing, "Teach me all that I must do to live with him some day." For surely it is not knowing what to do, but doing what we know we should do which enables us to be saved.
Part of the problem is that the tendency of a natural man in this world is to shun work. Much of history has been a game to see who could enslave whom. More people have lived as slaves in this world than have lived free, and there are more slaves today than there ever have been before. In such a setting, occupations that do not dirty the hands or cause the brow to sweat have been sought and esteemed. The Chaldeans, astrologers, and soothsayers have always been court attendants, next to the king or the president himself. In religion, orthodoxy has often been deemed more important than repentance. In a world where true knowledge and true wisdom are usually in short supply, those professing knowledge and wisdom are accorded the high honors.

But, thanks be to God, knowledge and wisdom are not in short supply in the kingdom of Christ; there is no such problem. Often the problem is that some of us know more than we wish to know. But that brings us to our problem, which is to be doers of the word. The Savior furnishes his kingdom with prophets, seers, revealers, scriptures, presidents, home teachers, fathers, mothers—and enables all of us to be accompanied by the Holy Ghost. Faith does not exist in the mere hearing of the word; it lives only in the doing. The Savior reminds us of this as follows:

But behold, verily I say unto you that there are many who have been ordained among you, whom I have called but few of them are chosen.

They who are not chosen have sinned a very grievous sin, in that they are walking in darkness at noonday. (D&C 95:5-6)

How would BYU differ from the world if it emphasized doing rather than knowing? Could not writing and speaking be more emphasized relative to reading? Internships and laboratory work would be more important than classroom lectures. Grading would be based more on performance than on memory. The whole of the educational practice would veer towards the application of knowledge. Graduation would be based on skill rather than on grade-point and seat-time. One of the reasons we enjoy sports so much is that we can tell who the doers are. What would it do to the university if at least once a week every professor had to compare his students with those of other universities? Many who decry competition do so out of fear; they know that they cannot compete in the real world. Only when tenured in an ivory tower before helpless students dare they puff up like men. But an emphasis on doing tends to change all that. And the doers turn out to be the real knowers.
What will people at BYU be doing? They will be reaching out to solve the problems of the world's intellectual poverty. Our educational transmission systems are woefully inadequate; they must be rather completely redesigned. Our teaching of scientific research puts on blinders as well as helping. Our society downgrades technical skills, for which folly we are paying dearly. Millions over the earth who now have little hope for education could receive basic instruction at low cost. Spiritually guided pure research could provide the basis for eliminating our energy crisis. The list extends to every intellectual and educational problem in the world. It is like genealogy. There is no danger of any one person's doing all the work.

NUMBER FIVE: CAREFUL DISTINCTION BETWEEN BEING INTELLIGENT AND BEING INTELLECTUAL

As we do the works of righteousness, the Lord can bless us more abundantly. He can shower upon our heads that intelligence which will enable us to become a great blessing to our fellow beings. But we must not be confused as to what this intelligence is, and we must distinguish it from its companion—intellectuality.

Intelligence is light and truth. Truth is knowledge of things as they are, as they were, and as they are to come. A study of human ability to know shows us that human beings as natural men—that is to say without divine revelation—are somewhat equipped to know physical things around them as they are; they are poorly equipped to know many things around them, such as other people; and they are very poorly equipped to know things distant. They are scarcely able to grasp the truth of things as they were. And they can only make guesses as to the truth of things to come. Small wonder that truth is a stranger in a world of fallen men whose god is the father of lies.

Light, the other part of intelligence, is wisdom. It is guidance, direction. It is knowing what to do to solve our problems. The natural man is at least as poorly equipped to be wise as he is to know the truth. In fact it is so bad that no human being or collection of human beings, acting on their own as natural men, can be sure that anything they propose to do is the best thing to do. And this applies to any discriminative standard of "best." All human wisdom is thus a guess. No wonder the Savior inveighs against priestcraft. He just does not like one man's guessing what is good for another, then taking praise and gain for it.

But the Savior does not leave it there. He gives us an alternative. He himself is the Spirit of truth. He himself is the Light of the world.
His mission is to bring light and truth to mankind. To everyone he gives a little. But only those who receive the light and do what is right receive more light. To him who is faithful, the Lord can and does give light and truth, increasing him line upon line, precept upon precept, until that person either has all he wants or has received all the Lord has. Those persons who love the works of righteousness and who have found the Savior are magnified through and in light and truth until they become like the Savior himself. They are then indeed intelligent beings. To be intelligent is to receive and understand the things of God.

To be intellectual, on the other hand, is to receive and to understand the things of man. An intellectual is a person who has mastered a goodly portion of the language and learning of men. Every intellectual person has great command of and can use precisely at least one language. This linguistic skill makes it possible for him to think more clearly and more powerfully than those less learned. Language is a tool, and the intellectual person must also know some subject matter well, to have applied the tool of language with considerable force and precision in some area of learning. Learning can take many forms, but the usual minimum mastery of a subject is to know what the principal accepted ideas in the field are, what the principal problems of the field are, and who the principal contributors to the field are. An additional echelon of eminence is attained if one himself is a contributor to the solution of problems in the field. To signify knowledgeability in a field is what is intended by the bestowal of the bachelor's and master's degrees. To signify a contribution to the solution of problems in the field is what is intended in the granting of a doctoral degree. Unfortunately, time and practice have blurred these distinctions and sometimes degraded them, but they originally were intended as meaningful ways of identifying a genuine intellectual.

I do not suppose that these two categories—the intelligent person and the intellectual person—can be fully mutually exclusive. I suppose that to understand the things of God one must have some language skill, be a good thinker, and acquire great understanding. I suppose that there is no person of great intellect whose mind is not quickened to some degree by the divine light and truth that emanate from the Savior. I judge that the learning of the world has a good deal of truth in it, and that when the Lord reveals a subject to the mind of a man, that revelation might include some truths already known to intellectual people. One problem lies in the fact that the learning of men, besides having a good deal of truth, is also shot through with error. Another problem lies in the fact that the tools of intellect are very clumsy in
separating truth from error in the minds of intellectuals. Witness how difficult a time even simple truths like the heliocentricity of the solar system have had in gaining widespread acceptance.

A prime example of a person of great intellect but little intelligence was Saul of Tarsus. A man well schooled in the learning of the Jews, a Pharisee of the strictest sect, Saul was nevertheless a zealous destroyer of the work of the Savior, the more devastating because of his intellectual prowess. What little intelligence that had come to him Saul had vigorously resisted, as the Lord reminded him in saying, "It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks" (Acts 9:5). But Saul was finally willing to receive intelligence. He submitted himself to Ananias, who was the Savior's appointed keeper in Damascus. He received the ordinances of salvation and accepted the light and truth that had burst upon him. As a new person, Paul diligently sought the Lord that he might remedy the gap in his education. Being called to the ministry, he bore a witness grounded in both intelligence and intellect that made him a powerful servant of the Lord, an apostle whose testimony and teaching have blessed every generation of the world since his calling.

A contrary example, one of a man of great intelligence but little intellectual attainment is the case of the boy prophet Joseph Smith, Junior. Blessed by the Savior to receive more light and truth than any of his contemporary human beings, he became a giant in intelligence, so far surpassing even those who accepted the restored gospel that he could not share much of what he knew. Because of his faithfulness, revelation continued to pour out upon him throughout the short span of his life. But lo, what did this man of superlative intelligence do? He, too, felt a gap in his education. With great diligence and persistence the prophet of the Most High sought to become an intellectual. He studied languages, law, and apparently every subject to which he could find access. And was he a greater and better prophet for his intellectual attainments? No more correct, no more moral, but surely more effective in communicating the God-given intelligence which crowned his soul. And communication is a large part of what being a prophet is all about.

Now I would guess that you can think of examples of people who tend to be intellectual without intelligence or intelligent without intellect. I dare say you will be able to think of more who are in the former category. One of the casualties of every dispensation is the person who tries to let intellect do for intelligence. Such learned ones suppose they can judge both the truth and the morality of the word of
the Lord and of his prophets. Jacob, the brother of Nephi, concisely expressed their plight:

When they are learned they think they are wise, and they hearken not to the counsel of God, for they set it aside, supposing they know of themselves, wherefore, their wisdom is foolishness and it profiteth them not. (2 Nephi 9:29)

Though there be many, in and out of the Church, who are intellectual with little intelligence, you probably will have difficulty thinking of many who are intelligent but with little intellect. This is so because a man on whom the Spirit of the Lord rests to quicken him with intelligence must be faithful to the light he receives, or it will withdraw from him. One of the things pertinent to the faithfulness of every servant of God is that he must learn to do well in the temporal matters in his stewardship. He must learn to understand, to control, to succeed. The Lord may instruct him in these things spiritually, or, if he has not sufficient faith, the Lord may send him to the world to learn to do well. The Lord says:

And as all have not faith, seek ye diligently and teach one another words of wisdom; yea, seek ye out of the best books words of wisdom; seek learning, even by study and also by faith. (D&C 88:118)

In a BYU for Zion, people will gain knowledge and skill both by study and by faith and will not confuse the two.

NUMBER SIX: NO PRIESTCRAFT

At a BYU for Zion, instruction would be different from that of other universities in that it will have been cleansed of the lies, the false notions of the world which are riveted upon the hearts of the children by their fathers, these being the chains of hell. It will also be different in that it will be strictly informational: it will limit itself to truth. It will not pretend to be a source of light, which is to say wisdom, to the world.

Now I am sure you are aware that being a source of supposed wisdom is what universities are traditionally all about. Aristotle's prescription for the ideal society was for men to find the path of wisdom, which leads to happiness, by reason. Persons not educated enough to reason were to go to a wise man, a philosopher, to have him reason out the path of wisdom for them. Universities were established originally as theological training schools, to teach the philosophies of men, appropriately mingled with scripture, so that society would be
amply furnished with wise men who could lead the people correctly. The "general education" which each university graduate receives is the residue of the wisdom training of the medieval priest. Though you are graduating in the robes of the medieval priest and are receiving similar recognition, hopefully you and I will avoid pretending that we are now, because of our degrees, adequate sources of wisdom to anybody. The scriptural term for lack of such avoidance is priestcraft.

To engage in priestcraft is to make a business out of being a wise man. It is to take reward for giving advice to others. Nephi says it this way:

The Lord . . . commandeth that there shall be no priestcrafts; for behold, priestcrafts are that men preach and set themselves up for a light unto the world, that they may get gain and praise of the world; but they seek not the welfare of Zion. (2 Nephi 26:29)

Indeed, one of the special reasons the Lord gave for restoring the gospel was to do away with priestcrafts. He says in the first section of the Doctrine and Covenants:

Wherefore, I the Lord, knowing the calamity which should come upon the inhabitants of the earth, called upon my servant Joseph Smith, Jun., and spake unto him from heaven, and gave him commandments;

And also gave commandments to others, that they should proclaim these things unto the world; and all this that it might be fulfilled, which was written by the prophets—

The weak things of the world shall come forth and break down the mighty and strong ones, that man should not counsel his fellow man, neither trust in the arm of flesh—

But that every man might speak in the name of God the Lord, even the Savior of the world;

That faith also might increase in the earth. (D&C 1:17-21)

Let us be plain: The Lord Jesus Christ is the true Light of this world. No man knows enough to tell any other man what to do, how to be wise, except he receives that light from Christ. The Savior reveals light and truth only through the channels of his true priesthood, and to individuals. For any man to preside as a source of light, that man must hold priesthood authority. To have a testimony of the Church is to recognize the true authority of Christ in this Church. But there are also signs that follow. True servants of Christ giving true light have these marks: They do not attempt to force their light upon anyone, and they do not take pay for administering it.

Money always clouds the helping relationship. We are free to go to the Lord to receive wisdom, and he gives liberally and upbraids not.
Freely we receive, and freely we should give. Is it not monstrous that a man should receive something freely from God, then turn and sell it to his fellowman? And is it not even more monstrous to substitute the wisdom of men for the wisdom of God and then to sell that paltry substitute?

BYU cannot save the world and will admit it. That will indeed make it different. BYU will be a haven of truth, a citadel of virtue, but it will eschew priestcraft. Its professors will give information and will teach technique but will not usurp the prerogative of the true priesthood to give personal advice.

In conclusion, let me extend two caveats. First, I am not supposing in my description of a BYU for Zion that BYU is presently doing none of these things. I deem that it is firmly on the path to such greatness at present. My purpose has been to celebrate what I take to be the goal of this institution. Second, perhaps what I have said may seem idealistic, even unrealistic. May I point out that part of the present reality of anything is what it can become. Not to see the potential in something is to miss the import of its reality as surely as does idle daydreaming. With man, many things I have said about BYU are not possible. But in Christ all good things are possible. Thank you.
The Role of the Lawyer in Modern Society

Warren E. Burger

In the ideal society toward which the human race has been working for 2,000 years, lawyers and judges would hardly be necessary in the sense that they function in our society today. Possibly in that ideal setting we would need even fewer physicians than we now have for there would be far fewer of the stresses that tend to make us ill. In that happy setting the base population would be made up of producers and teachers in the broadest sense of those two terms.

But until that society of the Golden Rule is achieved, lawyers and judges will be necessary components wherever men and women are gathered together in villages, towns, and cities where they must rub shoulders, share boundaries, and deal with each other daily. Lawyers will be necessary because, in their highest role, they are the healers of conflicts and they can provide the lubricants that permit the diverse parts of a social order to function with a minimum of friction. I emphasize that this is the role of the lawyer in the highest conception of our profession, but we know that members of our profession do not universally practice according to these great traditions and with due regard for the moral basis of much of our law. Yet laymen must try to remember that the process of resolving the balance of a lawyer’s duty to his client with the public good presents problems of great difficulty at times.

Here at Provo you have carried on the work of a great university for a century, and it is good that you have now added a school of law to carry on the training of lawyers in keeping with the standards that made this institution one of the great centers of learning in America, privately sustained and conducted in conformity with Christian teaching. A school of law with such inspiration and sponsorship fills a significant need in the legal education of this country—a need not met
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by all law schools today. Guided by these standards, it is safe to predict that this law school will become one of the foremost in the country.

For centuries lawyers have not been well regarded by the people, and if we are to believe the polls, that is still true today. The literature of the English-speaking world is replete with slurs on lawyers. Typical is the statement that the first step in creating a decent society is "to kill all the lawyers." But in fairness to lawyers we must see that their most visible activities are in the conflicts that arise between people, particularly those conflicts that are finally resolved in the courts. In the courts, however, the lawyers are not the principals but only the agents of those who are in conflict. It is inevitable that lawyers to some extent become the scapegoat in the play. Obviously, if all people lived by the Golden Rule and adjusted all their personal and business conflicts, there would be no lawyers to castigate.

Although critical analysis of all our institutions and professions has real value, we should also remember on the affirmative side the countless examples of courageous lawyers supporting the claims of people who were subject to operation or abuse of governmental power. Mr. Justice Jackson once commented that in every vindication of the rights of individuals and in every advance in human liberty in our history, key figures were lawyers who were willing to risk their professional reputations and their futures in pursuit of an ideal.

A new law school such as yours has a rare opportunity available to few others. It can engage in a reexamination of the basic assumptions on which our system of justice functions, always remembering that some are fundamental and immutable and some are open to change. We begin, of course, with the Constitution that implemented the ideals of the Declaration of Independence, and few better foundations could be conceived. In this 200th year of independence we will do well to look again at both those documents. We see that in the Declaration itself not fewer than four times the authors expressed direct reliance on God as "the Supreme Judge," as "the Creator," and in the closing sentence they call for the protection of Divine Providence. The uniqueness of this law school is, in part, that your basic charter exemplifies these concepts of the Declaration of 1776.

It is not always popular, even in the presumably rational setting of a law school or a university, to challenge or question long accepted parts of our system of law and justice. It is sometimes regarded as heresy to question the validity of the adversary system as it prevails in this country. It is sometimes thought even more heretical to ask whether the full panoply of courts and the contentiousness inherent in
the adversary system are indeed the best method to resolve the myriad human conflicts that today reach every courthouse in the nation.

If the idea of a university is to be maintained, however, these are examples of the kinds of questions that ought to be asked and examined in the pursuit of perfection. Certain aspects of law and procedure are not immutable truths but simply tools to get at the truth. Perhaps the most penetrating inquiry by our best minds will lead us to conclude that, with all its infirmities, our system is indeed sound. But if our system of justice cannot stand up under such inquiry, the flaws may call for change. To make such inquiry is to do no more than to apply the techniques of the adversary system to an examination of our institutions. Lawyers schooled in and dedicated to the adversary process should not object to using that process in a continuing self-examination of our institutions.

Another area deserves examination. It is a proud boast we often make that our system derives from British law that has been tested and found good for over three centuries, and indeed this is basically true. Yet when we lay the two alongside one another under the microscope of objective analysis, we will swiftly see that there are enormous differences in actual operation. The British Bar—by which we mean the barristers who have the exclusive right to appear in courts of general jurisdiction and in serious criminal cases is a small band of 3,000 men and women. I believe that any unbiased observer will agree that nowhere in the world is there more fearless, more vigorous, and more independent advocacy than that found in Britain’s courts. Yet British lawyers are probably the most rigidly regulated and disciplined lawyers in the world, and that regulation and discipline comes not from the coercive force of the government or of the judges but from self-imposed standards established and enforced by the legal profession itself. The qualities of independence and courage of the British bar trace back to great figures in the law like Sir Edward Coke, who forfeited his position as Lord Chief Justice rather than yield to the King, and Sir Thomas More, who forfeited both his position and his head in the exercise of that independence.

The tradition of independence of the bar in England and the corollary of accountability for the exercise of that independence flow from the system of training. After basic education in the theory and principles of law, the training for advocacy in the courts of Britain is probably the most intensive to be found anywhere. At the core of their training is the inculcation of strict standards of civility and decorum and, more important, in high standards of ethical conduct. That aspect
of the training begins the very first day of the education of the advocate and is pervasive throughout the training. They do not wait, as we tend to do, until the law graduate enters into practice and assumes that the ethical standards which must always guide the use of the unique power we place on lawyers will be absorbed in some way through the pores of the mind. Of course, lawyers continue to learn as they practice, but the student advocate in England sits in the courts observing trials and hears lectures given by the leading barristers and judges so that the study of ethics and behavior permeates the entire educational experience.

When it is suggested from time to time that we apply some of the methods and procedures used in England, a few shrill voices are raised that this will destroy the independence of the profession in its pursuit of justice. Far from it! Precisely because the adversary system is inherently contentious and pregnant with abrasive conflicts, the British long ago elected to regulate the forms employed in the clash of contending advocates. They do this by insisting that advocacy must be vigorous but always within the framework of a system regulated by fixed rules of personal conduct and civility between the contending advocates and with the court. Far from impairing the quality of advocacy, their system enriches the force and skill of the debate. Violations of these standards occur rarely because the profession polices itself sternly, and members of the bar accept the necessity for civility and rules of decorum as a means to keep the conduct of a trial from returning to the ancient clash of trial by combat—or worse yet, something resembling a barroom brawl.

It is now five years since a committee of the American Bar Association, chaired by my distinguished colleague, Mr. Justice Clark, reported in essence that although we lawyers profess to regulate and discipline ourselves, by and large discipline of professional misconduct of lawyers is virtually nonexistent in most of the fifty states. The American Bar Association is undertaking some steps to implement the Clark report, and in the past year or more there are encouraging signs of more progress than in the previous twenty-five years. That program demands more impetus and the moral support of the law school community, and of course the support of judges.

The law school at Brigham Young University has a unique opportunity in at least two respects: it is totally independent, and it is free to emphasize that there is indeed a moral basis for our fundamental law; and it is free to examine and explore whether it is sound educational policy to train people first in the skills of a
professional monopoly and leave it to some vague, undetermined, unregulated, undefined future to learn the moral and ethical precepts that ought to guide the exercise of such an important monopoly in a civilized society.

The operation of a law school is itself a high trust and, as with every fiduciary function, it must be treated as a stewardship for which there is an accountability. That accountability is to the public, to the concept of the rule of law, to the highest principles of justice, and in the last analysis, to a conscience responsive to the basic ideals of Western civilization.

As you enter the third year of your school of law, my wish for you is that the teaching here will always be guided by the need for lawyers who will understand their mission in terms of the great traditions of our profession. That tradition is to serve people’s needs, to act as the healers of the inevitable conflicts that are bound to arise in our complex, competitive, modern society; that the lawyers you train be participants at all times in the affairs of community and nation, and that they execute their trust in keeping with the traditions of Western civilization, with the ideals of the Declaration of 1776 and the Constitution—always guided, as the authors of those great documents were guided, by a Divine Providence. This is indeed a large mission for any school or university, but the background of 100 years of Brigham Young University assures that it will be accomplished.
Ethics, Morality, and Professional Responsibility

President Dallin H. Oaks

President Kimball, Chief Justice Burger, other honored guests, faculty, students, and friends:

We are not here to start a law school but to recognize the maturity of one that has come of age with the arrival of its third class, the assembling of most of its faculty, and the completion of its magnificent quarters. It is therefore unnecessary to review the formal charges given to the Law School faculty and students two years ago at the ceremony commemorating the opening. Rather, these remarks will add one additional charge, which concerns the J. Reuben Clark Law School's special challenges and opportunities for leadership in teaching ethics, morality, and professional responsibility.

During my first month of law studies at the University of Chicago, twenty-one years ago this fall, Professor Karl N. Llewellyn introduced us to Carl Sandburg's poem, "The Lawyers Know Too Much." I share it with you now because it provides a suitable introduction for my subject:

The lawyers, Bob, know too much.
They are chums of the books of old John Marshall.
They know it all, what a dead hand wrote,
A stiff dead hand and its knuckles crumbling,
The bones of the fingers a thin white ash.
The lawyers know
a dead man's thoughts too well.

In the heels of the haggling lawyers, Bob
Too many slippery ifs and buts and however,
Too much hereinbefore provided whereas,
Too many doors to go in and out of.

An address delivered at the dedication of the J. Reuben Clark Law Building, 5 September 1975. The research assistance of Ted D. Lewis is gratefully acknowledged. Dallin H. Oaks is president of Brigham Young University. Copies of the addresses delivered at the ceremony opening the J. Reuben Clark Law School, 27 August 1973, are available on request from the Office of the Dean.
When the lawyers are through
What is there left, Bob?
Can a mouse nibble at it
And find enough to fasten a tooth in?

Why is there always a secret singing
When a lawyer cashes in?
Why does a hearse horse snicker
Hauling a lawyer away?

The work of a bricklayer goes to the blue.
The knack of a mason outlasts a moon.
The hands of a plasterer hold a room together,
The land of a farmer wishes him back again.
Singers of songs and dreamers of plays
Build a house no wind blows over.
The lawyers—tell me why a hearse horse snickers
hauling a lawyer's bones.2

Despite unprecedented demand for admission to law schools and an
unequaled record of public leadership and service by graduates of law
schools, the legal profession is still the subject of widespread public
misunderstanding and mistrust. For example, a recent nationwide
survey of adults in all income groups, conducted by the American Bar
Association Special Committee to Survey Legal Needs, of which I am a
member, shows that more than one-third of our fellow Americans
believe that most lawyers would engage in unethical or illegal activities
to help a client in an important case, and that more than one-third also
believe that lawyers are not concerned about doing anything about "the
bad apples" in the legal profession.3 Happily, seven out of eight of
those who had personally used legal services gave their own lawyer
high marks for his honesty in dealing with them.4 In the same survey,
persons were asked to identify the personal qualities of greatest
importance in their decision whether or not to retain a particular
lawyer. The qualities of greatest importance to this decision were the
lawyer's general reputation and his ethical standards, including
honesty, integrity, and trustworthiness. The number of persons who
mentioned these qualities was three times the number who mentioned
competence.5

p. 142.
3Curran and Spalding, The Legal Needs of the Public, A Preliminary Report of the ABA
4American Bar Association Special Committee to Survey Legal Needs, Response to
Questionnaire, Part IV, Question 40.
5Ibid., Part V, Questions 4 and 5.
While a significant segment of the public persists in its traditional suspicion of the bar, the legal profession haggles over who is to blame. The organized bar criticize the law schools for failing to be more effective in teaching professional responsibility, while legal scholars charge the organized bar with failing to be effective in professional discipline. In an atmosphere of heightened concern about the ethical standards of the legal profession, we remain unsure of our remedies.

Retired Supreme Court Justice Tom C. Clark, a leader in the move for higher standards at the bar, has declared that "law schools must consciously undertake the one task that they have universally rejected: instilling normative values in their students." Explaining the increasing importance of teaching honesty and integrity in law schools, he observes that the influences of church and family, which formerly developed these virtues, "have drastically diminished in importance in this country, and no other force has arisen to take their place."6

In contrast, Dean Albert M. Sacks of the Harvard Law School is quoted as giving his opinion that the law schools do not have any clear sense of how to teach legal ethics.7 Voicing a common opinion of legal educators, UCLA Law Dean Murray L. Schwartz argues that formal legal education is not likely to contribute much to the moral and ethical development of law students because their notions of ethics and morality are established before they arrive at law school and because law schools are not organized or conducted to inculcate such standards in any case.8 This is because the law teacher is typically theoretical, skeptical, scholarly, and remote from his students, and all of these characteristics inhibit instruction in ethics and morality.

The promotion of moral and ethical concerns among law students is apparently no more effective in church-related institutions. In the words of Dean Thomas L. Shaffer of Notre Dame Law School, "most of the law faculties at what were once thought to be the great Protestant Christian universities appear uninterested in their institutional heritage, if not ashamed of it," and "law faculties in Roman Catholic universities have rarely passed beyond fruitless

phrases about natural law, which long ago became a banner rather than an idea, and is now neither banner nor idea."9

Former Stanford Dean Bayless Manning agrees that law schools cannot teach a student to become an ethical human being. He points the finger at the organized bar, charging that

if the bar's disciplinary standards were clear and stringent and enforcement an ever-present reality, the law schools could and would drive home to their students that it is a condition of being in the profession that the lawyer be not only noncriminal but an exemplar of lawful conduct...[which would be] the kind of moral and legal leadership the public is entitled to expect from...officers of the court.10

Our two honored judicial guests and honorary degree recipients have both been leaders in trying to raise the ethical standards of the bar. For example, during his term as President of the American Bar Association, Justice Lewis F. Powell, Jr., made professional ethics a major area of emphasis, launching an ambitious program that was to culminate in a full review of the old Canons of Professional Responsibility.11 Chief Justice Warren E. Burger has repeatedly used the weight of his high office, such as in his remarks this morning12 and in his influential annual addresses on the "State of the Judiciary," to call for and point the way toward increased attention to ethical questions by law schools and to professional discipline by the organized bar.13

As a consequence of these efforts and others, we are in a time when ethics, morality, and professional responsibility are among the most important concerns of the legal profession, including practitioners, teachers, and the judiciary.

There are also stirrings of concern about the deeper values from which we obtain our commitments to law, morality, ethics, and professional responsibility. In his recent book, The Interaction of Law and Religion, Professor Harold J. Berman of the Harvard Law School comments on the "integrity crisis" of Western society, observing that

12See page 301 of this issue of BYU Studies.
our whole culture "seems to be facing the possibility of a kind of nervous breakdown."14 The major symptom of this threatened breakdown is the apparent widespread loss of confidence in our two most basic institutions, law and religion. He finds one cause of the current disillusionment in "the too radical separation of one from the other." Law helps to give society its cohesive structure, but it is religion that gives life and emotional attachment to that structure. In the forthcoming and final book of their *Story of Civilization* series, Will and Ariel Durant observe that "the Twentieth Century approaches its end without having yet found a natural substitute for religion in persuading the human animal to morality."16 Berman says that the secularists and rationalists, who rely on an intellectual commitment to law, have drained law of its emotional vitality because their utilitarian ethic cannot sustain public support for the law. The emotion that ties us to the law is our belief in its "inherent and ultimate rightness," a belief fostered most effectively by religion. Consequently, Professor Berman concludes that "law and religion stand or fall together; and if we wish law to stand, we shall have to give new life to the essentially religious commitments that give it its ritual, its tradition, and its authority. . . ."17

To me there is a close relationship between the weakening of religious faith and commitment to transcendent values on the one hand, and on the other, the legal profession's current and intense preoccupation with legal rights and procedures, which sometimes seems to hamper our view and pursuit of the ultimate goals of truth and justice. As religious commitments weaken, we are more likely to have our attention diverted from ultimate values to others merely implementary.

While serving as a law clerk for Chief Justice Earl Warren of the United States Supreme Court, I read hundreds of handwritten petitions in which persons convicted of crimes sought relief from the nation's highest court. I was struck with the fact that these prisoners rarely asserted their innocence. While understanding the reasons why an appellate court must focus on the procedural fairness of the trial and does not ordinarily review the question of guilt or innocence, I was nevertheless amazed that nonlawyers convicted of crimes realize so soon that once they are convicted at trial, our criminal justice system

---

14Harold J. Berman, *The Interaction of Law and Religion*
15Ibid., p. 23.
focuses on procedure, treating the fact of their guilt or innocence as almost entirely beside the point. The preoccupation with procedure is coming to be predominant, even in the trial court. Justice Walter V. Schaefer of the Illinois Supreme Court is only one of many astute judges who has complained that

Almost never do we have a genuine issue of guilt or innocence today. The system has so changed that what we are doing in the courtroom is trying the conduct of the police and that of the prosecutor all along the line. Has there been a misstep at this point? at that point? You know very well that the man is guilty; there is no doubt about the proof. But you must ask, for example: Was there something technically wrong with the arrest? You're always trying something irrelevant. The case is determined on something that really hasn't anything to do with guilt or innocence.18

The operation of the exclusionary rule, which I have criticized elsewhere,19 provides another example.

Some of you will be saying, "But our procedural guarantees are designed to serve the ends of truth and to protect personal rights of fundamental importance to truth and justice." I agree. I am criticizing, not our concern with procedures, but our preoccupation, in which we may lose sight of the fact that our procedures are not the ultimate goals of our legal system. Our goals are truth and justice, and procedures are but means to these ends. When we lose sight of this relationship, then some procedures can cease to serve their designed objectives. In the long run that result will discredit law and the legal profession. "Too many slippery ifs and buts and however," Sandburg says, "too many doors to go in and out of. . . . Why does a hearse horse snicker, hauling a lawyer away?"

Truth and justice are ultimate values, so understood by our people, and the law and the legal profession will not be worthy of public respect and loyalty if we allow our attention to be diverted from these goals. It is surely past time for serious consideration of the recent American Assembly charge that

Too often our adversary techniques conceal or distort the truth rather than promote its discovery. The legal professional should consider and explore appropriate modifications of adversary procedures for the purpose of better determining the truth, and

should formulate ethical prescriptions embracing a higher
professional duty to seek the truth.\textsuperscript{20}

Judge Marvin E. Frankel developed this point brilliantly in his
recent Benjamin N. Cardozo Lecture before the Association of the Bar
of the City of New York titled "The Search for Truth." Lamenting the
fact that the adversary process "often achieves truth only as a
convenience, a by-product, or an accidental approximation," Judge
Frankel observes that "our relatively low regard for truth-seeking is
perhaps the chief reason for the dubious esteem in which the legal
profession is held."\textsuperscript{21} And the point reaches beyond reputation to
reality. Judge Frankel suggests that we are not likely to promote high
moral standards in a dispute-resolving system that focuses on
something other than truth: "In a system that so values winning and
deplores losing, where lawyers are trained to fight for, not to judge,
their clients, where we learn as advocates not to 'know' inconvenient
things, moral elegance is not to be expected."\textsuperscript{22}

To cite a related deficiency, as a profession we are preoccupied
with rights and, as Elliot Richardson noted a few years ago, "have
increasingly and unceremoniously ignored the subject of obligations.
At no time in history have we been more deficient in our sense of
obligation than we are today. The hoary and hallowed indebtedness of
a person to family, to tribe, to customs and gods, seems to have slipped
away like a guest at a much too crowded party."\textsuperscript{23} The history of the
American Bar Association's Section of Individual Rights and
Responsibilities provides an illustration. The word responsibilities
was added to the title of that Section by some foresighted persons who
foresaw what might happen but were unable by that measure to
prevent it. As a member of this Section from the time of its founding, I
have seen it concentrate almost exclusively upon the subject of rights.
This is the legal profession's instinctive thrust. In relation to rights, we
appear as gladiators, guarantors, and enforcers. On the subject of
responsibilities, the law is a schoolmaster and the legal profession its
faculty. And who would not prefer the role of champion of rights
rather than preacher of responsibilities? Clients conventionally retain
lawyers to secure an advantage under the adversary system, not to

\textsuperscript{20}"Law and a Changing Society," The Report of the American Assembly, Stanford,
California, 26-29 June 1975, p. 12.

\textsuperscript{21}Marvin E. Frankel, "The Search for Truth—An Umpireal View," 31st Annual Benjamin

\textsuperscript{22}Ibid., p. 40.

receive a lecture on their own deficiencies and their advocate's higher loyalties to the law. "Perhaps obligations took their quiet departure in the face of the rampant relativism of the day," Elliot Richardson suggests. "A sense of obligation implies, after all, a knowledge of right and wrong, and this in turn implies standards on which a society agrees." 24

So what, if anything, can the law schools do? Responsibilities of both lawyers and clients should be no stranger to the law school curriculum. Law schools can surely sensitize their students to professional problems by identifying and clarifying issues of legal ethics, a conventional and well recognized technique of law teaching. 25 To fail in this minimal role is to leave law students to infer that value judgments are not a significant part of a lawyer's function. 26 Law faculties must at least overcome their traditional lack of interest in moral, ethical, and professional problems. Conscientious and articulate disagreement among different law teachers on a particular moral and ethical issue is surely preferable to implied pretensions of unanimity that students will disbelieve and read as judgments of indifference on matters of ethics and morality.

But law schools can do more than this, and the J. Reuben Clark Law School has the most promising ideals and circumstances to be a leader in this important area. Notre Dame Dean Thomas L. Shaffer has sadly noted that

Christianity has had little to do with what is hopeful in the American legal profession. I believe that a motivating reason for that failure is our diffidence in talking about religious commitment; when few talk about religion, personal value is inaccessible and public style becomes irreligious. Too many candles are under too many bushels. 27

We have no diffidence in talking about religious commitment at Brigham Young University, and we will have none in the J. Reuben Clark Law School. Religious commitment, religious values, and concern with ethics and morality are part of the reason for this school's existence, and will be in the atmosphere of its study. As President Marion G. Romney, our third honorary degree recipient, noted in our opening ceremonies, this law school was established to provide an institution in which students could "obtain a knowledge of the laws of

24Ibid., p. 110.
26Schwartz, "Legal Ethics," p. 50.
man in the light of the laws of God," and the Trustees would like this school to reflect the aura of President J. Reuben Clark: "faith, virtue, integrity, industry, scholarship, and patriotism."^{28}

If it is true that law students cannot be taught ethics and morality in law school because those value commitments are fixed before they enroll, then that fact, an excuse for other law schools, becomes a unique opportunity for this one. Most of the students and faculty at this law school are rooted in the same religious tradition, and that tradition more than any other fact accounts for their choosing this setting to pursue their professional goals. The common ideals, principles, and commitments of that tradition should make this institution superbly effective in strengthening the moral, ethical, and professional foundations that compose the finest heritage of our profession.

Because of our reliance on these common ideals, principles, and commitments, the new building being dedicated today should not be looked on as a place where we apply some unique formula for inculcating ethics and morality. It is, rather, a monument to our determination that the fairness, decency, integrity, virtue, and love of truth taught at the hearthstones of thousands of homes throughout the land shall have a concentrated impact on the legal profession and the nation's laws. It is in these homes, by God-fearing parents, that the young men and women who will be our graduates have already gained that intangible moral instinct that will bear its fruits in the legislative halls, the courtrooms, the offices, and other private and public places in the years to come. Thus, this consideration of our law school's special challenges and opportunities would be incomplete without some grateful acknowledgement for those homes, those fathers, and those mothers. They may well be the most important teachers our graduates will ever have.

To illustrate what the Law School could do with this unique resource, I will borrow and share with you an excerpt from a memorandum that Acting Dean Carl S. Hawkins circulated to the law faculty just a month ago inviting them to begin a process of defining "The Distinctive Qualities of the J. Reuben Clark Law School." That memorandum included the following proposals:

1. We should be distinguished by the degree of our commitment to the development of our individual students, based upon our

^{29}Carl S. Hawkins, Memorandum to the Law School Faculty, 23 July 1975, pp. 4-5.
revealed knowledge as to the unique worth and dignity of each individual as a child of God.

2. The Law School should be distinguished by its efforts to research, publish, and teach the Judeo-Christian value assumptions underlying the development of our legal system.

3. The Law School should be distinguished by its efforts to discover and articulate
   a. The ultimate spiritual values underlying our Constitutional system and how they may be adapted to different cultures,
   b. The ultimate spiritual values underlying our Common Law legal system, and
   c. The moral and spiritual values underlying professional responsibility.

4. The Law School should be distinguished by its efforts to research, publish, teach, and work for legal reform in support of family institutions.

5. The Law School should be distinguished by its efforts to develop lawyering skills as tools to serve the needs of people in the light of their unique worth and dignity as spirit children of God.29

These are only illustrations, but sufficient to highlight the unique opportunities of and challenges to the J. Reuben Clark Law School. Whether or not there is an excess of law graduates now or in the future, the law, the legal profession, and this nation have need of a law school such as this, and we are proud to introduce you to its faculty, its students, and this magnificent building.
The Need Beyond Reason
Edward L. Hart

"Oh, reason not the need," King Lear cried in a flood of understanding as his daughters told him he had no need of any retainers; there were many servants to take care of his needs. "Allow not nature more than nature needs,/ Man's life's as cheap as beast's," Lear saw (2. 4. 267, 269-70). His physical wants could be taken care of by servants, but in taking away his retainers, his daughters had stripped him of the last vestige of his dignity as a human being. Like an ox in a stall, he could have food set before him, he could be kept warm enough to stay alive, but he would not be human. In that flash of insight delivered in his "Reason not the need" speech, he discovered that the ultimate result of a purely utilitarian philosophy of life is dehumanization.

During the next hundred years, will the disciplines of the humanities have to fight for existence again over the same ground fought over during the past hundred years? Every indication is that they will. Every indication is that the Philistines of the twentieth century are even more blind, more powerful, and more skillful in battle than their nineteenth-century counterparts. The only hope is that the humanities will find defenders as capable as those who kept them vital in the past.

Always at the door of every liberal curriculum in America, from kindergarten to the universities, is someone to ask Regan's question: What is the need? What is the need of music in the high school? Can students live without it? Yes. Then let it go. What is the utility of poetry? It has none. Then let it go. To our shame we in the humanities have at times left the high ground of our true defenses and have engaged the enemy in his bogs and quicksands. We have, in essence, at times conceded to our critics their basic premise: that to be justified in a curriculum a thing should be useful or needed. Having conceded the point, we then proceed to show how useful languages are in the business of the world; or we show how necessary the craft of

A speech delivered to faculty members of the College of Humanities, 11 September 1975. Edward L. Hart is professor of English at Brigham Young University.
composition is for a student planning to enter law school. By these devices we may win a battle, but by reliance upon them we are bound to lose the war; for once we have agreed to the point that usefulness should be the sole criterion for the existence of an object of learning, we have become King Lear's in the hands of inhuman monsters who will squeeze the life out of our disciplines and reduce them to trades.

There can be no other grounds for the defense of the humanities than those articulated by John Henry Newman in his essay, "The Idea of a University." Knowledge is its own end and beauty is its own end. When the most primitive human being added a design to the pot he had made, the design had no use. It did not make the pot either stronger or more leakproof. But it made the life of the maker richer for having conceived and executed the design; and it made the life of everyone who looked at it richer. That is the justification for the design on the pot, or for the design on a blanket or a canoe. The blanket is no warmer for the design, nor will the canoe float better; but to strip people of the means of responding to life in a distinctively human manner is to return them to a way of life indistinguishable from that of cattle. And that is the condition of life toward which the purely utilitarian approach inevitably tends. It is the condition of life unconsciously aimed at by every critic who objects to the teaching of the arts because they are not useful.

I should think that at Brigham Young University more than at any other place in the world one ought to encounter no objection to the idea that a thing is worth learning if it enlarges the scope of human existence. Such enlargement produces joy, "and men are, that they might have joy" (2 Nephi 2:25). It is significant that joy comes from that which we find in life beyond need. Joy comes from service to others, for instance; it comes by the sacrifice of something that might have been useful to ourselves for the benefit of others. Here is an example, then, of joy coming because a need was not satisfied. Even in purely private and selfish ways, joy comes from those little things that are beyond need; as a character in Robert Frost's poem "The Star-Splitter" discovered he didn't need a farm and did need a telescope, so he got rid of the farm and spent the rest of his life gazing at the stars. I remember as a high school student being employed in the summer on a farm from sunup to sundown. The endless hours of riding a plow or a rake or a mowing machine have been forgotten, but I can never forget those few minutes each day beyond the call of need when I read, and when I made that great discovery that the classics are the classics because they are the most interesting and best written books around.
Do we Mormons really believe that the purpose of life is the enlargement of souls and not the accumulation of property? Do we really believe that all we take with us to the next world is the knowledge we have attained here? If the answer is yes, why should not a knowledge of Latin syntax be as valuable a cargo as a knowledge of corporate taxation? And why should not the ability to write a poem or an essay be as valuable an acquisition as the ability to work out a mathematical problem? Still, as a visiting professor at Berkeley a few years ago, I had two young university students call as home teachers. Somehow we began talking about Latin, and they doubted if it should still be taught: "It's a dead language, isn't it?" The conversation reminded me with some chagrin that I had once shared their attitude. Proud of my ignorance, as a second-year university student, I had told Professor Brewster Ghiselin that I didn't know any Latin and had never missed it. His laconic answer initiated a perception that may have changed my life. He simply said, "A jellyfish never misses its face." I have since learned some Latin and some other languages as well and should miss them a great deal if they were gone. The truth is that we never miss something we have never become acquainted with. One of the marks of a genuinely educated person is that he respects the knowledge of others, even if he has not been so fortunate as to acquire it himself. On the contrary, a mark of an uneducated person is the assumption on his part that anything he does not know must not be worth knowing.

The term "useless knowledge" is relative. One needs to ask additionally, useful for what? If a person simply collects oddments of information, as did the woman in Ezra Pound's "Portrait d'une Femme," then there will be "Nothing that's quite your own. / Yet this is you." But if the assortment of facts anyone possesses, no matter what the assortment consists of, is thoroughly assimilated, if the facts are related to each other in the possessor's mind and in turn related to that mind, they become something that is his own. This is not to argue that a person should go out and provide himself with any kind of hodgepodge of information; but at the same time it is to claim that no knowledge can be called useless if it has been assimilated by an active mind. There are too many examples in the history of man of discoveries made on the basis of obscure parallels, distant similarities, minutiae keenly observed for us to dismiss them as useless. We think of the trains of thought put in motion by a swinging chandelier, a falling apple, or the growth of fungus on a culture dish. But lest anyone think that I have abandoned my position of denying utility the right to be
sole arbiter of a learning pursuit, I hasten to point out that I began by defending the right of the mind to pursue even seemingly useless information. The truth is that there inevitably will be things of utility come as a result of the pursuit. The larger point I am aiming at is that the kind of process described, that of an active mind thoroughly assimilating even minute particulars and making discovery of important truths on the basis of distant similarities, is essentially the metaphor-making process that goes on in the mind of a poet—and metaphor is basic in the existence of poetry.

The function of the metaphor was correctly assessed by Shelley in his *Defence of Poetry* as he discussed the language of poets:

Their language is vitally metaphorical; that is, it marks the before unapprehended relations of things and perpetuates their apprehension, until words, which represent them, become, through time, signs for portions or classes of thought instead of pictures of integral thoughts; and then, if no new poets should arise to create afresh the associations which have been thus disorganized, language will be dead to all the nobler purposes of human intercourse.¹

Thus, with the help of Shelley, we see that the threat of death to a language comes about not because people stop using it but because those who use it have lost the capacity to make metaphors. Latin, for instance, may be very much alive in the mind of a person conscious of its nuances; and English may be very dead in the mind of a person whose only goal is utility. "In the infancy of society every author is necessarily a poet, because language itself is poetry,"² said Shelley. Only if poetry dies out in a language is the language dead. Is poetry, then, needed in the curriculum of the next hundred years? It is needed unless our only aim is to exist on the level of brutish unknowing; but it certainly must find a place beyond mere need if our aim, as Latter-day Saints, is to continue to grow with a wholeness toward a godlike apprehension of our universe.

Our past hundred years has seen a decline in America, and at BYU, in the foreign language requirement for doctoral degrees. Those who have engineered the reduction have done it on the basis of the old argument: need. While a plausible defense could be made that foreign languages are needed, even in accordance with the hollow ring of the most narrow definition of need, I shall not make my defense on that
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basis. And I shall limit my defense of the inclusion of a foreign language requirement to the doctor of philosophy degree, leaving the more specialized doctorates to justify their own existence. The very term, doctor of philosophy, suggests that the holder of the degree ought to have made his approach to his subject on a broader basis than mere vocational utility. The term suggests that the recipient has a grasp of the principles upon which his discipline rests and that he sees his discipline in terms of the perspective of its relationship to all other disciplines. This in turn presupposes some philosophical understanding of the basic issues relative to the life of man on earth and of his struggle to understand himself and his environment. A knowledge of a foreign language, seen in this context, involves more than the technical ability (suggested by the popular notion of language as a *tool* course) to read that material important to one's field published in foreign books and journals—necessary as that may be. The learning of a foreign language is an experience, not merely an exercise such as working out a crossword puzzle; and it is an experience into which one's whole being should be totally immersed. The words of French or German or Greek do not have precise English equivalents enabling languages to be translated like simple transposition ciphers. To know a foreign language, a person almost has to learn to think all over again, and to think in modes previously unknown to him. Ways of apprehending truth vary according to the structure of the language in which that truth is reported. An English-speaking person, for example, may be incapable of understanding certain time concepts because of the fairly strict way in which we who speak English see everything as past, present, or future. Language, furthermore, did not develop in a vacuum in the country of its origin; it developed through historical periods in relation to passing events and to ways of life. To study the language is to learn something of that history and of those ways of life: in short, to have one's consciousness expanded. It is my personal belief that it is next to impossible for anyone to learn a foreign language without unconsciously developing sympathy for and understanding of the peoples who speak the language. This is a conviction that comes to me from my own experience. I learned Japanese while in the United States Navy during wartime with the intention of using my knowledge for the utilitarian purpose of helping to defeat Japan. And that was the purpose to which I did put my knowledge, nor was that purpose nullified in any way by the fact that the learning process was also a cultural experience. Knowledge of Chinese characters assisted me, as it did Ezra Pound, in the
understanding of the nature of language and of poetry (for "language itself is poetry," as Shelley said). Four things that are red, put together in a character, may no longer mean any of the individual things, but may mean the one quality they have in common: redness. Here we are back to that basic metaphoric process from which so much has grown, not only in poetry but in all of the sciences as well.

Japanese characters have both on and kun readings. The kun reading is the Japanese meaning already existing in the spoken language before the Chinese character was borrowed to stand for the written word. The on readings are Chinese pronunciations of the character, and there may be many for any one character, each one coming from a different period of Chinese history when the character was pronounced a certain way; for sound changes occurred in Chinese according to patterns of its own development, just as they did in English or German or any other language with a long history. Hence, to know Japanese well, a person must inevitably absorb some Asian history and some sociology of family life and some knowledge of world religions. There is even a special set of Japanese honorifics for reference to the Buddha.

From history to sociology to religion and to a great deal besides, the learning of a language stretches the mind toward an understanding of itself and of the universe. How can anyone be called a doctor of philosophy who knows no language but his own? Can a monolingual person know even his own language? How many of us have testified at one time or another that we really began to know English only after we started to learn a foreign language? Can any person locked, within the narrow confines of one language not fully understood, be competent to interpret the nature of either man or his universe as seen through the knotholes provided by his particular discipline? It will be to our detriment and to the detriment of our clientele if during the next hundred years we do not reclaim some lost territory. There is no "tool subject" that can serve adequately as a replacement for a foreign language. Should a doctor of philosophy degree be granted to a person restricted in his ways of knowing through lack of foreign language study?

All that has been said of the value of studying a foreign language applies equally, of course, to a study in depth of linguistics. But what about fiction? There are those who ask what grown men and women are doing spending their lives reading and teaching stories, tales that never actually happened. Who needs fiction? For the study of history, the Gonerils and Regans of academe find some justification in the fact that it really took place.
A case could be made for the utility of fiction; it has uses as an escape from tedium, historical fiction can teach one the real facts of a past historical age, and fiction is sometimes even useful as therapy. But all of these justifications skirt the real issue: "Oh, reason not the need."

It is in that reach of the mind for understanding beyond immediate need that fiction came into being and has a right to continue in being. Confronted with a real but isolated experience, we usually do not know what to make of it. It is usually only after time has gone by and the mind has related the isolated experience to all the other experiences we have had that we begin to understand it. The same process we have talked about before takes place: the metaphor-making process of the mind; only in the case of fiction, the metaphor is extended. From all its past experience the mind puts together the "before unapprehended relations of things" and builds a sequence of events touching upon all the relevant pieces of sights, sounds, colors, and actions synthesized by the imagination. When the work is finished it is a whole experience, one that relates the initial isolated event to a total perception of life. It is fiction, and fiction is an elaboration of a metaphor in that it brings multiple similarities and associations together. And the finished work, as Aristotle remarked about 2,300 years ago, is more valuable than a mere record of an historical event, because that event may have been an accident or an aberration that either has no meaning or that has one not discovered solely in the fact of its recital.

Fiction, it is not original for me to say, is thus in a sense more true than actual events; and a great historian is only great to the extent that he has acquired some of the assimilative powers of literature. Then who needs fiction? Anyone needs it who wishes to be alive as a human being rather than as a mere animal. Anyone needs it who wishes to discover the broader truths of his own existense—and of the existence of others as depicted in the fiction growing out of great authors' lives; for, after all, we learn too little from our own direct experiences to understand the multiplicity of truth acquired by the race of man. Direct experience is the most uneconomical teacher, especially if it is fatal—as many experiences are. But the need we are speaking of is a psychic need, the need to grow, the hunger for understanding, rather than physical need. And the reason for the need is beyond empirical reason; hence, it is a need beyond reason.

It is possible, shifting ground for a moment, for a person to acquire vast amounts of information without ever putting it to a good use or even understanding it. In "The Deserted Village," Goldsmith's schoolmaster seems to have done this:
And still they gazed, and still the wonder grew
That one small head could carry all he knew.

The schoolmaster, apparently, had not heeded the admonition from
the book of Proverbs that it is good to get wisdom: "therefore get
wisdom: and with all thy getting get understanding" (Proverbs 4:7).
One of the best ways to get understanding is to attempt to put down on
paper all that we know of a given subject. This process is known as
composition. A person facing a blank sheet of paper faces, on a smaller
scale, naturally, the same kind of problem faced by God as he proceeded
with the task of organizing our world out of chaos. And chaos is exactly
the condition in our minds, no matter how cram with information,
before we begin to compose. There is no greater challenge that a
person can face than that of a blank sheet of paper; and there is no
greater feeling of accomplishment than that which comes from having
organized chaos into the order of a well-written page. Each small area
of truth, no matter how small, when composed into order represents a
defeat of chaos and of mental anarchy.

Once again, the process is the familiar one we have recognized in
relation to poetry, fiction, and language study: the metaphor-making
capacity of the mind. Familiar modes of order are used to conjecture
the relationship of new truths, based on remote similarities: the old
truths with allowance made for the differences inherent in the new.
Edna St. Vincent Millay once said that it is not true that life is one thing
after another; it is one thing over and over. But one thing over and over
is monotonous only to the person who sees the similarities without
scrutinizing the infinite variations that make our earth, for instance,
distinct from every other world God may have created, that makes
every leaf and every twig and every person distinct from all others,
though recognizably participating in repeated patterns. Every truth
has always something old and new in it.

The need for the skills of composition is one that is well
recognized; but it is not always recognized for the right reason. The
utilitarian basis for admiration of composition skill is that its
possession makes for better engineers, lawyers, or Madison Avenue
hucksters. The overlooked fact is that these utilitarian uses of
composition skill are by-products, not ends in themselves. The inner
need a person has to compose is the pull toward godhood—the
necessity for inner growth: for experiencing a vision of the wholeness
of those small parts of the universe that have come within our
experience and knowledge. The true meaning of integrity, in terms of
personality, is being one person: not believing one thing and doing
another, not going off in more than one direction. Integrity is an older and more comprehensive term than the modern phrase about "getting it all together." If a person has integrity, he will have it all together; and the chances are that he got it all together, on the road toward integrity, by a process of composing, of organizing everything he knew about life, including what he knew from sources of faith as well as from sources of empiricism, into a fairly simple pattern that is complete and meaningfully interrelated. On the road to perfection, man is expected to contribute his own means and resources to the limits of his ability. It would appear that the least we can do is make the effort to organize the thoughts of our minds into patterns that square with the divine plan. The effort at organization is composition; and this justification of composition goes far beyond, but includes within its borders, the need involved in grubbing a daily existence.

The actions involved in grubbing for a daily existence, incidentally, will probably be less exhaustive for most people of the civilized world during the next hundred years than they were during the past hundred. I assume that suitable means of providing energy will be discovered and provided. I believe this, although I have to admit that at the moment there is no action on the part of any member of the present government of the United States designed to justify my belief. But assuming that the present will unfold without our being thrown back into one of civilization's already-passed ages of hand labor, our children will have even more leisure than we had—as we have had more than our parents had. The presence of too much leisure has already added some corrupting pages to our history. But here we have to stop to determine how much leisure is too much; and the answer is simple: any leisure time at all is too much for the person who does not know what to do with it. It is clear that in the past decade a great many people would have been better off, and we all should have been better off, if they had had to work instead of investing so many hours in crime, pornography, and other aimless diversions. It is apparent, also, that more leisure is going to make the problem even more acute.

One way to attack the problem of leisure would be to require more work out of the members of society so that they can be kept out of mischief. This is a hopeless approach, however, since not that much gainful employment is available. This leaves open a second solution, that of providing people with more worthy and worthwhile things to do with their increasing leisure. And this is where humanities ought to come into the picture. Industry and technology and trade are going to train the people they need for their purposes; but those people, and all
the rest of the people as well, are going to have more than enough time in life for their jobs. Unless, with all that leisure, we are going to put up with steadily increasing depredations against us, we are going to have to educate more people for life than for jobs. The sciences do not have the means of educating for living; only the humanities (including religion) possess those means. If the arts of music, painting, poetry, fiction, language study, and composition occupy an important place in the curriculum of the next century, we may anticipate generations of students finding meaning and joy in the discovery of the old truths in their new surroundings and, most important, discovering their kinship with God as builders of order out of chaos by composing the new-won truths into edifices of human integrity that will reflect his glory. More than it ever did in the past, the future rests on the shoulders of the humanities.
The Implications of Feminism for BYU

Elouise Bell

The academic year 1975-76 is rather a momentous year as far as commemorations go. We're launching into the celebration of our 200th birthday as a nation; we're celebrating the centennial of BYU—the 100th birthday of this great institution; and in memory of the Seneca Falls Convention 127 years ago, and in observance of International Women's Year, the United States Government is issuing a special commemorative stamp. (If you don't remember the significance of Seneca Falls, I urge you to look it up.) Nineteen seventy-five has been proclaimed by the United Nations, by the President of the United States, and by the Governor of the State of Utah as International Women's Year. When I was informed that I was to be given the honor of addressing a BYU forum, I thought that it would perhaps be my lot to inaugurate BYU's celebration of International Women's Year. But President Oaks beat me to the draw on that particular matter, as he does on all matters, by making two key speeches on the subject of women's concerns and by taking some steps in the university administration that are going to be very significant for women. Far from feeling cheated out of my opportunity to inaugurate our observation of Women's Year, however, I am delighted by the vigorous action the president has taken and by what this portends, but I will add my voice to his on the matter of women's concerns at BYU by turning my attention for this talk to the implications of feminism for BYU and for the larger LDS community.

I would like to begin by recounting something that occurred a number of years ago on the BYU campus. It happened in a forum assembly in the George Albert Smith Fieldhouse. The speaker was introduced as a Russian Communist, a foreign policy expert who would address us on certain Soviet concerns and give us the Soviet perspective on a number of vital issues. As you might expect, he drew a
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large audience. He spoke most lucidly, although with a rather heavy accent. But the forum progressed smoothly, if occasionally rather excitedly, to the end of his talk, at which point he suddenly lost his Russian accent and informed us that he was not a Russian, not a Communist, but a faculty member of a large California university, a political scientist if I remember correctly, and an expert in Soviet policy. He had chosen this particular way of presenting the Russians’ viewpoint to dramatize his message.

As I was leaving the fieldhouse that day, two faculty members behind me were talking. One said to the other, "Well, it was very informative and I really enjoyed it. The only thing that disappoints me is that we can’t have a real Communist talk on campus.” To which the other replied, "A real Communist! Are you serious? We can’t even have a real Democrat!"

Well, of course that was long ago and far away. But that anecdote came vividly back to my mind as I prepared these remarks and especially as I talked to people in other valleys than our own. When they asked me what I was going to talk about, I told them, and they said "You mean they’re going to have a real feminist talk at BYU?" I’m not sure how to answer that question because I’m not sure what those people mean when they say a "real feminist.” East of the Utah-Colorado border and certainly west of the Nevada border, I would be considered only a very moderate feminist if I were indeed granted that label at all. Within the boundaries of this state I think I might be considered only too real a feminist for some people’s taste. And even now as I am talking to you, even now as you are hearing me, some of you have already decided what I’m going to say and what you think about what I’m going to say. To put it another way, there are some people who will not hear what I say, but only what they think I have said. And as a teacher, I feel a strong impulse to correct this situation as much as I can. I want to challenge everyone who is listening to me or who may read these remarks to follow the example that President Oaks has set. Watching President Oaks in the last year or so as a number of women’s concerns and issues of feminism have come to his attention and required his action, I have observed that he considers each issue on its own merits. He brings the tools of his trained mind and his total education to bear upon each issue in turn, instead of making a blanket decision about a package labeled somewhat amorphously “Women’s Concerns,” “Feminism,” “The Women’s Movement.” And this is the challenge that I would like to put before every student in this studentbody, the men no less than the women,
the faculty no less than the students, and the community members as well.

Perhaps one of the first lessons a university or college tries to teach the student who comes within its influence is the lesson of not prejudging, of not deciding before examination, of looking at the evidence, of bringing the critical mind to bear on a matter. Wayne Booth, one of the foremost rhetoricians and critics in the country today, formerly dean of the Liberal Arts College of the University of Chicago, and a BYU graduate, has written a brilliant article called "Is There Any Knowledge that a Man Must Have?" In this article he talks about the way an educated person approaches a problem. He says that you cannot tell whether a man is educated by whether he believes in God or does not believe in God, by whether he believes the UFO's come from outer space or do not come from outer space, but, he says, you can tell whether a man is educated by the way he goes about examining the problem. My intention in this address is not to persuade anyone to my particular set of views on the matter of feminism, but hopefully to convince everyone to consider this important matter by bringing to bear on it the best tools that a good education can provide. I'd like to proceed by asking a series of pertinent questions. I hope that none of them is impertinent, but all of them pertinent to the matter of feminism and to its implications for BYU.

(In parenthesis I'd like to say here by way of instruction—and teaching is one of the things that teachers like to do best when they have any free moments from filling out report forms—I'd like to get in a little instruction here and say that you will not hear me using in any serious way the terms "Women's Lib" or "Women's Libber" during these remarks or at any other time. These words are considered pejorative, that is, negative words, by any woman who is seriously involved in the women's movement. They are terms of scorn, mocking terms. It is appropriate to speak of the Women's Liberation Movement, although the concepts that are involved in that phrase are narrower than in some other phrases. But the terms "Women's Lib" and "Women's Libber" are considered to be and are intended to be insulting. So if you are talking about this matter, it is more precise and certainly more polite to use other terms: The Women's Movement, the Feminist Movement, Women's Rights Movement, Feminism, and so forth.)

Let us begin, then, with a definition. What is a feminist? What are we talking about? What does it mean to say that Sister Bell is a feminist or that President Oaks is a feminist? Well, surely you could find in 1975
enough definitions to fill a semester's notebook. I'm not going to turn
to any printed definitions but rather give you my definition, which I
think is simple but useful for our purposes. In my understanding, a
feminist is a person, whether a man or a woman, who believes that
historically there have been inequities in the education and treatment
of women in several or many spheres of society and who is interested
in correcting those inequities as he or she sees them. That's about the
extent of my definition of feminism. That's about as far as I'm
prepared to go with a definition that will cover the views of the many
different people I know who are concerned about feminism. To
become more specific is to start to branch off into different aspects of
feminism about which agreement varies. You'll notice that my
definition has two corollaries, the belief in historical inequities in the
treatment of women and the concern for righting those wrongs. I will
not make an extensive case here for the fact that there have been
inequities in the treatment of women. This is a fact easily
substantiated, and anyone who is interested in finding out the details in
specific areas can do so. But, for example: Women were not allowed to
vote until 1920. This was a political inequity. Even today, women are
paid for the same work in some jobs as little as sixty percent of what
men in the very same job will be paid. This is an economic inequity. Of
all the people in the world who are illiterate, more than eighty percent
are women. This is an educational inequity. As I say, there are many
different spheres in which these inequities can be found, and different
feminists are interested in correcting different problems. You will find
individual feminists enthusiastic about particular concerns here as in
any movement.

Let me then now pose a second question. What are the concerns of
the feminist who is looking particularly at higher education? Or to
make the question even more specific, what is a feminist at BYU
concerned about? A feminist focusing on education is concerned with it
from the very earliest years of a child's life. A feminist is interested in
the way boys and girls are portrayed in children's storybooks, for
instance. She is interested in the implicit lessons that are taught in the
textbooks used in the early grades, in the textbooks used in junior high
and high school, in the classes that are offered, in the counseling that is
given both formally and informally, in the kind of messages that young
women receive through their educational careers, messages that for
years have said: "Don't be too smart." "Don't compete with the
fellows." "Don't take certain courses; you probably won't succeed. If
you do succeed, you won't be happy," and so forth. Many kinds of
training and many kinds of conditioning go on long before higher education. But let us focus on higher education. What is the feminist concerned about in higher education? First of all, that women have equal opportunities for scholarships and admissions. And in that regard I might say that BYU is moving ahead. The president's scholarship, named after the current president of the Church, and so currently titled the Spencer W. Kimball scholarship, is now, for the very first year, available to women as well as to men. (You'll be interested to know also that the prestigious Rhodes scholarship offered by Oxford University will probably be made available to women very soon.) The feminist is also concerned that when women come to college, they are counseled wisely, that they are told about a full range of options for career choices, that they are not channeled into two or three traditional majors only, that they are not, for instance, directed only into education, into home economics, into nursing. In April, 1975, BYU granted 1,510 degrees to women. Of that total, 1,180 were in two colleges—740 in Child Development and Family Relations and 440 in Education. While these are fine fields for women, there are many other opportunities. There are as many opportunities for women as for men, and it's this message that the feminist wants to communicate to the young college woman. The feminist is concerned also that at a university, a young woman have many strong and positive female role models. That is to say, she ought to see women in positions of authority, in positions of success, in positions of achievement, and she ought to get the message, indirectly as well as directly, that there are opportunities for women and there are many options open.

Another aspect of higher education which has been sorely neglected and will take considerable effort to reverse has to do with the whole presentation of knowledge, the whole organization of knowledge. While I do not have time to present this case here, let me just explain briefly. Nearly all of the disciplines—history, art, economics, agriculture, medicine, literature—nearly all of these disciplines have been organized by men, developed by men, the textbooks have been written by men, and they are, by and large, about men. Now the obvious thing to say in rebuttal is that most of the great achievements of the world have been made by men. Well, that is an easy rebuttal. But we are not sure that it is entirely an accurate rebuttal, and what many feminists are now calling for is a reexamination of the whole information basis of various disciplines. We know, for instance, that throughout the centuries much of the world's agriculture has been done by women. While not the case in our country, women have done
much of the farming throughout the other nations of the world, and therefore it is only logical to assume that a great many inventions, discoveries, and processes in agriculture were developed by women. Even the way we divide up history in order to look at it is usually on a political (and hence largely male) basis, the reign of such-and-such a king, or such-and-such an administration, or we take a chronological look at history. Many scholars now say if we look at history from the perspective of the other half of the human race, that is the female half of the human race, we might make very different divisions, we might ask different questions about history, and we might gain entire new insights if we ask a different set of questions. So the feminist is concerned with a scholarly, rational review of the actual fundamental underpinnings of most disciplines. As I said, this is a large order, but it's an exciting kind of thing. It's the kind of thing that has gone on before in the history of ideas, and it is certainly time for it to happen now.

But what would the feminist at BYU be particularly concerned about? She would be interested in all of these things that have been mentioned and in a number of others. Let me mention just two concerns out of a great many that interest me. The first has to do with what it is now fashionable to call life-planning. Someone has said that the average BYU coed has planned her life up to the point of naming her first four children, and beyond that she has made no plans. I am very much concerned that we help our young women to view their lives as a series of changing phases and that they use these college years to lay groundwork which will serve them in future years. Let us grant that most young women who come to Brigham Young University are planning marriage within four to eight years. I would like very much to see us, while we have those young women here at BYU, help them think through their lives beyond the wedding reception. No one, of course, can predict life in advance, but there are certain things that we can be aware of. We should help our young women gain competence and skill in specific areas so that if it were necessary for them to earn the family income for a short or a long period of time, they could do so. If they were widowed, if they were divorced, there would be a solid base of skill and college training on which they could build. I hope that we would encourage every young woman to plan for her years after child rearing. Certainly child-rearing years are crucial years, key years, but thanks to the advancements of science, medicine and nutrition, most women today have twenty-five to thirty-five years of healthy, relatively vigorous life left to them after their youngest children have
left home. Now a woman does not suddenly become, at the age of forty-five or fifty, a vital, questing, self-actuating, self-determining, person. She doesn’t finally see her youngest child off to college and then decide “Now I will become a person of fulfillment with many outside interests and much that I can contribute to the community and to the world around me.” That just doesn’t happen. We know what happens to talents that are not developed. The college years are the years to sow the seeds which may not be harvested for many decades but which can be nurtured and developed and be growing nonetheless. College women need to develop habits of using their minds, being interested in things, learning skills, asking significant questions, being alert to the world around them so that these attitudes can continue, perhaps lessened in quantity but still vital in quality, during the child-rearing years and ready to be expanded afterwards.

You may have read about Sister Camilla Kimball’s example in this respect. In all the years of her marriage to President Spencer W. Kimball, Sister Kimball has continued her education, taking a class regularly every year, except for one or two years when they were traveling. This is an example of the kind of thing that I am talking about. Surely while her children were small, she did not have the time or opportunity to do the things she can now do, but those habits were there, being nurtured and developed, building on the knowledge and talents she had gained while in college.

Let me voice my second concern as a feminist at BYU, and please keep in mind my definition of feminism. You may be familiar with the expression “separate but equal.” It’s a term that was used when racial integration was an issue in the schools years ago. The phrase “separate but equal” was offered by those who believed that the races, black and white, should have separate schools, but schools that were, at least in theory, equal in facilities. Thus, a black child and a white child would not go to school together, but theoretically they would get equivalent educations. Sometimes I have a nervous feeling that what we have at BYU is exactly the opposite. We have “integrated but unequal” education. Certainly our young women and our young men are integrated. I do not believe that there is any institution in the United States in which men and women are so thoroughly integrated as at BYU! But I wonder, in some cases, if the young women are receiving equal educations, or if they are not really receiving educations of quite a different character than the young men, educations in some senses quite inferior. Now why would this be so? Of course it has nothing to do with what the university offers to the young women, or what the
administration permits young women to take; instead it has to do with an attitude that I think many young women come with and some of us on the faculty may foster. Sometimes I worry that our young women pursue less rigorous courses than our young men. Sometimes I wonder if they are less concerned about the nature of the educational package that they are putting together. Integrated but unequal. I would ask the young women in the audience today: How eager are you for knowledge; how thirsty are you for wisdom and the learning that is available to you? What kind of priority do you put on your classes? Do they come rather far down on the list after your church activities, your social activities, your relationships with your roommates and a number of other interests? Most of our young women at BYU are very busy. That is not the issue. No one could ever accuse BYU young women of being slothful playgirls, but I sometimes feel there is not the active intellectual involvement that there should be. A bright young man at BYU usually realizes that there is a certain amount of knowledge and a number of ideas he must get into himself, that he must interiorize and make part of himself, before he’s equipped to go out into the world and make his contribution. Sometimes the bright young woman takes a more passive attitude. She may be less avidly searching and questing than her male counterpart. But I certainly don’t make this as a blanket indictment of all BYU women. I do think such an attitude is more prevalent than it should be, and it is more prevalent than the abilities and potential of our young women warrant.

Now let me ask a third question which may be of concern to many of you as you hear me, or anyone, talking about feminism, and that is the question, stated very directly: "Don’t the objectives of feminism threaten the family as an institution? Isn’t feminism at its heart inimical to many of the principles of the gospel, especially the principles of home and family?" Now this is a crucial question, because the family is the most sacred institution on earth, and any threat to the family as God has ordained it must certainly be resisted. But voices that decry the family as an institution, voices that tell us that there is a better way to do it than the family, are not new voices. They’ve been heard for centuries and they have been identified with many different movements—not just the women’s movement, but with political movements, economic movements, and so-called philosophical movements. Most anti-utopian novelists—Orwell, Huxley, and other writers—have depicted a future in which children were reared in some way other than by the family. So, this is not a threat that comes anew with the feminist movement. More importantly, I am convinced that
only the more radical voices in the feminist movement would seriously harm the family. Of course we must vigorously counter any such voices wherever we find them.

It is true, however, that a central thrust of feminism is a reexamination of many of society’s institutions: the family, the school, the penal institutions, the church. Many different institutions are being reevaluated, that is true. But reevaluation does not necessarily mean rejection, and in fact as I have read the writings of many feminists and talked with some of them, I have found that as a result of their reevaluation they are going back to family values and family traditions with a renewed zest and a renewed appreciation of what they mean. I find many people expressing a renewed determination to spend more time with their children, to spend less time “getting and spending”; less time after the material goods, and more time with the family. Many women feminists are not only spending more time with their children themselves, but urging and helping their husbands to find time to be with their children, to do things together as families, to work together as a family, play together as a family, get close to nature together as a family. I see many of these kinds of things happening. So, remember that reevaluation does not necessarily mean rejection. And while this reevaluation is going on, I certainly think that we as members of the Church ought to be involved so that we can show our brothers and sisters in the world just how important the family is, so that we may teach them what God has ordained in the way of family and family structure, and the eternal nature of the family, so that we may show them in specific ways how families can operate for the greater growth of every member.

Let me summarize, then, by saying, yes there are voices in the feminist movement which, in one sense or another, may threaten certain values which we cherish, but we can certainly counteract that threat and teach and instruct by example and by precept.

Now one more question. A question that I am asked very often when I’m away from campus and rather frequently when I’m on campus is this: “Can a person be a devoted member of the Church, a devoted Latter-day Saint, and a feminist at the same time?” Let me give two answers to that question. For the first answer I would like to cite a kind of evidence much revered in President Oaks’ field of training—the law. If I understand it correctly, precedence is an important factor in the law, and do we ever have precedent on our side for the fact that women can be vital, dynamic feminists, and devoted, dedicated members of the Church at the same time! Our pioneer foremothers
here in the State of Deseret in the last century were very much aware of what was going on in the feminist movement. They were in touch with the great feminist leaders of America like Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Cady Stanton. They not only corresponded with these women, but had them out here to Utah, talked with them, stumped with them from meeting to meeting. They were very active, very much concerned. They wrote essays, editorials, letters, and pamphlets; they worked vigorously for women's causes in those days and, at the same time, they went about their work in building up the kingdom. I'm talking about such leaders as Emmeline B. Wells, Susa Young Gates, and many other women whose names should be better known than they are. This is an intriguing chapter, a less known but intriguing chapter of our history, and light is being shed on it by a book which will be forthcoming within the week from Bookcraft. This is a book called *The Flight and the Nest* by Carol Lynn Pearson. It chronicles the activities of vigorous Latter-day Saint feminists of the past century. So there is great precedent for Mormon feminism.

But when people ask me that question, what they usually mean is this: "Is it possible to be an active, devoted member of the Church, and an active, concerned feminist when you know that sometimes there's going to be a seeming paradox in the principles and teachings and goals of these two parts of your life? There are going to be some questions raised by feminism that seem to be contradictory to gospel principles. There are going to be some things that are taught in the gospel that seem to go contrary to the objectives of feminism."

Let me give my own personal answer to that question. First of all, it is a real concern. There are questions that come up that seem to be paradoxical; there do seem to be conflicts, there do seem to be contradictions. I will not deny this. Some years ago a colleague of mine asked her freshman English class for a definition of maturity. The class tried many definitions and then a young man who was a little older than the average, he had been in the service and was perhaps twenty-five or so, raised his hand and said, "To me maturity means being able to live with a few loose ends; being able to live with a few unanswered questions." I believe this. I believe that we need not become panicked or upset when we see seeming disparities. We can live with unanswered questions.

I was delighted to read in the last issue of the *Ensign* magazine, the article about Sister Camilla Kimball, "Lady of Constant Learning." This same idea of living with a few loose ends is expressed in this article, and if you will permit me, I'll just quote very briefly from it. The
article says that, "even more important than Sister Kimball's freedom to read was the freedom granted her to explore ideas within the context of the gospel." She talks about going to her father with some new ideas about evolution that she had been learning in school. She explains, "My father very patiently heard me out then said, 'Well, daughter, there are theories, and then there's the truth, and you'll come to know the theories from the truth if you'll bide your time!'" Because of her family's hospitality toward searching and studying, Sister Kimball says, "I've always had an inquiring mind. I'm not satisfied just to accept some things. I like to follow through and study things out. I learned early to put aside those gospel questions that I couldn't answer. I had a shelf of things I didn't understand, but as I've grown older and studied and prayed, and thought about each problem, one by one I've been able to better understand them." And, she continues, "I still have some questions on that shelf, but I've come to understand so many other things in my life that I'm willing to bide my time for the rest of the answers."¹

My brothers and sisters, that is my answer to people who ask if I can reconcile my religion and feminism. May I share an experience with you that I think bears out how truly we can trust this principle. I went to Mexico City in June of this summer to attend the Tribune of the International Women's Year, a glorious conference for women from all over the world in celebration of the International Women's Year, and a conference called to discuss some very crucial issues. Before I went to that conference, I sought a priesthood blessing as is my custom in such travels; and a great priesthood leader placed his hands upon my head and gave me a beautiful blessing, in which he said, "I bless you that you may discern the influences of Satan at this conference, for they will surely be there. And I bless you equally that you may discern the influences of Deity and of righteousness, for they will also surely be there." Both influences are present in feminism, but we have God-given powers by which to discern between them.

As I have attempted to live the commandments and to live my religion, and also to be a concerned feminist, there have been questions come up to which I do not know the answers. There have been problems and puzzles and enigmas. I have found that clear thinking and the use of the tools that a good education can provide, utilized under the influence of the Holy Spirit, which one must seek, and which has province over all matters of the intellect and all matters of

learning, that these in combination, the Holy Spirit and the process of clear thinking, can solve many problems and answer many questions. But where they do not supply the answers, I am content to wait. There's no question for me where my priorities are or where truth abides. The gospel is an eternal, timeless context of truth. Feminism is a current, topical, timely matter of great concern to me as a woman in the year 1975. There need be no clash of priorities here whatsoever.

Now I would like, in closing, to answer very quickly a final question: Just how important is feminism anyway? One always hesitates to urge a Mormon audience to action, because there are so many demands on our time. There are so many things which we already feel a little guilty about not doing, and not keeping up with, that to say "here is one more thing about which we must be concerned" is to take a very great responsibility indeed, but I do take that responsibility. I believe that the issues of feminism are crucial to us. Feminism is going to influence us. There is no way we can escape the influence of this movement. I think history will show the feminist movement of the last part of the twentieth century to have as great an impact on the world as, for instance, the Russian Revolution, perhaps even as great an influence as the Industrial Revolution. We cannot escape being touched by the feminist movement any more than someone can escape being touched by television. A person may say, "I do not own a television, I never watch it; therefore it doesn't influence me." That just is not true. That's naive. There's not a person on this planet whose life in some way or another has not been touched because of television, so pervasive is that influence. I repeat that the women's movement is going to influence our lives. We must control the influence. We must confront the issues, rejecting goals and conclusions which are not congruous with the gospel, which are not righteous goals—and do so vigorously and boldly. We must accept and work for those principles which are clearly for growth and fulfillment and better lives for more people. And we must prayerfully search out the answers for the areas in between.

Now let me also say that the women's movement is not the greatest movement on earth today. The greatest movement on earth today is the movement of that stone cut out of the mountain without hands which is rolling forth, as Daniel foresaw, to fill the earth; that is to say, the spreading of the gospel of Jesus Christ throughout the world. That is the greatest movement. But it is my firm belief that the righteous objectives of feminism will help accomplish the goal of building the Kingdom. Elder John A. Widtsoe, of the Council of the
Twelve, made a relevant statement. He said, "Women bear joint responsibility with men in establishing the kingdom of God. They have a common destiny, which as free agents they may attain or lose according to their own actions." I truly believe that the righteous goals of feminism, the wise goals as opposed to the unwise goals, will help us prepare a generation of women more fit than ever before to bear their joint responsibility in establishing the kingdom of God.

Let it not be said that BYU or the Latter-day Saint people stood on the sidelines while great and needed social reforms were taking place in the twentieth century. Let it not be said that we turned our backs or placed our heads in the sand. Rather let it be said that we took our rightful positions in the forefront of that movement. That we were agents for directing it. That we used discernment to know worthy objectives from pernicious ones. That we became teachers and leaders for every righteous aim of self-fulfillment, growth, and high achievement. To all those in the BYU community, I extend the challenge to examine the issues of feminism, to make decisions about them individually on the basis of reason and the light of truth within you, to welcome a new day when women can hold on to all that is traditionally fine and right and God-given and God-ordained, and to encompass as well new alternatives, new options, greater fulfillment of potential, and an ever-increasing responsibility and desire and willingness to do our share in building the kingdom of God.

Forum Address

Charles Malik

Mr. President Oaks, Mr. President Wilkinson, my friend Dr. Walker, members of the administration and faculty of Brigham Young University, students of the University, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen:

I assure you, my friends, it is a distinct pleasure for me to address you here this morning. I spoke to this community more than once before, and always I felt wholly free, wholly myself. And today I feel the same. The secret lies, no doubt, in the fact that I am in the presence of people who fear God. To fear God is the beginning not only of all wisdom, but, believe me, of all joy and all freedom. May you always be filled with these three things: wisdom, freedom, and joy—the wisdom of God, the freedom of God, the joy of God, because you fear God and hold Jesus Christ in special honor.

DÉTENTE

I want first to make a few remarks on the question of détente.

The word "détente" means that you had a state of international tension and it is now being relatively relaxed. Channels of communication are now open and some agreements reached. People are less afraid of each other than before; they are on constant talking terms with each other; and in such a climate one could not say that war was around the corner.

The necessity for détente is the danger of nuclear war. Whoever knows the abc of nuclear war will at once concede that it is unthinkable. No man, no statesman, in his right mind, whatever his faith and whatever his ideology, can accept the prospect of mankind thoroughly annihilating itself, for whatever reason. The atom and the nucleus have radically altered all previous calculations with respect to war and peace.
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If the choice, then, were genuine, certainly any rational human
being would accept the strict preference: better red than dead!

But this choice is neither genuine nor strict.

Firstly, if by being dead somebody is still left over on your side,
and the red is changed into white or at least into pink, then to be dead
may be worthwhile.

Again, the slogan, better red than dead, is formulated from the
Western point of view. Therefore, the question arises: why should it
not be formulated from the other point of view? Why should it not
read: better democratic and free than autocratic and dead? Why should
the pinch of the unimaginable danger of nuclear war be felt more on
this side than on the side of the adversaries of freedom and democracy?

How to make it felt at least equally on the other side is the
principal challenge of high statesmanship today.

Again, open societies remain open, and, within limits, they should
remain open. But what about closed societies? Should not détente be
interested in seeing them open up? Or is détente just an end in itself?
These are very crucial questions. The open and the free cannot
indefinitely remain open and free if it does not seriously promote
openness and freedom in others. Nor can it indefinitely continue to
exist if it is perpetually infiltrable and subvertible from within.

Again, the ideas of those who are opposed to freedom and
democracy are spreading all over the world far more rapidly than your
ideas, and that precisely under the umbrella of détente. Nobody—and I
know what I am talking about—nobody among the youthful leadership
in Asia, Africa, Latin America, and the Middle East is reading Locke or
Rousseau or Jefferson or the Declaration of Independence. They are all
reading Mao or Che Guevara or the vast literature of Marxism-
Leninism. Thus the battle of ideas and fundamental attitudes is being
lost. I ask in all respect: Do you accept that your role in the world be
reduced now only to that of providing material goods and military
might, and of having nothing or very little to say, with conviction on
your part and effectively towards others, in the realm of intellectual
and spiritual values, in the realm of fundamental ideas and basic
attitudes?

Finally, my friends, I am not sure that even in the matter of the
balance of military and political forces détente has been advantageous.
Are you stronger or weaker now, relatively speaking, in terms of naval
and conventional forces, and even in terms of the strategic deterrence
of the atom and the nucleus? I do not know the authoritative answer to
this question, but all I read makes me feel uneasy about it. The fact that China herself has expressed profound uneasiness on this matter, though, of course, for different reasons from mine, is most significant. And politically, how about Portugal? How about Italy? How about Greece and Turkey? How about the outlook in Yugoslavia? How about many another situation in the Eastern Mediterranean? How about what happened in Southeast Asia? How about the Latin American world? How about many a situation in Africa? How about what is happening in the United Nations? I know there are bright spots in all these areas, but I am speaking of the net outcome, the overall trends, the total picture.

My friends, I am all for détente as a negative measure to render nuclear war, if possible, impossible. I am all for increased and deepened contacts, for sustained cultural and economic exchanges, for patient negotiations on all matters. But, if under cover of détente you lose in other respects, or you are lulled into a state of false complacency, then détente is not exactly the greatest achievement you are capable of. It does not do you justice. You can never move from the negative measure of détente to positive measures of real, historic, world statesmanship except if you act from conviction on fundamental questions; I mean, questions on the nature and being of man, and freedom, and truth, and righteousness, and God. If we lose our grip on our deepest, we forthwith lose our grip on ourselves. And then nothing matters. Your deepest problem, therefore, is precisely to rediscover your deepest.

LEADERSHIP

My second set of observations relate to the problem of leadership.

I respect all men, and it is from disrespect for none that I say there are no great leaders in the world today. In fact, greatness itself is laughed to scorn. You should not be great today—you should sink yourself into the herd, you should not be distinguished from the crowd, you should simply be one of the many.

The commanding voice is lacking. The voice which speaks little, but which when it speaks, speaks with compelling moral authority—this kind of voice is not congenial to this age. The age flattens and levels down every distinction into drab uniformity. Respect for the high, the noble, the great, the rare, the specimen that appears once every hundred or every thousand years, is gone. Respect at all is gone! If you ask whom and what people do respect, the answer is literally nobody and nothing. This is simply an unrespecting age—it is the age
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of utter mediocrity. To become a leader today, even a mediocre leader, is a most uphill struggle. You are constantly and in every way and from every side pulled down. One wonders who of those living today will be remembered a thousand years from now—the way we remember with such profound respect Plato, and Aristotle, and Christ, and Paul, and Augustine, and Aquinas.

If you believe in prayer, my friends, and I know you do, then pray that God send great leaders, especially great leaders of the spirit.

A great leader suffers in a hundred different ways, and keeps his suffering to himself.

A great leader survives both his suffering and the fact that nobody knows anything about it.

A great leader loves being alone with God.

A great leader communes with the deepest the ages have known.

A great leader knows there is a higher and there is a lower, and he always seeks the higher, and indeed the highest.

A great leader fights against the spiritual forces of darkness and disintegration, both in his own soul and in the world.

A great leader overcomes himself, rises above himself, daily, minutely.

A great leader is very polite, but he never tones down the truth just to please others.

A great leader never seeks fanfare and publicity—they come to him, and often he rejects them.

A great leader never craves the approval of the world—in fact he often intentionally provokes its disapproval.

A great leader hitches his wagon to the remote, the unattainable, the stars.

A great leader does not worship quantity, multiplicity, perpetual motion—he stubbornly sticks to the one or at most two ultimate truths that there are.

A great leader is very simple, but the moral force of his conviction shines through every tone of his voice and every gesture of his hand.

A great leader lets the oneness of his interest burst forth with endless creativity.

A great leader is absolutely fearless—fearless because he fears only God.

A great leader loves, not sentimentally, not by making an effort, but with the effortless overflow of God's love for him.

A great leader identifies himself with, and is not ashamed of, the deepest in his own tradition.
A great leader is never disturbed by the fact that other traditions too have their own deepest.

A great leader is decisive, yet with the utmost tentativeness and tenderness.

A great leader, under God, does not care if he is crucified—there is something he knows and sees in the distance infinitely more important than to avoid crucifixion.

A great leader knows what the Bible calls "the fulness of the time," I mean the time in which he lives, and God gives him the grace and the power to fulfill that fulness.

You insult a great leader if you call him great; he does not want your judgment; he wants only to please God.

A great leader calls forth the most secret and the most sacred impulses of those whom he leads.

A great leader leads those who are not even aware that they follow him, but only rejoice in the fact that he leads them.

A great leader is at the forefront of danger, be it physical or moral danger, when danger strikes.

A great leader heals.

And so I say, my friends, if you believe in prayer, and I know you do, then pray that God send great leaders, for that is the world's greatest need.

THE UNIVERSITY CRISIS

The third section of my address concerns what I term the university crisis. You are celebrating this year your Centennial. I congratulate you for your great achievements in the past and I wish you far greater achievements in the future. It is with your Centennial celebrations in mind that I make my remarks.

Of course, Mr. President Oaks, there are administrative problems, financial problems, curriculum problems.

Of course, how to relate the sciences to one another, how to make them (or even to make branches under any one of them) communicate with one another, how to introduce peace and order between and among them, is a great problem.

Of course liberal education is fighting for its life, the social sciences are in a state of flux, philosophy is under a thick cloud, and God knows what the theological seminaries are teaching or whether they care that what they are teaching is true.

All this that I am saying is true not only in this country, but throughout the world.
University existence today, ladies and gentlemen, is afflicted with these and many similar problems.

But in my opinion the heart of the university crisis (and of course part of the crisis is that it is not recognized that it exists) is the expulsion of God from the campus.

If Christ were to come to the world today, there is one place where he will not feel at home—one place where he will be a total stranger—and that place, speaking generally, is the university campus. He simply, my friends, is not wanted there. I assure you I know what I am talking about.

And, of course, this is justified, the expulsion of Christ and God is justified, in the name of pluralism. As if pluralism is pluralism if one of the many—Christ, and what a one!—is excluded. As if a university can be a university if one aspect of human existence—the religious aspect, and what an aspect!—is left out!

Now all universities arose—all of them in Europe at least—arose in the womb of the church, and the great majority of American universities were founded on God or on Christ, and in order, among other things, to serve the ministry of the church. And this their origin, their foundation, their first cause, they—I mean the greatest of them—have now completely moved away from. This is very strange—to forget your origin, to turn your back on your first cause.

And this is, of course, called progress. If you honestly inquire into the deepest definition of what is called progress today you will find that progress consists in how far you are away from God. The more progressive you are, the farther away you are from God; and of course the more reactionary you are, the nearer you are to God. Whatever else you might or might not be is only an adornment, an embellishment, an accident to this central thing. The important, the decisive thing, is that to be "progressive" you must either deny God, or forget about him, or live and think and act as though he did not exist, or as though, if he existed, he made no difference—or indeed the wrong kind of difference. In any event God and Christ are not a fit topic for polite conversation in a "progressive" society. And of course, the university has to be "progressive" in this sense.

And this banishment of God from the university has brought about in its trail a complete divorce—as President Wilkinson quoted me as saying—a complete divorce between scholarship and morals, between intellectual excellence and moral excellence, between mind and spirit, between the perfection of the idea and the perfection of the person; nay indeed between the existence of the idea and the existence
of the person. For today, my friends, persons no longer exist, but ideas exist, and how! You can be almost anything in your private life today, but if you answer to the norms of scholarship (in my opinion, mind you, excellent and necessary norms), namely, to certain standards of intellectual skill, you will graduate with honors, you will receive ready appointment on the faculty, and your quick promotion is assured.

In this way man is considered a product of the academic factory, much as a pair of shoes is the product of the shoe factory, and not a whole human being, with all that this means and implies, in terms of freedom and grace and brokenness of spirit before the truth, and in terms of the ability to listen.

Again—and this is most important—take the humanities and the social sciences. Consider the subject matter of the lectures and the contents of the textbooks. Inquire minutely into the kind of philosophy behind what is being taught and read. Whether you are examining economics, or politics, or sociology; whether it is art or literature or philosophy or history or even so-called theology; you will find that the underlying philosophy of the lecturer or textbook is some species of materialism, naturalism, scientism, atheism, moral relativism, Freudianism, hedonism, immanentism, the interpretation of man as the pure product of the social and economic conditions under which he lives, and of his racial and cultural background, the will to power, or at best—at best—self-sufficient humanism. You will hardly find in these lectures and textbooks any reference to, or any trace of, order, rank, excellence, higher and lower; any reference to, or any trace of, the valuable in itself, being in itself, the first in itself; any reference to or any trace of grace, love, community, adoration, quiet, waiting, the enraptured silence; any reference to, or any trace of, God, Christ, spirit, the saints, the faithful, the great souls of history, the Bible, the great sacred music.

Is this state of affairs healthy? Is it right? Do you accept it? What are you doing about it? Under its sway, can you look with confidence to the future—the future of your children, the future of this country, the future of Western civilization? And by “you” here I do not mean this university but the United States as a whole, the body of American universities as a whole.

I wish, therefore, that some foundation, or indeed this university, would donate a couple of million dollars for this project: namely, the investigation, on a strictly scientific basis, of the underlying philosophy, as to the nature of man, and history, and society, and truth, and happiness, and destiny, and the ultimate values and things, behind
the humanities and the social sciences, that is, behind the disciplines which determine the fundamental ideas and attitudes of youth, in the twenty or thirty greatest American universities, both in the thinking and character of the lecturers and in the literature that the students are asked to read. I cannot conceive of any two million dollars being used for a more worthwhile purpose. I assure you the results of this inquiry will be startling, and might awaken America as nothing else would as to what has been happening in its greatest halls of learning in these all-important realms of the mind and the spirit.

I put it then in the simplest possible terms—even at the risk of my simplicity being an oversimplification—that the most fundamental crisis in university existence, in America and in the Western world today—because I know the situation and I know it well—is the disastrous divorce between intellect and character, between mind and spirit, between man and God.

And this divorce at the heart of the university is the ground, the source, the origin, the ultimate cause of all the ills in Western civilization, including America’s domestic problems, including the incredible drama of Watergate, including the terrible ordeal this country went through in Vietnam.

The situation, therefore, brooks no further delay in seeking remedies for it. And yet when I think of it, I think of it with infinite humility. I have no illusions whatever about the practically insuperable difficulties involved. God and Christ, my friends, are not going to return to the university tomorrow, or next year, no matter what anybody does. In fact they may never return to it, in which case Western civilization will be doomed. But I believe they will return to it, but not tomorrow or next year. I am afraid it is going to be a very slow and costly process. Mankind would be very lucky, and God would be loving it more than it deserves, if God and Christ should find themselves at home in the university in a generation or even in two—or even when you celebrate your Bicentennial a hundred years from now. And yet, this is the ultimate issue today and always: how to annul the divorce between God and man, how to reconcile God to man and man to God.

And here I must make one point perfectly clear, because I have been misunderstood in certain places. I am speaking of the university and not of the church, and in the university I will tolerate no sloppiness in scholarship whatever; I demand the highest scholarship and creativity in all fields of science and learning; in the university I do not want godliness at the expense of scholarship; but neither do I hope for
scholarship without godliness. The question is whether the two are incompatible, whether in the nature of things you can only create intellectually away from God. It would be terrible if this were the case, and therefore I believe the expulsion of God from the university is artificial and accidental. Not until he returns to it in full glory, not until the most authentic scholarship resides side by side with the deepest and most sincere love and adoration of Christ, either in the same person or in different persons on the same campus on a vast scale, can we really look for real hope for Western civilization and the world.

I spoke of the problem of leadership. Will the right leaders arise who will see the need—the desperate need, the need of needs—and dedicate themselves to working day and night for meeting it—working not sentimentally, not with the expectation of quick and easy success, but working wisely and intelligently, and with the full knowledge of the forces of rebellion and darkness and opposition that will meet them at every turn? I do not know the answer to this question. Only God knows. But let nobody fool you—this is the question today.

AMERICA

Finally, a few words only about America. I need not tell you how much depends on America today. You know how much America means economically, politically, internationally. But much more than that is bound up with the fate of your great country and your great people.

Man and his dignity are bound up with the fate of America.
Freedom and fairness are bound up with the fate of America.
The continuity of history—and you are celebrating in this university your Centennial this year, and the country as a whole will be celebrating the Bicentennial of its founding next year—I say, the continuity of history is bound up with the fate of America.
The preservation and strengthening of the fundamental values of Western civilization are bound up with the fate of America.
Respect for the sanctity of the individual human person is bound up with the fate of America.
Faith in God and in man is bound up with the fate of America.
And so when we speak of America, we are speaking of something on which much depends, something from which much is expected—expected both by God and man. "For unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall be much required" (Luke 12:48).

Not that these things are not found elsewhere. For just as you have no monopoly of the evil that wells out from the heart of man, so
there is no good in America of which you will not find at least a trace—and sometimes much more than a trace—abroad.

The distinctive feature of America is the fact that its immense potential for good is conjoined to its immense actuality of power. Sheer good without power is powerless, and sheer power with no good to carry and convey is at best useless and at worst demonic.

This is the calling of America: to place its immense actuality of power at the disposal of its immense potentiality for good. The ability to do this can only come from God. Therefore, the calling of America is cheerfully to let itself be enabled by God.

And in all these realms I see today evident signs of hope.

People in this country and throughout the world are raising fundamental questions. The soothing, tranquillizing, hackneyed clichés no longer satisfy. People are more serious. They are really searching. Gone are the flippant days of the sixties. The reserves of goodness in this country are immense—they are waiting only for somebody to tap them, to call them forth. The industrial machine of the United States remains the most productive in the world, and capable of the most potential growth. The nuclear deterrent of this country remains very respectable. There are millions of wonderful families, living and bringing up their children in the fear of God. People abroad continue to place much of their hope in America. They continue seeing in America the principal bulwark of freedom. The universities remain great centers of learning, despite their many problems, and I have the deepest respect for the standards of scholarship in the best of them. The churches, each in its own way, continue their task of healing, saving, bringing Christ to thirsty souls. I know that Jesus Christ is wonderfully living in this country.

There are, then, these and many other signs of hope. But they remain hope, though hope grounded in faith.

And so if we really believe, my friends, we should pray, and work together, and accept suffering and sacrifice, and we should have the courage of our convictions when it comes to the deepest we know.

For the greatest single evil today is this blanket of fear and intimidation spread all over the world, so that people do not dare to stand up for their convictions.

But nothing great has ever been accomplished in history, nor indeed can it ever be accomplished, except through fearless courage in the face of the greatest terrorization. This is the now forgotten way of how really to live—I mean, the way of the Cross. The world needs today the unterrorized man—indeed, the unterrorizable man.
And so, as you celebrate the Centennial of this University, and as the country moves towards its Bicentennial, I pray you all to consider on your knees how much God has blessed you and how much therefore you owe him.

_For you owe him everything._ And once we realize how much we owe God, then, since we can never give him anything commensurate in return, we can at least pay him back tears of gratitude and love.
Who Shall Declare His Generation?

Elder Bruce R. McConkie

I have prayed and pondered earnestly to learn what the Lord wants me to say on this occasion. In the early hours of the morning, as I tossed and turned in bed and kept my wife awake, I concluded upon a subject. I shall talk, if I am properly guided by the Spirit, about what I consider in some respects to be the third greatest miracle that has ever occurred in all eternity. This miracle is of such a nature and of such moment that its accomplishment was attended by a heavenly choir, who sang, "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men" (Luke 2:14). It was attended by an angelic visitant who proclaimed to all of the earth's inhabitants that "unto [us] is born this day in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord" (Luke 2:11). It is clear that, if we are to consider this matter, we need a great outpouring of the Holy Spirit. I need it so that what is said may be expressed discreetly and wisely and in harmony with the mind and will of the Lord, and you need it so that the thoughts expressed will sink into your hearts and you will have a feeling of their eternal verity.

THE THREE GREATEST MIRACLES OF ETERNITY

As I analyze and view the matter, it seems to me that the greatest miracle that ever occurred was the miracle of creation: the fact that God, our Heavenly Father, brought us into being; the fact that we exist; that we were born as his spirit children; and that now we are privileged to abide in mortal tabernacles and partake of a probationary experience.

It seems to me that the second greatest miracle that has ever occurred, in this or any of God's creations, is the atoning sacrifice of his Son; the fact that he came into the world to ransom men from the temporal and spiritual death brought into this existence by the fall of Adam; the fact that he is reconciling us again to God and making  
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immortality and eternal life available to us. This atoning sacrifice of Christ is the greatest thing that has ever happened since the creation.

You probably know that the Prophet was once asked, "What are the fundamental principles of your religion?" He responded:

The fundamental principles of our religion are the testimony of the Apostles and Prophets, concerning Jesus Christ, that He died, was buried, and rose again the third day, and ascended into heaven; and all other things which pertain to our religion are only appendages to it.\(^1\)

The very heart and core and center of revealed religion is the atoning sacrifice of Christ. All things rest upon it, all things are operative because of it, and without it there would be nothing. Without it the purposes of creation would be void, they would vanish away, there would be neither immortality nor eternal life, and the ultimate destiny of all men would be to become as Lucifer and his followers are.

The underlying foundation upon which the atoning sacrifice of Christ rests is the doctrine of the divine sonship, by which we mean that the Lord Jesus, the firstborn spirit child of the Father, having been foreordained to his mission, was born into this world, on the one hand as the Son of God, inheriting thus from his Father the power of immortality; and that he was born, on the other hand, as the offspring of a mortal woman, inheriting from Mary, his mother, the power of mortality. Thus he became the only person who has ever lived who had the power within himself to either live or die as he chose—and therefore the power to work out the infinite and eternal atoning sacrifice upon which all things rest. It seems to me that it would be appropriate on this occasion—as we come into the Christmas period, when we gladly and joyously join with all Christendom in commemorating the traditional day of his birth—for us to talk about the doctrine of his coming into mortality. This is what I consider, in many respects, to be the third greatest miracle of eternity.

MESSIANIC TEXTS IN THE SCRIPTURES

There are several texts that we might take. One text is the great messianic utterance of Isaiah, which he couched in these simple words: "Who shall declare his generation?" (Isaiah 53:8). This means, "Who will give his genesis? Who will reveal his genealogy? Who will give the source from whence he sprang? Who will announce the divinity of the

---

mortal Messiah?" We might also take another text, and this is one that Jesus himself spoke. He said, "Whose son is he?" This is the context: "What think ye of Christ? whose son is he? They say unto him, The son of David. He saith unto them, How then doth David in spirit call him Lord, saying unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand till I make thine enemies thy footstool?" (Matthew 22:42-44).

Whose son is he? Is he the son of a mortal father and a mortal mother? Is he the Son of God? Is he separate and apart from all mankind by virtue of the birth that was his? Who shall declare his generation? We have an account in the New Testament that begins, "The book of the generation of Jesus Christ" (Matthew 1:1). Then Matthew proceeds to outline what appears to be the ancestry of the Lord, but we can't quite figure out how it fits in with other scriptural passages, at least in the form it has come to us. Luke gives another account that does not agree with that in the book of Matthew. We suppose it may be that one of them is a kingly, royal genealogy, intended to indicate his position and place as the one to sit upon the throne of his father David; the other is possibly a genealogy either of Mary or Joseph—we can't be sure. The commentaries of the world talk about the virgin birth as being "pious fiction." No one, they say, could have been born in that way; it was something which Matthew assumed, and so it became a tradition in the early Church. This matter of the genealogy, this matter of the birth of our Lord, is at the heart and core of Christendom. Thanks be to God that by the opening of the heavens and by revelation in our day we have gained an understanding of what is involved. As a result we can put the atoning sacrifice in its proper position and relationship to all things, and then we are in a position to work out our salvation and do the things that we must do if we are to inherit peace and happiness in this life and go on to eternal glory in the life to come.

Whose son is he? He is the firstborn spirit child of God, our Heavenly Father. There is no possible way to conceive of the genealogy, the genesis, the generation of Christ, without knowing that God our Father is a personal being in whose image we are created; that he has a body of flesh and bones as tangible as man's; that he is literally—in the most real and personal sense of the word—the father of the spirits of all men. The Lord Jesus, the great Jehovah, the creator of all things under the Father, is the firstborn of all that spirit host.

In that premortal life our Father ordained and established a plan of salvation named the gospel of God, which plan was to enable his spirit children, Christ included, to advance and progress and become
like him. In that day he issued a great cry, a great proclamation went forth through the councils of eternity, with reference to the Father's plan. He said, "Whom shall I send to be my Son, to work out the infinite and eternal atoning sacrifice? Whom shall I send to be born into mortality, inheriting from me the power of immortality? Whom shall I send to lay down his life for the sins of men and to reconcile fallen man to me?" When that great cry went forth, as you know, there were two volunteers. One stepped forward, the firstborn of the Father, the Lord Jesus, and said, "Here am I. Send me. I will be thy son. And, Father, the honor and the glory be thine in all things. I will do thy will. I will follow thy plan, do all things in harmony with that which thou hast ordained." There was another volunteer, and he said, "Here am I, send me, I will be thy son, and I will redeem all mankind, . . . and surely I will do it; wherefore give me thine honor" (Moses 4:1)—that is, "Let me replace you and be the exalted and most noble of all the persons who live and are." Well, the decree was issued: "I will send the first" (Abraham 3:27), and that was the day when there was war in heaven, as you know.

The first volunteer was the Lord Jesus; he then became the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world, the one appointed to come down and do all things needed to put in operation his Father's plan. Now from that day, from the day of creation on, the prophets foretold his coming and ministry. We call these prophetic utterances messianic prophecies, as for instance, "Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel" (Isaiah 7:14). Or, "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, The mighty God, the everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even for ever" (Isaiah 9:6-7).

How many sermons were preached in ancient Israel on these messianic texts we can only imagine. The most perfect prophecies and the greatest sermons are found in the Book of Mormon. Here is a sermon-prophecy that an angel spoke to a Nephite prophet:

For behold, the time cometh, and is not far distant, that with power, the Lord Omnipotent who reigneth, who was, and is from all eternity to all eternity, shall come down from heaven among the children of men, and shall dwell in a tabernacle of clay, and shall go forth amongst men, working mighty miracles, such as healing the
sick, raising the dead, causing the lame to walk, the blind to receive
their sight, and the deaf to hear, and curing all manner of diseases.

And he shall cast out devils, or the evil spirits which dwell in
the hearts of the children of men.

And lo, he shall suffer temptations, and pain of body, hunger,
thirst, and fatigue, even more than man can suffer, except it be unto
death; for behold, blood cometh from every pore, so great shall be
his anguish for the wickedness and the abominations of his people.

And he shall be called Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the Father
of heaven and earth, the Creator of all things from the beginning;
and his mother shall be called Mary. (Mosiah 3:5-8)

ACCOUNTS OF THE SAVIOR'S BIRTH

In due course, at the appointed time, in the fulness of the
Lord’s own time, the Savior was born into the world. Who shall declare
his generation? We have attempts made by prophetic writers of old.
Matthew says, “Now the birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise: When
as his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together,
she was found with child of the Holy Ghost” (Matthew 1:18). And
then he recites what happened and quotes the prophetic utterance of
Isaiah about the virgin birth. Let me read you the kindred passage in
the book of Luke, this one spoken by Gabriel to Mary:

The angel said unto her, Fear not, Mary: for thou hast found
favor with God.

And, behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth
a son, and shalt call his name Jesus.

He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest;
and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father
David:

And he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his
kingdom there shall be no end.

Then said Mary unto the angel, How shall this be, seeing I
know not a man?

And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost
shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall
overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born
of thee shall be called the Son of God. (Luke 1:30-35)

Now I take those two statements—one written by Matthew, the
other by Luke—not perhaps perfectly transcribed and recorded for us
in their present form, and I add these words spoken by Alma as the
Holy Ghost moved upon him. Alma, as we shall see, will tie together
what Matthew and Luke have written and give us the accurate and
perfect perspective as to the generation of the Lord Jesus. He said:
Repent ye, and prepare the way of the Lord, and walk in his paths, which are straight; for behold, the kingdom of heaven is at hand, and the Son of God cometh upon the face of the earth.

And behold, he shall be born of Mary, at Jerusalem, which is the land of our forefathers, she being a virgin, a precious and chosen vessel, who shall be overshadowed and conceive by the power of the Holy Ghost, and bring forth a son, yea, even the Son of God. (Alma 7:9-10)

Now I shall call your attention to one other passage, and then we shall see if we know the answer to our query, "Who shall declare his generation?" This passage is from that wondrous, marvelous vision that Nephi had. He said:

I beheld the city of Nazareth; and in the city of Nazareth I beheld a virgin, and she was exceedingly fair and white.

And it came to pass that I saw the heavens open; and an angel came down and stood before me; and he said unto me: Nephi, what beholdest thou?

And I said unto him: A virgin, most beautiful and fair above all other virgins.

And he said unto me: Knowest thou the condescension of God? [If the angel had asked that of you, what would your answer have been? Nephi was a little hesitant. He knew in part, but not in full.]

And I said unto him: I know that he loveth his children; nevertheless, I do not know the meaning of all things.

And he said unto me: Behold, the virgin whom thou seest is the mother of the Son of God, after the manner of the flesh.

And it came to pass that I beheld that she was carried away in the Spirit; and after she had been carried away in the Spirit for the space of a time the angel spake unto me, saying: Look!

And I looked and beheld the virgin again, bearing a child in her arms.

And the angel said unto me: Behold the Lamb of God, yea, even the Son of the Eternal Father! (1 Nephi 11:13-21)

Who shall declare his generation? Whose son is he? Well, now it is perfectly clear. On the one hand he is the son of God, the God who said in messianic vein, "Thou art my son; this day have I begotten thee" (Psalms 2:7). On the other hand, he is the son of David and the son of Mary. He inherited from his Father the power of immortality and from his mortal ancestors the power of mortality. How do we know this? How can it be established? We are dealing with spiritual things. Matthew says his book is the book of the generation of Jesus Christ, and he records the facts. He says there was a virgin birth; but the whole world—Christians, so-called—contends and is uncertain and has
difficult feelings about this passage. Some say, "Yes, he was born of a virgin," and others say, "It was a pious tradition." Then we read the Book of Mormon account, and we discover what the perfect rendition of the doctrine is. Whose son is he and how do you know it? Paul said a very impressive thing: "No man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost" (1 Corinthians 12:3). The Prophet improved this by saying: "No man can know that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost."

TESTIMONY OF THE SAVIOR'S GENEALOGY

Who shall declare his generation? Whose son is he? We have been called out of darkness into the marvelous light of Christ. We have been called to the place where the heavens are opened, where the gifts of the Holy Ghost are poured out bounteously, abundantly, upon all the members of the Church who seek the Lord in integrity and uprightness of heart. We have the gifts of the Spirit, we have the gift of revelation, and we know what is involved in these things. Every member of the Church has had the hands of a legal administrator placed upon his head, and the decree issued: "Receive the Holy Ghost." This means that we receive the gift of the Holy Ghost, which is the right to the constant companionship of that member of the Godhead, based on faithfulness.

Who shall declare his generation? His generation can be declared only by living witnesses who have had the revelation of the Holy Ghost which certifies to their souls that Jesus is the Lord. There is no possible way to know that he is Christ above all, that all power is resident in him, that he is God's son, except by the process and means of revelation—and I speak of personal revelation. Peter received a personal revelation as he stood in the presence of the Lord, and it came by the power of the Holy Ghost. He certified, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God" (Matthew 16:16), and received a blessing from the Lord for the witness that he had borne.

Now, if we want to know who is going to declare his generation, the answer is that it is the Latter-day Saints; it is the elders of Israel; it is the prophets and apostles who minister among us; and it is all of those among us who have lived in such a manner that we know by the whisperings of the Holy Spirit within us that here is eternal verity, that these things are true. You can be one, as well as I can be one, who declares the generation of Jesus Christ, who gives his genealogy, who comes to know in his heart by a power that is beyond intellectuality, by a power that comes from revelation and revelation only, that he is the
Lord, that God is his Father; and this is the beginning of a course of personal righteousness. Unless and until we know that Jesus is the Lord and that God is his Father, we do not have testimonies of the truth and divinity of the work. In our day a testimony is to know, number one, that Jesus is the Lord, which is the doctrine of the divine sonship. It is to know, number two, that Joseph Smith is a prophet of God and a revealer of the knowledge of Christ and of salvation for us in our day. And it is, number three, to know that The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints is the only true and living church upon the face of the whole earth.

Now, I am just one among you. There are thousands of us here congregated in the spirit of worship. I have been speaking, and you listening, and the Spirit of the Lord has been present. I have given utterance to truths that are eternal, that will endure to all ages, that are the great foundation upon which the cause of truth and righteousness rests. Those truths have sunk into the hearts of all of you who have been endowed with the same Spirit, and you know as I know that they are true.

Now, in conclusion, I, acting as voice, as mouth as it were for you, declare the generation of the Lord Jesus, his genesis, the source from which he sprang: He is God's son. He was born into this world after the manner of the flesh, with God as his father and Mary as his mother, inheriting the powers of mortality and immortality thereby. He was thus able to work out the infinite and eternal atoning sacrifice. He was thus able to bow in that garden outside Jerusalem's walls, that garden called Gethsemane, and take upon himself the sins of all men on conditions of repentance. That act is the greatest miracle of all time since the miracle of creation, and underlying it is the event which we celebrate with the world this coming season, the birth of our Lord into mortality. Is it any wonder that angelic choir sang, "Glory to God on high, and peace to men"? That is the message we proclaim at this season, and we do it with a sure knowledge whereof we speak, and in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.
The Fragility of Freedom

Milton Friedman

Thank you very much. It is a special pleasure for me to be introduced to you here today by Dallin Oaks, who was not only a colleague at the University of Chicago, but a tower of strength in our times of trouble during the late 1960s when many universities in this country were subjected to disturbances and disruptions. The University of Chicago handled them particularly well, and one of the main reasons we were able to do so was because of the willingness of Dallin Oaks to serve as chairman of a committee which played a very important role in those events. We regret very much losing him, but our loss has been your gain.

Dallin Oaks referred to the Bicentennial. I trust you know that 1976 is a double Bicentennial. It is a Bicentennial of the publication of The Wealth of Nations, that great book by Adam Smith which is a bible of economic freedom and is closely related to political freedom. And, indeed, almost everything I am going to say today could be found in one form or another in that book.

Those of us who have been fortunate enough to be born in the United States in the twentieth century naturally take freedom for granted. It seems to us that a relatively free society is the natural state of mankind. But that is a great misconception. Freedom is very far from being the natural state of mankind. On the contrary, it is an extraordinarily unusual situation. If you look back through history, in any place on the globe, you will find that the natural state of mankind in most periods in history has been tyranny and misery. If you look over the globe geographically at any point in time, you will find that most of the people in the world at that point of time were living in a state of tyranny and misery. The periods and places in which there has been something approaching a free society have been few and far between. There was a small example in the fifth century B.C. on the Peloponnesian Peninsula in Athens, but that was only a partly free
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society. It was a society that was free for the citizens of Athens, but not for the slaves who also inhabited the city. There was a brief spurt of freedom during the Renaissance in the Middle Ages. The most extended period of freedom has been the period in the eighteenth and nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in Western Europe and the United States. Yet, look at how fragile that freedom has been. The countries in the world that have been able to maintain during that period something roughly approaching a free society are few in number. They consist almost entirely of the English-speaking countries and the Scandinavian countries.

This fragility of freedom was brought home to me dramatically last April when I spent a week in the small country of Chile in South America. I was in Chile for a week as part of a group that was examining and considering the economic problems which Chile was then facing—problems which you and I have in our future (I hope in a very distant future). Problems which were epitomized by the fact that they had managed after great effort to bring the rate of inflation down from 900 percent a year to 400 percent a year. But I don't want to talk about Chile's economic problems; I want to talk about the problems of freedom.

Chile, of course, is a very different country than the United States, and a very much poorer country than the United States. Yet the history of Chile is highly relevant to our present situation and our future problems. Of all the South American countries, Chile had about the longest history of a reasonable degree of democratic government and a reasonably free society. That history dates back to the nineteenth century.

The origin of the present problems in Chile, which has lost freedom and which today is governed by an authoritarian regime, in my opinion, goes back some fifty or sixty years. Chile was not only one of the countries in South America that had the longest history of freedom and political democracy, but it was also one of the earliest countries in South America to institute a welfare state and welfare state measures. I was surprised to find in reading about Chile that, like Great Britain, the class of measures that we today associate with Welfare Statism, the New Deal, and the Fair Deal, got their start in Chile about 1906, 1907, or 1908, at about the same time that these processes started in Great Britain.

The present state of Chile, in my opinion, is the end result of an expansion in the role of government over the lives of people. The important thing about that development and the main lesson I am going to try to elaborate on in this talk, is that the measures that led to that result were done by good people for good objectives. The measures that
led to Chile's problems were not bad measures that were taken by bad people with the aim of grinding the poor under their heels. On the contrary, the problems of Chile derived from the attempt to use the State and the political mechanism to achieve good objectives. That development led to an increasing expansion in the role of the State in the society. It led to an increasing accumulation of legislation in which the government controlled what people could do. The obvious numerical counterpart of this was an increase in government spending until, by the time Mr. Allende came to power in Chile, government spending had reached something like 40 percent of the national income.

Since Chile was a poor country, it was difficult to impose explicit taxes to generate revenues of 40 percent of national income. As a result, taxes were imposed indirectly in the form of inflation. There is a great misconception about what happened. Mr. Allende, who produced the great confrontation and was clearly seeking to turn Chile into a communist dictatorship, was only carrying out the laws that had already been enacted by his predecessors. He introduced very little that was different. He just continued in the same direction that policy had been proceeding, ever more rapidly, during the past thirty or forty years. However, the end result was the tipping point at which the willingness of the public to put up with increasing involvement in their own lives was exceeded. There was first, the Allende regime with its threat of a left-wing dictatorship; and then a counterrevolution with the military taking over and a military junta being established, which also is very far indeed from a free society. It, too, is an authoritarian society which denies the liberties and freedoms of the people in the sense in which you and I conceive of them.

Lest you think that this tale of the history of Chile need not concern us, let me ask you to consider a case much closer. Cast your eyes across the Atlantic to the home of most of the ideas of freedom that we cherish—to the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom is a much richer country than Chile. It has a far stronger tradition of a belief in freedom and in democratic rights. Yet, the United Kingdom is going down the same path as Chile and I fear is headed for the same end. It is almost impossible for any one of us who was brought up in the great traditions emanating from Great Britain—the great tradition of freedom and of democratic rights starting with the Magna Carta and coming down through the whole list of famous Englishmen who have written and taught us about free institutions—it is almost impossible for anyone brought up in that tradition to utter the words that Britain is in danger of losing freedom and democracy, and yet it is a fact! I was
in Britain a little over a year ago. It was precisely because I had spent some time in Britain and had seen what was happening there that I was so much reminded in Chile this spring that I was seeing the same scene over again. It was like a continuous movie and this was where I came in. Or maybe I should say this was where I went out. What has been happening in Great Britain?

About the same time as Chile, Great Britain started on the welfare state line. In 1913, a great English constitutional lawyer, A. V. Dicey, revised and published a series of lectures he had given in this country under the title, Relation Between Law and Public Opinion in the Nineteenth Century. In its preface, referring to the measures that Britain had already taken by 1913, particularly in the area of old age benefits and of the treatment of people in institutions, he said, "This is a road on which no reasonable man can refuse to enter, but once entered nobody can tell where it is going to lead." That was an extraordinarily prescient prediction of what was in store for Great Britain because the role of the government has, from that point to this, expanded until today (again by that simple numerical measure that I used) total government spending in Great Britain (central and local) amounts to 60 percent of the national income. And yet, there is enormous pressure for still more government spending. Nobody is satisfied; everybody is dissatisfied. Society is being polarized. It is hard to see how Britain can avoid the fate that Chile experienced. Lest I seem alarmist, I can quote (I was amazed to hear it I must confess), from one of our modern oracles, Eric Sevareid, who in one of his little pieces of wisdom over the network after a visit to Britain, made exactly this analogy and said Britain is on the verge of the Allende period of Chile. And so it is. I fear very much that within the next five years the odds are at least 50-50 that British freedom and democracy as we have seen it will be destroyed.

But again, I need not go that far away. Let me come closer to home. Consider at the moment New York City. New York City displays precisely the same trends as Chile and the United Kingdom. New York City has the dubious distinction of having the most welfare state oriented electorate in the country. New York City has been following the same policy of ever-growing governmental involvement in the affairs of its citizens and the result has been exactly the same. Wherever this path has been followed, whether in Chile or in the United Kingdom or in New York, it has two consequences. The first is financial crisis. Certainly that characterized the situation in Chile. Certainly that characterizes the situation in the United Kingdom.
where the rate of inflation has reached something over 25 percent; where the government budget is enormously in deficit; where Britain is able to survive primarily by borrowing from overseas. Similarly in New York, the first effect—financial crisis—is obvious.

The second effect is less obvious. This path leads not only to financial crisis, but also to a loss of liberty and freedom; and New York City has lost its liberty and freedom. New York City is no longer being governed by the citizens of New York City or by people elected by the citizens of New York City. It is now being governed by a committee of overseers appointed by the State of New York with power to overrule the elected officials of the City of New York. This loss of self-government and freedom has been concealed by the shift of power from one democratic institution, the City of New York, to another democratic institution, the State of New York. But the principle is the same: financial crisis leads to a loss of self-government. There is only one important difference between New York City on the one hand and Chile or the United Kingdom on the other and that is that New York City does not have one of those printing presses on which you can turn out green pieces of paper that people call money. It cannot issue its own money. Chile and Britain could issue their own money and, therefore, the financial crisis took the form of inflation; whereas, in New York it degenerated more promptly to bankruptcy.

Let me come still closer to home. Consider the United States in general and Brigham Young University in particular. The United States has been following the same path. Again, to use a simple index which I have been using, for the period from the founding of this country to 1929, leaving aside periods of major wars such as the Civil War and the First World War and the Revolution, total government spending in the United States (federal, state and local), never exceeded 10 percent of the income of the people. State and local expenditure more immediately subject to the control of the citizenry was twice as large during that period as federal government expenditures. Total federal government expenditure in 1929 was 3 percent of the national income. In the forty-five years since, total governmental expenditures have risen to 40 percent of the national income in the United States and federal government spending is twice as much as state and local spending. Federal spending today is something like 25 percent of the national income, or roughly 10 times as large as it was in 1929. We have been moving in the same direction as Chile and Britain and New York, and we have been experiencing signs of financial crisis—the
emergence of inflation at a higher and higher rate. We have also been experiencing the second effect: the loss of freedom.

People always talk as if the problem is in the future; as if the problem is that individual freedom is threatened by the encroaching control of our lives by the State. It is not merely the future, it is the present! Freedom has been greatly reduced in many dimensions. After all, the spending of 40 percent of our income for us by government is a restriction on our freedom. We have nothing to say about that 40 percent except through the political process which is what I am going to come to in a moment. But put aside the question of income. Go to those more fundamental freedoms of speech, of belief, of personal behavior. They, too, have been severely restricted. Consider for a moment the simple question of freedom of speech. Let me ask you how often you read in the papers any statement on public issues by a major businessman or industrialist except where it immediately concerns his own enterprise.

A little over a year ago, President Ford constructed a program, hastily buried shortly thereafter, called the WIN Program for Whip Inflation Now. Now it was a program that had some good things and some bad things, but taken as a whole it was a pretty silly program. You will search every newspaper in this country without finding a single major businessman who made a public statement against that program. Why? Was it because they agreed with it? It is inconceivable. At least it is inconceivable that they unanimously agreed with it. Surely there was some businessman who didn’t.

However, if you were a businessman at the head of a great corporation you would think three times before you spoke out on a major public issue. You would look over your left shoulder and see the IRS getting ready to come and audit your accounts and you would look over your right shoulder and see the Department of Justice standing only too ready to launch an antitrust suit against you. And then, if you had more shoulders than two, you would ask what is the FTC going to do about my advertising; and what is the FDA going to do about the products I produce; and what is the Safety Council going to do about this, that and the other thing? You are not free to speak if you are in that position.

Let me get closer to home. Let me get to my own area and your area—the academy. Is the scholar free to speak? I ask myself whether the professors who teach medicine at any medical school in this country, most of whose research is being financed by the National Institutes of Health, whether they really feel free to speak out against
socialized medicine and against further involvement of the government in medicine. Some of them obviously will. But is there the slightest doubt, to use those famous words of the Supreme Court, that their dependence for the major source of their financing on the Federal Government has a "chilling effect" on the freedom of speech? About the only people who now have full freedom of speech are people in the fortunate position that I am in—a tenured professor at a major institution on the verge of retirement.

Let me come down to Brigham Young University. The bureaucratic lash which has extended from Washington has even reached here with a proposal to impose on Brigham Young various requirements of Health, Education and Welfare—requirements that, in my opinion, would interfere severely and seriously with your performance of your selected mission. Every academic institution in the United States is threatened in exactly the same way. If it were not so serious, it would be humorous because there is no group in this country that has done more to bring this upon themselves than the academic community. We have been in the forefront in persuading the public at large that the doctrine of individual responsibility is a false doctrine; that the source of all good things is Big Brother in Washington. We only complain when it comes home and hits us.

Let me go from a description of the situation to an analysis. Why? What is the explanation of the tendency for the attempt to use the political market to achieve noble objectives to go awry and destroy our freedom. Why does it happen? In the simplest form, the fundamental fallacy of the welfare state which leads to both financial crisis and the destruction of freedom is the attempt to do good at somebody else's expense. That's the fundamental fallacy. First, nobody spends somebody else's money as carefully as he spends his own. That's why trying to do good at someone else's expense leads to financial crisis.

Second, if you are going to do good at somebody else's expense, you have to take the money away from them. So force, coercion, destruction of freedom is at the very bottom, at the very source, of the attempts to do good at somebody else's expense. About seven or eight years ago, in an article published in the New York Times magazine section, John Kenneth Galbraith said that there was no problem in New York City which would not be solved if the city government's budget were doubled. In the interim the city government's budget has been quadrupled and so have the problems. And the reason is straightforward. While the city government had more to spend, the
citizens had less to spend because the government can only get the money by taking it away from somebody else.

More fundamentally, to get beneath this simple description, what is at bottom of our problem is the failure to recognize the distinction between the political market on the one hand and the economic market on the other. This distinction, which I would like to develop, is one that can be expressed in various terms. You will pardon me if my professional background leads me to put it in economic terms. The political system is a marketplace; the economic system is a marketplace. These are two different kinds of market mechanisms and they have very different consequences. Though it may seem a paradox, the economic market is a freer, more democratic market than the political marketplace.

Let me at the outset put to one side a false distinction between the two markets. We tend to be misled by words. Because we speak of a person in the economic market as having a private enterprise, we think of him as serving his private interest. Because we speak of a government bureaucrat as being a public servant, we speak of him as serving the public interest. But that is an utterly false distinction. Almost every individual serves his own private interest. That interest need not be pecuniary; it need not be monetary, or physical, or material. The great saints of history have served their private interest just as the most money-grubbing miser has served his private interest. The private interest is whatever it is that drives an individual. A government bureaucrat is seeking to serve his private interest just as much as you or I or the ordinary businessman is serving his private interest. To make this point in the most extreme form, if you compare the manager of a Russian factory who is a public servant and the manager of an American factory who is supposedly a private employee, they both are serving their self-interests. The only difference is that the actions that will serve their self-interest are different. The American manager has to worry about getting fired; the Soviet manager has to worry about getting fired at! And that makes a big difference in what's in their self-interest.

In exactly the same way, the bureaucrats at HEW in Washington who are trying to extend their control and impose regulations on Brigham Young, on Chicago, on Hillsdale, on all the other colleges, are serving their private interest. They may believe thoroughly in what they are doing, but they are nonetheless serving their private interest in seeking to extend the scope of their power, their importance, and their influence. It is a myth that there is a difference between the
motives of the people who are employed in government and the people who are employed in the private sector. That is equally true of those who are competing for votes. The legislators are competing one with another. They are competing for votes and it is in their private interest to do those things which will get them enough votes to get elected.

A second myth about the political market is that as opposed to the economic market in which individuals vote with dollars, in the political market there is one person-one vote. That is true on a formal level, but it is obviously false on a realistic level. It is a system in which there is highly weighted voting; in which some people have an enormously greater influence on the political outcome than others. This is obvious in all sorts of ways. You need only look at the kind of thing that we have been talking about. Take the most dramatic example at the moment. We have a great dispute in this country about forced busing. Whatever may be said for or against it, there is not the slightest doubt that 80-90 percent of both whites and blacks in this country are opposed to forced busing. Yet we have it and we are going to continue to have it. How can you explain that on the basis of one person-one vote?

There is a highly weighted voting system and an analysis of the political market must investigate why there is such a weighted voting system. Is the problem with the political market that you have wicked people? No. The people who operate in the political market are just as wicked or just as noble as the people who operate in the economic market. They are the same people. The difference is the structure of the market. The difference is that the political market is a system under which all decisions have to be yes or no.

The fundamental difference between the political market and the economic market is that in the political market there is very little relation between what you vote for and what you get. In the economic market you get what you vote for. Let me give you a very trivial example of the kind of thing that I have in mind. Let's suppose the question at issue is whether neckties should be red or green. If that is going to be decided by a political mechanism, everybody votes. If 51 percent of the people vote that ties shall be red, 100 percent of the people get red neckties. In the economic market each one of us goes to the store separately. If 51 percent of the people vote that ties shall be red, 51 percent get red neckties and 49 percent get green neckties. Everybody gets what he votes for. Now this is a fundamental difference between the two markets.
There are some things for which the vote has to be yes or no. Those are the things which are the appropriate function and role of government. There is no way in which 51 percent of the people in the United States can be at war in Viet Nam and 49 percent of the people can be not in war. That is precisely the kind of a decision that has to be decided through a mechanism which permits a yes/no vote. The problem is that we have extended the political market beyond things of that kind and to the kind of things where it is possible for each person to get what he votes for, where we do not have to have a yes or no decision. If you have a yes or no decision, then there is almost always a very loose or no relation between your vote and the result. As a consequence, you do not in general have any incentive to examine the issue you vote on thoroughly, i.e., to vote intelligently. In the political market, this phenomenon leads to weighted voting in favor of special interests and opposed to the general interest. If I have some piece of legislation that is going to benefit a small group a great deal, the members of that small group have a real incentive to learn about the issue, to bring pressure on their legislators to lobby for it in Washington. The rest of us? Here is something which is going to mean millions of dollars separately to each of a small number of people, but to you and me it means fifty cents extra on our tax bill. What incentive do we have to find out about it or to spend any time voting intelligently, or to bring pressure on our legislators.

Let me give you a few very simple examples. About three or four years ago President Nixon tried to eliminate a program under which the federal government had for many years been subsidizing people who tasted tea. This is literally true. This is a program under which the government graded tea for the benefit of importers and you and I paid taxes to hire people to taste the tea and decide what grade it should get. It is very hard to see any general public interest in that. After all, the tea industry can provide those people. Mr. Nixon made the simple, obvious proposal that we should eliminate it. We still have that program because the people in the tea industry got up in arms about it. They didn't want to have that little thing taken away from them. Is there anybody in this audience who would take his vote away from a representative because that representative voted to keep the tea tasting arrangement?

Let me give you a more important case. We have a post office which I would hardly suppose is distinguished for its efficiency. For many years I have been trying to propagandize for eliminating the monopoly privileges of the post office—for opening it up to
competition. About a dozen years ago, I talked to a good friend of mine who was then in Congress to urge him to introduce a one sentence bill eliminating the monopoly privileges of the post office. He said to me, "You know I agree with you completely, but can you name me an organized group that will come and testify in favor of that bill? I know about the organized groups that will be there to testify against it. There will be the postal employees union; there will be the organization of newspapers and of magazines who will testify against that bill," and he went down the list. All of those organized groups would testify against it. The people who are benefited don't even know that they would be benefited. If you eliminated the monopoly on the post office, there would develop a viable active private industry carrying mail. Some of you people in the audience might at some time be employed in such an industry, but do you know it? Are you going to go down to Washington to campaign in favor of that bill? Not a chance of it. "So," he said, "there is not a chance in the world of getting that bill through. It's just a waste of my energy and time to move in that direction."

We mustn't suppose that this favoring of special interests only applies to others. Brigham Young University may be an exception in that it relies to a very limited extent upon governmental subsidies, but most institutions of higher education in this country are very much subsidized by the government.

Some of you may remember that years ago a former president of General Motors testified before Congress and was so injudicious as to make the statement, "What's good for General Motors is good for the country." My colleagues at the university hooted and scorned him for such a self-serving statement. But then the next day they were taking airplanes to Washington to testify before Congress that what was good for higher education was good for the country. And not one of them saw the irony and the inconsistency.

Each of us separately will try to use this government mechanism to get special benefits for ourselves. Again, going back to that episode last September before the WIN Program was instituted, President Ford had a summit meeting at which people from around the country came together on the subject of inflation. I heard one representative of special interests after another get on the platform and say, "What this country needs to stop inflation is to cut down government spending and the way to cut down government spending is to spend more on me." That was a universal refrain from the farmers, the trade unions, the business representatives, the representatives of the universities.
That is the fundamental defect of the political mechanism: it is a system of highly weighted voting under which the special interests have great incentive to promote their own interests at the expense of the general public. The benefits are concentrated, the costs are diffused, and therefore you have a bias in the marketplace which leads to ever greater expansion in the scope of government and ultimately to control over the individual. The way to get elected to Congress or to the presidency is not really to appeal to the general interest. A majority decides, but it is a special kind of majority. The way to get elected is by putting together a coalition of special interests. You go to a group that has 5 percent of the vote and say, "I will vote for what you want if you don't care what else I do." And, they say, "Oh, I don't care what else you do." You go to another 5 percent and in this way you assemble 51 percent.

The characteristics of the economic market are very different. The fundamental point is the one I mentioned before. In the economic market—the market in which individuals buy and sell from one another—each person gets what he pays for. There is a dollar for dollar relationship. Therefore, you have an incentive proportionate to the cost to examine what you are getting. If you are paying out of your own pocket for something and not out of somebody else's pocket, then you have a very strong incentive to see whether you are getting your money's worth. In addition, nobody can get money from you in the economic market unless you agree. There is nobody who can put his hand in your pocket without your permission. In the political market that is the standard way of financing everything. As a consequence, you have in the economic market true individual freedom and a true individual incentive to get what you vote for and, more importantly, the incentive to find out whether what you are getting is what you voted for and is proportional to the cost to you.

The fundamental problem of a major society, of a society like ours, is that millions and millions of people must cooperate with one another for their daily bread. Fundamentally, there are only two ways in which large groups of people can be induced to cooperate with one another. One way is the method of the army, through force and coercion and direct order. The general tells the colonel, the colonel tells the major, who tells the lieutenant, and so on down to the private. The other way is through voluntary cooperation among people, each of whom is separately pursuing his own interest. In fact, the first method cannot work. The world is simply too complicated. There are too many facts of special time and place for it to be possible to run any
complicated system on the basis of direct order. So that in fact, all systems of cooperation among large groups of people involve a mixture of these two. But, it makes an enormous difference what the mixture is. You know, it is like the joke about hasenpfeffer—half horse, half rabbit—one horse, one rabbit. The character of our society is fundamentally determined by whether the horse is the political market and the rabbit the economic market or the other way around. Paradoxically, therefore, the situation is that the economic market is a more effective means for achieving political democracy than is a political market.

Let me add one more word on that. When you think of the economic market and the political market you tend to think in narrow terms. You tend to think of the economic market as concerned with the mundane, material things such as producing bread or cheese, or automobiles or houses. But the principles I have described apply much more broadly. The private market, the economic market, is also the most effective means for doing good. If you go back to the period in the United States when we had the most unrestricted operation of the free private market, the nineteenth century, it was also the period of the greatest burst of eleemosynary and charitable activity in the history of our country. Brigham Young University, my own University of Chicago, many of the other colleges and universities of this country were established during the period of the nineteenth century. They were established by the private market arrangement; namely, by voluntary cooperation among people spending their own money for something they themselves believed in—to establish a university or a college. The great system of public libraries, the Carnegie Libraries, was established during that period. That was a period that saw the birth of the private eleemosynary hospital, of the foreign missions, of the society for the prevention of cruelty to animals. You name the charitable activity and you will find that in almost every case its origins go back to that time. So the private market (what I described as the economic market of voluntary cooperation), is in my opinion the most efficient and effective way of doing good as well as the most effective way of organizing economic activity.

The U. S. is coming to a crossroads. We cannot continue along the road we have been going. In going from 10 percent of the national income being spent by government to 40 percent it was possible to maintain a large element of freedom and individual liberty because it was possible to give large benefits to small groups at small costs spread over many people. But one thing you can be sure of: In the next forty
years we cannot go from 40 percent to 160 percent. So, we are coming to the crossroads. We are coming to the problem that faces Chile which as a poor country tipped over at 40 percent. Britain is wealthier, but appears on the verge of tipping over at 60 percent. We still have some ruin left in us, but pretty soon we are going to be forced to face up to the issue. Where we go from here depends on you, on the generation that is going to determine our future, on this generation, on whether in time to come you recognize that this is a false road which leads to tyranny and misery, and not to freedom. Let me propose to you that as you contemplate that future, you take as your major motto what I would like to see as an eleventh commandment—that everyone shall be free to do good at his own expense. Thank You.
The Arts and the Spirit
of the Lord

Elder Boyd K. Packer

I am particularly appreciative of the music we’ve just heard, and quote from Section 25 of the Doctrine and Covenants:

For my soul delighteth in the song of the heart; yea, the song of the righteous is a prayer unto me, and it shall be answered with a blessing upon their heads. (D&C 25:12)

I very anxiously lay claim to those blessings from these righteous young men and women who have sung so beautifully this sacred hymn of Zion. My gratitude to them will, I’m sure, be more obvious when I move into the message that I have chosen to speak upon tonight.

I want to respond to a question that I face with some frequency. It has many variations, but the theme is this: Why do we not have more inspired and inspiring music in the Church? Or why do we have so few great paintings or sculptures depicting the Restoration? Why is it when we need a new painting for a bureau of information, or perhaps for a temple, frequently nonmember painters receive the commission? The same questions have an application to poetry, to drama, to dance, to creative writing, to all the fine arts.

Now, I’m sure there are those who will say, “Why does he presume to talk about that? He is uninformed. He is just out of his province.” It may comfort them to know that I know that. My credentials to speak do not come from being a musician, for I’m not. I am not a composer, nor a conductor, and certainly I am not a vocalist. I cannot, for example, play the piano. I would be very unwilling to do so. However, should I be pressed to it, I could without much difficulty, prove my point. I am not adequate as an artist, nor as a sculptor, a poet, or a writer.
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But then I do not intend to train you in any of those fields. My credentials, if I have any (some of them should be obvious), relate to spiritual things.

I hope for sufficient inspiration to comment on how the Spirit of the Lord influences or is influenced by the art forms that I have mentioned. Since I have been interested in these matters, I have, over the years, listened very carefully when they have been discussed by the Brethren. I have studied expressions of my Brethren and of those who have led us in times past, in order to determine how those questions should be answered.

The reason we have not yet produced a greater heritage in art and literature and music and drama is not, I am very certain, because we have not had talented people. For over the years we have had not only good ones but great ones. Some have reached great heights in their chosen fields. But few have captured the spirit of the gospel of Jesus Christ and the restoration of it in music, in art, in literature. They have not, therefore, even though they were gifted, made a lasting contribution to the onrolling of the Church and kingdom of God in the dispensation of the fulness of times. They have therefore missed doing what they might have done, and they have missed being what they might have become. I am reminded of the statement: "There are many who struggle and climb and finally reach the top of the ladder, only to find that it is leaning against the wrong wall."

If you are willing to listen, I would like to express some concerns I have had over these matters and describe to you some disappointments I have heard expressed among the leaders of the Church.

Because I intend to be quite direct in my comments, I am a bit concerned. For I know when we touch this subject we talk of people who are very gifted. And people who are very gifted, it would seem tend to be temperamental. We were discussing some time ago the music and musicians of the Church, when one of the twelve pointed out that it may be difficult to get instruction across because some of our musicians, among others, have a tendency to be temperamental. "Yes," observed one of the senior members of our Quorum, "More temper than mental." That, I suppose describes all of us at one time or another.

Before I continue, I want it clearly understood that we have in the Church tens of thousands of gifted people who not only have talent, but who are generous with it. Our gifted people are greatly needed in the Church. The work of the Lord has been moved by the members in the wards and stakes and branches who have been blessed with special gifts and who use them unselfishly. Because of what they do, we are
able to feel and learn very quickly through music, through art, through poetry some spiritual things that we would otherwise learn very slowly. All of us are indebted to them for their generous service. I am humbly grateful to those who render such service in the Church. But then it is only right that they should contribute.

You who have such talents might well ask, "Whence comes this gift?" And gift it is. You may have cultivated it and developed it, but it was given to you. Most of us do not have it. You were not more deserving than we, but you are a good deal more responsible. If you use your gift properly, opportunities for service are opened that will be beneficial eternally for you and for others.

Has it ever occurred to you that you may leave this life without it? If the gift is yours because of the shape of your vocal cords, or the strength of your lungs, or because of the coordination of your hands, or because your eye registers form and color, you may leave the gift behind. You may have to be content with what you have become, because you possessed it while you were here. It has not been revealed just how this would be. I rather suspect that those gifts which we use properly will stay with us beyond the veil. And I repeat, you who are gifted may not be more deserving, but you are much more responsible than the rest of us.

Elder Orson F. Whitney said:

We shall yet have Miltons and Shakespeares of our own. God's ammunition is not exhausted. His highest spirits are held in reserve for the latter times. In God's name and by His help we will build up a literature whose tops will touch the heavens, though its foundation may now be low on earth.1

Since that statement was made in 1888, those foundations have been raised up very slowly. The greatest poems are not yet written, nor the paintings finished. The greatest hymns and anthems of the Restoration are yet to be composed. The sublimest renditions of them are yet to be conducted. We move forward much slower than need be, and I would like to underline some things that stand in our way.

You will quickly notice that I refer frequently to music. There is a reason for that. We use it more often. But the point that I shall make about the musician applies to all the arts: painting, poetry, drama, dance, and others.

For some reason it takes a constant vigilance on the part of priesthood leaders—both general and local—to ensure that music presented in our worship and devotional services is music that is appropriate for worship and devotional services. I have heard presidents of the Church declare after a general conference, or after a temple dedication, words to this effect (and I am quoting verbatim from one such experience):

I suppose we did not give enough attention to the music. It seems that our musicians must take such liberties. Something spiritual was lost from our meetings because the music was not what it should have been. Next time we must remember to give them more careful instructions.

Why is it that the President of the Church, or the president of the stake, or the bishop of the ward must be so attentive in arranging music for worship services and conference meetings? Why should the anxiety persist that if the musicians are left to do what they want to do, the result will not invite the Spirit of the Lord?

I have in the past made not altogether successful attempts to set a mood of devotion on a very sacred subject, having been invited to the pulpit immediately after a choir or choral number which was well performed but did nothing to inspire the spirit of devotion; or after a brass ensemble has rendered music that has nothing to do with spiritual inspiration.

The selections, which for other purposes might have been admirable, even impressive, failed in their inspiration simply because they were not appropriate. For some other gathering, some other time, some other place, yes—but they did not do what the hymns of the Restoration could have done. How sad when a gifted person has no real sense of propriety!

Let me illustrate this matter of propriety. Suppose you sponsor a pep rally in the stadium with the purpose of exciting the student body to a high point of enthusiasm. Suppose you invite someone to present a musical number with the expectation that the music would contribute to your purpose. Imagine him playing a sonata on an organ in subdued tones that lulls everyone into a contemplative and reflective mood. However well composed the music, or however well performed, it would not be appropriate for the occasion.

This example, of course, is obvious. It makes me wonder, therefore, why we must be constantly alert to have appropriate music in our sacrament meetings, conference sessions, and other worship services. Music and art and dance and literature can be very
appropriate in one place and in one setting and for one purpose and be very wrong in another. That can be true of instruments as well.

We have, in our instruction to the musicians of the Church, this suggestion:

Organs and pianos are the standard musical instruments used in sacrament meetings. Other instruments, such as orchestral strings, may be used when appropriate, but the music presented must be in keeping with the reverence and spirituality of the meeting. Brass and percussion instruments are generally not appropriate.²

We are under resistance from some highly trained musicians who insist that they can get as much inspiration from brass instruments or a guitar solo as from a choir. I believe that an organ perhaps could be played at a pep rally in a way to incite great enthusiasm. And I think a brass section could play a hymn in such a way as to be reverent and fitting in a worship service. But if it should happen, it would have to be an exception. We cannot convey a sacred message in an art form that is not appropriate and have anything spiritual happen. But there is a constant attempt to do it.

Several years ago one of the organizations of the Church produced a filmstrip. The subject matter was very serious and the script was well written. The producer provided a story board. A story board is a series of loose, almost scribbled sketches, sometimes with a little color brushed across them, to roughly illustrate each frame of the filmstrip. Very little work is invested in a story board. It is merely to give an idea and is always subject to revision.

Some members of the committee were amused by the story board itself. It had a loose comical air about it. They decided to photograph the illustrations on the story board and use them in the filmstrip. They thought they would be quite amusing and entertaining.

When the filmstrip was reviewed by four members of the Council of the Twelve, it was rejected. It had to be made over again. Why? Because the art form used simply was not appropriate to the message. You just don’t teach sacred, serious subjects with careless, scribbled illustrations.

Now, again to music. There have been a number of efforts to take sacred gospel themes and tie them to modern music in the hope of attracting our young people to the message. Few events in all of human history surpass the spiritual majesty of the First Vision. We would be
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ill-advised to describe that event, the visit of Elohim and Jehovah, in
company with rock music, even soft rock music, or to take equally
sacred themes and set them to a modern beat. I do not know how that
can be done and result in increased spirituality. I think it cannot be
done.

When highly trained artists insist, as they occasionally do, that
they receive spiritual experience in tying a sacred gospel theme to an
inappropriate art form, I must conclude that they do not know, not
really, the difference between when the Spirit of the Lord is present
and when it is not.

Very frequently when our musicians, particularly the more highly
trained among them, are left to do what they want to do, they perform
in such a way as to call attention to themselves and their ability. They
do this rather than give prayerful attention to what will inspire. I do
not mean "inspire" as the music or art of the world can inspire. I mean
*inspire*!

They are not content to use the hymns and anthems of the
Restoration, for such a presentation, they feel, will not demonstrate
their full capacities. When pressed to do so, they may grudgingly put a
hymn on the program. But it is obvious that their heart isn't in it, for
the numbers they select themselves seem to say, "Now let us show you
what we really can do."

We instruct stake presidents that "preference should be given to
the singing of well-known hymns" at stake conferences.\(^1\)

I know there are those who think that our Church music is
limited. Some with professional abilities evidently soon get very tired
of it. They want to stray from it and reach out into the world. They
present the argument that many of the hymns in our hymnbook were
not written for the Church or by members of the Church. I know that
already. And some of them are not really as compelling as they might
be. Their messages are not as specific as we could have if we produced
our own. But by association they have taken on a meaning that reminds
members of the Church, whenever they hear them, of the restoration
of the gospel, of the Lord, and of His ministry.

Sometimes, to ensure that music will be appropriate, one of the
hymns or anthems of the Restoration is specifically requested. "Oh, but
they sang that last conference," our conductors will say. Indeed we did,
and we preached the same gospel last conference also. The preaching of
it over and over again gives it a familiar and warm feeling. We build it
into our lives.

\(^1\)1976 Stake Conference Program Schedule.
As speakers we are not trying to impress the world with how
talented we are as preachers. We are simply trying to get across, by
repetition, if that's the only way, the sacred message that has been
entrusted to us.

Those of us who lead the Church are not constantly seeking new
doctrine to introduce. We simply teach over and over again that which
was in the beginning. It is with great difficulty that we try to pass on to
the next generation, in some form of purity, that which was given to
us. We will lose it if we are not wise.

The musicians may say, "Do you really want us to take those few
familiar hymns and present them over and over again with no
introduction of anything new?" No, that is not what I would want, but
it is close.

What I would desire would be to have the hymns of the
Restoration characteristic of our worship services, with others added if
they are appropriate. There are a great many things from elsewhere
that are very appropriate. Many numbers can be used in our worship
services with complete propriety.

Our hymns speak the truth as far as they go. They could speak
more of it if we had more of them, specifically teaching the principles
of the restored gospel of Jesus Christ.

If I had my way there would be many new hymns with lyrics near
scriptural in their power, bonded to music that would inspire people to
worship. Think how much we could be helped by an inspired anthem or
hymn of the Restoration. Think how we could be helped by an inspired
painting on a scriptural theme or depicting our heritage. How much we
could be aided by a graceful and modest dance, by a persuasive narrative,
or poem, or drama. We could have the Spirit of the Lord more frequently
and in almost unlimited intensity if we would.

For the most part, we do without because the conductor wants to
win the acclaim of the world. He does not play to the Lord, but to other
musicians. The composer and the arranger want to please the world.
The painter wants to be in style. And so our resources of art and music
grow ever so gradually. And we find that there have marched through
this grand parade of mortality men and women who were sublimely
gifted, but who spent all, or most, in the world and for the world. And I
repeat that they may well one day come to learn that "many men
struggle to reach the top of the ladder, only to find that it is leaning
against the wrong wall."

It is a mistake to assume that one can follow the ways of the world
and then somehow, in a moment of intruded inspiration, compose a
great anthem of the Restoration, or in a moment of singular inspiration paint the great painting. When it is done, it will be done by one who has yearned and tried and longed fervently to do it, not by one who has condescended to do it. It will take quite as much preparation and work as any masterpiece, and a different kind of inspiration.

There is a test you might apply if you are among the gifted. Ask yourself this question: When I am free to do what I really want to do, what will it be?

If you find that you are ashamed of our humble heritage in the arts, that ought to be something of a signal to you. Often artists are not free to create what they most desire because the market demands other things of them. But what about when you are free? Do you have a desire to produce what the Church needs? Or do you desire to convince the Church that it needs to change style so the world will feel comfortable with it? Although our artistic heritage as yet is relatively small, we are losing some of what we have—through neglect!

At the recent rededication of the St. George Temple each session was closed, as is traditional in temple dedication, with the presentation of the "Hosanna Anthem." The audience, on the signal from the conductor, joins with the choir on that part of the anthem known widely through the Church as "The Spirit of God like a Fire is Burning." I sat through those sessions and carefully observed, with great sorrow, that fully eighty percent of those in the audience did not know the words.

We can lose our heritage. We have lost part of it. Let me cite an example in the field of poetry.

William Ernest Henley wrote "Invictus," a proud, almost defiant expression that concludes:

I am the master of my fate,
I am the captain of my soul.

Some years ago an answer to "Invictus" was given. Let me quote it to you:

Art thou in truth?
Then what of Him who bought thee with His blood?
Who plunged into devouring seas
And snatched thee from the flood,

Who bore for all our fallen race
What none but Him could bear—
That God who died that man might live
And endless glory share.
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Of what avail thy vaunted strength
Apart from His vast might?
Pray that His light may pierce the gloom
That thou mayest see aright.

Men are as bubbles on the wave,
As leaves upon the tree,
Thou, captain of thy soul! Forsooth,
Who gave that place to thee?

Free will is thine—free agency,
To wield for right or wrong;
But thou must answer unto Him
To whom all souls belong.

Bend to the dust that "head unbowed,"
Small part of life's great whole,
And see in Him and Him alone,
The captain of thy soul.⁴

And who wrote that? Orson F. Whitney of the Council of the Twelve Apostles, a gifted and inspired poet whose work is virtually unknown in the Church.

Let me quote another of his poems:

There's a mountain named Stern Justice,
Tall and towering, gloomy, grand,
Frowning o'er a vale called Mercy,
Loveliest in all the land.

Great and mighty is the mountain,
But its snowy crags are cold,
And in vain the sunlight lingers
On the summit proud and bold.

There is warmth within the valley,
And I love to wander there,
'Mid the fountains and the flowers,
Breathing fragrance on the air.

Much I love the solemn mountain,
It doth meet my somber mood,
When, amid the muttering thunders,
O'er my soul the storm-clouds brood.

⁴Orson F. Whitney, "The Soul's Captain," in Special Collections, Harold B. Lee Library, Brigham Young University.
But when tears, like rain, have fallen
From the fountain of my woe,
And my soul has lost its fierceness,
Straight unto the vale I go;

Where the landscape, gently smiling,
O'er my heart pours healing balm,
And, as oil on troubled waters,
Brings from out its storm a calm.

Yes, I love both vale and mountain,
Ne'er from either would I part;
Each unto my life is needful,
Both are dear unto my heart.

For the smiling vale doth soften
All the rugged steep makes sad,
And from icy rocks meander
Rills that make the valley glad.

Both of these poems are new to most of you. Why would that be? I think it more than a pity that work such as this remains unknown to most students and faculty—even to some of the faculty in the field of literature. It is sad when members of the faculty here would discard them in favor of assigning their students to read degenerate compositions that issue from the minds of perverted and wicked men.

There is the temptation for college teachers, in the Church and outside of it, to exercise their authority to give assignments and thereby introduce their students to degradation under the argument that it is part of our culture. Teachers in the field of literature are particularly vulnerable.

I use the word warning. Such will not go unnoticed in the eternal scheme of things. Those who convey a degraded heritage to the next generation will reap disappointment by and by.

Teachers would do well to learn the difference between studying some things, as compared to studying about them. There is a great difference.

There is much to be said for a great effort to discover the humble and inspired contributions of gifted Saints of the past and thereby inspire the gifted in our day to produce works that will inspire those who come after us.

It is sad but true that, almost as a rule, our most gifted members are drawn to the world. They who are most capable to preserve our cultural heritage and to extend it, because of the enticements of the world, seek rather to replace it. That is so easy to do because for the most part they do not have that intent. They think that what they do is to improve it. Unfortunately many of them will live to learn that indeed, "Many men struggle to climb to reach the top of the ladder, only to find that it is leaning against the wrong wall."

I mentioned earlier that the greatest hymns and anthems have not been composed, nor have the greatest illustrations been set down, nor the poems written, nor the paintings finished. When they are produced, who will produce them? Will it be the most talented and the most highly trained among us? I rather think it will not. They will be produced by those who are the most inspired among us. Inspiration can come to those whose talents are barely adequate, and their contribution will be felt for generations; and the Church and kingdom of God will move forward just a little more easily because they have been here.

Some of our most gifted people struggle to produce a work of art, hoping that it will be described by the world as masterpiece! monumental! epic! when in truth the simple, compelling theme of "I Am a Child of God" has moved and will move more souls to salvation than would such a work were they to succeed.

Some years ago I was chairman of a committee of seminary men responsible to produce a filmstrip on Church history. One of the group, Trevor Christensen, remembered that down in Sanpete County was a large canvas roll of paintings. They had been painted by one of his progenitors, C. C. A. Christensen, who traveled through the settlements giving a lecture on Church history as each painting was unrolled and displayed by lamplight. The roll of paintings had been stored away for generations. We sent a truck for them and I shall not forget the day we unrolled them.

Brother Christensen was not masterful in his painting, but our heritage was there. Some said it was not great art, but what it lacked in technique was more than compensated in feeling. His work has been shown more widely and published more broadly and received more attention than that of a thousand and one others who missed that point.

I do not think Brother Christensen was a great painter, some would say not even a good one. I think his paintings are masterful. Why? Because the simple, reverent feeling he had for his spiritual
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heritage is captured in them. I do not think it strange that the world would honor a man who could not paint very well.

The ideal, of course, is for one with a gift to train and develop it to the highest possibility, including a sense of spiritual propriety. No artist in the Church who desires unselfishly to extend our heritage need sacrifice his career or an avocation, nor need he neglect his gift as only a hobby. He can meet the world and "best" it, and not be the loser. In the end, what appears to be such sacrifice will have been but a test.

Abraham did not have to kill Isaac, you know. He had to be willing to. Once that was known, that he would sacrifice his only begotten, he was known to be godlike and the blessings poured out upon him.

A few years ago Sister Packer and I were in Washington, D. C. to represent the Church at an awards banquet held in the reception hall of the Department of State. The elegant and stately surroundings, with a priceless collection of antiques and memorabilia, were impressive. Here, for instance, hangs the painting of George Washington by Gilbert Stuart and other priceless works of art. Both the occasion and the setting were ideal to make reference to the spiritual heritage of our country. And what was the program? A large brass section from one of the service bands played at great length, and with deafening volume, music from Jesus Christ, Superstar.

I sat next to a lovely, dignified woman, the wife of an officer of the government. When the crescendo weakened for a moment I was able to ask, by raising my voice a bit, if she was able to hear them all right. Her obvious amusement at the question soon changed to serious disappointment, as she asked in return, "What would Jesus think?"

That is well worth keeping in our minds if we have the talent to compose music or poetry, to illustrate or paint, or sculpt or act, or sing or play or conduct.

What do I think He would think? I think He would rejoice at the playing of militant martial music as men marched to defend a righteous cause. I think that He would think there are times when illustrations should be vigorous, with bold and exciting colors. I think He would chuckle with approval when at times of recreation the music is comical or melodramatic or exciting. Or at times when a carnival air is in order that decorations be bright and flashy, even garish.

I think at times of entertainment He would think it quite in order for poetry that would make one laugh or cry—perhaps both at once. I think that He would think it would be in righteous order on many occasions to perform with great dignity symphonies and operas and ballets. I think that He would think that soloists should develop an
extensive repertoire, each number to be performed at a time and in a place that is appropriate.

I would think that He would think there is a place for art work of every kind—from the scribbled cartoon to the masterpiece in the hand-carved, gold-leaf frame.

But I am sure He would be offended at immodesty and irreverence in music, in art, in poetry, in writing, in sculpture, in dance, or in drama. I know what He would think about music or art or literature or poetry that is purely secular being introduced into our worship services. And how do I know that? Because He has told His servants that. In what ways has He told them? He has told them by either withholding, or on occasions withdrawing, His Spirit when it is done.

I mentioned earlier that I have sometimes struggled without much success to teach sacred things when preceded by music that is secular or uninspired. Let me mention the other side of it.

I have been in places where I felt insecure and unprepared. I have yearned inwardly in great agony for some power to pave the way or loosen my tongue, that an opportunity would not be lost because of my weakness and inadequacy. On more than a few occasions my prayers have been answered by the power of inspired music. I have been lifted above myself and beyond myself when the Spirit of the Lord has poured in upon the meeting, drawn there by beautiful, appropriate music. I stand indebted to the gifted among us who have that unusual sense of spiritual propriety.

Go to, then you who are gifted; cultivate your gift. Develop it in any of the arts and in every worthy example of them. If you have the ability and the desire, seek a career or employ your talent as an avocation or cultivate it as a hobby. But in all ways bless others with it. Set a standard of excellence. Employ it in the secular sense to every worthy advantage, but never use it profanely. Never express your gift unworthily. Increase our spiritual heritage in music, in art, in literature, in dance, in drama.

When we have done it our activities will be a standard to the world. And our worship and devotion will remain as unique from the world as the Church is different from the world. Let the use of your gift be an expression of your devotion to Him who has given it to you. We who do not share in it will set a high standard of expectation: "For of him unto whom much is given much is required" (D&C 82:3).

Now, in conclusion, may I remind you what I said at the beginning. My credential to speak does not come from personal mastery of the arts. I repeat my confession. I am not gifted as a
musician or as a poet, nor adequate as an artist, nor accomplished in the field of dance, or writing, or drama. I have a calling, one which not only permits, but even requires, that we stay close to Him and to His Spirit.

If we know nothing of the arts, we know something of the Spirit. We know that it can be drawn upon meagerly or almost to the consuming of an individual.

In 1832 the Prophet Joseph Smith received a revelation which now stands as Section 88 of the Doctrine and Covenants and was designated by the Prophet as "The Olive Leaf." I quote a few verses:

Draw near unto me and I will draw near unto you; seek me diligently and ye shall find me; ask, and ye shall receive; knock, and it shall be opened unto you.

Whatsoever ye ask the Father in my name it shall be given unto you, that is expedient for you;
And if ye ask anything that is not expedient for you, it shall turn unto your condemnation.

Behold, that which you hear is as the voice of one crying in the wilderness—in the wilderness, because you cannot see him—my voice, because my voice is Spirit; my Spirit is truth; truth abideth and hath no end; and if it be in you it shall abound.
And if your eye be single to my glory, your whole bodies shall be filled with light, and there shall be no darkness in you; and that body which is filled with light comprehendeth all things.

Therefore, sanctify yourselves that your minds become single to God, and the days will come that you shall see him; for he will unveil his face unto you, and it shall be in his own time, and in his own way, and according to his own will. (D&C 88:63-68)

The Spirit of the Lord can be present on His terms only. God grant that we may learn, each of us, particularly those who are gifted, how to extend that invitation.

He lives. Of Him I bear witness. Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, the Only Begotten of the Father. Spencer W. Kimball is a prophet of God. We have on our shoulders in this generation the Church and kingdom of God to bear away. God grant that those among us who are the most gifted will devote themselves in order that our task may be easier, I pray in the name of Jesus Christ. Amen.
Some Thoughts on the Gospel and the Behavioral Sciences

Elder Neal A. Maxwell

I appreciate the chance to be with you, my brothers and sisters. I am always renewed and benefited by coming to this campus. This is the only university in the world that is asked to be both a display university and a real university at the same time. You must not be surprised, therefore, if those of us who are not with you every day draw strength from and are renewed by being with you. Even our nonmember friends usually come away thrilled, and yet somewhat perplexed, by their experiences here.

I appreciate the invitation that came to me from Allen Bergin to join you. His optimism that I might have some things to say is basically why I am here. I certainly have no research to report as, happily, do others. I have appreciated the chance to react to many of the presentations to be made, and I commend BYU for including in its Centennial celebration a symposium of "The Gospel and the Behavioral Sciences." Surely, this is an area of special concern for the Church—its people and its scholars. I commend the scholars who are participating and all like them who are striving to join their gospel scholarship and their academic scholarship.

This leads me to the second reason I am here—to suggest that the LDS behavioral scientists become more of a link and bridge between revealed truth and the world of scholarship. The LDS scholar has his citizenship in the kingdom, but carries his passport into the professional world—not the other way around.

Of such bridge building, these caveats need to be issued at the outset:

1. Some such bridges can be built—but not easily. We sometimes know more spiritually than we can tell, simultaneously, in scholarly terms. Sometimes we see the tip of a certain iceberg of insights. Other times we do not even see the tip, but we know it is there.
2. Some such bridges cannot be built for a while. There is much that God will yet reveal to us. Since divine disclosure comes so often by degrees, some of the great insights in the behavioral sciences that might bear on "how-to" skills and approaches may not be divulged for a while.

3. Some footbridges have already been built which can be widened into thoroughfares. More work can be done in converging scholarship and scriptural truths.

4. While we may not now know fully how to construct all these bridges of which I have been speaking, we know now that some bridges simply cannot be built, however much some secular scholars struggle to do so. For instance, we may not yet know the best form of therapy in every case, but we can know that certain forms of therapy are clearly inappropriate for us as Latter-day Saints.

Having said those things by way of caution, my basic assumption is that much more bridge-building can be done than has been done—without compromising the concepts contained in the revelations of God and without being so eager that our scholarship becomes sloppy, for academic advocacy soon strips itself of the sense of science.

The two responses to be avoided when discussing the challenges of such bridge-building are, first, disinterest in even trying; and second, assuming a posture in which LDS behavioral scientists are, at every point, indistinguishable from those whose approach is purely secular.

When we start building the proper and needed bridges, God will help us—individually and collectively. It will not surprise me in the least if some of the insights and methodologies of able, orthodox, LDS behavioral scientists will exert an increasing gravitational pull on some of our thoughtful nonmember colleagues in the years ahead. Perhaps there will even be the academic equivalent of what Isaiah foresaw, and thoughtful souls will say in various ways, "Come ye, let us go up" to the Lord's house of learning to be taught and shown his ways (see Isaiah 2:3). If we are not ashamed of Jesus Christ and his teachings, he will not be ashamed of us.

When we seek to communicate, however, with those in the world of scholarship, we must speak to them and communicate with them "after the manner of their language" (see D&C 1:24). We can, as many LDS behavioral scientists have done, develop our skills in that "tongue" without coming to prefer it and without losing the mother tongue of faith.

To build bridges will require both courage and competency. It will require the perspiration and persistence of a Pasteur. It will require the
forsaking of the easy praise of the world that comes from following the fashionable. But real esteem is earned, while often authority is conferred.

We must not be disturbed if we are unfashionable in terms of the trends of the time, for as Paul reminds us, "The fashion of this world passeth away" (1 Corinthians 7:31).

It is a great source of satisfaction to me to know in the realm of relationships—of an individual to himself, to God, and to his fellowmen—that the Lord has disclosed the doctrines that are crucial and essential.

Though we cannot fully fathom all their implications, if we can accept the basic truth, we have already come some distance. Such basic truths include:

1. That man is created in the image of God.
2. That environment and heredity by themselves do not account for all human differences.
3. That free agency is an exceedingly important element in the growth and development of individuals; indeed, as President Marion G. Romney has said, "The preservation of this free agency is more important than the preservation of life itself."
4. That life's design is such that God, speaking of us, has said with reference to this mortal estate, "Let us prove them herewith" (see Abraham 3:25), a truth that is rich with implications.
5. That life's Divine design also involves "an opposition in all things" (see 2 Nephi 2:11-16).
6. That this is a world of law, the breaking or keeping of which brings misery or blessings, respectively.
7. That "almost all men" misuse authority and power (see D&C 121:39).

We will find that not only are there strategic signposts of morality, but there are also tactical standards of morality with which we must be concerned if we are to preserve our identity in the way that is most helpful to us and to our fellowmen. We must not unintentionally assume the appearance of evil in its various cultural costumes and dispensational dimensions. The length of Samson's hair not only gave him strength, it set him apart from the Philistines, whose passion for alcohol Samson did not share either. The prophet will always help us to set the tone of tactical morality when such is needed to set us apart from some contemporaries. Paul did this for female Church members in Corinth, counseling them, I am told, so they would not be confused with prostitutes because of uncovered hair.
Thus, the principles do not change, but as Dr. Daniel H. Ludlow has said, the practices may vary. We can always look to the prophet for guidance with regard to these tactical dimensions of morality.

In these and in many other ways, we have been blessed with decisive insights.

By contrast, the uncertain relativist is flooded by facts at the same time he is parched by the trickle of theory. But the disciples of Jesus will be able to take hold of the timbers of truth to survive and ultimately use these timbers of truth to build the bridges about which I have been speaking.

What we do know, therefore, is so very much! We have been given more cosmic clues and cues than we have yet used as Latter-day Saints.

We know what others only surmise. It was Marcel Proust who wrote insightfully of premortality as follows:

All that can be said is that everything in our life happens as though we entered upon it with a load of obligations contracted in a previous existence. There is no reason arising from the conditions of our life on this earth for us to consider ourselves obliged to do good, to be tactful, even to be polite. . . . All these obligations whose sanction is not of this present life, seem to belong to a different world, founded on kindness, scruples, sacrifices, a world entirely different from this one, a world whence we emerge to be born on this earth, before returning thither, perhaps to live under the empire of those unknown laws we have obeyed because we bore their teaching within us without knowing who had taught us.¹

We know the reality of what men like that may surmise. Could it be that with regard to the behavioral sciences we are in much the same position President Spencer W. Kimball says we are in with regard to missionary work: he reminded us as members of the Church that the Lord won’t open any doors until we are truly ready to enter those doorways.

I am pleased with the many thoughtful people of the world who share many of our concerns and who are increasingly anxious to address themselves to fundamental issues. Ronald Butt, writing recently in Great Britain, said of pornography:

Pornography, like peace, is indivisible. Of course, some pornography is much worse than others; the more it suggests physical cruelty, the worse it usually is. But all pornography, even what is

usually called "soft," which today is harder than most people think, has certain things in common. One of the essential qualities is the exploitation of those who provide the material.

Ronald Butt also reminded us that not only is pornography paternalistic—it is devilishly desensitizing. He wrote:

The history of the Roman arena instructs us how the appetite of a people can be created by what is fed to it—the upper classes of Rome were systematically addicted by their rulers to the frenzy and titillation of sadistic violence by a steady progression from less to more until the Roman character itself was conditioned to a coarse insensibility to suffering.

Butt concluded his interesting discussion of the challenge of pornography by saying:

It is, in the end, not a matter of quibbling about the words of statutes; it is about priorities and first principles.2

In my view, brothers and sisters, the "first principles" and "priorities" about which Ronald Butt speaks are the very truths and insights that we have in such abundance in the gospel of Jesus Christ!

For me, another fundamental insight is the reality that our Father in heaven knows us deeply, longitudinally, and individually, and perfectly. Because of his knowing us in these ways, God has sent consistent and repetitive messages concerning human behavior through Jesus Christ, and through prophets, emphasizing again and again certain key principles. The very repetitiveness of those messages lets us know much about man's nature, especially in view of God's perfect love for us and his perfect knowledge about us.

Man has been taught, therefore, concerning the "thou shalt nots," and we have also been taught the "thou shalt" by the Sermon on the Mount and other eloquent expressions. In so teaching us, God has portrayed the proximate and ultimate consequences of various behavior in terms of the misery that follows sinning, or the happiness that follows righteousness. Thus, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints is not "data rich and theory poor." These patches of profundities (some samples of which I have cited) are, of course, interconnected in a spiritual ecology in a system of law which can and must be much better presented to the thoughtful people of the world than we have yet done.

The reality that there are such guideposts or signposts to mark the way (so that we need not fall off either side of the straight and

narrow path) does not make our journey any less a real adventure. In getting from mark A to mark Z, we must walk carefully and watch our footing along the path and help those who struggle less successfully.

We shall probably learn later on that the number and nature of the markers are such as to maximize our growth in mortality while in this second estate. Too few, and we would be lost. Too many, and we would not stretch our souls. After all, the dispute in the premortal councils focused in large measure on that very issue!

If we sometimes wonder about the stress the scriptures place on the avoidance of certain evils, as well as the choosing of certain goods, it is because the human development sought for consists of both refusing to do evil and choosing to do good, in rejecting some things and affirming others. A commitment to truth requires the rejection of some things as well as acceptance of others. That is part and parcel of the process of progression. Otherwise, we would be like so many precious souls who are neutralized or stranded in a psychological no-man’s-land in between the behavioral barbarians on one hand and the righteous on the other. The prophet Mormon says that those so stranded experience the “sorrowing of the damned” (Mormon 2:13), a mortal melancholy, a schizoid suffering as did one such sample group because, as the scriptures say:

They did not come unto Jesus with broken hearts and contrite spirits, but they did curse God, and wish to die. Nevertheless they would struggle with the sword for their lives. (Mormon 2:14)

In what we are asked to reject are certain important clues concerning that human behavior which produces lasting growth and happiness and that which produces misery.

Our conduct—not whether we are Asian or American—finally determines, in fact, whether we are to enjoy a terrestrial culture, a terrestrial culture, or a celestial culture, for finally, as Paul reminds us:

There is one glory of the sun, and another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars: for one star differeth from another star in glory.

So also is the resurrection of the dead. (1 Corinthians 15:41-42)

There are contemporary cultural differences, too, of course, but the sincere seeker after celestial culture must be more concerned with the preparation for that culture than with the preservation of present culture. Such things as how we hold a knife and fork when we eat or how we dance are differences that seldom matter much. There are other current cultural differences that do matter much: a morbid sense
of despondency about life itself, a feeling of futility about man’s purpose could depress a people to a point where they do not extract from this second estate those things which really matter and which are intended to happen here. Enough prophets have inveighed against unwise or wicked “traditions of the fathers” for us to know that certain mortal traditions can be devastating and disabling. Cultural differences, however, which are matters of preference and not principle can continue to provide color and variety. God seems to love variety, except in doctrine—because the latter is so crucial.

The hard sayings of the scriptures are, therefore, in fact just that. They are especially hard to bear if we are guilty. Little wonder that we read on one occasion how, having heard the rigorous requirements of a revealed religion, the disciples of Jesus became anxious. Of them we read: “And they were astonished out of measure, saying among themselves, Who then can be saved?” (Mark 10:26; italics added)

The ways of God are not the ways of the world. Just because sometimes behavior is changed gradually is no reason to obscure the ideal. Since Jesus spoke of the wrongness of mental adultery, are we free to sanction salacious imagery in therapy? There are real risks if we appear to sanction, even tacitly, something less than what is required. There are some ditches we cannot jump in two jumps. We must jump all the way across to the other side or not at all.

It should not matter to us that we may be misunderstood by the world in this respect. Remember the taunt flung at Jesus as he was on the cross: he could save others, but could he not save himself? Naivete often stares at reality without seeing it! Beneficiaries are often blind to their blessings.

When others see us enduring to the end, following “first principles,” it may make no sense to them at all. But we must endure anyway. For if the salt, the Saints, were to lose their distinctiveness, then the world would be increasingly tasteless. It was Jesus who said:

Ye are the salt of the earth: but if the salt have lost his savour, wherewith shall it be salted? it is thenceforth good for nothing, but to be cast out, and to be trodden under foot of men. (Matthew 5:13)

If all things are a matter of preference and nothing is a matter of principle, why not put Dracula in charge of the blood bank? If we became just like the world, the world would hold us in double contempt; and the Lord would be as displeased as he was when, through his prophet Ezekiel, he said his “priests have violated my law, and have profaned mine holy things: they have put no difference
between the holy and profane, neither have they shewed difference between the unclean and the clean” (Ezekiel 22:26; italics added).

Thus it must be in the behavioral sciences, as well. Otherwise, we will be victimized by relativism, as most of the world has been already. Paul made a plea for us to see the importance of simplicity and certainty:

For if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?

So likewise ye, except ye utter by the tongue words easy to be understood, how shall it be known what is spoken? for ye shall speak into the air. (1 Corinthians 14:8-9)

This pattern of doing what is right faithfully and conscientiously may reduce the rewards and plaudits of the world which will usually go to others, for as the Savior said:

"They are of the world: therefore speak they of the world, and the world heareth them” (1 John 4:5).

G. K. Chesterton warned about accommodating ourselves "to the trend of the time," which he said "at its best consists entirely of people who will accommodate themselves to anything," even "to a trend that isn't there." Meanwhile, while there may be much mocking, significant numbers of sober scholars and thoughtful individuals in the world will notice the glow of the gospel light as it breaks forth in the behavioral sciences, as elsewhere, in preparation for the promised period Isaiah foresaw when "the inhabitants of the world will learn righteousness” (Isaiah 26:9; italics added). But the spirit by which we proceed is not the spirit of this world. Paul said, "Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God” (1 Corinthians 2:12; italics added).

Many insights have been "freely given to us of God" that remain to be spoken of articulately, humbly, and scholastically—in the classrooms and from the rooftops of our academic enclaves for, as Jesus said: "Ye are the light of the world. A city that is set on an hill cannot be hid” (Matthew 5:14).

Let us not keep that light hidden under a bushel, especially when others need the truths which we have—for their happiness here and for their salvation in the world to come!

We will need to be at least as diligent as the children of this world are in pursuing their research and in advancing their values, for the children of light often are lax and slack. It was Jesus himself who, at the

end of the parable, observed: "And the lord commended the unjust steward, because he had done wisely: for the children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light" (Luke 16:8; italics added).

LDS behavioral scientists must extract both the obvious and hidden wisdom embedded in the value system of the gospel of Jesus Christ.

"But we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, even the hidden wisdom, which God ordained before the world unto our glory" (1 Corinthians 2:7).

We have to avoid doing what the world so often does, missing the simple truths and missing the obvious truths—in Jacob's diagnostic phrase—because we are forever "looking beyond the mark" (Jacob 4:14).

There are some striking parallels between the mocking of the Saints experienced in Lehi's vision and what we are warned about. It was the Savior who said, "Blessed are ye, when men shall hate you, and when they shall separate you from their company, and shall reproach you, and cast out your name as evil, for the Son of man's sake" (Luke 6:22; italics added).

We must also avoid being conformed to the world.

"And be not conformed to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect will of God" (Romans 12:2; italics added).

More than has been the case so far, quality research can prove that which is the good. Conventional wisdom will often not be enough, given our goals and obligations. We must not be surprised, either, if some people on the earth regard Jesus Christ, his gospel and his Church, as either "foolishness" or a "stumblingblock." It was Paul who said: "But we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumblingblock, and unto the Greeks foolishness" (1 Corinthians 1:23).

We must not be perplexed or be taken by surprise either, by the actions of those who are not believers. We read in Acts:

But the Jews which believed not, moved with envy, took unto them certain lewd fellows of the baser sort, and gathered a company, and set all the city on an uproar, and assaulted the house of Jason, and sought to bring them out to the people" (Acts 17:5; italics added).

Often those who believe not will act with envy concerning those who do believe. What accounts for this envy I cannot fully say, but the
envy is often there. There was, in ancient Greece, the tale of Aristides the Just:

Aristides encountered an illiterate citizen who was struggling to make out his ostrakon [the periodic way in which ancient Greeks could, with sufficient “votes,” exile an offending countryman]. When Aristides inquired as to whether or not he could help this man mark his ostrakon, the man said yes and asked, not knowing who his helper was, to have the name of Aristides put on the “ballot” as deserving of ostracism. Aristides, wisely seeking feedback, still did not identify himself but asked why the man wished this fate upon Aristides. The man said it was because he had grown tired of hearing incessantly how noble and how just Aristides was. There was, apparently, an intrinsic resentment of Aristides’ image of nobility.4

Indeed, there are and will be those who are stirred up to anger against that which is good! We, likewise, will be confronted with major ironies in which people will turn to teachers of the world and be turned away “from the truth” and “turned unto fables” (see 2 Timothy 4:4).

The appetite of man for “fables” and the turning away from truth is not confined to the behavioral sciences, but it is present there also.

If, as some suggest, unchecked drives for sexual gratification and indulgence are in fact “a sign of regression to primitive and infantile forms of satisfaction and gratification,” and if sex gratification is “usually symptomatic of retardation or regression in personal development,”5 then little wonder that we must be concerned not only with behavioral chastity, but with chastity of our thoughts. One scholar, Unwin, years ago examined thirty-seven societies and concluded that a society cannot have both sexual permissiveness and significant social energy for more than one generation.

Will and Ariel Durant, who studied twenty civilizations, producing ten volumes, warned, among other things, that sex is a river of fire which must be banked and cooled by a hundred restraints or it will destroy both the individual and the group.

John Lukacs warned that sexual immorality is not merely a marginal development but is at the very center of the moral crisis of our time.

For the unchaste, we can be both truthful and loving in helping them to see sin and to forsake it. Alma did this with warmth and wisdom for his unchaste son. He said:

4See Plutarch’s Lives.
And now, my son, I desire that ye should let these things trouble you no more, and only let your sins trouble you, with that trouble which shall bring you down unto repentance.

O my son, I desire that ye should deny the justice of God no more. Do not endeavor to excuse yourself in the least point because of your sins, by denying the justice of God; but do you let the justice of God, and his mercy, and his longsuffering have full sway in your heart; and let it bring you down to the dust in humility. (Alma 42:29-30)

Some significant clues for therapy and counseling are contained in that episode.

The growing heresy, that disarming fable that there is a private morality, not only turns many away from the truth but also threatens to bury man in an avalanche of appetite.

Norman Cousins wrote that "People who insist on seeing everything and doing anything run the risk of feeling nothing." 6

Mormon saw his degraded people finally reach a stage wherein they were "past feeling." The gospel can guard us against the desensitizing consequences of sin.

The gospel also reminds us of proximate as well as ultimate accountability. Where there is a wrong, there is always at least one victim. The test for morality is never the visibility of an act, but the rightness of an act. Surely Henry VIII is not the only example of how "private morality" has a way of having public consequences!

But the fable about private morality would not exist if there were not the preceding and larger heresy of relativism.

Relativism involves the denial of the existence of absolute truths and, therefore, of an absolute truth-giver, God. Relativism has sometimes been a small, satanic sea breeze, but now the winds of relativism have reached gale proportions. Over a period of several decades relativism has eroded ethics, public and personal, has worn down the will of many, has contributed to a slackening sense of duty, civic and personal. The old mountains of individual morality have been worn down. This erosion has left mankind in a sand-dune society, in a desert of disbelief where there are no landmarks, and no north, no east, no west, and no south! There is only the dust of despair!

As Shelley said of a fallen statue, "Nothing beside remains. Round the decay of that colossal wreck boundless and bare, the lone and level sands stretch far away." 7

So much of today's literature, art, film, and music mirrors the pathos of the inhabitants of this desert of disbelief, needing to be rescued, but sometimes resisting rescue and even making fun of the rescuers. We cannot help those who are lost in the desert of disbelief by joining them, nor can we help them if we are naive about evil. Evil is never tolerant of righteousness, it never has been and never will be, any more than the father of evil, Lucifer, is tolerant. He was, and is, a poor loser!

Behavioral scientists, perhaps more than anyone else, can appreciate the marvelous imagery of La Rochefoucauld who once observed, "There goes another beautiful theory about to be murdered by a brutal gang of facts." So many erroneous theories have been advanced about human behavior, only to be murdered by brutal gangs of facts. Latter-day Saints especially have no excuse to be deaf to the lessons of history—for we can listen with both the ears of scholarship and scripture. "True believers," as Alma used the term, are also true scholars.

Theories based on relativistic ethics are congenitally and fatally flawed, and these have created the greatest confusion around the very issues that matter most.

Men who are strangers to God will also be strangers to each other. Men who do not accept God's plan will never have a lasting sense of purpose about this life. Men who do not have a true perspective about their relationship with God will never achieve identity. Men who navigate by their own light and after their own way will find themselves, in Mormon's words, "as a vessel... tossed about upon the waves, without sail or anchor, or without anything wherewith to steer her" (Mormon 5:18).

The world's "solutions" are no solutions at all. The world would merely have us substitute a copulation explosion for a population explosion, as one commentator warned. The world would destroy the family, while urging people to search for their identity and for a sense of belonging. The world promotes sexual freedom even while such promiscuity places many in peer prisons, tightly regimented, whose walls of appetite are higher than any prison wall. The solutions the world offers are cruel, conceptual cul-de-sacs.

He who often gets mortals to shout shrilly, "Power to the people," actually has in mind a rather small number of people to be the ultimate power brokers. Would you believe a number as low as "one"? And that "one" desires that all men might be miserable like unto himself!
Sadly, brothers and sisters, relativism also sires statism, causing man to settle in the slums of security by breaking off his quest for the city of God. In concluding his famous essay, On Liberty, John Stuart Mill warned:

A State which dwarfs its men, in order that they may be more docile instruments in its hands even for beneficial purposes—will find that with small men no great thing can really be accomplished; and that the perfection of machinery to which it has sacrificed everything will in the end avail it nothing, for want of the vital power which, in order that the machine might work more smoothly, it has preferred to banish.8

In my personal opinion, unlike Lucifer’s way, we will find, as President Joseph F. Smith said, that when we educate our desires, then man can be safely left with his desires. We will find that we not only need to receive the correcting impressions of the Spirit but feedback from our fellowmen and family. Our institutionalized interface with the Church can help us greatly, too, in this same respect.

If we want to bring about improvement, there must be the presence of desire; there must be the presence of feedback. We must avoid compartmentalization, because there is something about the gospel that has a way of breaking down walls and barriers. There must be the presence of challenge and adventure. There must be the presence of models and exemplars.

Unlike the contempt and condescension with which Satan views us, our Lord and Savior views us with love and with a sense of perfect anticipation about what is possible. He sees us not alone for what we are, but for what we might become. We will find that men and women do best when we appeal to their ideals, to their spirit of sacrifice, to their desire for service, and to their instincts for causality and liberty.

Thus of these bridges to be built and to be enlarged, it is perhaps not too much to say to you that once built, more individuals will cross them than we know, drawn by the light and warmth of the gospel. Some will come to see and to survey. Happily, many will come to stay!

The timbers of truth are waiting to be used. You have the professional and spiritual tools as has no preceding generation of LDS scholars. Go to, and build! Be about your Father’s business!

Thank you for letting me come to be with you. I recognize that I am not a part of the construction crew, but I am happy to be here to cheer you on in this and subsequent enterprises.

I witness to you again, as I am always delighted to do, that this is the work of our Father in heaven, that this university and LDS scholars here, and others like them elsewhere, have special things to do in a special age in a special time.

We must not fail, individually, for if we fail, we fail twice—for ourselves and for those who could have been helped, if we had done our duty.

I witness to you that we are prophet-led and that, in fact, in many ways (more quickly than we know) the light of the gospel is breaking forth. We stand for things others only equivocate about or simply practice in individual isolation. For instance, I would ask any here to name an organization, if you can, that cares so deeply and consistently about the principle of chastity that it regularly interviews its members and leaders to see if they comply therewith?

As Peter said to us, we must be ready always to speak of the gospel in meekness, giving reasons to others for the faith that is in us (see 1 Peter 3:15). May God bless us so to do and may I leave this testimony with you about the ultimate nature of the things with which we are concerned and of the kingdom of which we are a part, whose ultimate high priest is the Lord—all of which I do in his name, Jesus Christ. Amen.
The Child is Father of the Man

Arthur H. King

The word "humble" is supposed to occur at this point. Mr. President, Sir; Professor Broadbent; Brothers and Sisters; my wife and I are deeply glad to be here this evening. I think principally because when we came to the U. S. A. we found affection. It seems to me as to so many other Europeans that affection is a great quality of the American people generally. It may be partly due to their immigrant origins, but it is to be noted; and the principal pleasure that we have on an occasion like this is that it is a demonstration of affection that we meet.

My thanks are due to the Faculty Lecture Committee; to the BYU Women, who have done a very great deal and very charmingly to make this a good occasion; to Dr. Foxley who pleased me greatly by playing some Purcell; to Dr. Woodward and the Chamber Choir, who succeeded in reminding me of what it was like to be at a formal banquet at Trinity College, Cambridge, when it is normal for the madrigal choir to sing from the Music Gallery; and to the Haydn String Quartet. To hear that particular movement of the Emperor Quartet was a great joy to me, because I had two semesters in Germany—one in Bonn in 1930 and one in Marburg in 1935—and Germany is one of the four countries that hold primacy in my heart. To hear the tune of the German national anthem in that way is to hear Germany at its very best; and I am convinced that no country has made such a contribution to music and letters since the eighteenth century as Germany has, going through the greatest suffering and producing the greatest art. My thanks are also due to the delightful way in which we were welcomed (when we left the Wilkinson Center to come here) by Dr. Longhurst's chimes on the carillon. That, too, was a very charming thing for me to hear; because we have a great many bells in England, and you seem to have fewer, and these are one of the things I miss. I would have thought that in a non-Puritanical church (and this is preeminently a non-Puritanical church)—otherwise there could be no doctrine of
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spiritbody forming soul)—in this Mormon Church above all, I don’t see why the Puritan tradition of hating bells should continue.

And now to turn to my theme. I have a text and I am going to read it in the New English Bible version; because it will be a little fresher to us in that, and we know it well, for there it is in Philippians and there it is also in our Articles of Faith, and it runs as follows:

All that is true, all that is noble, all that is just and pure, all that is lovable and gracious, whatever is excellent and admirable, fill all your thoughts with these things. (Philippians 4:8)

And I would make an addendum to that text from a different source—from the poet, W. B. Yeats—which may become clearer when we come to the end: "In dreams begins responsibility." Quite other than some post-Freudians think.

I’ve taken the title of my talk from a short poem that Wordsworth wrote on 26 March 1802, when we were about to leap again into the war with Napoleon.

My heart leaps up when I behold
A rainbow in the sky;
So was it when my life began;
So is it now I am a man;
So be it when I shall grow old,
Or let me die!
The child is father of the man;
And I could wish my days to be
Bound each to each by natural piety.

He does not mean by that the piety of the natural man who is an enemy to God: man is "naturally" supernatural. Now on that poem of Wordsworth’s a comment of an unknown late nineteenth century author which in the amusingly obtuse acuity of its wit is worth quoting:

"The child is father of the man."
How can he be? The words are wild.
The man is father of the child!

Now I want you to take something of a biographical journey with me. (Robert Thomas reminded me that as I was so close now to my anecdotage, I might permit myself some stories.) What I am going to try to do is to go back to my childhood and show how certain major themes ran through my life as the result of the literature I read. It seemed to me that that was a better way of making clear to you the value of literature in one’s life than to pontificate in abstracts. I am

thinking first of all of voices that come from before my continued recollection and before I learned to read. I can still hear the voice of my father reading the scriptures. (Incidentally, what is to stop Mormons from getting up every morning at the same time as the earliest person in the family and having scripture reading at breakfast all together, aloud? Some people in my stake are now doing that. That is to be remembered as a possibility.) Anyway, there is my father's voice echoing from the distant caverns of memory, and it will echo right through my life (although he was killed when I was nine years old), reading—I think perhaps the first thing I can remember is the calling of Samuel. That is a passage greatly to impress a quite small child. Reading about the voyages and the shipwreck of Paul, reading the parable of the prodigal son. I can hear my mother's voice and my grandmother's voice reading to me (not my grandfather's—he preferred to be read to; but my grandfather I shall never forget because he used to say, "Boy, get all the education you can; but remember, never get it for anything else than its own sake. Don't get it for success in life. Get it for its own sake." And he was a very poor man. I never forgot what he said.)—But these voices: Hiawatha. I can remember my father reading me to sleep (obviously) with Hiawatha at the age of five; and that rhythm stuck in my mind until I broke it on my own with Evangeline, and then began at the age of twelve to write hexameters, trying to imitate Longfellow, because that was (oddly enough) the first passage of nature poetry I came across.

Now I have an important point to make, and I would ask you all to search your own souls about this: how far does your continued recollection and sense of continuity with yourself go back? Mine goes back to the age of six: I very much doubt whether I've advanced from that age, I still feel fundamentally to be that boy of six. And I have continuity with him, and I remember his life, and I remember his thoughts. And if I ask myself why, the answer is because it was then that I had learned to read and was reading, and that has been a continuity in my life ever since—reading has helped to bind my life together with bonds of "natural piety." I learned to read then, and then of course as soon as I had learned to read—in my generation the obvious way of amusing oneself was to read—I read and read. I have filled every vacant moment of my life ever since with reading. I haven't got a book with me in this side pocket tonight, because this suit is a little small for me since I have put on ten pounds recently; but otherwise it would have been in that pocket.
Even though I had learned to read, my family continued to read to me for many years. My father, as I said, thought that Hiawatha was appropriate, followed by Tales of a Wayside Inn. Practically all the Quaker sect learnt "Robert of Sicily, Brother of Pope Urbane and Valmond Emperor of Allemain." (Probably no child learns that nowadays.) And then we progressed. My father bought me the Jungle Book for my sixth birthday present, and he bought me Alice in Wonderland for my seventh birthday present, and he bought me Alice Through the Looking Glass for my eighth birthday present, and all of these were carefully read to myself and my younger sister and are a permanent part of our literary lives.

But the two turning points that I want to come to were a little later than that. The first was when I was eight years old. It was a bad winter: it was the winter of the flu of which twenty-one million people died in 1918-19. My father was sitting downstairs with a temperature of 104. My mother was giving birth to my younger brother upstairs. The total area of each small room down below—there were two—was ten by ten. There was an earth kitchen at the back where the rats ran, and I had a little cubbyhole by a window (a small window in this ten foot by ten foot room just to the right-hand side) which looked out on the farm and the fields. This house was afterwards known as Holly Cottage; not at that time—it wasn't worthy of a name at that time—at least we never thought of giving it one. And now my sister and her husband have retired to a Norfolk cottage called Holly House, about the field behind which I have written, for this lecture of mine, the following poem:

The Field Behind Holly House
Right at the end, I mean to see that field:
fifty-five hundred miles as crows make wing.
steady, deliberate, straight to their own end.
At any time of year now I am old,
that field I aim to scan: wheat-blades in spring
sprouting to blackbird whistles; grain-stalks' bend
under the claw, as small birds thin the yield
in swarms and swoops of avid pilfering;
the stubble trampled into mud; the brand
of hoar frost on the furrow—a cultured wild,
not the Grand Canyon, or too tame to sing.
The kind of scene to give one peace of mind?
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At the south end, one oak takes pride to be
isolate in the hedge, tawny in Fall
and April, ilex-green in August, bare
by my years' time, a sturdy, skeleton tree
that shows its stripped form best at the annual lull,
yet sleeps indifferent to my aging stare.
At the north end, the house end, in its lee,
grows from the ditch a crippled bush for all
titmice—blue, great, cole, marsh—and more that dare
a forage-base for suet or nut. I see
those many miles away the flick of a tail,
flirt of a wing, head's quirk, there—here—here—there.

The black cat through a tunnel of gold or green,
or slinking round the selion hugs his way,
following smaller bodies rarely seen
that save their lives or give them up as prey.
The stoat and weasel similarly pass
from east to west through oats, lucern, or grass,
from west to east. The cycle day by day
by month by season, the will be and has been—
present: right now I mean that field to stay
in all its times, as I in mine, one scene
in every scene, the field that is and was
my eyes and ears, my equal gain and loss.

This field's the one that Judas' crime lays waste;
where Faust despairs, and the Old Guard goes west;
where Hector runs to kill or shed his blood;
where "country folk would lie," but the adder stings;
the field of folk where Lehi, Langland, brood;
the field by Mamre, where all Israel clings.
The dark frown conjures, but the white brow sings: —
The soul has found a cross-tree in the wood.
The Lord of Easter, roused by morning's wings,
has risen, and here I stand as Magdalen stood.
My days now one to me from first to last
I watch for sleep and wake my future's present past.

Anyway, there I sat that autumn and winter (sometimes with a candle
and sometimes with a lamp) and read practically the whole of Dickens;
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because at last I had got hold of myself and I realized how much I was getting out of reading. My father's library was not extensive, only about a hundred books; but they were there. Some of them were trash. I read them too, but I have forgotten all about them, except Marie Corelli's dreadful book (The Mighty Atom) about a boy of nine who hanged himself, but I did not take that example—the book was in too bad taste. I read through most of Dickens; I suppose that was my first introduction to real literature, and I think you know that Dickens can get across to quite young children.

Now I'm going to talk about things which arose from my reading of Dickens and ran through my life. And I am going to talk about four main themes which I can denominate a) class, b) death, c) love, and d) creation. And I'll begin now by talking about what Dickens opened up to me about class. I think at the age that I read Dickens, although we were extremely poor and my father was a farm laborer at that time, I had no previous idea of class at all. But I read David Copperfield and there are several very distressing class events in that. There is the one in which Mr. Mell at Salem House School is dismissed because he has a mother in a poorhouse. And there is David's own shame reflecting Dickens' shame at going to the factory as an eight- to nine-year-old.

And then above all there is that superb study of class self-consciousness and class aspiration which is represented by Great Expectations, when Pip, the small boy who is brought up by his blacksmith brother-in-law (who is a true Christian) inherits money from a convict (although he doesn't know it); and how the boy's whole sense of values is turned upside down so that he falls in love with a girl—actually also the daughter of the convict though they don't know it—who he thought belonged to a higher class; and how he at last through illness and deprivation and despair comes to realize the value of that blacksmith brother-in-law of his and returns to sensible views on class. This class position of David Copperfield at his lowest and this class position of Pip appealed to me in my position, and I remember making up my mind that I never would do what Pip did—and indeed what David did—and I have not. I was born a lower middle-class boy and I have been a lower middle-class boy and man all my life. I have never sought affected or precious intellectual company. I've occasionally grazed it, but I managed by degrees to develop a healthy contempt for it. The amount of affectation in the world cannot readily be comprehended by someone who has spent most of his life in this valley; but I assure you it is tremendous and appalling, and that is why I wish you would give up
one little piece of affectation that so many of you seem to have, and that is that use of the word "wonderful." Now, this business of class is a serious business still in Britain, and I suppose it also exists here. I feel it when I'm introduced as "Mr." in Salt Lake instead of being introduced as "brother." This doesn't normally happen in Provo, but in Salt Lake it does happen. Even if I'm being introduced to another member of the Church by a member of the Church, it happens occasionally; and it distresses me. I wonder what its significance is. Some of you may remember the very sharp speech that Sister Sharp made down here—was it a year and a half ago?—on this subject of being too proud of one's family or whatever, because after all it is oneself that is in question.\footnote{Marianne Clark Sharp, "Ninety-ninth Annual Commencement Address," Brigham Young University, 16 August 1974.}

Class, then, is something which in Britain has produced a great deal of affectation over the generations; and it may partly do that here, too. You see, we have been very clever in Britain in taking the more able people in the lower class and bringing them up through into the higher classes so that they shan't be a nuisance. We have deprived our lower classes of their natural leaders. I believe you may be doing this, too. It is essential that there should be intellectual, highly intelligent men among the working classes to help lead them. One of the major reasons why we have such trouble with trades unions nowadays is that we have advanced the natural leaders of the working class into other positions in society where they are no longer interested, where they have no kind of feeling together with the working class any longer.

Following on from my Dickens—when I was fifteen years old I came across Karl Marx's \textit{Manifesto} (1848), and what struck me there is something that again has never left me, because it seemed (and still seems) to me an absolute gospel principle embedded in the middle of that hateful tract: "As long as there is a lower class, I am of it." But in my life I have interpreted that in a deeper way I feel than Marx himself did. As Eliot says, following the mystic tradition, "The way down is the way up." That's why I am troubled and puzzled by the American doctrine of success, because it is so diametrically opposed to my own feelings on the subject. Apart from anything else, if we are ambitious, if we are optimistic, then we are so often disappointed. But if we are not optimistic—if we don't expect anything and we get something—gratitude becomes the main point in our life; and I assure you that gratitude has been the major emotion of my whole life until this very
moment (a moment which I can hardly believe). Gratitude is a fundamental gospel principle. Gratitude is what we have to feel: we have to give it back to the Lord in all things, and that is what gratitude means. We had two German Shepherds. When I brought them back from Pakistan, it was a hot summer. We had to put them in quarantine. They were allowed their runs. At the beginning of their six months in quarantine, they thought that all wasps were flies. At the end of that six months, they thought all flies were wasps.

The reward of optimism is pessimism: the right thing to do is not to think of our future in terms of either optimism or pessimism—preferably from the gospel point of view not think of it at all—because if we think of our future, how can we have our quality in the present? There is no future, there is no past—they don't exist. Only the present exists, and if we are not living now (all of you—those of you who may be inclined to be asleep at the moment), we are not living at any other time—we are not living. That is one of the essential gospel principles, together with gratitude. And I seem to have learned that early, because I had no ambitions. I was born extremely poor; but I had no ambitions, and I was surprised every time something good happened to me. And I continue to be so. One of the most surprising things of all was to be told—I was going to give this lecture; and that itself might have been a less than pleasant surprise, but it turned out to be a very pleasant one—at least for me. What one doesn’t expect may prove to be a source of gratitude. I say these things at some length because it seems to me that having been brought to the U. S. A. as a kind of missionary in reverse, I had better perform that role by sometimes saying things which seem contrary to the doctrine of success espoused in this country.

Anyway—going down is the thing. "As long as there is a lower class I am of it," but "the lower class" goes deep. It's not simply the working class, it's all oppressed creatures: women, children, animals. I felt this in the dying eye of the deer, and the fish desperately flapping at the bottom of the boat. And going down in this way, one finds oneself like Milton in Lycidas at "the bottom of the monstrous world"—far more monstrous than that ridiculous effusion, Jaws. And it is at the bottom of the monstrous world that we meet death.

Death seems at least to get rid of class distinctions. I met death in Dickens. It made more impression on me than anything else in Dickens. The death of Little Nell, the death of Paul Dombey, the death of Barkis in Copperfield, the death above all of Dora. I remember reading that the winter of 1918-1919. I don't think I have ever got over it. I certainly mourned in an access of grief for several months at the
time. And yet, you know, when I read Dickens again before I gave this talk, I found and remembered a death, which impressed me more than all those deaths, and that was the death of Jo in Bleak House. Jo was a boy with no home, not even in the slums. No parents, no nobody. There were tens of thousands of his kind when Dickens was alive, in your country as well as mine. Jo, as he cannot fail to do, dies. A good young doctor is looking after him. He has made some friends, and I am going to read the account of his very brief death, because it brings together what I said about class and about death; which are deeply linked, you know, because a class society is a society dead to the gospel.

"—It’s turned very dark, sir. Is there any light a comin’?"

"It is coming fast, Jo... Jo, my poor fellow!"

"I hear you, sir, in the dark, but I’m a gropin’—a gropin’—let me catch hold of your hand."

"Jo, can you say what I say?"

"I’ll say anythink as you say, sir, for I knows it’s good."

"OUR FATHER."

"OUR FATHER!—yes, that’s very good, sir."

"WHICH ART IN HEAVEN."

"Art in Heaven—is the light a comin’, sir?"

"It is close at hand. HALLOWED BE THY NAME!"

"Hallowed be—thy—"

"The light is come upon the dark benighted way. Dead!"13

I give you a testimony of death. I think it is terrible that people no longer die in their own families, but die in hospitals. I can understand all the reasons for it, but I still think it is terrible. One third of the children who were born in the nineteenth century also died as children: died in their families, died at home, with others at their bedside.

My father was killed when I was nine, under a bus. The last thing he said in his life was, "Get me out of here." The policeman came and knocked on the door, and I remember the heavy knock and wondering what was there. And yet, even at the age of nine, I felt as I did my boots up to go to school—as I tried to go to school—that morning, how much I loved him and how much he loved me and how his death made that

clear—much more clear than anything else could make it. I lost my small brother in pneumonia a year and a half later, and I can still remember his little leaden face before they put him in the coffin. I had good reason to remember him fifteen years later, when my own only son died at the age of one week, at 4:00 A.M. on Easter morning. And I remember then the same feeling as I had had about my father, and that was gratitude—I was grateful for that week. My late wife died after four years' struggle with cancer. I can still remember how she felt when her lips were already cold and her forehead still warm. Then the death of my mother at the ripe age of eighty; but she had been senile for the last two weeks, and she died with a curious smile on her face which, of course, in my objective way, I knew was a question of the relaxation of muscles—no more. But these things always take on significance. At each of these deaths, I felt love and gratitude, and I wonder how many of us sufficiently feel how profoundly grateful we should be to death for the way it intensifies our lives as nothing else could do. And how we need to prepare children for death, as Dickens' deaths prepared me to take as I should the deaths that came to me. Going back to Dickens after those many years, after fifty-six years (I had read him incidentally in between but never read him en bloc like that), I realized that he is a great writer of the gospel, and we do ill in our Church to ignore him. He has the quality that Tolstoy found in Victor Hugo's Les Misérables: above all, the quality of human sympathy, which is of supreme importance in writing. Those who hate mankind may express themselves well on the surface, but they have nothing to do with the gospel.

One more point about death—a very different point—which is what happens when you live in a world that doesn't understand or realize death. I'm transported to the walls of Troy, and there is Helen on the walls, and she is looking at the Greeks assembling. And as she looks round, she doesn't see her brothers, Castor and Pollux, and she says, "I wonder where they are. Why are they not here?" And then she has a purely egocentric and (for Helen) characteristic thought. She thinks, "I suppose they are not here because they are ashamed of me." And then Homer produces two wonderful lines: "But they were already lying under their own country's earth, in their dear Lacedaemon" (Homer, Iliad, 3.236-44). Those who are egocentric have no understanding of death, have no comprehension of how it is always round the corner and one of the things which we have to take into account throughout our lives if our lives are to be of quality.

Now I said that what I was going to do was to move through four subjects, and this is the time where I come to the most important one
that I have to talk about; because, as I have tried to show you, the experience of death is perhaps the greatest experience of love that we can have in this world. And therefore it is natural that out of the depths of death I should rise to this. Children learn love of various kinds earlier than most parents realize. I fell in love with a little girl—I remember intensely—at the age of six. It didn't surprise me, therefore, to find that Dante first met Beatrice when he was nine and she was nine, too. I fell in love with a little girl at that age. It lasted about a year. And then I met a girl at the place where we went down to spend our holidays. I met her only a few times for three weeks each year, but I thought of no one else in the interim: the age of twelve, age of thirteen, age of fourteen, and then at the age of fifteen I saw her one evening, the first evening I had got down there. And that was, I suppose, one of the major climaxes of my life. I shall never forget it. I moved away from that few moments of meeting so full of feeling that I did not know what to do with it. Luckily I was alone, and I rushed off to the woods. I shouted and sang up and down those woods, because what I had discovered for the first time was something I suppose that I didn't know was the priesthood and the power of the priesthood until I had got into this Church. But as it was it was just, as it were, streaming wasted through me. It was an exaltation of a kind which can rarely come later in life. It was an exaltation which began my true intellectual life, because that summer I started to read intensively the higher things. I was, luckily, reading As You Like It at that time and the wonderful interplay between Rosalind and Orlando. And, at the same time—I'll have to come back to this experience and say more about it in my last section—but in the meantime, do remember how old you were when you were as old as your own children, because so many people underestimate all the time and have no idea of how mature their children are. They forget how mature they were themselves, and this causes difficulty and damage. Well, that ecstasy remained with me for about three years. This experience of love that I then gained, I gained in life first before I gained it in books. But then, when I came to it, I knew what Act II, Scene 2, of Romeo and Juliet was all about, and it remains to me today one of the greatest lyrical sweeps of the human spirit—the balcony scene between Romeo and Juliet. It never fails. It has an extraordinary strength and flow and sweetness. It is the greatest expression of young love that has ever been. Lust cannot be seen anywhere near it: it has nothing to do with lust.

And there were many other experiences, like the wonderful experience of Florizel and Perdita in Winter's Tale of which I have no
time to tell you. And so it went on through my life until I was reading Dante, Goethe, and others who have had that feeling. But what is that feeling? That's the point. It seems to me that the onset of sexual love so-called, and I think we should call it so even in its highest reaches, nevertheless is the onset of a deeper appreciation, if it happens rightly to one, of all love. And it is one of my greatest convictions that all love is a reflection of the Divine love, no matter how twisted and perturbed it may be: it is some kind of reflection of the Divine love, and all love is ultimately the same in that sense. Curious that Freud should think so, from a rather lowly point of view. But it remains true in the higher point of view. It is the love of God, and we are lucky to have that kind of genitive in English, because it means the love we have for God and the love that God has for us. And it is the love of parents for children and children for parents, and brothers and sisters and husband and wife—it is this love. It is the one love, ultimately. I am not one who believes in the separateness of Agape and Eros. I am one who believes that only in the Eastern Mediterranean (which was bored stiff with its physical experience) was such a division possible. But for us in the Mormon Church who believe in the oneness of spirit and body in soul, there is one love and it is Divine love in all its forms.

I am going to read to you what I think to be the greatest passage in all literature. It is the reconciliation scene between Cordelia and Lear, and it is one of the demonstrations of how profoundly Christian Shakespeare is. Nothing matters in this play after that. Does it matter really that Cordelia was hanged and that Lear dies? This is the reconciliation. This is a human image of the atonement. In many respects I think our human love is an image of the atonement in that way.

CORDELIA

How does my royal lord? How fares your majesty?

LEAR

You do me wrong to take me out o' th' grave:
Thou art a soul in bliss; but I am bound
Upon a wheel of fire, that mine own tears
Do scald like molten lead.

CORDELIA

Sir, do you know me?

LEAR

You are a spirit, I know. Where did you die?

......
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Where have I been? Where am I? Fair daylight?
I am mightily abused. I should ev’n die with pity,
To see another thus. I know not what to say.
I will not swear these are my hands: let’s see;
I feel this pin prick. Would I were assured
Of my condition.

CORDELIA

O, look upon me, sir,

And hold your hand in benediction o’er me.
No, sir, you must not kneel.

LEAR

Pray, do not mock me:

I am a very foolish fond old man,
Fourscore and upward, not an hour more nor less;
And, to deal plainly,
I fear I am not in my perfect mind.
Methinks I should know you and know this man,
Yet I am doubtful; for I am mainly ignorant
What place this is, and all the skill I have
Remembers not these garments, nor I know not
Where I did lodge last night. Do not laugh at me,
For, as I am a man, I think this lady
To be my child Cordelia.

CORDELIA

And so I am, I am.

LEAR

Be your tears wet? Yes, faith, I pray, weep not.
If you have poison for me, I will drink it.
I know you do not love me; for your sisters
Have, as I do remember, done me wrong.
You have some cause, they have not.

CORDELIA

No cause, no cause.

(4.7.44-76)

When you read great literature and find echoes in it over the centuries—sometimes over the thousands of years—it goes deep. It is an extraordinary experience. "And so I am, I am," "No cause, no cause." These are the simple words that Cordelia says. And when you go to the Purgatory of Dante to the 30th canto, 73rd line, when Vergil has gone and left Dante alone and he is in despair that Vergil has left him—there is she. And quoting Vergil himself, he says, "I recognize the traces of the ancient flame." And the first words that Beatrice says
to him are these: "Guarda mi ben. Ben son, ben son Beatrice"—untranslatable because of those three "ben." "Look well at me, I am, I am Beatrice." Cordelia: "And so I am, I am." The simple repetition of love.

But for us Mormons, love is not just an ecstasy, not just an intense feeling. It's a driving force. It's something that carries us through our life of joyful duty. And here is another passage from Dickens which I loved when I was a child, which helped me to understand because if there was a Christian marriage it was that between Arthur Clennam and Little Dorrit at the end of that novel; and indeed Dickens says that the light shone through the image of the Savior in the stained glass window upon them as they stood there at the altar. The passage is practical, but it is profound and has all this feeling behind it. They finish signing the register and go out of the church. This is the end of the novel:

They all gave place when the signing was done, and Little Dorrit and her husband walked out of the church alone. They paused for a moment on the steps of the portico, looking at the fresh perspective of the street in the autumn morning sun's bright rays, and then went down.

Went down into the modest life of usefulness and happiness. Went down to give a mother's care, in the fulness of time, to Fanny's neglected children no less than to their own, and to leave that lady going into Society for ever and a day. Went down to give a tender nurse and friend to Tip for some few years, who was never vexed by the great exactions he made of her, in return for the riches he might have given her if he had ever had them, and who lovingly closed his eyes upon the Marshalsea and all its blighted fruits. They went quietly down into the roaring streets, inseparable and blessed; and as they passed along in sunshine and shade, the noisy and the eager, and the arrogant and the froward and the vain, fretted, and chafed, and made their usual uproar.¹

I come to my final section. This is the most difficult section, but it is a section which subsumes all the rest, and that is the sense of creation: the sense of God's creation, the sense of our being created as artists, as fathers and mothers. One morning in April, 1916, my father put me on the back of his bike where I had a little seat and said, "Off we go." And then he turned in the wrong direction, for I thought he was taking me down to Quakers' meeting. It was a Sunday. "No," he said, "We are going somewhere else today." And we rode for about eight miles, and we stopped at a wood. (It is now a housing estate. I went to

see it—took my wife there—there was nothing to show her.) We went into the wood; and there, suddenly, was a great pool of bluebells stretching for perhaps a hundred yards in the shade of the oak trees. And I could scarcely breathe because the impression was so great. Then it was just the bluebells and the scent. Now it is the recollection of the love of my father who chose to do that that morning—to give me that experience. I’m sure he had been there the day before, found it and thought, “I’ll take my son there.” As we rode there, and as we rode back, we heard the distant thunder of the guns at the Battle of the Somme, where thousands every day were dying. That overwhelming experience of a natural phenomenon, a demonstration of beneficent creation at the same time as one could hear those guns on the Somme, has remained with me almost more clearly than anything else in my life. And again it was an experience that I had before I met it in literature, but when I did meet it in literature, I knew it—I recognized it. I knew what Wordsworth was writing about, and Wordsworth is a good step to greater men. I often think it’s better to read Wordsworth in the original, for example, than Goethe in translation because they have so very similar a message for so much of them, except of course that Wordsworth is so much narrower. Those of you who have not read the Prelude by Wordsworth, which is the greatest autobiographical poem there is, should do so. I’ve no time now to go through the landscapes of that. I’ve no time to discuss in any kind of detail what landscape is about because, obviously, landscape is not just about itself. It’s “a type and symbol of eternity,” as Wordsworth called it. Those of you who don’t know it might do well to look at a passage of the Prelude which was written separately and is often printed separately in anthologies and is easy to find. It is an account of how Wordsworth and his companion (this was back in 1792) were walking across the Alps. They were looking forward to the tremendous experience (they were Romantics, you know) of crossing the Alps. And alas as they were walking along the road, they met a Swiss and they asked him where they were. And to their disappointment they discovered that they had crossed the Alps without even knowing it. And so in a state of great disappointment they continued. But then comes the greatest passage in all of Wordsworth to describe it:

[DEFILE OF GONDO.]

The brook and road  
Were fellow travellers in this gloomy strait,  
And with them did we journey several hours
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At a slow pace. The immeasurable height
Of woods decaying, never to be decayed,
The stationary blasts of waterfalls,
And in the narrow rent at every turn
Winds thwarting winds, bewildered and forlorn,
The torrents shooting from the clear blue sky,
The rocks that muttered close upon our ears,
Black drizzling crags that spake by the way-side
As if a voice were in them, the sick sight
And giddy prospect of the raving stream,
The unfettered clouds and region of the Heavens,
Tumult and peace, the darkness and the light—
Were all like workings of one mind, the features
Of the same face, blossoms upon one tree;
Characters of the great Apocalypse,
The types and symbols of Eternity,
Of first, and last, and midst, and without end.

(621-640)

Those of you who ever feel any doubt about Joseph Smith, knowing that he spent so long getting right that account of the vision of the Father and the Son, would do well to remember that Wordsworth produced a perfunctory account of his experience in his Descriptive Sketches of 1792. Thirteen years later he had his experience ready. He didn’t know what it was until then. It took him those years. It took Joseph Smith about eight. The greatest experiences of our lives may not be clear to us, even in their most important significance, when they first happen to us. They are there for us to keep and treasure and observe and watch and know and live with. I firmly believe that as I walk through my life, I live with all my years coming along with me. They are there and there and there; it must happen to you too, but the point is it is important. In a moment of leisure, in a moment of meditation, you are there or there or there. There may be twenty or thirty or forty or fifty years in between; for me it’s sixty years sometimes now. But it’s still there—the whole of life traveling forward with you. Not only do we come here trailing clouds of glory, we don’t lose them. I know Wordsworth was disappointed, but he made a rather formal marriage, and after that he seemed to have had no particular inspiration left except very occasionally. But you know these clouds of glory are there the whole time. They are there for the whole of our lives. The longer we live, the greater the trail if we remember and if we remember in the right way.

I could go on to talk about the greatest of writers and to suggest that that is what we do well to be accompanied by—the greatest of
writers. There is no time for inferior writing. There is no time indeed for grumbling about how bad literature is when what we are basing the grumbling on is bad literature. The great thing about great literature is that the greater it is, the greater the scriptures are to us, as a result of reading it. Why? Because the scriptures are even greater. We have a different sense of dimension when we know great literature and its part in our lives. Where Lear ends, Job begins. Where Lear ends, the Prodigal Son begins; and so on. Our testimony of the scriptures, our sensitivity to the scriptures is inordinately assisted by our experience with the greatest literature, and I mean the greatest literature. No one can find that great literature is contrary to the gospel. When I say great literature, I mean Homer, I mean Vergil, I mean Dante, I mean Shakespeare, I mean Goethe; and Goethe was a bit doubtful still when I was a boy. It takes a long time for this to grow. Now I am convinced of Goethe. Eliot, too, spent a lifetime before being convinced of Goethe, and I think his convincement was formal. Mine, I assure you, was genuine. The whole of our literature in Europe and the United States and anywhere else in the West since Goethe is Goethe’s aftermath, just as the whole of Greek literature was Homer’s aftermath, and the whole of the great period of English literature was Shakespeare’s aftermath, and Italian literature is still Dante’s aftermath. We can’t expect (publishers would like to see it every week) great literature more than once every few hundred years at its greatest height. And what’s the good of reading modern trash when we’ve left Goethe and Shakespeare and Dante and Homer and Vergil unread? And I assure you that even in translation they are greater than the other things. That’s all I have time to say—my testimony of the value and place of great literature. Now, don’t get me wrong, even the greatest of literature doesn’t always tell the truth. Only the scripture always tells the truth. Only the scripture is inspired in that way; but unless you are familiar with great literature, you are missing something—missing something that could help the gospel, can help your own soul and can help you realize: what? What I said just now and will repeat: how great, how ineffably great the scriptures are.

Now there are two main aspects of this creative process. One is its intensity. When I rushed out into the wood at that time after meeting that girl again at the age of fifteen, that evening I had as full an apprehension of the intensity of the creative force of the universe and of the feeling of gratitude as I could have. “This is in me! Astonishing,

---

15There are, of course, other great writers. These are meant to represent the best, the reading of whom leads us to a greater understanding of the scriptures.
it's in me!” It’s something to live up to. I wonder how I should have felt then had I known that I held the priesthood in the true Church. My mother always said she wanted me to be a priest. I didn’t quite see how that was going to be fulfilled, but it was fulfilled. One is that intenseness, but it’s extraordinarily difficult to feel intenseness from outside. But what can be felt is what sometimes comes to us as another aspect of the universe—not simply the intense activity down to the least particle of it, but its peace—the vast sabbath of the universe. In his greatest lyric poem, which may well be the greatest short lyric poem ever written, a few lines indeed, Goethe has seized that. I’ve been playing around for three months trying to get these few lines right in English, and of course I haven’t succeeded. I suppose I’ve got about a hundred versions. But I will first of all read you this, and then I will read you the original German because I think you will get something of the music of it even from me. Let me first then give you the translation so that you know more or less what it’s about and then I’ll give you the German.

Mountain and evening sky
Make peace.
Light airs in the high
Branches ease,
Breathe, and are through.
No birds now sing for the solemn wood.
Patience: soon you should
Be at peace, too.

_Ueber allen Gipfeln_
_Ist Ruh._
_In allen Wipfeln_
_Spuerest Du_
_Kaum einen Hauch._
_Die Voegelein schweigen im Walde._
_Warte nur: balde_
_Rubest Du auch._

The peace of death, the peace of love, the peace of the most intense activity of creation, are all aspects of the peace of God which passeth understanding.

We are Mormons: I’ve already allowed the practical to intervene at the end of _Little Dorrit_ and I will allow the practical to intervene again. This time for you to take away something to help sensitivity and to help observation. There are other elements I could have explored and haven’t had time for. I’ll just mention a couple and then we will finish. First, is the whole question of morality. I have never been in
doubt at any time of my life that morality is a prime function of literature. Literature is there to teach. How it teaches is another matter. It may be thought of as teaching through sweetness. But unless a great writer is a teacher, he is not a great writer. And the moral issue is clear, and the moral issue to us in this Church is clear. Very often bad men have good moments. Very often bad men have aspirations. Very often bad men are struggling not to be bad, and in these cases they may well produce great work. I have no brief for Michelangelo's private life, but I say that when he was painting the Sistine ceiling—when he knew that Eve had a spirit body and painted it—he was under some kind of inspiration. We have to remember that, but we have to remember also that there are great writers who have managed to maintain a high level through a great deal of their lives. There is a lot of gossip about Shakespeare, but we really know very little about Shakespeare's private life. We know he didn't like drinking—hated it. I've only time just to mention that to you, but it is a profound conviction of mine and I will assert it and I will defend it at any point. People talk to me about great writers and they are not talking about great writers. They are thinking of Oscar Wilde as "great." Every epigram of Oscar Wilde's contains self-love, and when he tried to write a serious poem he spoiled himself very badly, and that Ballad of Reading Gaol is a disgraceful piece of self-pity, because that is one of the great characteristics of bad men: self-pity. And self-pity is the dominant feeling of most modern literature in most countries: try it out in Faulkner, try it out in Hemingway—self-pity. Watch out for self-pity. Anybody who expresses self-pity to any considerable extent in his work is suspect. What is a self to have a pity about? But that's another problem.

The other thing I want to remind you of is a great protection and defense to us in this dreadful situation in which we are constantly being pushed to be of the world and are nevertheless struggling to remain only in the world without being of it. That is irony. Look for irony in the scriptures. It is there. It is there in the Old Testament, it is there in the New Testament, it is constantly there in Christ's dealings with the Pharisees. It is superbly there in the account of David and Bathsheba in 2 Samuel 11 and 12. You look at those two missives that Joab sends to David. You look at the first verse of chapter 11 and then look at the last four verses of chapter 12, and then look at the last verse of chapter 17. By juxtaposition—irony. By silence—irony. Learn to look. Learn to see what is not said because it is being said more effectively because it is not said.
Here are two quotations about drink. One is from the *Journal of John Woolman*. One is from *Benjamin Franklin’s Autobiography*.

... I perceived that many white people do often sell rum to the Indians, which, I believe, is a great evil. First they being thereby deprived of the use of their Reason and their spirits violently Agitated, quarrels often arise which ends in mischief, and the bitterness and resentments Occasioned hereby are frequently of long continuance: again their Skins and furs gotten through much fatigue & hard travels in hunting, with which they intended to buy Cloathing, *these* when they begin to be Intoxicated they often Sell at a low rate for more rum, and afterward when they suffer for want of the necessaries of life, are angry with those who for the Sake of gain took the advantage of their weakness; of this their Chiefs have often complained at their Treaties with the English.

Where cunning people pass Counterfeits and impose that on others which is only good for nothing, it is considered as a wickedness, but to sell that to people which we know does them harm, and which often works their Ruin, for the sake of gain manifests a hardened and Corrupt heart; and it is an evil which demands the care of all True lovers of Virtue [in endeavouring] to Supress. ...¹⁶

*(John Woolman)*

... if it be the design of Providence to extirpate these savages in order to make room for cultivators of the earth, it seems not improbable that rum may be the appointed means.¹⁷

*(Benjamin Franklin)*

I ask your attention to these two books, both of which are among the most important books in American literature. Most of you have probably read the *Autobiography of Benjamin Franklin*. Do yourselves now the credit of doing something which is immensely more to the sympathy of Mormons and that is the *Journal of John Woolman*, who sought the Spirit daily and hourly in order to make sure that he got the message of the Spirit and not another message; who was never clever, who was never anything but himself, and was himself because he never thought about himself from the beginning of his life to the end. It was he who really started the American Emancipation movement by gradually throughout his life persuading the Quakers first to stop trading in slaves and then to stop buying them, and finally to stop


having them and releasing those they had. A humble man to be classed with Thomas à Kempis and Dame Juliana of Norwich: they all three wrote with great limpidity.

My final message to you is perhaps an enlightening message, and I hope never again shall we have Polonius quoted at general conference or anywhere else. Polonius was a wicked old man and is so presented to us. He was a coarse and vulgar old man. He was capable of saying to the king, "I'll lose my daughter to him"—meaning, using the image of loosing a sow to the boar or a mare to the stallion. That is the coarse image that it is: that he would loose her to Hamlet so that they could get some knowledge of what was in his mind. The only good thing about Polonius is his poor daughter's grief at his death. Now let's take a look at this "famous" speech of Polonius:

... Give thy thoughts no tongue,
Nor any unproportioned thought his act.
Be thou familiar, but by no means vulgar.
Those friends thou hast, and their adoption tried,
Grapple them to thy soul with hoops of steel,
But do not dull thy palm with entertainment
Of each new-hatched unfledged comrade. Beware
Of entrance to a quarrel, but being in,
Bear't that the opposed may beware of thee.
Give every man thy ear, but few thy voice.
Take each man's censure, but reserve thy judgment.
Costly thy habit as thy purse can buy,
But not expressed in fancy—rich, not gaudy.
For the apparel oft proclaims the man,
And they in France of the best rank and station
Are of a most select and generous chief in that.
Neither a borrower nor a lender be,
For loan oft loses both itself and friend
And borrowing dulls the edge of husbandry.
This above all: To thine own self be true,
And it must follow, as the night the day,
Thou canst not then be false to any man.

(Shakespeare, _Hamlet_, 1. 3. 59-80)

The sentiments of that speech, perfunctory as they are, given on a comic occasion when Laertes is trying to get away to the ship (he has already had a farewell speech with his father and now all this is being added unto him)—are directly opposed to the sense that Shakespeare has of the generous man, the magnanimous man. This is a miserable and meanly prudential speech. Moreover, it is perfunctory advice from a worldly father to a worldly son who has no intention whatever of
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carrying anything out, and the father knows that but he is doing the correct thing on this occasion. Now look at some of those things there. What is there? Look at it—not just hear the burble in your ear but look at it. "Grapple them to thy soul with hoops of steel." What an extraordinary image of friendship—grappling your friends to your soul with hoops of steel. What an uncomfortable and possessive process in the extreme. Five lines further down: "Give every man thy ear, but few thy voice." Prudentiалity. And then so characteristic: what gets more than anything else in this speech? Costume. "Costly thy habit as thy purse can buy." What very English advice this is. Spend all the money you possibly can on your clothes, but make sure they are neat and not gaudy because your affectation must be not seeming to have any affectation. Last line but one: "And it must follow . . . " and how does it follow? " . . . as the night the day," but the night is the symbol of a very different kind of thing from the day and makes the sentiment ludicrous. And of course it is ludicrous because, of course, if you are the kind of man Polonius is and his son will be, and all such people are, it follows that you may be honest enough in expressing your falseness to others because that is your "To thine own self be true." If the false man is true to himself, what is he? "As the night the day," then, is not "as the day the night"—it's very different. Go away and think about that. Think about Polonius stabbed behind the arras with the comment of Hamlet on it afterwards: "I'll lug the guts into the neighbor room."

I want to finish on a different note, and this is really my final note. Your laughter, even, sounds a little weary. I and Patricia have in common a fifth-great-grandmother and she was the daughter of a man who spent nearly twenty years in jail because of his faith, being constantly put there by the minions of Charles II. And here is an extract from her last letter. Her name was Susannah Martin (born Garton) and we shouldn't have known anything at all about her but for the genealogical program of the Church. And we share her—Patricia and I—as we share so many hundreds of others of seekers, seekers, seekers: the technical term for those who didn't yet know what their religion was. Sometimes I feel that our forebears for generations were seeking and that Patricia and I have found. This is Susannah's last letter, which was put into the Annual Register because she died suddenly of an apoplectic stroke, as they then called it, and had no time to have the kind of recorded deathbed that Quakers then had. So this letter was in lieu, and there is only a little bit of it and there's only one phrase of it that is important, and it's so important to us. And I hope
you will feel that my lecture tonight and my conversion to the Church, and my marriage to my wife all come together in these lines of our fifth-great-grandmother written in 1735:

For I can say it is good to Serve the Lord, and to give up the strength of our Days to Honour him with it, who hath given it unto us; and having Tasted and felt how good the Lord is to them that are given up to follow him, I have wrote these few lines for the Encouragement of those who I may leave behind, when I may be in the Silent Grave, That they may be given up to Serve the Lord in their Day. . . .

You can imagine what feeling my wife and I felt when we first read that extract in the minutes of the meeting, because we felt that we had been raised up, as she said, to serve the Lord in our day; and we have done her work and the work of her father and her husband and all her relatives, and we now know that they wait for us on the other side.

And so it is with those great writers of whom I have tried to speak tonight: they have left it for us. Let us not leave it unread. Let us think of great literature as a way—a special way—of appreciating the scriptures. "I am the way, the truth and the life," says the Lord. "No man cometh unto the Father but by me." That is true; but it is also true that great literature, and it is only great literature that can do it, can bring us nearer to Him in whose name I now say it.
Mormonism and the Secularization of Religions in the Modern World

Ernst Benz

Secularization of religions in the modern world is one of the most discussed themes among the scholars of sociology, of theology, and of history of religions of today. I had the privilege of attending two of the main international discussions of that theme, the "Salzburger Humanismusgesprache" (September 1970) and the International Colloquy on Secularization in Rome (January 1976). The general impression of both colloquies was that of a happy confusion, which is very typical for conferences of learned specialists. Some sociologists taught the imminent definite collapse of religion; others admitted that this decay seemed to be unavoidable under the present situation, but that there may be a small chance of the survival of religion in case of unpredictable catastrophes. Marxists like Ernest Bloch attacked Christianity because of the fact that the Roman inquisition burned thousands of witches, and even neo-Marxists like Max Horkheimer came back to the theme of burnt witches, as if Christians through centuries had done nothing else than to burn witches.

But just this impression of happy confusion encourages me to condense the broad variety of contradictory statements into some very few and I hope understandable concepts:

There is one basic understanding of secularization of religions in the modern world, which is very widely spread among the leading groups of modern sociologists, and that says that religion in all its historical forms is more and more disappearing from modern society and from the consciousness of modern man, which means that modern life and secularization are identical. Secularization not only concerns the shrinking influence of religious institutions, especially of the institutional churches, on the public life, but also the diminishing influence of religion on the self-understanding of modern man and especially on his ethical behavior. Secularization in this broadest sense
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is desacralization—the loss of the consciousness of the holiness of life not only in the social structures, but also in the private sphere of man. Of special importance is the assertion that this process is irreversible, it cannot be stopped anymore, and that means religion has no future at all; it still survives as a vanishing phenomenon in some marginal fields of society, in some areas of cultural hinterland, but its destiny is sealed.

This concept of secularization seen from the standpoint of history of modern ideas, in spite of its claim to be based on facts and critical observations, sounds a little suspicious because of its surprising resemblance with the concept of religion developed by Karl Marx in the footsteps of Ludwig Feuerbach. According to Marx, religion is necessarily dying out from itself as the result of the progress of the socialist society, and this dying out of religion is irreversible, because religion is based on an ideological self-deception of man, keeping man in the state of an opiate dream of a pretended better beyond, which hinders him from settling his life in this world by his own force and from building up here the perfect socialist society.

Yet it would be dishonest not to admit that there are some real historical reasons for the rise of a strong process of secularization in modern times. This process began in its conspicuous form in the time of enlightenment of the seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries as a direct consequence and reaction upon the terrific religious wars, during which the Christian gospel of love was so thoroughly compromised by the fighting Christian churches themselves. There arose a sharp criticism of the traditional religions and of their established institutions among the leading spirits of the epoch. The criticism of religious doctrines and institutions of this "First Enlightenment" was at first represented by only a small minority of intellectuals and scholars, but with the spreading of the modern natural sciences and the extension of public education of the modern school and university-system in the following centuries, we reach today the epoch of the so-called "Second Enlightenment," which means that the state of merely rationalistic and scientific interpretation of nature, history, and man has now reached the broad masses and modelled the whole consciousness of modern society. We have to admit that the religious institutions were by themselves the main reason and stumblingblock of the general criticism of religion because of the discrepancy of their own theological pretension and highly sublime self-interpretation on the one side and the deficiency of their practical behavior on the other side.
As a matter of fact, secularization is a phenomenon typical for all living world religions, for Judaism and Islam as well as for Hinduism and for Buddhism. There are some peculiarities among the different types of secularization in the religions in question, and there exist very interesting studies about the typical form of secularization, for example, in Hinduism and Buddhism, but we cannot enter here and today into the details of this side of the problem. I suggest to limit our inquiry of the phenomenon to the secularization in modern Christianity with a special outlook on Mormonism.

Here let us begin with a critical distinction, which is the more necessary as most of the scholars of sociology did not take it into consideration. Basically there are two types of secularization:

The first one is the type already mentioned at the beginning, the disappearing of the concept of the holy, the negation of the transcendent origin of our world and our human life, the desacralization of social and private life, the limitation of our self-understanding on a merely rational worldly concept of the rules of our social and private life and of our situation in the natural universe, with the general tendency to eliminate the rest of religion also from the marginal areas where it still survives, especially from the ethical field.

But there is a second type of secularization which is typical and essential for Christianism. The main idea of the Christian faith is God’s self-manifestation in this our world through Jesus Christ, and God’s self-realization in this our world through the power and the gifts of the Holy Spirit. And this involves a quite different positive type of secularization, which means God’s way of secularization. In a very pointed formulation we could say: Secularization is the way of divine incarnation. God’s will, God’s power, God’s spirit will penetrate the matter of the world to model and shape it according to his own will, for modelling mankind, for building up His kingdom. Martin Luther says in his commentary to the first chapter of the first book of Moses: "The Holy Spirit does not like to move always upon the face of the waters like a goose, he will penetrate and work."

Considering this type of secularization we must as historians admit that Mormonism is the best example of this positive secularization of the Christian gospel because it was driven from its very beginning by the aim to prepare and even to anticipate the promise of the coming kingdom of God. Mormons were so strongly and directly and so verbally convinced of the reality of the message of Christ—"The kingdom of heaven is at hand" (Matthew 3:2)—that they began to anticipate it on the American soil by cultivating vast
areas, by building cities after cities in which they gathered their people as citizens of the coming kingdom of God. The persecution and the destruction of their holy places drove them finally into the western desert, and there they fulfilled the most admirable and astonishing work of making, as you say, the desert blossom under the most atrocious exterior conditions of nature, of climate, of absence of material resources.

Let me put for a moment the Mormon concept of the kingdom of God into the framework of Christian eschatology in general. In the time of Jesus there were three different types of eschatological expectation in Israel side by side:

The first one was a merely political hope to overcome the Roman conquerors and to reestablish an independent Jewish state under the guidance of the Messiah in this world with the center in Jerusalem. The Messiah was expected to be a political leader, sent by God, who by the help of God's miraculous power would fulfill his work of liberation of the people. In the New Testament we find several examples of such cases of Messianic political rebellions trying to expel the Romans from Israel and to build up an independent Jewish state. Jesus himself was condemned by the Roman political authorities and sentenced to death as such a Messianic rebel.

There was another more pietist group of believers which did not expect the foundation of an earthly kingdom of a political Messiah, but the coming of the heavenly kingdom, the manifestation of the heavenly Jerusalem, brought down by the heavenly "Son of Man," the apparition of the new heaven and the new earth, in which the chosen people of all times and generations participated in the state of resurrection. But these two different forms of expectation and of hope were not so clearly separated from each other in the hearts of the believers.

We find very soon, already in Saint Paul's letters, a third kind of expectation: The resurrected Christ will return to this earth in glory and will establish with his chosen people a kingdom for a thousand years on this earth, a millenium, and will rule the world with them during the time in which Satan is bound. Only after a thousand years of the rule of Christ the rest of the promises of the Apocalypse will be fulfilled: the last visitation of the Church of Christ, the last judgment, the resurrection of the dead, the coming of the new heaven and the new earth, and the apparition of the heavenly Jerusalem with its golden gates and its walls of diamonds, jasper, and emeralds and with its river of the water of life.
We can observe during the long history of Christianity that this expectation of the millennium fascinated the Christian believers much more than any other merely abstract theological concepts of the kingdom of God, because it excited much more the human hope of salvation and of fulfillment of the divine promise, it fascinated much more the human imagination, it impelled much more the human energies to work directly for the coming of the kingdom of God, it inspired much more the purpose to accelerate its coming by human collaboration and to prepare for and even to anticipate it here in this world.

This expectation of the millennium produced quite unexpected political and social consequences. Already in Jesus' time there were people, who tried to take the kingdom of heaven by force (see Matthew 11:12). Sometimes this millenarist movement also took the form of a political revolution as in, for example, the millenarist movement of Thomas Müntzer, the revolutionary contemporary of Martin Luther. Müntzer was convinced that it was necessary to eliminate first the enemies of the kingdom of God, the princes and the bishops of this time, by the power of the sword, accelerating so by an open rebellion the coming of the kingdom of God. His revolt was shot down by the artilllery of the Protestant and Catholic princes and bishops.

The Mormons differed from all other millenarian movements of Christian history by two reasons:

- First, their program to assemble the chosen people of God in an own reign or empire or kingdom or state or church was realized under the colonial conditions of the United States, first in the Middle West, and later on in the Far West. There was at that time still empty land enough to build up such an own holy state by the work of their own hands and to extend this planning of an own church-state or state-church of the Latter-day Saints even to the enormous size of "Deseret," covering most of the western territories of the United States to the coast of the Pacific Ocean.

- But there is a second still more striking peculiarity of Mormon millenarism: in the Book of Mormon the traditional eschatology finds its new geographical center in America. The traditional idea of the Christian "Heilsgeschichte"—history of salvation—with its center in Jerusalem, in Palestine, in Minor Asia, in Europe, gets a new pole in America, first in Jackson County, Missouri, and then in Salt Lake City in Utah. The sacred history of the redemption of mankind, described in the Old and the New Testament, finds its parallel in the sacred history of America, described in the Book of Mormon. Europeans generally do
not understand very clearly what that means, and I had always some difficulty to explain it to my students. Prior to Joseph Smith, America as a continent seemed to be in a certain sense excluded from the traditional biblical history of salvation. America is never mentioned in the Bible. For the Puritan immigrants, America was the wilderness, including the American Indians, a wilderness provided by God to European religious refugees for the plantation of a better church in the desert, better than the older European churches corrupted by popes, bishops, and kings. The American continent appeared to the European immigrants as a wild place of refuge, a wilderness without history, a *tabula rasa* offered by God for a new beginning. The historical consciousness of the Puritans was always that of immigrants.

The Book of Mormon brings a supplementary description of God's deeds on the American soil. America in the Book of Mormon is no more considered as a wilderness devoid of history but has its own long history of people and tribes and generations, including the whole pre-Columbian period, and this history of America is sacred history, history of salvation from its beginning. Even the history of the Jews finds its parallel on the American continent by the presence of the lost ten tribes of Israel or at least of some of them. This was one of my first experiences in this country. In 1960 I had an invitation to be a guest professor at Harvard Divinity School. In that time the visa regulations were still so complicated that they gave me an immigration visa. So I had to go to the immigration office at Boston. I was waiting there for a long time in the midst of a crowd of Italians, Syrians, Greeks and other newcomers. At the wall of the office I discovered a poster, representing the famous Indian chief standing on the rock at the coast of Plymouth, looking at the approaching *Mayflower* and crying: "Hey, foreigners!" It was a very nice comfort for all these timid newcomers to discover that this continent is populated by foreigners like them. With the only exception of the Mormons, who belong together with the Indians to the old-timers of this continent.

That means the Mormons are the only true Americans with a fully developed American historical consciousness, without any minority complex of immigrants. They belong to their American continent from ancient times, not only from the late *Mayflower* times. This historical consciousness directly inspired, for example, the studies of pre-Columbian archaeology and ethnology which are so highly developed at this university. And I would say Mormons alone from all the rest of Americans have the privilege to celebrate not only centenaries like the latecomers of this continent, but millenaries of
American history and prehistory if they want to do so. Mormonism is the producer and the most realistic and practical result of the positive way of secularization of the gospel of the kingdom of heaven at hand in America, including, in the most advanced point of secularization, the printing of their own dollar bills of the Kirtland Safety Society, Antibanking Company, signed by Joseph Smith, Israelite.

Now, I have talked about the two types of secularization and I have to underline that there is a danger also in the positive line of secularization. The process of secularization in the sense of developing the original impulses of the gospel, of the power of the Holy Spirit, can proceed so far into wordliness, that it comes in the advanced state of it to an interruption or a loss of contact with the original or heavenly source and with the heavenly aim. The vision of the heavenly kingdom of God may disappear and may be more and more absorbed by a merely social, technical, economical interpretation of the aim of mankind. "Vertical eschatology," the expectation of the "kingdom of heaven which is at hand," turns over into a merely "horizontal eschatology," the expectation of the perfect society of this world only.

Both dangers are threatening Christianity today. In the second half of the nineteenth century an American of German origin, Walter Rauschenbusch, discovered and propagated the so-called "social gospel," which influenced very quickly modern Protestant theology. The heavenly kingdom seemed to be no more relevant; the main aim of Christian theology was said to settle first the material social needs of this world. And evidently it was necessary in that time of industrialization to emphasize the social responsibility of the Christian churches in a socially and economically changing world, but some theologians went so far in this program of the social gospel that they forgot the Everlasting Gospel of the heavenly kingdom. Today we hear day by day from the newspapers about the worldwide activity of the Ecumenical Council of Churches to help underdeveloped countries to overcome their social troubles, an activity based on merely social and even political understanding of a so-called "theology of liberation" including revolution and terrorism; the whole activity seems to move more and more in the line of a merely "horizontal eschatology" with all its political consequences. This danger of forgetting the heavenly origin and the heavenly aim of the gospel is evidently also threatening the Mormonism of today. I am not entitled to talk in the name of Mormonism, and I want to avoid the slightest suspicion of arrogance to do so, but after all my studies of the religious sources of Mormonism and of the fascinating history of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-
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day Saints, and of the modern research-works on Mormon eschatology, I have the impression that Mormonism keeps in its own traditional understanding of Christian life and thought three basic concepts, which are sources of permanent spiritual reinforcement and could be antidotes to overcome this danger of a wrong secularization:

The first is the concept of the Everlasting Gospel, which we find in the Apocalypse of St. John and which is so strongly emphasized in the Book of Mormon and in the prophecies given to Joseph Smith, recorded in the Doctrine and Covenants. It means that the basic promise, the primitive power, the original spirit and force of the gospel of Jesus Christ is not exposed to decay, to corruption or to depravation in any sense of the word. This Everlasting Gospel includes the permanent duty of universal mission, as it is said in the Apocalypse itself; and the same appeal to the permanent duty of universal mission is also expressed by Joseph Smith in Doctrine and Covenants 13:36:

And now, verily saith the Lord, that these things might be known among you, O inhabitants of the earth, I have sent forth mine angel flying through the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel, who hath appeared unto some and hath committed it unto man, who shall appear unto many that dwell on the earth. And this gospel shall be preached unto every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people. And the servants of God shall go forth, saying with a loud voice: Fear God and give glory to him, for the hour of his judgment is come.

This order demands the continuity, the permanence and universality of the spreading of the Everlasting Gospel, which represents an effective antidote against the theory of the irreversible secularization of religion.

The other point of resistance, of attack, and of reconfirmation against the dangers of the wrong secularization seems to me to be the insisting upon the promises of the permanent presence of the gifts of the Holy Spirit. Today we can observe in midst of the crisis of Christianity and of the different Christian churches the completely unexpected rise of the so-called "charismatic movement" or "pentecostal movement," emerging in the different traditional Christian denominations, even in the Roman Catholic Church. Many Christians, disappointed by the general progress of secularization in midst of their own church, begin to rediscover the reality and the power of the gifts of the Holy Spirit, which were forgotten or neglected or ignored in the different churches sometimes through centuries. If I look into the history of Mormonism, I discover that
Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints insisted from the very beginning of its dramatic history on the powerful presence of these gifts of the Holy Spirit; they never forgot them or ignored them. Other Christian churches are beginning to rediscover the imposition of hands, forgotten and ignored through centuries. Mormons practiced it permanently from the beginning. They understood their whole history as guided by the presence of the Holy Spirit in the form of prophecy, of advice, of confirmation, of warning, and—let us use an otherwise unfashionable word—of miracles. What the charismatic movement propagated as their new discovery, can be already found in the seventh Article of Faith of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, formulated by Joseph Smith: "We believe in the gift of tongues, prophecy, revelation, visions, healing, interpretation of tongues, etc. . . ." Mormons always preserved a very living feeling and consciousness of the presence of the Holy Spirit and of the activity of his gifts, above all of prophecy as a living element of the guidance of the Church. Prophecy is more than mere adaptation, more than compromise; it is the way of divine guidance through the dangerous deserts and rocky mountains of human history, it inspires and enables the believers in the future as it did in the past to prepare and to anticipate so far as possible the coming kingdom of God.

There is still a third concept, which may preserve Mormons better than others from the wrong way of secularization. This is a concept in which they distinguish themselves from all other Christian denominations. It concerns the understanding of the religious origin and destiny of man. It is the idea of the incarnation of preexisting spirits in human bodies. But this incarnation is understood in a completely different sense than we find it expressed, for example, in the Hindu concept of incarnation. Man does not come into this our world as a victim of his thirst for life, and the incarnated soul is not understood to be a victim of a theft by which his heavenly garment, the heavenly pearl, is stolen from him; incarnation is not considered a catastrophe, caused by the sin committed in an earlier life, but the human soul descends from heaven into this bodily world to get the unique chance to advance in the grand scale of being, in which he is to move in the eternal worlds. The spirit descends into a body of flesh and bone because of the great council in heaven, in which God shows the human soul the possibility to develop his force and his knowledge in full consciousness of all the difficulties awaiting him there. To this knowledge belongs also the knowledge about death. The spiritual beings pressing for incarnation know very well from the beginning
that the passing of death belongs to the tasks in whose performance man has to stand the test in this world. This great council is put before the free spirits for their decision. In a free decision man enters the way of endless progression, and with the full knowledge of all the risk of it, the great law of increasing complexity, the law of endless development of all his powers in the midst of a universe becoming increasingly complex. In this concept of man there is practically no place for the sense of the loss of the consciousness of the transcendent origin and aim of man. Denying his heavenly origin, man would deny himself, would deny the sense of his life, the meaning of the community of man in which he lives, the sense of the universe in which he dwells.

This is actually, as I think, the main argument against the assertion of the end of religion and the irreversibility of its secularization. This assertion ignores and even offends practically the human nature itself. Man is not only the *homo faber*, the technical man, not only the industrial and economical man, *homo economicus*, but also from the beginning the *homo religiosus*, the religious man, the man who has a *sensus numinum*, an inner sense of his transcendental origin and aim. It is that inner sense, which is described in the Book of Creation by the words: "And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness. . . . So God created man in his own image" (Genesis 1:26, 27). The will of developing this image of God, the will to perfection, the will to reach the end of the development of all his power given him from above is deep-rooted in man’s life; hope and aim of perfection is a basic element of life itself.

This allows me to add still a few words about the centenary of this university. With respect to the University of Marburg, which is my university, the oldest Protestant university of the world, founded as a Protestant university in 1526, it could be said that the Brigham Young University is a relatively younger institution. But this would be an inadequate consideration. If we consider the circumstances of its rise, it is a really admirable and unique foundation. Let us look at others. The Spaniards arrived in America in 1492, and they founded their first university forty-six years later in Santo Domingo in 1538; other universities were established in 1551 in Mexico and in Lima, 1562 in Guatemala, 1573 in Bogota and 1598 in Cusco. They founded them 50 to 100 years after their arrival, and that in spite of the fact that they had at their disposition all they needed for such academic foundations: learned scholars, who were monks and could easily be sent out by obedience, maintained by their monastic organizations; they had excellent libraries and printing presses at home, providing them with
all the necessary materials for study and education and with the full traditional system of academic training.

The Protestants in America were a little faster with building up an educational system of academic level: the Pilgrim fathers arrived in 1620, Harvard College was founded in 1636, sixteen years later. The Puritans also had the opportunity to import directly their scholars and their books from England and to adopt the continental academic traditions directly from the other side of the ocean. For the Mormons the task of building up a system of higher education was much more difficult. They were poor people, persecuted from the beginning, but even under these circumstances they started already in Nauvoo a university which was destroyed during the brutal expulsion. But with an indefatigable resoluteness they came back to this plan here in Utah in spite of the fact that they were fully occupied with the enormous difficulties of colonization of the country and the daily need of survival in the desert. One generation after the arrival at the Salt Lake Valley they had their own university which reached very soon the standard of the highest academic institutions of this country. This university had to be founded under the most difficult outer circumstances, far away from the academic foundations of the East coast. Even after the construction of the railway they had to build up their system of higher education under greatest sacrifices.

They could do it, because for the founder of this university, Brigham Young, education was of central value in his religious thinking, a main part of religious life itself, intimately connected with his idea of eternal progress, of permanent perfection. For him education was included in the order of Jesus Christ "Be ye therefore perfect even as your Father, which is in heaven, is perfect" (Matthew 5:48). His concept of education has its roots in its understanding of the highest aim of man, the aim to become perfect. "Intelligent beings are organized to become Gods, even the Sons of God, to dwell in the presence of Gods, and become associated with the highest intelligences that dwell in eternity. We are now in the school, and must practice upon what we receive."¹

In that sense he proclaimed for his people the program to reach the highest possible standard of knowledge as an essential element of the gospel. And he says:

Not only does the religion of Jesus Christ make the people acquainted with the things of God, and develop within them moral

excellence and purity, but it holds out every encouragement and inducement possible, for them to increase in knowledge and intelligence, in every branch of mechanism, or in the arts and sciences, for all wisdom, and all the arts and sciences in the world are from God, and are designed for the good of His people. (JD, 13:147)

I was very much surprised to discover in Brigham Young's writings the interpretation of a biblical idea, which is very much discussed among the pietists of my own country in Wurttemberg, the concept of sin against the Holy Ghost mentioned in St. Matthew 12:31: "Wherefore I say unto you, All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men, but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men." There were some pietists who were very much terrified by the atheistic and merely materialistic development of modern sciences, and sometimes they understood the warning of Christ against the blasphemy of the Holy Ghost as a warning against modern science. Brigham Young ignored such an anxious attitude. He says in his genial interpretation:

If we continue to learn all that we can, pertaining to the salvation which is purchased and presented to us through the Son of God, is there a time when a person will cease to learn? Yes, when he has sinned against God the Father, Jesus Christ the Son, and the Holy Ghost—God's minister; when he has denied the Lord, defied Him and committed the sin that in the Bible is termed the unpardonable sin—the sin against the Holy Ghost. That is the time when a person will cease to learn, and from that time forth, will descend in ignorance, forgetting that which they formerly knew. . . . They will cease to increase, but must decrease. . . . These are the only characters who will ever cease to learn, both in time and eternity. (JD, 3:203)

So his concept of education, and with it his concept of the aim of a university, is included in his concept of perfection, which opens the human mind and fills it with a real love of knowledge and joy of wisdom. In our time, where all kinds of reform programs of education are elaborated all over the world, based on a more or less totally secularized understanding of human nature, I find it quite inspiring to discover in the discourses of the founder of this university words which encourage students, teachers, and scholars to study and learning as an essential element of perfection of man and of human society with its outlook on the kingdom of God, the kingdom of heaven. Let me close with this really ecumenical statement of Brigham Young, underlining the right way of secularization and preserving from its going wrong:
How gladly would we understand every principle pertaining to science and art, and become thoroughly acquainted with every intricate operation of nature, and with all the chemical changes that are constantly going on around us! How delightful this would be, and what a boundless field of truth and power is open for us to explore! We are only just approaching the shores of a vast ocean of information that pertains to this physical world, to say nothing of that which pertains to the heavens, to angels and celestial beings, to the place of their habitation, to the manner of their life, and their progress to still higher degrees of perfection. (JD 9:167)

This concept of education is unique for this Brigham Young University and is worthy to be celebrated forever.
Food Production, People, and the Future

Sylvan H. Wittwer

Solutions to the world food problem seem more common today than the problems themselves. The issue is not one of agricultural production capability. There was never a greater opportunity for food abundance. The exploitation of that opportunity, however, was never more vulnerable to the uncertain responses of human political institutions. There must be the political will to produce food. The USA and the world are becoming increasingly susceptible to this constraint.1

Assuring our food supply is also more than production. It involves post-harvest handling, processing, storage, and consumer use and acceptance. There is enough food now produced to feed the world's hungry. Today we have more food per capita than twenty years ago. That people are malnourished or starving is a question of food distribution, resources and economics, not agricultural limits. The problem is delivery. It's putting the food where the people are, and providing an income so they can buy it.

Currently, hysterical campaigns are being waged against population growth. An expanding population is declared the greatest threat to mankind.2 Americans have been persuading themselves, but not the world, that man is overrunning the earth. Little can be done in the immediate future to reduce population growth, short of
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catastrophic events such as earthquakes, famine, pestilence or war. These are either uncontrollable or undesirable alternatives.

I am optimistic about man’s capability of feeding himself, now and in the foreseeable future. How many of the 1.5 billion people at the beginning of this century would have believed the earth could have now absorbed 4 billion?

We often speak and write as if malnutrition, famine, and starvation are new afflictions besetting the human race. They’ve always been with us, and more acutely so in the past than at present. A worldwide communications network of visuals and words, now brings home to us daily the reality and at times the unreality of it all.

I totally reject the concept of “triage” or the “lifeboat ethic.” This philosophy states that we cannot possibly save all mankind from starvation, and we have to decide now who is expendable. It is morally unacceptable, politically unrealistic, economically unsound, ethically unthinkable, and realistically unnecessary if one gives any recognition to human creativity and the management of resources.

The immediate solution lies in all-out food production, improved nutrition, and education. The victory has to be an agricultural one. It will take a Herculean effort. “We will have to find in the next 25 years, food for as many people again as we have been able to produce in the whole history of man till now.”

There are four good reasons for increased emphasis on food production in the United States. First, the humanitarian—assist starving peoples overseas. This has become a tradition and legacy of America. Secondly, it will help reduce current worldwide unrest, anxiety, and tensions. Thirdly, it will help keep food prices reasonable for everyone. Finally, it is good business to maintain a favorable balance of payments in international trade. During 1975, the USA produced 92 percent of the world’s surplus food and had an agricultural export return of over $23 billion (Table I). The prospects are that food dependence on North America will continue.

FOOD PRODUCING TECHNOLOGIES — AT HOME AND ABROAD

U. S. research and technology have developed an agriculture which is capital-management-and-energy intensive. There is emphasis on
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laborsaving technology. This may not be what the rest of the world wants. It may not continue to be the best for us. Unemployment, inflation, and food needs are global issues. Partial resolution of these problems may come from food-producing technologies that are labor intensive with production maintained at high levels, and with minimal input of capital, management, and the nonrenewable resources of land, water and energy. Such technologies must also be nonpolitical.

Thus far we have given little attention to research and development in these areas, but they do exist. A good example is the production of hybrid cotton in India where tens of thousands of workers are required to hand pollinate the flowers, but yields are doubled. Ultralow-volume knapsack sprayers for pest control in agriculturally developing countries; the production of short statured wheat varieties in Pakistan and the Punjab of India; multiple cropping systems in the tropics; and reduced tillage and surface interseeding of crops in temperate zones are other accomplishments.

A prime example of a food producing system that is labor intensive, high producing and with a minimum of resource, capital and management input is the home food garden. Vegetable and fruit crops are seldom included in world food statistics. Yet they can, and do, contribute significantly to food supplies. The science and art of food production in home gardens should be exploited. Production is at the site of use. Wastes and by-products can be utilized as fertilizer. Energy expenditures from fossil fuels are minimized. Marketing, packaging, and transport problems are eliminated. High production and top quality are possible. Home gardening can be the most intensive food production system on earth. Vegetables (beans, peas, potatoes, cucurbits, root crops, tomatoes, onions, crucifers, and sweet corn) are principle sources of calories, proteins, vitamins, and minerals for hundreds of millions of people.

**FOOD SOURCES**

A consideration of the world food problem must include thought as to what food is to be provided for whom. If the world's population is to be fed, what will it be fed with? It will likely be that which people are familiar with.
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When it comes to human nutrition there are issues of flavor, appearance, and acceptability. Someone is going to have to eat what is produced. Dietary habits of people are not changed easily or quickly. The primary effort in food production for the immediate future must be directed toward conventional food crops, not the unconventional. Conventional food and feed crops serve as the primary food sources for both people and the livestock products consumed by man. Chief among the food crops are rice, wheat, maize, soybeans, millet, barley, oats, rye, sorghum, field beans, chick peas, pigeon peas, peanuts, cassava, potatoes, sweet potatoes, sugar beets, sugarcane, coconuts and bananas. Fruits and vegetables, processed and fresh, add personal enrichment and joy in eating and provide essential dietary nutrients. Hay and pastures provide most of the feed units for cattle and sheep.

There is now the strong suggestion that the world's food problem is not one of protein deficiency but caloric adequacy. If sufficient calories are provided through conventional food crops, and the biological values of the proteins of these same crops are genetically upgraded, there should be no protein problem. Eighty percent of the people in India are vegetarians—they don't eat meat. The dietary merits of a vegetarian diet based on new improved cereal grains and legumes should be experimentally evaluated. Cereal grains alone account for 60 percent of the calories and 50 percent of the protein now consumed by the human race.

STABILITY OF PRODUCTION

Variabilities in the yields of food crops and in livestock production from year to year and area to area are principle causes of food shortages and surpluses. Weather is the most determinant factor in food crop productivity. Production stability at high levels can be achieved only as environmental stresses are minimized. Season to season weather variations are of much greater significance than any identifiable long-term climatic changes.

The year 1975 was a classic example. India, with favorable climate and rainfall produced an all-time record crop of 115 million tons of
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9University of Wisconsin. Papers from a Workshop on Unconventional Sources of Protein, Madison, Wisconsin, 22 April 1975.
10National Science Foundation—Research Applications Directorate, Protein Resources and Technology—Status and Research Needs, NSF RA-T. 75-037, 1975.
food grains. The USSR by contrast, had a dismal failure with an estimated 135 million tons of grain compared with a projected hope of 210. Not since the days of Khrushchev have the Soviets had such an agricultural disaster. Meanwhile, the USA produced a record corn and wheat crop in 1975. A drought in the U.S. corn belt during 1974 resulted in production that was more than 20 percent off in yields per acre of corn, wheat, soybeans, and sorghum.

Decreased vulnerability of crops to weather uncertainties must be sought. Stability of food production at high levels should be a global research imperative. It could be improved by nitrogen self-sufficiency; identification of aspects of photosynthesis which limit CO₂ input; innovative water management; an understanding of the mechanisms of senescence; improved pest management systems; and for both crops and livestock the ability to predict extreme weather events at crucial times.

Little research has been done to optimize the use of limited water resources in crop production. Over one half billion people live in the semiarid tropics. These are areas frequented by violent and unpredictable storms. The goals are the development of improved water management practices, and crop varieties less vulnerable to the weather. An international agricultural research center has been established for this purpose.¹⁴

There are current anxieties as to the price of food and its adequacy. The impact of weather, and a rising population of increasing affluency coupled by a depletion of world stocks of grain have precipitated an instability, volatility, unpredictability, in the price of corn, wheat, soybeans, rice, sugar, beans, potatoes, beef and pork never before experienced.

Only farmers produce food. They will do it only if there are economic and other incentives. Farmers in the United States and throughout the world now face numerous and ever mounting numbers of economic, social, political, and environmental constraints and disincentives to food production.

The principle of free enterprise must prevail in American agriculture. The family farm is the most efficient food producing system the world has ever known. Corporate agriculture, in spite of the great visibility recently attached to it, has not met with resounding success in the USA, nor has it worked abroad. The Soviets with their state and collective agricultural enterprises have tried for 40 years to

---
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develop an efficient food producing system. Free enterprise with opportunity for profit is nonexistent in the USSR. Producing food is more than a factory operation. In addition, the Soviet Union has vast agricultural areas that are marginally too cold or too dry for stable crop production at high levels. The Soviets cannot consistently feed themselves.

**FOOD PRODUCTION RESEARCH**

If food production is important, it's not reflected by current investments in research. The 1977 projected federal research and development budget assigned to the United States Department of Agriculture is approximately $0.5 billion. This is not on par or even close to that currently projected for defense ($9.5 billion), energy ($3 billion), space ($3.5 billion), or health, education, and welfare ($2.5 billion).

A recent National Research Council report states that crop surpluses, political pressures from commodity groups, budgetary reductions, and emphasis on immediately applicable information have resulted in a formerly substantial basic research effort in the USDA-Agricultural Research Service and the State Agricultural Experiment Stations, to virtually disappear. "Fundamental research undergirding food production has languished for two decades."\(^5\)

As a nation and as an agricultural food and nutritional research community, we have been guilty of gross neglect in the very areas that hold the keys to crop and livestock productivity. The United States is no longer the leader in fundamental research on some of the biological processes that control the productivity of renewable resources.

Our agricultural technology system has been designed to support research at both ends of the applied-basic research spectrum, but not in the middle. This was the stimulus for the Michigan State University Agricultural Experiment Station with its applied-mission oriented background to join forces with the basic research scientists of the Charles F. Kettering Foundation in sponsoring an International Conference on Food Crop Productivity, October 20-24, 1975 at Harbor Springs, Michigan. The *Proceedings* of this conference relate to six biological process areas that control and limit food crop production.\(^6\)

---


\(^6\)Michigan State University Agricultural Experiment Station and the C. F. Kettering Foundation, *Proceedings of an International Conference on Crop Productivity*.
The focus for many new technologies should be mission oriented basic research.

NEW TECHNOLOGIES • CROP PRODUCTION

The resource base can change with time and new technology. Expanded efforts for greater photosynthetic efficiency, biological nitrogen fixation and unconventional approaches to plant breeding would literally add to the resources of the earth. Photosynthetic carbon dioxide fixation and biological nitrogen fixation are the two most important biochemical processes on earth. Photosynthesis is the source of all carbohydrates and calories consumed by man and the fossil fuels he is now exploiting. Biological nitrogen fixation provides the raw products for protein synthesis. These processes are nonpolluting. They are renewable. No limits can be ascribed as to what might be accomplished. Acquired technologies would be global in their impact and nonpolitical. These three mission oriented basic research areas are interrelated. Photosynthesis and nitrogen fixation are interdependent processes. Research on one complements the other. More carbon flow is essential if biological nitrogen fixation is to be enhanced. Moreover, since new techniques for genetic manipulation have worldwide application in the development of new and improved plants, research in all three areas should be coordinated. Results of such research investment have global interest and application and are nonpolitical. Details concerning most promising approaches in each of these three areas have been described.¹⁷

Photosynthesis. Food production involves effective utilization of land and water. But it is more than that. It's a series of strategies in crop management and design to most effectively farm the sun. Plants differ dramatically in their photosynthetic efficiencies. Most crops capture only one percent or less of the energy from the sunlight that illuminates their leaves. The most efficient producers are sugarcane, corn, sorghum, and pearl millet. Other crops such as rice, wheat, soybeans, field beans, peas, potatoes and cotton respire twice as fast when exposed to sunlight and burn up to half the carbohydrates they produce. Not so with sugarcane, corn, sorghum and millet. They have
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little if any photorespiration. Ribulose diphosphate carboxylase controls photorespiration. A key to feeding the world resides with the control or regulation of a single enzyme. Biochemists and plant scientists are working feverishly, both genetically and chemically, to accomplish the task. Meanwhile, better light receiving systems for many crops are being created. Plant architecture can be changed. Repositioning of the flag leaf above the panicle of new rice varieties is a classical example of achievement. New plant shapes can be quickly created.

The atmospheric concentration of carbon dioxide remains the most important variable determining the rate of photosynthesis in food crops. All respond. Remarkable effects occur when the normal level of 300 ppm is raised to 1000. A six-fold increase in biological nitrogen fixation for soybeans has been achieved.\textsuperscript{18} While CO\textsubscript{2} enrichment is now commonplace with greenhouse-grown crops, its use has not been actively pursued as a means of maximizing the production of food crops in the field. Massive quantities of CO\textsubscript{2} are now being flared into the atmosphere, and large geological reserves are being discovered in current explorations for natural gas and oil.

**Biological Nitrogen Fixation.** The focus has been on legumes. They are major food crops and include soybeans, field beans, broad beans, mung beans, peanuts, chick peas and pigeon peas. Agricultural legumes in the United States annually fix about 12 million tons of atmospheric nitrogen per year.\textsuperscript{19} This is greater than the amount applied as fertilizer. Worldwide, biological nitrogen fixation by agricultural and nonagricultural species fix over 200 million tons of nitrogen for crop production. This contrasts with a world supply of approximately 40 million tons of nitrogen fertilizer, fixed chemically. The magnitude of biological nitrogen fixation under field conditions can be measured by the acetylene reduction technique. The stimulus for research on biological nitrogen fixation is the rising cost of nitrogen fertilizer (Table 1), its low recovery by plants, and the massive fossil fuel (natural gas) input required for chemical fixation.

Opportunities for optimization lie in improvement of nitrogen fixation by legumes, the extension of this capability to additional plants, the discovery and use of new nitrogen-fixing organisms, and finding new chemical mechanisms of nitrogen fixation.\textsuperscript{20} There are

\textsuperscript{18}Harold J. Evans, ed., *Enhancing Biological Nitrogen Fixation* (Washington, D. C.: National Science Foundation, Division of Biological and Medical Sciences, 1975).

\textsuperscript{19}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{20}National Academy of Sciences, *Enhancement of Food Production.*
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three known sources of biologically fixed nitrogen in the rice paddies of Southeast Asia—bacteria that are rhizosphere associated, the free-living azotobacter, and the blue-green algae. Cropping systems involving interplantings of legumes and cereal grains are emerging in Southeast Asia and elsewhere as new labor intensive, high-producing food systems with a minimum of resource input and the potential for year around production.

New Techniques in Plant Breeding. Many remarkable achievements have been made in the creation of new plants. These include hybrid corn, sorghum, and millet. The development of hybrid corn is the most spectacular of all scientific achievements in American agriculture. Increases in productivity have been truly remarkable. The creation and introduction of short statured, nonlodging, photoperiodically day neutral, high yielding rice and wheat varieties have resulted in a Green Revolution. Hybrid wheat is becoming a reality. Most all commercial hybrids until now are hard, red winter types adapted to the winter wheat regions of Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas. There has also been great progress with fruits and vegetables. This includes dwarf and spur-type apples, hybrid coconuts, hybrid onions, carrots, cabbage, spinach, melons, and parthenocarpic seedless cucumbers.

We are now moving beyond the horizons of conventional plant breeding. Included are the in vitro techniques for asexual approaches and broad crosses between crop species. Vegetative cells can now be crossed. The fused cells are then cultured for organ differentiation. New plants are then created from crosses that otherwise would be incompatible. Haploids can be produced by culturing pollen grains or anthers.

Wide or Broad Hybridization is listed under the heading of "radical research" in the report of the International Maize and Wheat Improvement Center (CIMMYT) in Mexico. Quantum leaps in crop productivity will require some form of radical research. Wide hybridization is one of them. The production of specific, generic and even hybrids between plants of different families may be possible. Barriers to wide crossing appear to be biochemical. The use of

immunosuppressant chemicals to possibly circumvent this limitation is an emerging technology.\textsuperscript{22} Chemical control of genetic processes, particularly barriers to crossability between species and genera may be a key to rearranging genes and the synthesis and building of new crop species. The development of triticale, a synthetic species derived from a cross of wheat and rye is one success story. Triticale is superior to either parent in productivity, adaptability, and nutritional value. A much wider range of genetic variability, with less genetic vulnerability, than presently exists in food crop species will be necessary to allow plant breeders to continue crop improvement programs for the next 25-30 years. Species can be "endangered" by man but they can also be created.

\textit{Chemical Regulators.} Interest for the first time in history has moved beyond the parameters of horticulture. Chemical regulation of rooting of cuttings; setting of fruit and control of flowering; flower sex expression; vegetative growth; senescence; and fruit shape, size, color, and ripening has thus far been confined largely to ornamentals, fruits and vegetables. The focus now is on the agronomic and major food crops. Leading agricultural chemical industries are interested. There now appear to be breakthroughs for enhancement of yields of two important crops—sugarcane and corn. Seven thousand hectares of sugarcane were treated with a variety of chemical ripeners in Hawaii in 1975. Sugarcane ripeners are herbicides used at low doses. They are applied several weeks before harvest. Vegetative growth is slowed and carbohydrates (sucrose) accumulate. The resultant increase in productivity of sugar from sugarcane approximates 2 tons per hectare per year.\textsuperscript{26}

Related to the chemical ripeners for sugarcane is 4,6 dinitro-o-sec-butyl phenol (DNBP) for corn.\textsuperscript{27} It, along with a wetting agent, is applied as a foliar spray when the unemerged tassels are about \(\frac{1}{2}\) inch in length. Again, as with sugarcane ripeners, the vegetative growth of corn is slightly interrupted and metabolites are shifted earlier to the reproductive parts. The results are earlier pollination, more ears per plant, larger ears, and a 5-10 percent increase in grain yield. Some hybrids are very responsive. Again, DNBP is an herbicide applied as


plant sprays at low dosages and at critical stages in crop development.

*Crop Protection and Pest Management.* Annual losses from pests (insects, weeds, diseases, nematodes, rodents, etc.) in the United States are enormous. They approach \( \frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{3} \) of the total harvest.\(^{28}\)

Approximately one billion pounds of chemical pesticides are used annually. They still provide the foundation (over 90 percent) of contemporary pest control practice.\(^{29}\) New strategies for pest management offer promise. These include insect viruses and bacteria and chemicals (juvenile hormones) that interfere with reproductive cycles. Egg and larvae parasites, pheromones, and resistant varieties may be alternatives. The hope is for reductions in cost with fewer environmental and health hazards.

Heretofore, biological methods for control of weeds have been successful only on individual species. Allelopathy is an emerging technology.\(^{30}\) It is defined as mutual harm, where chemicals released by one plant species inhibit the growth of another. Allelopathy provides the opportunity to control weeds by genetically incorporating such chemical factors into desirable food crops. It has been documented for the cucumber, rye, and oats.\(^{31}\)

*Nutrient Absorption and Fertilizer Utilization.* There is inadequate knowledge concerning nutrient absorption and its control of crop productivity. Improved efficiency in fertilizer uptake is a major challenge ahead. Only 50 percent of the applied nitrogen and less than 35 percent of the phosphorus and potassium are recovered by the crop. Losses of nitrogen are even greater in the tropics with recovery averaging only 25-35 percent.\(^{32}\) Several new and high priority technologies are emerging to reduce these enormous losses. Greater efficiency in fertilizer uptake can be achieved through the use of improved cultivars with enhanced capacities of ion uptake. Modulation of nitrification and denitrification also offer promise. Recovery and efficiency for nitrogen fertilizer can be improved by sulfur-coated urea and treating with nitrification inhibitors.\(^{33}\) One such inhibitor is
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\(^{28}\)National Academy of Sciences, *Enhancement of Food Production*, Michigan State University, *Conference on Crop Productivity*.


\(^{32}\)National Academy of Sciences, *Enhancement of Food Production*.

\(^{33}\)D. M. Huber, H. L. Warren, and D. W. Nelson, "Nitrification Inhibitors: Powerful Tools to Conserve Fertilizer Nitrogen," Manuscript, Department of Botany and Plant Pathology, Purdue University.
known as "nitropyrrn" [2-chloro-6-(trichloromethyl) pyridine]. Nitropyrrn is a highly specific bactericide which is toxic to *Nitrosomonas* bacteria. It reduces but does not eliminate the population of this organism. The reduction of nitrification lasts from six weeks up to three months. This nitrification inhibitor is under extensive trial in the tropics and for rice production in Southeast Asia.

Another promising means of improving nitrogen uptake efficiency in India is use of a product of the Neem tree. This tree produces a seed, the pulp of which is used, after the oil is extracted. It is mixed with the nitrogen fertilizer. There are identifiable bacteriociidal properties in the Neem tree product. Most nitrogen fertilizer for crops in India and Southeast Asia is in the form of urea.

Foliar absorption of nutrients, with both beneficial and harmful aspects, has taken on new significance. Little credence, however, has been heretofore attached to the process by authorities on nutrient uptake, although the author and his colleagues have published extensively on the potential role of non-root absorption in meeting the mineral nutrient requirements of food crops. The role of plant foliage in absorption of carbon dioxide has already been emphasized. The gradual lowering of the pH in atmospheric precipitation in the eastern part of the United States is having an effect on the soil as well as what is absorbed by the leaves of plants. Sulfur is seldom applied to the soil as a fertilizer because adequate quantities are absorbed directly from the atmosphere by aerial plant parts. Many other gaseous liquid and particulate materials are removed by plant foliage from the atmosphere. Some are beneficial, but more often they are air pollutants and harmful. Air quality standards in the United States have given little attention to the effects on renewable resource productivity.

There is a remarkable report on foliar fertilization of soybeans. Yields have been increased by 10 to 20 bushels per acre. The results are

---


all the more remarkable because the yield increases were obtained from a production base that was already high and derived from the best in conventional practices. The gain was in harvestable seeds, not an increase in seed size. The ratios of nitrogen, phosphorus, potassium and sulfur in the foliar spray are the same as in the seed. Phosphate is applied as polyphosphate, and nitrogen as urea. The first spray is applied when beans can be felt in the pods of the upper four nodes. Two to three sprays are then applied 10-14 days apart. The leaves must be active and green. Nineteen gallons of solution containing 25 pounds of nitrogen, 6 pounds of P₂O₅, 9 pounds of K₂O and 1.5 pounds of sulfur are applied either by ground or air equipment in each of three applications. These results with a major crop, confirm the long reported added efficiency of uptake associated with foliar applications of nutrients to many horticultural crops, sugarcane and pineapple; and micronutrients for major food crops. Foliar applications have been declared the most efficient method of fertilizer placement. Future yield barriers may well be broken by utilizing the absorptive capacities of leaves at crucial stages of plant development. The rising costs of nonrenewable fertilizers should be an added stimulus for the further development of this technology.

NEW TECHNOLOGIES - RESOURCE UTILIZATION

Land Resources and Utilization. Food production capacity reserves are delineated by land, water, energy, fertilizer, chemicals, capital, credit, machinery, management and technology. Food production is a renewable resource but requires nonrenewable resource inputs.

Land comes first. The productivity of land may be improved as well as depleted by cropping. To meet domestic and world food needs we have brought into production during the past three years approximately 12 million new hectares—at a cost. What cost resources would it take to bring an additional 12 million hectares into crop production? Agricultural research directors ought to be as concerned about preservation of the land base crop and livestock production as for new yield or productivity practices. A 10 percent increase in the yield of corn or wheat, or preservation of the land base by an equal percentage for its production at the same level, gives an identical result in the amount of grain produced. The resource input and flexibility in the use of the land resource, however, is quite different. Also, as we drive our land resource base harder, different kinds of problems

9Wittwer and Bukovac, "The Uptake of Nutrients."
emerge. We need to review the options in food security, prices, world trade, energy, and employment for society at different levels (quantity and quality) of a land base.40

Irreversibility of land use for food production is becoming a national disaster. During the past 20 years, 11 million hectares have been converted into urban areas and highways. At the same time, the quality of our arable land is being slowly degraded by excess tillage and soil erosion. Losses in the United States are about 3.6 billion metric tons of top soil annually, equivalent to 31 metric tons per hectare.41 These soil losses are accompanied by degraded water quality, fertilizer and organic matter losses, and the silting of rivers and harbors.

No more than 25 percent of our farm lands are under approved conservation practices. It is not now profitable and there is little incentive for individual farmers to apply conservation practices. This must be changed.

There is one exception—reduced tillage. The no-till systems of soil management conserve soil, water, organic matter, fuel, labor, machinery and fertilizer. One of the secrets of the no-till economy is a seed drill that disturbs only enough soil in the stubble or sod from one crop to make an opening for the seed of the next crop. A still newer innovation is interseeding—sowing the seed of a second crop such as soybeans before the first one such as wheat is harvested. The concept involves complete elimination of tillage. Competing weeds are controlled with herbicides, not cultivation.

For the U. S. corn belt, no-till has proven the most effective management practice ever developed for the control of wind and water erosion. Zero tillage can be seen throughout the United States for corn, soybeans and sugar beets. It is effective for asparagus. No-tillage farming has spread to more than three million hectares in the United States. Minimum tillage technologies now embrace more than 18 million hectares in the U. S. It is projected that more than half of America's cropland will be farmed without plowing in thirty years. Much additional land can now be used for crop production formerly not considered suitable. It is now used for small grains in Britain, rice in Southeast Asia, and provides an improved system of land management for highly erodible and difficult-to-manage tropical soils. Entire issues of professional and trade journals are devoted to the


41Pimental, et. al., "Energy and Land Constraints."
topic. The advantages of reduced tillage which come through most clearly to the producer are the (a) saving of time, (b) reduction of costs, (c) greater land utilization, (d) quick turn around time from one crop to the next, and (e) taking advantage of short spells of good planting weather.

Water Resources and Utilization. It is estimated that in the United States 90 percent of all water that is withdrawn from streams and ground water storage for use, is consumed in irrigated agriculture. Eighty-one percent of the sugar beets, 70 percent of the fruits and vegetables, 40 percent of the cotton and sorghum, 30 percent of the alfalfa, 25 percent of the barley and 10 percent of the corn and wheat produced in the United States is from land that is irrigated. In view of the predominate use of water in food producing systems it is somewhat ironical that the 1975 Staff Draft Report of the National Commission on Water Quality does not address itself to water quality for agriculture. All other aspects of water quality ("fishability," "swimability," leisure, human health, etc.) are, however, given thorough treatment.

Irrigated land generally is the most productive. Up to 30 percent of the food for mankind is produced on about 15 percent of the irrigated cultivated land of the globe. Irrigated acreages in the Peoples' Republic of China, the USSR and India exceed those in the U. S. Agriculture, other than dryland grazing and dryland farming, would be nonexistent in the western USA without irrigation.

Agriculture suffers from some degree of water deficiency over the entire globe. Drought is one of the major factors contributing to food shortages and instability of supplies. While billions of dollars have been expended for development of new land resources through irrigation, little attention has been directed toward increasing efficiency of water usage by crops and new technologies for water management. Efficiency in usage of irrigation water varies from a low of 30-40 percent in the United States to more than 80 percent in Israel. The amount of water required to produce a unit of food is also a variable. In the Hawaiian Islands only 18-20 inches of rainfall is required annually for pineapple but for sugarcane it is 90-100 inches per year.

An improved system of water management is trickle or drip irrigation. It had its origin 25 years ago in the greenhouses of western
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41Imperial Chemicals Industries; Plant Protection Division, 1973, 1975. Outlook on Agriculture, 7:4 and 8: special number.
42Michigan State University, Conference on Crop Production.
Europe. Only in the 1970s, however, has it been introduced for production of high value crops in the field. It is irrigating the crop not the soil. Quantities of water required to start young orchards in the desert may be reduced to 1/20th of conventional sprinkling systems. For sugarcane, corn and sorghum, nutrients may be added through the system and the lines may be buried 12-18 inches deep to discourage weed growth.

Drip irrigation is being installed in the sugarcane plantations of Hawaii at the rate of 5,000 hectares per year. All new plantings are equipped with the drip system. The total estimated cost of $1,500 per hectare is amortized in one year as a result of savings in labor. Drip irrigation will eventually be installed in all sugar plantations of Hawaii (50,000 hectares) that are currently irrigated. This water conserving-labor saving technology needs careful evaluation for other major food crops as well as high value fruits and vegetables.

**Energy Resources and Product Utilization.** The importance of energy options with land, water, and labor in food systems has been emphasized. While food production is more than energy and protein, the two are closely related. Use of agricultural by-products and hydrolysis of waste cellulose could add enormously to our food and fuel sources. Economic viability will determine the rapidity with which such technologies are developed.

Meanwhile, studies of energy inputs into alternative agricultural production techniques and total food systems are crucial. Low energy production and handling techniques for the major food crops and their products, should be pursued on a national and global scale. Improved food processing efficiency could reduce energy use by 35 percent, waste and effluent by 80 percent, and increase processing yields by 5-20 percent. Total losses between harvest and consumption could be reduced by 30-50 percent.

**NEW TECHNOLOGIES - LIVESTOCK PRODUCTION**

Domestic animals produce meat, milk, and eggs from nutrients derived from crops, forages, and by-products that have less value elsewhere. The magnitude of the current contribution of animal products to the U. S. food supply is significant. They produce 2/3 of the
protein, 1/3 of the energy, 1/2 of the fat, 4/5 of the calcium and 2/3 of the phosphorus consumed by man.47

Make Ruminants Less Competitive With Man for Protein and Energy. Cattle (beef and dairy), sheep and goats can grow and produce primarily from plant foods that cannot be consumed by man, but are converted to useful products (meat, milk, hides, wool). The rumen stomach is essentially a fermentation vat. Nonprotein nitrogen sources (anhydrous ammonia, ammonia solutions, urea) can be added to whole chopped corn plants and other forages in the field or at the silo. If done at the proper stage of maturity sufficient energy and nitrogen is provided for finishing beef cattle and all but the very high producing dairy cows. Only 12-15 percent of the nation’s corn crop is currently harvested as silage. A vast new energy resource could be put to use. Forages now constitute about 3/4 of the feed units consumed by ruminants (beef cattle, dairy cows, sheep, goats). This could be raised to an even higher level with an effort directed toward improved management of range lands and pastures coupled with the development of superior grasses and legumes, and improved harvest technologies. Targets of opportunity in these areas have been outlined.48

Ruminant livestock do not have to compete with man for energy or for protein. Large quantities of grain have been fed to livestock in the past only because it was in surplus and it was economically feasible to do so. Forages can be produced on vast areas of land that globally exceed by two-fold that suitable for cultivated crops. Only ruminant animals can convert these forages to human food. One of the greatest research challenges is to increase the efficiency of this conversion. The ultimate goal may be control of rumen fermentation to optimize the production of desirable end products.49

Improved Animal Health. Prenatal immunization of the unborn dairy calf is now a reality.50 This is an insurance against calfhood diseases. A worldwide record for speed of adoption of a new technology was recently achieved in the history of agricultural science. A vaccine for Marek’s disease was first introduced by a team of four

47National Academy of Sciences, Enhancement of Food Production.
48Hodgson, "Forage Crops"; National Academy of Sciences, Enhancement of Food Production.
scientists in 1971.\textsuperscript{51} It is a vaccine that will control a type of cancer in chickens. This contribution for the health of laying hens and broilers is now being studied for possible adaptation to human health problems relating to the control of cancer.

\textit{Improved Fertility.} Closely allied to disease control is high reproductive performance. A new frontier is emerging for fertility control in dairy and beef cattle and for horses. Prostaglandin $F_{2\alpha}$ controls estrus and greatly improves efficiency of artificial insemination.\textsuperscript{52} An approved commercial use has already been introduced for horses and final clinical tests are underway for dairy and beef cattle. Ovulation control with prostaglandin $F_{2\alpha}$ will permit artificial insemination in herds where detection of estrus is now difficult or impossible. The potentials lie in rapid genetic improvement and for greater reproductive efficiency. The implications of this discovery are global. This may be the long awaited technological breakthrough for improving the notoriously low fertility of the water buffalo in Southeast Asia, and in other parts of the world.

\section*{Conclusions}

Modern food systems must be viewed in their total context. The production of a commodity begins with the seed, land, water, fertilizer and pesticides. It requires machinery, capital, labor and often credit. This assemblage on the farm demands superb management. The natural resources, some nonrenewable (land, water, energy, fertilizer), some renewable (sunlight) are utilized. The vagaries of weather and climate must be dealt with. The farmer must put it all together and make it work. Raw agricultural products (corn, wheat, soybeans, beef, pork, milk, poultry, eggs, fruits, vegetables, cotton, etc.) are produced. They must be harvested. They then move beyond the farm to processing, packaging, transportation, storage, and distribution to consumers everywhere.

There are many technological solutions to the world food problem. One is impressed by the number of potentially important and viable alternatives. We have emphasized the development of new agricultural technologies for enhancement of food production as our best hope for the future. These advances, however, will be of little value without the free enterprise system, the family farm, and

\textsuperscript{51}H. G. Purchase, W. Okazaki, and B. R. Burmester, "Long Term Field Trials with the Herpesvirus of Turkeys Vaccine against Marek's Disease," \textit{Avian Diseases} 16 (1972):57-71.

economic and social incentives to produce food. There must also be the political will.

Agricultural productivity as a renewable resource, the adequacy of our food supply, and improved nutrition will assume an increasingly greater importance and visibility. Never in the history of mankind has one nation had such a monopoly on food. Never has a single nation exported so much food. This nation has never experienced a famine. Today's generation has never known hardship or witnessed a shortage of food, shelter or clothing. Never before in history has there been such an interest in agriculture, food, and nutrition. College and university enrollments in agriculture and renewable resources have doubled in five years.

Recent records of accomplishments in food production have never been equalled by any nation in the history of mankind. Agricultural, food and nutrition education must be expanded rapidly to meet current demands and an escalating interest. Otherwise, those with nonagricultural backgrounds will be prone to take over. There is already the perception that the present agricultural establishment is obsolete and incapable of meeting today's problems in the food area. Never was there a greater need and opportunity for qualified and trained people. To meet the food requirements of an expanding population, quantum jumps even greater than we have thus far witnessed must be achieved in agricultural productivity during the next 25 years. I am confident that we can meet these challenges.
Mormon Views of Religious Resemblances

Spencer J. Palmer

Scholars have already worked out elaborate comparative studies of Christianity and the Asian faiths. At the purely religious level, and at least from one perspective, the opposition is fundamentally between the great biblical religions and the religions of India. It is the clash between theism and monism, between the appeal to a God who is Creator and Lord of all and the quest for unity with an impersonal divine principle. This carries with it a grave difference in the evaluation of the world and history. The biblical religions (Judaism, Christianity, and Islam) accept the world as real, as having a definite origin and moving towards a definite termination at some future date; for monism it is *maya*, illusory, the present phase is a beginningless and endless series of cycles. The biblical faiths take pride in the fact that they have a historical basis: the exodus from Egypt, the crucifixion under Pontius Pilate, the Hegira. For the monists, general philosophical ideas replace historical events. The Hindu doctrine of man is metapsychological, a piece of subtle and—so it would seem to Latter-day Saints—unsubstantiated analysis.

Perhaps the most acute conflict has still to be mentioned. The historical Buddha may say that the difference between his way and that of the Jew, Moslem, or Latter-day Saint is so great that he must deny the word religion is really common to all. Gotama, the founder of Buddhism, acknowledges no God at all, but only gods who are caught, like men, in the net of karma; no future life, but only the bliss—or extinction—of Nirvana; no soul, but only the legacy of one life bequeathed to another that falls heir to it; no prayer, but only meditation as a form of spiritual discipline; no grace, but only man’s resolve to tread the Noble Eight-Fold Path to the end. The ultimate doctrines of Buddhism, like those of Hinduism from which it sprang,
are negative and pessimistic in terms of their response to the worth of this mortal life and the individual as the locus of value. Since Buddhists believe that underlying reality is one inclusive mind or stream of consciousness, Christ and judgment are imaginary, irrelevant, or "untrue." Could there be more serious conflicts and discrepancies than these?

But the restored gospel does not contradict Buddhism on every hand. In fact there are between the two a number of remarkable resemblances. Both Christ and the Buddha believed that covetousness and lust were at the root of human suffering; that men must shake the dust (the cares of this world) from the mirror of their minds, and seek to nourish the spirit of the inner man; both declared that freedom lies in following a way of life that is free from cruelty, falsehood, killing, stealing, and unlawful sexual relations. Parallels between the life stories and the reported sayings of Jesus and Gotama have intrigued the followers of these two religious leaders, as well as secular scholars at large, at least since the time of St. Jerome. Leaving aside for now the credibility of the narratives, and comparing only commonly accepted beliefs, how should Latter-day Saints explain the following resemblances?¹

1. Both were foreordained in a preexistent spirit world to come forth at a particular time, after preliminary examination and selection of the most favorable family, country, race, and mother into which to be physically born.

2. Both entered the womb of their mother in a miraculous manner, having no mortal father.

3. Both were born into a world whose inhabitants' bodies had become coarse and gross and who had lost much of their original brilliance because "a being of an inquisitive nature" had commenced eating a debilitating food.

4. Both had births accompanied by special heavenly illuminations.

5. Both were recognized in infancy by respective religious leaders as persons of great promise, with special missions to perform among mankind.

6. Both visited holy temples in their youth and displayed unusual precocity and wisdom before their elders.

7. Both launched their ministries early in their thirtieth year following periods of fasting and solitude.

¹These are drawn from W. Woodville Rockhill, *The Life of the Buddha and the Early History of his Order* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., 1884), which is derived from Tibetan works in the Bkah-Hgyur and Bstan-Hgyur, the Tibetan Tripitaka.
8. Both gained disciples under a fig tree.
9. Both were severely tempted by an Evil One (Mara and Satan).
10. Both selected a council of special disciples and joined with them in carrying out their religious ideals, by way of example.

In addition to these, agreements in thought and phraseology between the gospels of the New Testament and the Dhammapada of Buddhism include the following:

1. From Christ: "Now do ye Pharisees make clean the outside of the cup and the platter; but your inward part is full of ravening and wickedness. Ye, fools, did not he that made that which is without make that which is within also?" (Luke 11:39, 40)

From the Buddha: "What is the use of platted hair, O fool? what of the raiment of goat-skins? Within thee there is ravening, but the outside thou makest clean."2

2. Christ: "Strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it" (Matthew 7:14). "Our soul is escaped like a bird out of a snare of fowlers; the snare is broken, and we are escaped" (Psalms 124:7).

Buddha: "This world is dark, few only can see here; a few only go to heaven, like birds escaped from a net."3

3. Christ: "Let them alone; they be blind leaders of the blind. And if the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch" (Matthew 15:14).

Buddha: "As when a string of blind men are clinging one to the other, neither can the foremost see, nor can the middle one see, nor can the hindmost see. Just so, methinks, Vasettha, is the talk of the Brahmans verse in the three Vedas."4

4. Jesus spoke to the woman of Samaria that his salvation is as "living water" (John 4:10-14); in Saddharma-pundarika (the Lotus Sutra), Gotama compares salvation to "water for all."5

In the face of such examples, how do Latter-day Saints explain religious similarities and parallels? Are these and other agreements imaginary? Are they only accidental coincidences? Are they simply remarkable illustrations of poetic license, or of distortions of language and culture at the hands of faulty translators? Should they be explained by reference to the similarity of circumstances under which both Christ and Buddha taught? Have the Buddhist legends and teachings derived certain of their elements from Christian sources? Or must Christians

---

1 Dhammapada, 394, trans. F. Max Muller, Sacred Books of the East, ed. F. Max Muller, 14 vols (New York: Scribner's, 1901), 12-90. Hereafter cited as SBE.
2 Dhammapada, 174, SBE, 12:1-47.
4 Saddharma-pundarika, trans. H. Kern, SBE, 10 chapter 5.
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accept the allegation that certain things in the Gospel records have either derived from the earlier Buddhist legends, or from another common ancient source? Are these the work of the devil, of God, or of man? Is the identification and acceptance of religious resemblances a benefit or a disadvantage to the interests of the expanding Church? These are serious questions that carry highly significant implications and call for critical research.

In the restored Church the relationship of Christ to his prophets is clear. But within the context of world religions, their relationship to Buddha, Mohammed, Mahavira, Zoroaster, Confucius, or Lao Tzu is not so well defined. For Latter-day Saints, who are eager to see their faith disseminated worldwide and to see it effectively implanted among all peoples, and yet who wish to accept and encourage anything that is "virtuous, lovely or of good report or praiseworthy," questions of religious comparison between the cultures of man, East and West, are of great significance. Do religious elements that seem harmonious or even universal spring from a common source when once the pure gospel of Jesus Christ was known to our fathers? Are similarities to the gospel simply Satanic substitutes, counterfeit attractions suggesting that all roads lead to heaven? Or are there other explanations possible? How do Mormons handle non-Mormon religious beliefs, values, rituals, and symbols which seem to be not only compatible with true gospel principles but in some cases even appropriate manifestations of them? Are such resemblances an advantage or a disadvantage to those declaring a unique Latter-day Saint message?

Acting on the premise that religious similarities are indeed ubiquitous in the world, how have Mormons generally approached them? In this paper I shall examine five basic Mormon views of religious resemblances, the first two of which have been less argued and much less developed among members of the Church.

1. Primordial Images—Echoes of a Preexistent State. In Mormon theology human predispositions of thought and feeling may be viewed as "echoes of eternity," since all men lived together under common conditions with God in a premortal spirit world. After quoting Wordsworth's famous "Ode: Intimations of Immortality . . .," which suggests that the minds and spirits of mankind come to earth "Not in entire forgetfulness, . . ./But trailing clouds of glory do we come/From God, who is our home," Joseph Fielding Smith comments that "there may be times when flashes of remembrance of these former days come to us." Then he quoted Orson F. Whitney, a

---

"Joseph Fielding Smith, The Way to Perfection: Short Discourses on Gospel Themes"
member of the Council of the Twelve, who explained that more than once, upon hearing a noble sentiment expressed, though unable to recall that he had ever heard it until then, he found himself in sympathy with it, was thrilled by it, and felt as if he had always known it. Elder Whitney referred to the Savior’s statement that “My sheep know my voice,” concluding that those things which are true and instinctively beautiful appeal to men everywhere because we were all acquainted with the gospel in a previous life before we came here, and it is this that gives to it a familiar sound. President Joseph F. Smith “heartily endorsed” Elder Whitney’s observation that common experiences in the antemortal spiritual life predispose, influence, and guide human thoughts and preferences in this life, for “we often catch a spark from the awakened memories of the immortal soul, which lights up our whole being as with the glory of our former home.”

Of course this is not the same as Carl Jung’s view of the “collective unconscious,” but there is much in that scholar’s discussion of “basic archetypes” that nonetheless seems congruent with the Mormon view of preexistence, and that might well help explain resemblances of thought and belief among mankind. Jung taught that a symbol can express itself among large masses of people simultaneously. He saw parallels with mythological motifs among his patients. For example, a very young child would recite a dream to Jung which exactly paralleled some ancient Persian myth. The child could not have been taught the myth, for very few people who were not classical scholars even knew of it. After considerable study and deliberation, he found that general story outlines of myths were identical across cultural heritages which had no possible chance of contact. He concluded that there is a common, almost instinctual disposition among all men—including civilized men—to symbolize identical themes in their religious myths. Why are the story lines of religious fantasy and experience so common among all men? In 1919 Jung developed the term “archetype” to account for these expressions of “collective psyche.” He did not suggest universal symbolism, but he did suggest universal archetypes. He did not see these archetypes as conscious images of the mind, but

---


Ibid., p. 45.


they did stand in the deepest reaches of the unconscious. He called them “primordial images”—congenital preexistent images, believing that the mind has inherited an a priori disposition to work in a certain way. The psyche is not passive; it is an active agent in the framing of meaning.

From a Mormon point of view, ways of thinking and acting can easily be interpreted as genetic from our existence with God; and perhaps, the so-called “psychic unity” of man that has been argued by so many may indeed go back to our preexistence, to our primordial, native intelligence. President Smith, Elder Whitney, and so many others of us in the Church from time to time have talked about “glimmers” and the “thin veil.” We say that thoughts rise in our minds to make us feel that we have experienced this, felt that, or believed something else. And such “echoes of eternity” seem to be the common experience of mankind. Having common beginnings in the spirit world, naturally we should expect, if only at times in faint and wistful ways, common manifestations of those beginnings with God. In his Commissioner’s Lecture of 1973, Truman Madsen concluded that only something of such magnitude can account for conscience and the full phenomenon of other powers inherent in man, and

... though presently a veil is drawn over specific images of that realm—we do not now recall our name, rank, and serial number—there is built in us and not quite hidden a “collective unconscious” that is superracial in character, a pool of such vivid effect, such residual power in us, that our finite learnings and recoveries are at best a tiny aftermath.10

And it is in this that one should be able to find explanations of resemblances in the beliefs and religious experiences of man.

2. The Devil Invention Theory. Milton R. Hunter draws attention to the work of the devil theory in his book, The Gospel Through the Ages. He observes that many of the pagan practices were so similar to those of early Christianity that many Christian apologists have concluded that all this had to be the work of the devil. Elder Hunter points out that Justin Martyr, about 150 A.D., after describing the Lord’s Supper as given in the Gospels, reportedly remarked: “The wicked devils have imitated it in the mysteries of Mithra, commanding the same thing to be done.” Tertullian, another Christian teacher (160–220 A.D), stated that “the devil, by the mysteries of his idols, imitates even the main part of the divine Mysteries. . . . He
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baptizes his worshippers in water and makes them believe that this purifies them from their crimes.” And 1300 years later, Las Cases (1747-1566 A.D.), a Spanish Catholic missionary observing that the ceremonies of the American Indians closely resembled those of the Christians, concluded that the devil had arrived in America ahead of the Christians and implanted in the minds of the natives many teachings closely akin to Christianity.11

In this view, the devil has exerted a powerful influence upon men in counterfeiting the true principles and ordinances of the gospel. Lucifer has fostered many clever imitations in an effort to lull mankind into satisfaction with partial truths, and to weaken the appeal of divinely authorized teachers. In the words of Jacob, the Book of Mormon Prophet, men can become angels to a devil, for Satan, who beguiled our first parents, is capable of stirring up the children of men with dreadful works of darkness by transforming himself “nigh unto an angel of light” (2 Nephi 9:9).

Thus, similarities to the gospel are considered Satanic substitutes—counterfeit attractions suggesting, among other possibilities, that all roads lead to heaven.

3. Diffusion. Among Latter-day Saints, by far the most popular and compelling explanation of religious resemblances is the belief that religious elements that seem harmonious or even universal spring from a common source when once the pure gospel of Jesus Christ was known to all our fathers. Adam, the first man, was taught the fulness of the gospel. In turn he taught it to others. But men, yielding to the temptations of the evil one, sinned and departed from the truth. The original, true doctrines were changed and warped to suit the appetites of evil, ambitious men. Thus the principles of the gospel have appeared in more or less perverted form in the religious beliefs of mankind. The gospel was again taught to the world in its purity in the days of Jesus Christ. Again, willful men changed the doctrine, and a host of Christian parties came into being. The many religions among the human race are an evidence of the magnitude of apostasies from the simple, easily understood revelations of God.12

The pioneer Mormon study of Mormonism in a world religious setting was Thomas C. Romney’s. Consistent with his diffusionist approach, he suggested that doctrines of trinity as applied to Deity


11 Which is the theme of John A. Widtsoe’s introduction to Thomas Cottam Romney, World Religions in the Light of Mormonism (Independence, Mo.: Zion’s Printing and Publishing Company, 1940).
reach back into the remotest past and are universally espoused. The numerous examples of trinitarian belief among ancient Egyptians, Mesopotamians, Babylonians, and Sumerians are all reflections of an original authentic model—the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Romney argued that both blood and bloodless sacrificial offerings of the Vedic gods of India (Indra, Agni, Varuna, Vishnu, and Krishna); the libations to Confucius in the traditional ceremonies of the state cult of China; the sacrificial offerings to the gods of the ancient Greeks and Romans, as well as those many Jewish and Christian sacrifices to deities for the purpose of placating their wrath or of placing the worshippers in happy accord with unseen and ineffable powers, are all evidences of "common bonds of union"—universal religious patterns—that in the main at least "sprang originally from a common source." Anciently mankind offered sacrifices without really knowing the roots of their own practices, which are found in the original sacrifices of Adam and his posterity, which were in similitude of the sacrifice of the Lamb of God, even Jesus Christ. The scripture explains:

And after many days an angel of the Lord appeared unto Adam, saying: Why dost thou offer sacrifices unto the Lord? And Adam said unto him: I know not, save the Lord commanded me. And then the angel spake saying: This thing is a similitude of the sacrifice of the Only Begotten of the Father, which is full of grace and truth. (Moses 5:6-7)

In like manner, the doctrine of reincarnation, transmigration, and rebirth in Hinduism, Buddhism, Jainism, and Sikhism, is actually a modified and "strange type of immortality." Romney points out that the early Rig Veda, the earliest book of the Indo-Aryans, makes no mention of reincarnation. This belief developed much later. Only after the people were forced to face the enervating climate of the region of the Ganges, the myriads of insects and other forms of animal life, and the difficulty of extracting a decent living from the soil, did a new drab outlook upon this life develop. And this new negativism vitally affected the Indian view of immortality. Life was no longer an experience to be thankful for, another step in the process of eternal development which, if rightly lived, will lead toward God. In a widening disparity, the ultimate goal of Nirvana in Hinduism and Buddhism is a form of annihilation to be reached only after countless

13bid., pp. 64-72.
14ibid., p. 217.
15ibid., pp. 77-78.
incarnations, during which the soul gradually attains the power to negate the desire to live, not eternal individualized progress.

Elder Alvin R. Dyer, another exponent of the diffusion view, concludes that religious confusion in the world has resulted from deviations from established principles, from mutations of original truth. Items: The Hindu worship of Dyaus Pitar, a nature god of the sky or heaven, can be thought of as "a legendary perversion of the teachings of Abraham and Moses concerning preexistence and of God our Eternal Heavenly Father."16 Despite the original illustriousness of the teachings of Confucius and Lao-Tzu and the mystical and ornate rituals of earlier Buddhism, all of which seized the instincts of the Chinese race, there have been long periods of transition which have resulted in a "universal apathy" among that people. All life and vitality in the religious thought and sentiments of the Chinese have now disappeared;17 as also those of Hinduism, Zoroastrianism, Taoism, and Islam have fallen under "the lash of departure" from their own original doctrines. Modern Taoism is quite different from the high theories of its founder. It presents a pathetic history. It started with some admirable features of truth, but it has degraded fearfully into polytheism, demonolatry, witchcraft, and occultism.18 Shinto has become so vague as to be undefinable in the minds of either priests or philosophers. Originally there was a pure and righteous "law of the birthright," which existed among the families of the ancients. This patriarchal order was established by God. It was a call to responsibility. Through a long process of mutated developments, this great principle was later expressed in southern Asia as the Hindu caste system. And in like manner, the Moslem belief in jihad or holy war against the unbelieving infidels, and the sense of superiority associated with state Shinto in Japan, by which the Yamato race claimed an inherent right to rule over others by force and bloodshed if necessary, are all decadent expressions of the ancient law of the birthright.19

By far the most influential and effective Mormon spokesman of a diffusionist view is Hugh Nibley of Brigham Young University. In all his prodigious scholarship, there is an underlying view of an unchanging God who in his dealing with man follows a constant pattern. God repeatedly reveals his will, his unchanging truth, to selected peoples of the earth. Resemblances and ties which seem to exist among all the religions of antiquity reappear in history primarily

---

17 Ibid., p. 98.
18 Ibid., p. 105-10.
19 Ibid., p. viii.
because of a pattern of divine restorations and human apostasies. And since the teachings and powers of God to chosen peoples have often been deliberately imitated in every age of the world, and in other ways disseminated among men, a diffusion of truth from a single center has continued to recur. What has been done in one dispensation has often been foreshadowed in another. In Nibley we have an eschatological pattern of history which is also prominent in Jewish and Christian scriptures, and in apocryphal writings as well: a periodic repetition of certain characteristic events—a “visitation,” as it was called, from heaven; the making of a covenant; the corruption and wickedness of men, leading to the breaking of the covenant; the bondage of sin, then the coming of a prophet with a call to repentance; the making of a new covenant; and so around the cycle. God is at the helm of history. Thus, at the base, religious parallels are rooted in the mind and will of God, in repeated revelations. Parallels between the history of the restored Church and the doings of the ancients are not consciously contrived imitations; the analogies that can be drawn between the sufferings, wanderings, and spiritual aspirations of the Mormon pioneers and those of the people of ancient Israel cannot be drawn because the former wanted it so. The Mormons were pushed around entirely against their own will. All along, the whole history of the Church has been the will of God. Resemblances to earlier beliefs and experiences have an extraordinary force among Latter-day Saints because they have not been intentional and they actually are the fulfillment of prophecy.

In his most recent book, faced with resemblances between the LDS temple endowment ceremony and ancient Egyptian endowment rites, Nibley sees these as an example of countless parallels, many of them instructive, among the customs and religions of mankind. But they are imitations of earlier gospel models, and little more. The Egyptian rites ... are a parody, an imitation, but as such not to be despised. For all the great age and consistency of their rites and teachings, which certainly command respect, the Egyptians did not have the real thing, and they knew it."

4. The Common Human Predicament. There are Mormons who believe that the diffusion theory explains religious parallels only in a limited way. They readily agree that God revealed original principles and ordinances of the gospel, and bestowed the authority

---

21Ibid., pp. 214, 215.
and power of the priesthood to Adam, and that in the course of time as
populations expanded and as peoples moved away from one another
and became independent they took with them some of their original
features and applied them in new settings. But to these Latter-day
Saints this is a handy explanation that fails to cover much of the
ground. At best such a view explains common religious forms only
within limited geographical areas.

William A. Wilson, the Mormon folklorist, observes that if all
stories develop out of the original story in the Garden of Eden, then we
should be able to find in the Bible account all the materials that have
generated other stories as they fragmented and broke into parts. But
this cannot be done. Moreover, folklore studies indicate that certain
kinds of stories and beliefs are limited to particular peoples. They do
not circulate worldwide. In a study of folk beliefs among peoples of the
Indo-European languages, that is, from Ireland to India, one can find
common themes. Wherever Indo-Europeans have travelled, parallel
beliefs have been widely diffused. Similar ideas can be found in North
America, South America, and other parts of the world by travellers
who have taken them there. But such diffusion is limited; the elements
of Indo-European folk tales, for example, are not found in Southeast
Asia. Diffusion from a single source answers only part of the problem
of religious parallels worldwide.

The view here is that there are certain things that are
fundamental to all human beings—arising out of the common human
predicament—that explain many of the similarities of thought and
practice so widely experienced here on earth. All men face problems of
birth, life, sex, disease, death, joy, disappointment, and grief. All men
ask, Why must we die? Why must we be sick? Why must we grow old?
Why must we suffer? What happens after death? Common beliefs and
practices arise from the common predicament of man in responding to
his circumstances. Parallels to the experience of Job in the Old
Testament are everywhere.

This polygenetic view that religious beliefs and rituals have arisen
spontaneously and independently in various countries, but have
generally followed uniform patterns of development, offers special
insights into the uses of religious symbols, rituals, and ordinances
among mankind. Mircea Eliade, the great professor of comparative
religion at the University of Chicago, says that human actions have no
intrinsic value. Human actions become valuable only insofar as they
unfold according to divine patterns. If human life is to have any

23In a tape recorded interview.
ultimate meaning it must somehow transcend this human predicament. It must somehow become identified with the transcendental, the divine. If things remain earthly, they have only limited earthly value. Eliade concludes that human beings all over the world carry out festivals, rituals, and ordinances, as an aid and an effort to transcend the ordinary human predicament.\textsuperscript{24} Victor Turner, and others, speaks of these as "periods of timeless time," wherein men, through the language of ritual, transcend the arbitrary human world, and connect themselves, their relationships, their institutions, and their social order with something beyond this life.\textsuperscript{25} Thus, religious symbols are the means by which they establish contact with the divine. And without such ordinances and rituals the provisional and arbitrary arrangements of this world have no ultimate value. If life is to have intrinsic value it must be derived from some external transcendent source. People all over the world realize this. And this common realization brings about similarities in religious belief and practice.

Since our mundane world has no ultimate meaning until it is connected with something beyond this, frustration and pain are relieved primarily through extraordinary rituals and symbolic expressions. And in this, God is not a God of one point in time, or of one people, or even one genetic line.

Latter-day Saints may be exclusive in ways that they are not aware of all the time. Other peoples have basic operating principles in their religious systems that find expression in terms of their own cultural idiom. We differ from these people culturally; the vehicles of our expression are different. But when we deal with others at similar levels of meaning or seek to communicate according to similar principles rather than expecting to use similar cultural idioms, we reach common ground. We find similarity. Thus Merlin Myers has observed that it may well be that for the celestial kingdom, the symbolic vehicles and the underlying principles must be adapted to each other in ways that preclude variation there. He believes that:

\ldots no doubt there are cultural vehicles that are peculiarly adapted to the celestial order of things. Truth can be given expression in a variety of cultural and symbolic vehicles, and can provide valid functions and services for those who receive them, but the cultural symbols of man can also be regarded as vehicles to aid people in reaching higher means of expression in the celestial kingdom.

\textsuperscript{25}Viktor Witter Turner, \textit{The Drums of Affliction: A Study of Religious Processes among N\text{}d\text{}a\text{}m\text{}b\text{}u of Zamb\text{}i\text{}a} (London: Oxford University Press, 1968). See especially p. 5ff.
Within the Church there are instrumentalities by which such levels of insight are encouraged and achieved.\textsuperscript{26}

In the 84th Section of the Doctrine and Covenants the Lord explains that the greater priesthood holds the keys of the mysteries of the kingdom and that "without the ordinances thereof, and the authority of the priesthood, the power of godliness is not manifest unto men in the flesh" (D&C 84:21).

John A. Widtsoe repeatedly emphasized that man lives in a world of symbols, and some not so beautiful and pleasing, but that their forms are of relatively little consequence. In the end, it is what they suggest and teach that counts: "No man or woman can come out of the temple endowed as he should be, unless he has seen, beyond the symbol, the mighty realities for which the symbols stand."\textsuperscript{27}

For those Mormons who give credence to "the common human predicament" view, there is superiority in the rites and ordinances of the priesthood, but at the same time peoples all over the world are trying to accomplish similar goals within the framework of their own world view. They have their symbols and ordinances, too, and through these symbols they seek to transcend their earthly predicament. These people seek to break through this mundane realm and realize the supernatural by means of them. In other words, all men bear the stamp of the entire human condition; the similarities of their concern and their response to the needs and conditions of this life is not essentially a question of either divine or nefarious forces emanating from another world; but of the harsh realities of this one.

5. \textit{The Light and Spirit of Christ}. In Mormon theology, the spiritual influence which emanates from God is not confined to selected nations, races, or groups. All men share an inheritance of divine light. Christ himself is the light of the world; even those who have never heard of Christ are granted the spirit and light of Christ. In the Book of Mormon, Christ told the brother of Jared, "In me shall all mankind have light" (Ether 3:14). In a revelation to Joseph Smith, the Lord explained:

\begin{quote}
Whatsoever is light is Spirit, even the Spirit of Jesus Christ. And the Spirit giveth light to every man that cometh into the world; and the Spirit enlighteneth every man through the world, that hearkeneth to the voice of the Spirit. (D&C 84:45-46)
\end{quote}

And in the "Olive Leaf" revelation of 1832 we are told that this Light of Christ

\textsuperscript{26}I am indebted to Professor Myers, not simply for his insights, but for the insights he has stimulated within me in our taped discussions.

...proceedeth forth from the presence of God to fill the immensity of space—
...[It is the light] by which all things are governed, even the power of God who sitteth upon his throne, who is in the bosom of eternity, who is in the midst of all things. (D&C 88:12-13)

If any man acts according to this inspiration, he progresses from grace to grace, learning precept upon precept, until he receives full enlightenment.28 That every man ever born enjoys the light of Christ was reiterated by Brigham Young, who taught that there has never been "a man or woman upon the face of the earth, from the days of Adam to this day, who has not been enlightened, instructed, and taught by the revelations of Jesus Christ."29 This allows each individual to recognize truth, and the associated results often lift men to new and higher insights than were traditionally known among a given people.

Since God has thus inspired men of all cultures and creeds, the possibilities are staggering. Such religious reformers as Martin Luther and John Wesley—despite their personal frailties and errors—may be looked upon as instruments of God’s will. Likewise, a whole continuum of Christian mystics in medieval European history, some of whose ideas seem at times to closely resemble Mormon teachings today, show the extent to which they separated themselves from the “orthodox” thought of the Catholic Church. These include St. Francis of Assisi and St. Bernard de Clairvaux, to name only two. Also, Christian devotionalism represented by Thomas a Kempis’ The Imitation of Christ (1426), on the way in which a true Christian should behave, and the development of Christian art and architecture in Russia, beautifully express a diffusion of inspiration and light among the peoples of Europe.

Among Mexicans, Latin Americans, and Spaniards, in Europe as well as in the Western Hemisphere, contributions to civilization are monumental and countless. Called the "Greeks of the New World" because of their advanced culture, the Maya Indians created a calendar that has the reputation of being more nearly perfect than those devised elsewhere in the world. The works of Diego Rivera and Rufino Tamayo, as well as Francisco Goya and Diego Velázquez, in the fields of literature and painting, are celebrated worldwide for their illuminations and beauty. From Spain, Miguel de Cervantes’ classic, Don Quixote, has provided inspiring insights that have encouraged and sustained men of all lands to seek for betterment in life. Mexican

29Brigham Young in JD, 2:139.
achievements in establishing the first university in North America and in publishing the first book in the Western Hemisphere (in 1539 by Juan Pablos), have been a great blessing to all those who have been able to come under their influence.

Columbus and the Pilgrims were moved upon by the "Spirit of God" to sail to the New World. The founding fathers of the United States were also moved upon by the Spirit. Great western scientists and poets were likewise inspired.30

INSPIRATION OF "HEATHEN" PHILOSOPHERS, RELIGIOUS LEADERS, AND PEOPLES

It follows, then, that God inspires not only non-Mormons but also non-Christians as well. God has raised up inspired teachers and great reformers in various cultures throughout history—not only Jewish and Christian spokesmen. In this Mormon view, all peoples and even all religions possess elements of truth. To illustrate, all of the following religions or philosophies profess a statement of moral principle in essentially the same wording as the Christian golden rule: Judaism, Hinduism, Buddhism, Sikhism, Zoroastrianism, Islam, Shinto, Socratic Philosophy, Confucianism, Taoism, and Jainism. John Taylor affirmed: "The Catholics have many pieces of truth; so have the Protestants, the Mahometans, and Heathens. . ."31 George Albert Smith reiterated this theme,32 and Brigham Young observed:

"Do you suppose the Hindoos have the light of the Spirit of Christ?" I know they have; and so have the Hottentots, and so has every nation and kingdom upon the face of the earth, even though some of them may be cannibals.33

Latter-day Saints believe that America was divinely prepared as a haven for the establishment of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints; that Columbus was inspired to discover this promised land, and that the Constitution of the United States was instituted of God. But they also teach that the Omnipresent Spirit moved upon the thinkers of Greece and Rome, and upon the Protestant reformers of European history. Likewise artists and thinkers in Asia have been moved upon by inspiration from God: Ferdosi of Persia; Kalidasa, Asoka, and Gandhi of India; Mencius, Tu Fu, and Po Chiu-I of China; Sejong and Cong Mong-ju of Korea; Basho and Chikamatsu of Japan;

10This is elaborately emphasized by Charles W. Penrose in JD, 23:346.
11JD, 1:154-59.
12Conference Reports, 5 October 1931, p. 120.
13JD, 2:140
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and José Rizal of the Philippines, to name only a few at random. God’s Spirit has rested upon other inquiring and imaginative men who have produced incomparable Shang bronzes, T’ang pottery, Sung landscapes, Koryo celadons, and magnificent buildings, mosaics, paintings, and sculptures in India and in the Middle East; it has also lead to the invention of Arabic numerals and the Indian zero, and in China, Korea, and Japan to the spinning wheel, paper, the first ironclad ships, the foundations of modern chemistry, and the first printing presses with moveable type.

Although there may be Latter-day Saints who believe that God’s operations are confined to their Church, in the teachings of the Church leaders, this is a mistake; for God operates among his children in all nations. The living prophet and president of the Church communicates God’s will to those within the Church and to all men who are prepared and able to listen; for those outside the Church, God often employs other spokesmen. Brigham H. Roberts explained, “It is nowhere held that this man [the living prophet] is the only instrumentality through which God may communicate his mind and will to the world.” All who seek God are entitled to further light and knowledge, regardless of historical or cultural setting. Thus, John A. Widtsoe’s view helps explain the impetus for various religious developments:

Spiritual outreaching are not peculiar to one country. Instead, in every land men have sought the gifts of the spirit. . . . Men have arisen in every land, who have tried to formulate the way to happiness, for the benefit of themselves and their fellow men. . . . The religions of Egypt, China, India, and Persia, are examples.

Brigham Young believed that even idolatry arises from the actions of men of faith.

Orson F. Whitney taught that Zoroaster, Mahavira, Gotama Buddha, and Confucius were servants of the Lord in a lesser sense, and were sent to those pagan or heathen nations to give them the measure of truth that a wise Providence had allotted to them who, along with others “have been used from the beginning to help along the Lord’s work—mighty auxiliaries in the hands of an Almighty God,  

\[\text{Refereces: } \text{JD, 24:60.} \]

\[\text{In B. H. Roberts, } \text{Defense of the Faith and the Saints}, \text{ 2 vols. (Salt Lake City: Deseret News, 1907), 1:514.} \]

\[\text{John A. Widtsoe, } \text{“Is There a Master Race?”} \text{ Essences and Reconciliations (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1947), vol. 2, Gospel Interpretations (1947), p. 216.} \]

\[\text{JD, 6:194.} \]
carrying out his purposes, consciously or unconsciously."38 Brigham H. Roberts summarizes:

While the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints is established for the instruction of men; and is one of God's instrumentalities for making known the truth yet he is not limited to that institution for such purposes, neither in time nor place. God raises up wise men . . . of their own tongue and nationality, speaking to them through means that they can comprehend; not always giving a fulness of truth such as may be found in the fulness of the gospel of Jesus Christ; but always giving that measure of truth that the people are prepared to receive. Mormonism holds, then, that all the great teachers are servants of God; among all nations and in all ages. They are inspired men, appointed to instruct God's children according to the conditions in the midst of which he finds them. Hence it is not obnoxious to Mormonism to regard Confucius, the great Chinese philosopher and moralist, as a servant of God, inspired to a certain degree by him to teach those great moral maxims which have governed those millions of God's children for lo! these many centuries. It is willing to regard Gautama, Buddha as an inspired servant of God, teaching a measure of the truth, at least giving to these people that twilight of truth by which they may somewhat see their way. So with the Arabian prophet, that wild spirit that turned the Arabians from worshiping idols to a conception of the Creator of heaven and earth that was more excellent than their previous conception of Deity. And so the sages of Greece and of Rome. So the reformers of early Protestant times. Wherever God finds a soul sufficiently enlightened and pure; one with whom his Spirit can communicate, lo! he makes of him a teacher of men. While the path of sensuality and darkness may be that which most men tread, a few, to paraphrase the words of a moral philosopher of high standing, have been led along the upward path; a few in all countries and generations have been wisdom seekers, or seekers of God. They have been so because the Divine Word of Wisdom has looked upon them, choosing them for the knowledge and service of himself.39

George A. Smith believed that Mohammed "was no doubt raised up by God on purpose to scourge the world for their idolatry."40 Parley P. Pratt, in a General Conference address, declared that

... with all my prejudices of early youth, and habits of thought and reading, my rational faculties would compel me to admit that the Mahometan history and Mahometan doctrine was a standard raised against the most corrupt and abominable idolatry that ever

38Conference Reports, 3 April 1921, pp. 32, 33. See also Cowley and Whitney on Doctrine, comp. Forace Green (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1963), pp. 292-93.
40JD, 3:32.
perverted our earth, found in the creeds and worship of Christians, 
false so named.41

Moses Thatcher, another member of the Council of the Twelve of 
the Church, was "... struck by the profound philosophy, pure 
morality, and comprehensiveness exhibited in the writings of 
Confucius and Mencius and the Chinese sages" as "divinely inspired, 
far-reaching and heavenly doctrines."42 Likewise, in a KSL radio 
address in 1927, Elder Matthew Cowley expressed his belief that 
"Confucius understood the doctrine of repentance" and that on the 
basis of his teachings on purity and virtue "one would almost believe 
that the gospel was borrowed from Confucius."43

Thus in this Mormon view, God has inspired men to think and 
write according to the conditions in the midst of which he finds them; 
Islam, Hinduism, Taoism, Confucianism, Shinto, and Buddhism have 
within them inspired and inspirational principles, and the peoples of 
these lands will be judged by God in accordance with their individual 
willfulness to abide by them, as they are not totally subversive of 
gospel values, but are striking evidence that God has spoken "to all 
nations of the earth," and that mankind will ultimately be judged by 
that which they have been inspired to receive, at least until a fulness 
of the gospel has been provided.44

James E. Talmage saw authentic comparisons between Mormo-
nism and Buddhism, believing that the latter provided a constructive 
path that could consistently lead upward to the fulness of the restored 
gospel:

We believe that man may advance in righteousness and 
become more nearly perfect; even as the followers of Buddha teach, 
that by the "Holy Path" [Hinayana] or by the "Pure Path" 
[Mahayana] men may walk in the light and become Buddha. 

We believe as you do, my beloved readers in Japan, that some 
will follow the path of Hinayana and others the higher road of 
Mahayana—each choosing for himself, according to inclination and 
capacity; and, sad to say, yet others use that God-given freedom of 
choice and follow the path of sin that leadeth downward to 
perdition.45

The distinction thus made is significant and impressive, and it is 
in effect the difference between the Mosaic law and the gospel of Jesus

41JD, 3:40
43Matthew Cowley, "The Gospel of Repentance," KSL Radio Address, Sunday evening, 31 
April 1927.
44Cf. 2 Nephi 29:7-12.
45James E. Talmage, "In the Lineage of the Gods," Improvement Era 8 (August 1905):726-
27.
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Christ. Better to live by Hinayana—in obedience to the stern commands, "Thou shalt" and "Thou shalt not"—better to do good through hope of reward and eschew evil through fear of punishment, than to do evil and reject good. But better still, far better is it, to imbibe the spirit of righteous law—to walk by Mahayana—to make right living the natural mode of life, and through inspiration and divine love, rather than because of the law's demands, rise to exalted rank.

CONCLUSION

Each of the five Mormon views elaborated here provides useful and meaningful insights into questions of religious resemblances. But none of them covers the whole ground alone, and all of them together fall short of explaining all such parallels. My own feeling is that only inspiration from the Lord can provide the answers as to which of these five possibilities should be dominant in a particular case. Regardless of the relative importance of each of the five in a particular setting, we must decide from a tactical point of view whether the work of the Church will be more effective if we emphasize the diabolic nature of the similarities between the gospel and the native faiths, or if we emphasize the heritage of the pre-earth life, or of the light of Christ, or of a partially accurate deposit of faith and truth from ancient times, or of whatever else. But this much is certain, the view one takes has important implications for the future of the Church.

Our reactions to religious similarities not only influence our perceptions of the religions of Asia but also our feelings for missionary work in that part of the world. With even a little familiarity with other religions, we can be much impressed by what seem to be duplications of elements usually assumed to be totally unique to the restored gospel of Jesus Christ. To come upon these parallels in the remains of cultures long dead (Assyrian, Egyptian, Babylonian, Ugaritic, and others) is one thing. To come upon them in the scriptures of living world faiths which compete with us for the hearts and minds of men—Buddhism, Hinduism, and Islam—or in Confucian and Taoist teachings honored among the Chinese, Koreans, and Japanese—this may be more difficult to handle. A little such familiarity with non-Christian religion can breed confusion and concern. And some may be tempted to turn to sheer relativism, to believe that one faith is as good as another, or that all faiths express the same truth in variant cultural trappings.

This is one of the pitfalls often associated with polygenetic "human predicament" and "Light of Christ" approaches to the whole problem of religious resemblances. Some men have seized upon the
ressemblances of Christ to other men of his age and to other so-called hero figures of all time, and upon resemblances between Joseph Smith and Mohammed, or some other religious leader, to prove that these two were simply two of many. That makes the Savior and the Prophet much easier to explain. Hugh Nibley has warned us that by diligent research one can match all the Christian teachings with the teachings of others; and these have been pointed to repeatedly by students of comparative religion in order to bring Christ and his prophets down to the level of everyday experience and supplant the miraculous and embarrassing by the commonplace and reassuring. As to the process of gaining a sure knowledge of the Lord and his prophet, I heartily agree with Nibley's colorful and cryptic statement:

One does not compose music with a sliderule, and the divinity and truthfulness of Christ were never meant to be proved by history, since we are told from the beginning that that knowledge comes to one only by direct revelation from the Father in heaven.  

There is one aspect of the diffusionist approach that I find particularly challenging to Mormon students of comparative religion. Diffusionists tend to think in terms of dispensation patterns as a framework for understanding the religious experience of mankind. At least by implication we are told that the human story is a conflict between two states of mind, between those who have been rebellious, indifferent or hostile to God, and those who have been custodians of truth, the lovers of God. This is the yardstick by which the various religions may be measured. Therefore, in each case we must ask ourselves how much it has preserved of the primitive, original revelation—and what are its known historical links. After Israel (Judaism), how should the great religions be ranked? Should first place be assigned to Zoroastrianism, because it hands on and recasts a tradition of remote antiquity, of severe truth and high morality? Should Zoroaster be followed by the rishis of the Vedas, Brahmins by birth, who spring from Seth's descendants by one line or a class of men chosen by God, who though somewhat crippled or degenerated, are still devoted to God's service, as E. L. Allen has contended?  

Or, on the other hand, shall we agree that among the nations of antiquity who stood nearest to or at least, very near to the source of primitive revelations from God, the Chinese must hold a distinguished place? Among the Chinese are there not many remarkable vestiges of eternal

---

46 Nibley, The World and the Prophets, pp. 16-17.
truth to be found in their classical works and in their time-honored religious traditions. As Latter-day Saints begin to seriously investigate the source of Japanese religion, and lay claims of finding extraordinary links between them and the peoples of the Old Testament and Book of Mormon, does this require a significant revision of our perceptions of that people's place in the unfolding of God's work in the Latter Days, as so many of our students have suggested in recent years?

Among those Latter-day Saints who underscore the manifestation of God's influence among all men on an independent and personal basis—either through his spirit or in response to common needs and problems in the human condition—the universality of God is stressed. The whole race of man, in every land, of every color, and every stage of culture, is not only the offspring of God, but in the vast compass of his providence all are being supported by his love to reach within the limits of their powers a knowledge of the Supreme. Not only in this is God thought of as having a more universal and direct involvement in the lives of all his children on an individual basis, but also the sense of community among human beings is enhanced. On the other hand, diffusionists tend to stress the eternal struggle between truth and error between eternal truth and local culture, between God's chosen people and those who are not so chosen, between the revelations of God and the ways of the world. Implicitly, this calls for a primary focus on the ways in which Latter-day Saints are different from others, rather than upon their common humanity or their dependence on a common Father. Among diffusionists there is always the temptation to construe a narrow, exclusive, and arrogant view of themselves and of the Church that militates against true brotherhood—the pure Love of Christ—the expansion of Zion in "nethermost" places in the earth, the full acceptance of gospel values in alien heathen cultures, and full recognition that the God of Israel is also the God of the whole earth.

For those of us who seem ready to see God's handiwork throughout the world, and even in the lives of wise teachers, poets, philosophers, and scientists, and who are happy to believe that they all

---

28One delightful example of this proposition is Gerrit Gong's, "We are Waiting the Impact of Chinese Ancestor Worship," a typescript with slide illustrations, which argues that the Chinese have enjoyed the Spirit of Elijah (i.e., a great tradition of salvation for the dead) from times of remote antiquity.

29This is a popular theme among some Japanese Latter-day Saints, and particularly among Japanese, and missionaries returned from Japanese fields of labor. Some of the ramifications are suggested in my article, "Did Christ visit Japan?" BYU Studies 10 (Winter 1970):135-58; see also "In Search of Japanese Identity," in my forthcoming book, Every Nation, Kindred, Tongue, and People.
have a work and mission under an overruling Providence, there are
two final cautions I would like to make. First, although the Spirit and
power of Christ is manifest worldwide, this is not to suggest that the
founders and teachers of the great religions of man have a full
endowment either of light or power. They have not. They did not
receive the gift of the Holy Ghost or the keys and authority of the Holy
Priesthood, and without these they could not receive revelation and
authority to perform more than preparatory principles and ordinances
for their people. Gotama Buddha has been a light for Asia, but he could
not be the light of the world. He was not appointed or empowered to
that position. I believe that Mohammed was an inspired man, a
prophet without priesthood, who performed a particular mission, at a
special time, among a people with special needs. But God has a living
Prophet who heads up his universal kingdom in the earth—The
Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. The President of the
Church is God's mouthpiece; a universal mouthpiece, endowed with
the keys of presidency over all affairs dealing with a fulness of God's
power and authority throughout the earth.

As Latter-day Saints we cannot dismiss Buddhism out of hand
simply as a false religion. The light of Christ shines in it too. But there
is danger here. A friendly and appreciative approach to non-Mormon
religions in Asia carries with it an intrinsic temptation to think that in
places like Thailand we must at least symbolically, if not literally, dress
the Mormon missionaries as Buddhist monks. But recognition of
religious parallels does not imply the need or advisability of such a
course. In seeking for that which is "virtuous, lovely, and praise-
worthy" within the native faiths, we are not seeking accommodation
or compromise. Others have tried this with no effective benefit. There
is no value to the Church nor to the people of Asia in allowing Jehovah
to be accepted into the Buddhist pantheon; and there is no gospel
benefit in having Jesus Christ identified as an avatar of a Hindu god, as
an incarnation of the Buddha, or in any way less than the Son of God,
"the only name given among men" whereby we must be saved. But
despite the prospect of this negative result, the positive implications of
using good things in Asia as building blocks for bringing people into a
fuller realization of their own spiritual possibilities must not be
ignored.
... OUTRAGED BY SILENCE

John A. Howard

Members of the Class of 1976:
A chronological quirk has given to you and me some unusual opportunities. You are privileged to launch a second century for this sturdy university, and a third century for our cherished and somewhat confused nation. From today henceforth, by your works you can prove that the era now beginning can be one of hope and dignity. You can prove that courage and virtue are once again equal to the task of rigorous pioneering.

For my part, I have my own small anniversary to observe. Twenty-five years ago this month I was named president of a college. My opportunity is to distill from that quarter-century of experience a message sufficiently striking to penetrate the emotions of your graduation, and sufficiently wise and explicit to serve as a proper culmination for your studies and a remembered challenge in the years ahead. May we both measure up to these tasks.

The pioneers who came to Utah to bring a righteous civilization to a wilderness, and to convert barren deserts into fruitful farms and thrifty towns had no illusions about the work they set out to accomplish. They were fortified in their hearts for the hazards and the cruel frustrations they were to encounter. Their triumph stands as a glorious testimonial to a people powered by faith and guided by piety.

The work that faces your generation is no less arduous. The deserts you must bring to blossom are no less arid, but your mission may demand even more of you, for unlike the early pioneers of this state, you are confronted by a wilderness that is subtle and fluid and elusive. Indeed the wilderness you must conquer is disguised as a civilization so that there is the double necessity to unmask the deceit, to distinguish between what is authentic and what is counterfeit, so that you may labor to support the one and oppose the other.

Commencement address to the graduates of Brigham Young University, April 1976.
John A. Howard is president of Rockford College.
I speak, of course, of the wilderness of unprincipled behavior into which our nation has wandered. The moral wasteland stretches from coast to coast, with only a few oases of righteousness here and there. The noble promise of America, the dream of a nation under God, which brought the Pilgrims to Massachusetts and which was confirmed in the Declaration of Independence, has been obscured and distorted and negated. That dream is today mocked and degraded by many of the most powerful forces in our society.

It is not a small challenge which I pose to you, but then you are not without special qualifications to meet it. When the invitation to speak at this ceremony was conveyed to me by President Oaks, I was greatly honored. I was also greatly pleased, for I recognized that for a person who earnestly cares about the future of this country—and I do—there are few audiences of such beneficent potential for our nation as a graduating class of Brigham Young University. I believe there is no single large group of your generation in the United States as consistently trained in its religious obligations, as ready to work long hours and make sacrifices for its principles, and as well-versed in the dignity of self-reliance as you are. If that estimate is correct, you are greatly blessed and highly privileged.

I would not, however, want that flourish of admiration which is, I assure you, very genuine, to go to your heads. It must be remembered that "unto whomever much is given, of him shall be much required" (Luke 12:48). The special assets of character which you possess seem to be so scarce in our land that if morality, integrity, and piety are once again to become widely respected, the few people who do understand and cherish these fundamentals are going to have to work overtime, and with a rare degree of persistence, intelligence, and humility.

Hercules, when first setting eyes on the Augean stables, could not have been more appalled by the mess that confronted him than a conscientious American scrutinizing the contemporary scene. The moral depravity of what appears on television is rivalled by the moral tone of many campuses where cohabitation is a commonplace and where the use of illegal drugs does not even raise an eyebrow. The swelling tide of crime is matched by the deluge of dishonesty on the part of politicians who callously promise what they know they cannot deliver, and try to deceive the people into believing that projects can always be paid for out of someone else’s pocket. The unscrupulousness of the press for whom nothing seems to be sacred or prohibited is scarcely more appalling than a legal profession which, as President Oaks has noted, often seems more concerned about technicalities of the
law than it does about the fact and the consequences of the crime. Wherever one looks, a narrow concern for self-advantage seems to prevail over any thought of the well-being of the society; principles seem to be overwhelmed by expediency.

The person who may wish to involve himself in reestablishing principle as the guide for public and private conduct, may benefit from some perspective on the events of the last decade during which a slow-moving decline of character in our country has developed into an avalanche. It may be difficult for your generation to conceive what our society was like a scant ten years ago. Gutter language was rare on public platforms and in plays and movies. Coeducational dormitories were unthinkable. Most people had little worry about being out on the city streets late at night. Salacious literature was not publicly available on the newsstands and in the bookstores, and marihuana was used by just a few people, mostly jazz musicians, migrant workers, and a handful of silly socialites.

The revolutionaries who launched their blitzkrieg against our nation from the Berkeley campus may not have known how fragile our society was or how shallow were the moral commitments of America, but they seemed to understand with devastating precision how to cleave our people into hostile factions internally and how to paralyze our will to defend our principles abroad. By appealing to the passions and the fears of the young, they were able to shred the fabric of self-restraint which alone binds a free civilization together. By glorifying the right to pleasure one's self, they swept away the respect for legitimate and responsible authority which is necessary for the cohesion and coordination of any group.

The radical quartet of seductive sirens—filthy speech, marihuana, sexual liberation, and defiance of the military draft—singing with soothing and self-righteous sophistry, lured young people onto the shoals of personal and public anarchy where no rules or laws were acknowledged other than their own whims and passions. Although only a small percentage of the nation's youth completely accepted the call, few there were who were altogether immune to its invitation. The do-your-own-thing philosophy has spread throughout the country. It has toppled such venerable institutions as the campus honor system. This group technique for maintaining integrity, which had operated on many campuses, called upon every student to take some of the responsibility for making sure that no student cheated on his examinations. The priority now placed upon permitting each person to make his own judgments without regard to group norms has turned
traditional values inside out, so that the act of "ratting" on another student is now regarded as more offensive than the act of cheating. In many places, the honor system which was once a manifestation of honorable people working together has been discarded. The old concept of honor based on integrity has yielded to a new code of honor based on dishonesty, also known as honor among thieves, which is, in fact, the source of the term "ratting."

The do-your-own-thing philosophy is, by definition, antisocial. Its partisans automatically disqualify themselves from effective membership in any formal group. If a person actually lives according to the belief that there are no restrictions upon his conduct other than what he chooses for himself, that person is in actuality a barbarian. The nightmare stories of the SLA and the Manson family make it clear that there are in America today genuine 24-karat barbarians, who have carried this depraved philosophy all the way to its ultimate degree of evil.

There is one particularly virulent aspect of this cancerous philosophy which needs to be recognized. The person who is only somewhat contaminated, who still has some moral sensitivities, is caught in a trap by his partial commitment. If he insists on the right to make his own decisions free of external authority, he is logically bound to champion the right of other people to do the same. Thus, he may find himself shielding and covering for other people in their commission of acts which he abhors. The phenomenon of multiplying vandalism clearly is dependent for some of its growth on the silence of many who know about the acts of destruction and deplore them, but say nothing. The malignancy feeds on itself. The deeds which are openly tolerated are becoming more and more bestial, and the limitations which once restrained barbarism are atrophying, while the so-called "liberation movements" are multiplying.

Well, what is to be done? Let us begin by reminding ourselves of a very simple moral fact. It was well-phrased by the Swiss author, Henri Frederic Amiel. "Truth," he said, "is violated by falsehood, but it is outraged by silence." The abandonment of principle has of course been hurried along by false prophets preaching erroneous doctrine, but that fateful trend has been accelerated at least as much by worthy citizens who know better and sit quietly on the sidelines. Shakespeare observed in 3 King Henry VI, "A little fire is quickly trodden out which, being suffered, rivers cannot quench" (4.8.7).

Far too many religious people of our country, clergymen and laymen, mute and inactive, have suffered the arsonists of self-
indulgence to put the torch to one sacred principle after another until we now face a general conflagration. As already noted, the task is a large one, but that is no cause for dismay: the works of lasting importance are never easy.

In calling upon you to rise to this circumstance and carry an oversize share of the responsibility, I have noted the particularly fortunate environment you have here at Brigham Young University. This campus is truly one of the few oases of righteousness. I recognize, however, that that blessing may also pose for you certain barriers that may not loom so prominent for the general citizenry. The devout person, knowing all too well his own shortcomings, is called upon not to pass judgment on others. This altogether commendable trait is to some extent reenforced by the First Amendment of our Constitution, which asserts the right of each citizen to proclaim his own views, whatever they are. It may then appear that the conscientious citizen is barred from speaking out against the doctrines that to him seem evil and against the advocates of those doctrines who are misleading the people.

We need to remember that although Jesus admonished the scribes and Pharisees not to stone the adulteress unless they, themselves, were without sin, still he commanded the woman to sin no more. To be charitable about the weaknesses of another person does not require silence about misdeeds. Furthermore, the First Amendment was never intended to prevent public discussion, nor to silence the virtuous citizens.

We seem, however, to be caught in a circumstance where the spokesmen who are opposed to our traditional religious and civic virtues are either greater in number than their opposites, or else are given more opportunities to be heard and read. That situation will persist until enough worthy and intelligent people decide they will no longer permit truth to be outraged by their silence. The citizen who is offended by the literature displayed in the grocery store where he does his shopping has only himself to blame if he fails to communicate his distress to the proprietor, and if he fails to encourage his friends to do the same. The viewer who considers certain television programs beyond the reasonable limits of public acceptability is abetting the problem if he does not write the sponsor, particularly now that one can obtain a complete list of the addresses of national television advertisers. The parent who finds wholly inappropriate certain subject matter in his children’s classes has an obligation to make known his concern to the school authorities.
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To a very great extent, the degeneration of public standards of conduct, and the increasingly corruptive character of literary, artistic, and dramatic works are simply the result of what the citizens tolerate without voicing their strong objections. Like the small child who keeps going a little farther to see how much he can get away with, the pacesetters of the news and entertainment industries seem impelled to reach deeper and deeper into the cesspools of sensationalism, animalism, and degradation. Their success is only possible because of the tolerance of those who know better. We must bear in mind that in public matters, there is no such thing as moral neutrality. Those who do not stand up forthrightly in behalf of their convictions, by their inaction are supporting the opposite view. On any scale wherever a person perceives right and wrong, silence turns out to be a vote for wrong.

Let us turn the coin over. The mission which lies before us is two-fold. The recivilizing of America will not be accomplished merely by taking responsible action to discourage that which is vicious and decadent. We must proclaim the good news and make known to others that which is pure and worthy and wholesome and inspirational. Along with evangelism for one’s religious beliefs, in which the Mormons need no advice and encouragement from outsiders, there must be a comparable evangelistic effort in secular matters. If a political officeholder takes a firm stand for some worthy cause in the face of contrary gusts of passion, write him and thank him and send a few copies of your letter off to other office-holders who need to recognize that courage and integrity are appreciated. If the publications you read are inclined to review only books of a sleazy and degrading character, write a letter to the editor with your own review of some book of hope and dignity, perhaps Corrie Ten Boom’s *The Hiding Place*, or Ralph Moody’s *Man of the Family*, or Russell Kirk’s *The Roots of American Order*. If a teacher serves for your children as a model of upright and uplifting character, by all means express your appreciation to the teacher, but also make sure the school board understands how much it means to your family to have that kind of person in the classroom.

What I am suggesting here is that the guides to lead our nation out of the moral swamp do not all have to be generals in command of some nationwide movement. Repeated small acts by courageous and thoughtful people will often prime the pump, bringing forth a flow of similar acts by other citizens.
In undertaking to support that which is righteous and to express rational disapproval for that which is morally destructive, I think we need to understand as well as we can the paradox which governs human response to moral principle. For the religious person, the greatest freedom comes only with total commitment to God. Perhaps you are familiar with the poem by Francis Thompson, entitled "The Hound of Heaven." It is the story of one man's effort to seek pleasure and peace of mind apart from God. In his words:

For, though I knew His love Who followed,  
Yet was I sore adread  
Lest, having Him, I must have naught beside.

This fear of being stifled and hemmed in by religious commitment, so powerfully described by Francis Thompson, is banished only in the discovery that it is precisely within such a commitment that life is fulfilled. There is, I believe, an analogy in our secular activities. Each group, be it family or friendship, college or business firm, city or nation, exists to accomplish certain functions. Trial and error and common sense eventually identify certain things which the members must do and must not do if the group is to hold together and be effective. Living in a household would be impossible if some member persisted in flooding the place by leaving the faucets on with the stopper closed, so the prohibition of that act becomes a rule of the household. Thus it is that codes of conduct suitable to each kind of group are developed.

The person who refuses to abide by the ground rules runs afoul of his colleagues, generates animosities, and must waste time and effort and burden his conscience with furtive activities to cover up his wrongdoing. By contrast, the person who learns and abides by the rules of the group, if they are reasonable and legitimate, is free to be creative within those limits. He is a welcome member of the group and is more likely to be productive as a result of that welcomeness.

This "sentiment of submission" as Duncan Williams has called it, is one of the most fundamental aspects of human life and one of the least understood today. The physicist understands that he cannot defy the laws of physics and amount to anything as a physicist. The religious person knows that he cannot ignore the dictates of his church and maintain his own respect for himself as a churchman. So, too, with the human being operating as a member of society. To disregard the tenets of courtesy, morality, truthfulness, kindness and the other norms of
civilized living dehumanizes the individual; it makes him a social misfit and leads to loneliness and frustrations. Our failure to convey an understanding of this cause-and-effect has given rise to the tragedy of the counterculture in whose ranks are innumerable young people who, like the protagonist of "The Hound of Heaven," foolishly suppose they can find joy and fulfillment by running away from the only source of these blessings, the commitment to noble causes and the submission to the obligations they entail.

In closing, I want to go back to where we began. The task that faces your generation is no less difficult than the work which confronted the pioneers of this state, but much of what they had to accomplish was starkly obligatory. For them to fail to take action often meant to perish. Not so today. There is no comparable sense of urgency upon us. It is so easy, even for the righteous person, to busy himself with the many real claims upon his daily life that he defers until some future time his involvement in the effort to clean up our morally polluted atmosphere and to strive for the health-giving and joy-bearing environment of respect for truth and principle and piety. Let me, therefore, make one request of you. I invite you to take a little card and put it on your mirror or fix it with a magnet to the refrigerator door; display it in some prominent place where it can serve as a daily reminder for yourself and a lesson for your children. I suggest you inscribe on that card the phrase, "Truth is outraged by silence." I earnestly believe that it has been the silence of the good people much more than the yammering of fools or the persuasion of intentional evil which has converted this once predominantly lawful and beneficent nation into a moral wasteland. That process can be reversed if enough citizens of moral conviction will raise their voices. I call upon you to join that chorus and prove yourselves worthy of your proud heritage.

May God be with you throughout your lives, and may you always be with God.
Index
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