The development of the family as the central institution of Mormonism, has, together with the local ward, enabled the formerly communitarian Mormon church to create a contemporary basis for community.

THE PERSISTENCE OF MORMON COMMUNITY INTO THE 1990S

By Mario S. De Pillis

DICTIONARIES ARE CURIOUSLY DELINQUENT IN defining the word *community*. *The American Heritage Dictionary*, for example, gives as the first meaning of community, "a group of people living in the same locality and under the same government."[1] Scholars know that "community" means a good deal more than place, group, and government. All the cliché titles that we have heard since the 1950s—for example, "The Search for Community"— clearly connote a close emotional network of people, a group of ungoverned hearts, if you will. This indeed has been the usage of sociologists, philosophers, and historians from Ferdinand Tönnies earlier in this century down to Rosabeth Kanter and Marshall MacLuhan in our own time. Thus, for most Americans, and perhaps for other English-speaking peoples, community is both a state of human relations and an object of yearning.

For twentieth-century Americans the word has special philosophical overtones, most of them positive. Thus, in May 1990, when Yale President Benno C. Schmidt Jr., awarded an honorary doctorate of humane letters to Wilma P. Mankiller, chief of the Cherokee Nation, he praised her as "a model for others" who was keeping alive "a spirit of community which too many others have lost."[2] Given the positive connotations of the word, everyone tries to exploit it. Even a feminist group in conflict against male oppressors and simultaneously in conflict among themselves may try to call itself a "community of feminists" or a community of "those oppressed by men." Attacking this feminist usage, literary critic Helen Vendler noted that "the utopian and 'touchy-feely' use of the word 'community' deriving from the intimacy of small groups meeting for discussion or living together can give an outsider the creeps."[3] Many other interest groups, of course, exploit the positive connotations of the word.

It is difficult to find any social and historical sense in the welter of self-interested, undefined, and often nonsensical usages of "community." And using sociological theory as an escape route often bogs one down in trivial sociological data about such criteria as "ideal size." At the same time, one must also avoid the loose, macro-historical use of "community" as a mere settlement of people held together by money and a mayor: Daniel J. Boorstin, for example, celebrated the American, moveable, "Everywhere Community."[4]

A. DEFINITIONS OF COMMUNITY

WE can distinguish some categories of community that may help slice through the fog and prejudice surrounding the word. The following four classes of community represent, I believe, historical realities: (1) the *philosophical-ethical*, which despite its abstractness frames all American discourse on the subject; (2) the *socio-political*, a community of self-interest, like the familiar, everyday American small town; (3) the *religious community* that often helps define peoplehood (as it does for the Mormons); and (4) a community of *special People of Zion, Chosen by God*, a community that is almost always utopian or communitarian in its thrust: the chosen Jews have had their *kibbutzim* and *moshavs*, the chosen Mormons their Ordervilles.[5] For the sake of clarity I am excluding from these general categories the special case of utopian communes like the Shakers or the Mormon United Orders or the secular Owenites; but I shall define these self-separated, "intentional communities" later.

MARIO S. DE PILLIS is a professor at the University of Massachusetts History Department in Amherst, Massachusetts. *An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Plotting Zion conference on 5 May 1990, sponsored by the Sunstone Foundation and the Pacific Chapter of National Historic Communal Societies Association (renamed in 1991 without the words "National Historic").*

1.
The Philosophical-Ethical Community: A Community of Neighbors

THE philosophical-ethical community is the one that we all want: *a place (but not always) of neighborliness, of relative peace, of what sociologists call face-to-face relationships in primary groups*. Americans sought community with a passion in the social anomie of the Jacksonian era and again in the social breakdown of the 1960s. The first sentence in Rosabeth Kanter's 1973 book on communes reads simply: " 'Community' may be the word of the decade."[6] Actually, it may be the word of the century.

We usually think of philosophical-ethical communities as small places, perhaps one in which we do not actually live. In its most idealistic connotation, a community is the place where individualistic, self-motivated Americans would *like* to live. Americans write books with titles like *In Search of Community*, and we speak of a local community "rallying together" in times of crisis. The philosophical-ethical community is thus in part a mental construct.

Politicians love to use the philosophical-ethical community for its positive connotations. In some Eastern states, for example, the politicians and mental-health administrators like to say that we should return the mentally ill to "their" local communities, where presumably they will be better off. It turns out that the local communities are not eager to have "their" mentally ill back. They do not want a house for the mentally ill in any of their neighborhoods, and sometimes neighbors have resorted to arson.

In speaking of the "community" as a safe haven, government leaders are clearly exploiting the good connotations of community as a friendly, somewhat small place, where primary relationships thrive, where residents know who lives next door. In this secular, non-religious sense of community the word has a philosophical-ethical content: a community as a place of caring human beings who know and help one another. In this sense, i.e., a place of human caring, we all seek community. Yet in the best of small communities we find serious conflict between people, and sometimes, in towns and cities demoralized by a generation of unemployment, we do not detect a desire for the public good, for the commonweal.

There is a way in which the Mormon people have made this idealistic, philosophical-ethical definition of community a reality, and I will allude to it again. But now I must turn briefly to the *socio-political* sense of community.

2.
The Socio-Political Community of Self-Interest

CONFLICT points to a second sense of community: *the social-political group held together by self-interest, whether by money or by values*.

The myth of the ideal small town in America has obscured the conflicts and social changes that have revolutionized and sometimes destroyed any sense of community in small towns. In the Northeast, for example, Bostonians and New Yorkers who want to escape the problems of their respective cities have been migrating to the idealized villages of Northern New England. Shortly after settling down they discover that these towns are socio-political entities with some of the same conflicts that could be found back in the big city. Still, those small towns are working socio-political communities. And as such, they resemble religious sects in their criteria for full membership; that is, the newcomer must acknowledge or at least make some public obeisance to local customs and beliefs. Thus, the New Yorker who resettles in South Peacham, Vermont, and complains at a town meeting about traffic back-ups caused by 150 cows ambling across a time-honored cattle crossing has transgressed against the social code and won't "fit in." Even when urban escapees do respect and conform to local mores, they remain "flatlanders," a term which native Vermonters apply to urban newcomers.

If industrious or well-heeled outsiders descend on a small town in sufficient numbers, they can totally annihilate it as a community, as did the followers of the Bhagwan Shree Rajneesh in 1981 in Antelope, Oregon, or as the Mormons did in 1831 in Jackson County, Missouri. To be sure, Independence, a frontier town at that time, was not much of a community for the Mormons to overwhelm; but the numerous local settlers had a very strong sense of their own economic and political rights, and, as they believed, their own religious superiority to the deluded Mormonites. The non-Mormon settlers of Jackson County thus formed a community of beliefs and customs; and these thousands of non-Mormons who were flooding westward, intended, like all settlers, to reproduce the beliefs and values of their cultural homeland in the upper South. Despite the helter-skelter nature of American frontier settlement, hundreds of small towns sprang up, all of them real socio-political communities, all replete with charters, town plats, and lots of lawyers. Like most of us today, the Missourians organized their self-interests around these socio-political communities. Similarly, the anti-Mormon settlers in the vicinity of Nauvoo, in Hancock County, Illinois, wished to organize their lives around the typical socio-political community of their day, a small-town way of life based on individual entrepreneurship, fervent post-Revolutionary republicanism, an acceptable mix of denominations, and minimal control of moral behavior. This order of life differed dramatically from that of the Mormons in what Robert Flanders called "corporate Nauvoo."[7] The Church permitted individual enterprise in Nauvoo, but corporate enterprise was more important. As for the mix of denominations so characteristic of the American socio-political community, that was irrelevant in a unified Mormon town. As a self-conscious, communal religious group, the Mormons of the City of Nauvoo could and did enforce a uniform morality.

In a few rare but supremely influential instances the socio-political community coincides with the philosophical-ethical community, such as Calvin's Geneva or the scores of Puritan towns, or "covenanted communities," of New England before the 1750s. This theocratic kind of town creates "outsiders,"

and thus the New England towns evicted Baptists and Quakers, and the Genevans banished Anabaptists and advocates of free agency and burned Michael Servetus. For a brief moment in Nauvoo the Mormons created what was very nearly a covenanted community. Tolerant of non-Mormons, they nevertheless got rid of troublesome outsiders by "whittling them out of town"[8] or by taking gentler, less frontier-like measures. Calvinists, both in Europe and America, not only kept out other Christians, but also punished insiders—i.e., believers adjudged guilty of sin. They did so in order to preserve what the leading historian of social control in such communities calls the "Eucharist community without sin." Calvinists, at least up to the late eighteenth century, had to be "without sin on their soul or hatred in their hearts" in order to come to the table of the Lord. Neither now nor in the past have the Mormons ever used the Eucharistic "sin discipline" to maintain the boundaries of community.[9]

Most of us live in socio-political communities and most of us accommodate our lives to them. But the Mormon people have always kept a psychic distance from relationships of mere self-interest—somewhat like the present-day Catholic nuns who hold jobs and wear modern street clothes but return to a communal household at night. They are in the socio-political community but not of it. I am exaggerating the moral separateness of the Mormons to make a distinction between the Latter-day Saints' community, which is religious and which is no longer tied to a place (like Missouri or Utah) and, on the other hand, the socio-political community, which is both secular and spatially bounded.

3.
The Religious Community: Peoplehood

LOOSELY speaking, one can describe a religious community *as a group of people who can find a common identity in religious membership*. Anthropologists sometimes call this identity tribal: all the Lebanese Moslems in Detroit, all the Catholics in Northern Ireland, or even all the Mormons in Utah before 1890. As in the loose dictionary definition, the tribal identity is that of a group of people living in the same place under the same religious government but maintaining a strong consciousness of separation from, or even hostility toward, all immediate neighbors.[10]

Though useful for the general anthropology of religion, this definition is not very helpful for the social and intellectual history of Mormon community. To be sure, the pre-Manifesto (pre-1890) Mormons of Utah constituted a kind of tribe: 99 percent white, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant in background; endogamy separated them socially; a vast distance still isolated them spatially from the society of Jim Fisk and Boss Tweed; and polygamy burned a mark in their consciousness that strengthened the group. But after the 1890s membership in the Mormon community functioned only in part as a source of identity. As the Mormon Community persists into the 1990s, it bears two distinctive marks that make it a good deal more than a tribal or a religious group identity.

First, the Mormons still believe that Independence, Jackson County, Missouri, is the Center Place of Zion. To be sure, since the death of Brigham Young in 1877 no general authority has explicitly advocated a resumption of the Gathering unto Zion. We shall examine below whether this silence amounts to a betrayal of Mormon scriptures and whether it has weakened or destroyed the communalism of the Mormons.

Second, the Mormon people retain their tie to the "utopian" meaning of religious community: the millennial Zion (which includes the belief that Christ will come again)—even if today they are likely to speak of "Zion community" as a vague, ideal goal which fervent Saints always hope to reach. This "Zion" as a pious goal has gotten out of hand in recent years as a kind of Mormon HolyTalk (my term), even among educated Latter-day Saints.[11]

In these two ways Mormonism conforms in part to the strict communitarian sense of the definition of "religious community." According to Arthur Bestor Jr.'s classic definition, a communitarian society or "utopia" is a society of people that has voluntarily separated from the world, is generally small, strives after perfection in its institutions, shares many things in common, and usually makes chiliastic claims.[12] This standard communitarian definition certainly applies to the original Mormon City of Zion of 1831 (and to the United Order of Enoch): the early Mormons in the Center Place of Zion were a small, property-sharing group of believers eagerly awaiting the second coming of Christ at a particular place. But by 1838 the quasi-communist economic basis for the City of Zion had changed into tithing by individuals, many of whom did not even reside in the Land of Zion.[13] This new law of tithing represented the first official Mormon departure from the Law of Consecration and a return to individual private property and capitalism. Gone now was early Mormonism's version of "things in common."

Also gone was the Bestor criterion of spatial isolation in a particular place. By 1847 the Latter-day Saints were no longer living together in one community isolated from the larger society but found themselves scattered throughout North America and Northern Europe. In this dispersion we find the beginnings of the later international community of Mormons, but because the Church still expected the Saints abroad to gather unto Utah, dispersion remained just that, and not real internationalization. Foreign Saints did not remain at home and build wards, because the Church was still preaching the millennial doctrine of the "Gathering" to a sacred place in the United States.

During the administration of Brigham Young (1847-1877) the Gathering remained in place, and the Saints kept fresh their faith in the Millennium; but after the death of Young, the Church began to downplay the communitarian heritage and the Gathering,[14] not just in the economic sphere, but also in the minds of the Saints. Thus by the 1890s, Mormon end-time expressions became less urgent and fearful; by contrast with the 1830s, we read no sermons about planetary catastrophe (maybe tomorrow!), no reports of blood falling from the skies. Few Latter-day Saints were planning their lives around the

imminent arrival of Christ. In 1990 Saints say loosely that Zion is "the pure in heart," which avoids locating it in Jackson County, Missouri. Zion-in-the-heart HolyTalk obscures the related but truthful statement that Zion as an ideal and a doctrine does in fact survive in the minds and hearts of the Saints, from which place the voice of Zion repeatedly reminds them of their forgotten Order, inspiring them to help the poor (Welfare Plan), to seek equality (tithing, new plan for equality in ward budgets), even to invoking the need to return to Missouri. As noted below, Zion truly resides in Mormon hearts and minds, not as HolyTalk, but as a real understanding that somehow Mormons still expect Christ to come again—in America.

By the late 1980s the Church was no longer a small society. Now a huge international organization of about 7 million members, the Church has had to downplay, if not discard, the small-scale communitarian (utopian) ideals of their old Jacksonian Zion. But the Mormon people have found new ways to separate themselves by institutional and psychological boundary maintenance. Unlike Jews and Catholics, for example, who try to maintain endogamy through the coercion of talmudic and canon law, the Mormons have created techniques like single adult wards (for unmarried adults) and celibate missions (with a marital reward at the end) that make in-group marriage less a legal requirement than a natural event favored by the odds. "Temple work," too, exerts a unifying power unimagined by non-Mormons. This pedestrian Mormon phrase conceals emotion-laden activities like baptism for the dead, administering various ordinances, sealings to one's family, and so on, all carried out in the "House of the Lord." Latter-day Saints consider their temples extremely sacred places, so sacred that very few reliable concrete details about interior arrangements and secret ordinances are available to the public, and only members with a written "temple recommend" may enter. Once inside, the Saint can feel a powerful, even sensual connectedness with other Mormons both living and dead.

The most ordinary Saint can see and touch the alabaster and the gold of the temples in Washington, D. C., and Salt Lake City, or admire the giant mosaic and the free-form Art Deco concrete of the Honolulu temple, and can feel himself or herself transported. Every devout Saint can feel renewed in his or her consecration and loyalty to the group in ways that neither Catholic cathedrals nor Buddhist shrines can rival. Many women, who do not hold the priesthood, can feel quite "equal" and powerful in the temple.[15]

Strict dietary rules, very ancient in the history of new religions, represent still another source of group solidarity. In the course of the twentieth century, Utah developed from a curious byway into a modern urban state, and the Church burst the confines of the American West and confronted a world of mammon, individualism, and urban decay. The Church's need to maintain the boundaries of the Mormon people reached emergency levels, so it required strict compliance with the Word of Wisdom, which prohibits coffee, tea, alcohol, and tobacco. Nineteenth-century Mormons drank wine, beer, and coffee; but twentieth-century Mormons need to identify with one another and maintain a boundary between themselves and the Gentile world.[16]

Finally, need one repeat that tithing—that faint shadow of early Mormon property sharing—forms another internalized fence that keeps the Saints in and the goats out? By drawing precise boundaries the Latter-day Saints can at least remind themselves of the perfectionism, of the millennial sense of economic justice, and of Zion's original ideal of social equality. Ironically, some recent converts, reading Mormon scriptures for the first time, have in fact repeatedly tried to revive the old communitarian, United Order ideals of spatial separation and sharing of property. Mormon dissident groups, historically always spatially segregated, have invariably turned to some version of the United Order as their basic communal, organizing principle.

How, then, can one reconcile the character of the Mormon people today—growing, prosperous, capitalist, numbering in the millions, and as respected as any mainline church—how can that be reconciled with a definition of community based on the superseded conditions of the City of Zion way back in the agrarian period of American history? After all, didn't LDS Professor Louis C. Midgley rightly puncture a lot of balloons filled with airy talk of "Zion" when he pointed out that "we have only a toe in Zion, but a whole foot in Babylon"? How can I possibly imply that Mormons are really saints, sequestered from the sins of the Me Generation? I shall perform that miracle in a moment. First we must take note of some history.

Now a huge international organization, the Church has had to downplay, if not discard, the small-scale communitarian ideals of their old Jacksonian Zion. But the Mormon people have found new ways to separate themselves by institutional and psychological boundary maintenance.

B.
THE SAINTS SURVIVE THREATS TO MORMON COMMUNITY: 1860S TO THE 1960S

MY theme is this: How did the Mormon culture of Utah in the 1850s, 1860s, and 1870s survive the arrival of hostile Gentile settlers, the coming of the transcontinental railroad, and the onslaught of anti-Mormons? How is it that the Mormon people did not disperse and dissolve with the invasion of the United States Army in the 1850s, followed by the in-migration of thousands of non-Mormons after the Civil War, then more federal persecution for polygamy in the 1880s and 1890s, and, finally, after a period of relative isolation, the influx of tens of thousands of non-Mormons during and after World War II? Why didn't the Mormons escape to out-of-the-way farming areas, as did the German pietists who went to Uruguay or the Utah polygamists who fled to Mexico and Canada?

Clearly one explanation is that by the 1950s the thoroughly urbanized Saints no longer had the option to move. The wartime influx of non-Mormons and of heavy industry had thoroughly urbanized Utah's Wasatch Front, the line of cities running from Ogden in the north through Salt Lake City to Provo in the south, and permanently altered the dominant Mormon tone of daily life. Moreover, having finally attained acceptance in American society, the Latter-day Saints did not feel that the Mormon way of life was in dire jeopardy. What a contrast with that other postwar year of 1868! In that year, just a few months before the transcontinental railroad was completed through Utah, Brigham Young and other leaders deeply feared the corrupting power of incoming Gentiles and began preparing for the worst.[17]

In contrast, the Mormons of the 1950s felt supremely confident about the future of their church and way of life. They had finally won acceptance, even a certain admiration among their fellow Americans, and it was more than symbolic that Ezra Taft Benson, current Church president, became one of the first Mormons to hold a cabinet-level position in American history.[18]

Notwithstanding all the peace, stability, and self-confidence in the Church of the 1950s, the historian is always looking for, and can always find, seeds of trouble. And the troubles did come to the Mormon community in the 1960s, just as they did for every major non-Mormon institution. Black Mormons wanted the priesthood; students and intellectuals were questioning Mormon history and doctrine; old timers wondered about the wisdom of discontinuing ward and stake farms in favor of vast agricultural enterprises based on hired labor; a flood of new, sophisticated scholarship authored by Saints poured off the presses, deeply disturbing some general authorities; and between 1962 and 1972 three Church presidents[19] had to restructure the entire Church. Although many Saints might have found fault with the manner in which the Church carried out the restructuring program, some kind of serious revision of the norms of worship and the administrative apparatus of the Church was overdue. The restructuring of Church government had already begun in the 1930s to meet the stresses of the Great Depression and to deal with signs of renewed vitality in the life of the Church and in its foreign missions. The number of stakes had grown from 100 in 1928, to 137 in 1940, and to over 700 by 1975. Technological change after 1940 forced the Church to face the power of television, and Mormons were among the first religious denominations in the country to learn how to use television and to invest heavily in broadcast media and later in audio and video cassettes. Economic changes during and after the war forced it to reconsider the nature and function of its large agricultural holdings. As a response to these and many other changes, various presidents, beginning with Heber J. Grant, began a policy of restructuring that dealt brilliantly with the new challenges to the Church's economic policies and outreach (media) techniques.[20]

President Heber J. Grant, during the second decade of his administration, carried out what the Church called "consolidation" and "correlation." For example, it combined publications that duplicated one another's functions, like one magazine for young men and one for young women. As membership began to expand into non-Mormon areas such as California and the Pacific Northwest, the Church established stake missions and attempted to "coordinate, consolidate, eliminate, simplify and adjust the work of auxiliary organizations." These measures relieved the overburdened general authorities of extra assignments (such as president of the Young Men's Mutual Improvement Association). In 1941 the Church set up the first high-level administrative cabinet called Assistants to the Twelve (five in 1941 and over twenty-four by 1980). The Assistants were later assumed into the quorums of the Seventy. Many Saints believe that the Correlation Movement, which gained momentum in the 1960s, has been overdone, especially since the establishment in 1975 of an officious new Correlation Department headed by a new Correlation Executive Committee (consisting of the senior members of the Council of the Twelve Apostles). The Committee's decisions have altered the order of Sunday worship, revised orders of scriptural studies (a serious weekly activity for all active Mormons), suggested changes in architectural policies, and in general has re-routed sensitive currents of everyday Church life. Understandably, this powerful revision of long-standing ways rankles many Saints, and Correlation is a favorite topic for cartoons, jokes, and general muttering.

In a separate action, the First Presidency inaugurated the Church Welfare Program (or Plan) between 1933 and 1936 to help the poor and unemployed in the Church. The politically conservative general authorities realized that they were getting dangerously close to the "socialist" communitarianism of "Enoch's city of Zion," so they felt compelled to deny repeatedly that the Welfare Plan had anything to do with reestablishing the United Order. Nevertheless they felt pride and gratification in the program. In the words of First Presidency Counselor J. Reuben Clark, "We shall not be so very far from carrying out the great fundamentals of the United

Order."[21] Through these and other changes, the confident Mormonism of post-World War II obviously managed to preserve its fabled doctrinal integrity and its Church unity—and even a smidgeon of its ancient communitarian root. Like polygamy, that root has refused to die.

C. POST-WAR AFFLUENCE: A THREAT TO MORMON COMMUNITY

WHILE granting the gleaming success of the thirty-year period from 1945 to 1975, I believe that most faithful Latter-day Saints and informed non-Mormon observers would agree that since 1945 two developments have posed particularly dangerous threats to the integrity of Mormon religious community. One is the widespread affluence, materialism, and hedonism of America since World War II. The other threat lies in the spatial dilution of the Mormon community as it expanded from "The Valleys" of Utah throughout North America, and then in the 1970s throughout the world. The Church, of course, has faced more than two major problems including (but not detailed in this essay) the wholesale revision of American mores in the 1960s and the unrest arising among blacks, Native Americans, and women in the Church. In other words, just as the Church was reaching a new pinnacle of Weberian bureaucratic rationalization in 1975-76, it had to confront problems much less pleasant and simple than organizing growth or arguing about new names for old stakes.

In the twentieth century the Church burst the confines of the American West and confronted a world of mammon, individualism, and urban decay. The Church's need to maintain the boundaries of the Mormon people reached emergency levels, so it required strict compliance with the Word of Wisdom.

Confronted with the first of these two threats—four decades of rampant materialism and hedonism in Utah and in all their main American missionary areas, with glittering malls from Salt Lake to Seattle, the ongoing sexual revolution of the 1960s and 1970s, the seduction of post-World War II American youth with cars and prosperity, and so on—the Saints have demonstrated a remarkable ability to maintain their nineteenth-century zeal and commitment. Fawn M. Brodie certainly would not have seen much of a challenge to Mormon spiritual integrity in consumerism and big corporate money, because Mormonism is (she would have said) already a materialistic religion and not an ascetic one.[22] Nevertheless, the pages of serious publications like *Dialogue*, SUNSTONE, *Exponent II*, and BYU's famous (or infamous) *Seventh East Press* and its successor *Student Review* are filled with articles and letters struggling critically with a perceived loss of Mormon spirituality. In an editorial containing typical criticisms of materialistic trends among the Saints, a student writes:

> Although at BYU we are probably as preoccupied with sex (or the lack of it) than we are with money (or the lack of it), I think that when we look at Mormons in general, matters of the wallet are more intriguing and more controversial than matters of the heart. In some ways our cultural identity as Mormons in society is defined by our wealth. . . . More interesting than how the world perceives our prosperity is the internal conflict wealth causes within Mormon society. . . . Perhaps the reason that we are so obsessed with wealth is that Mormon scripture deals so heavily and repeatedly with the problem of wealth. This is particularly true of the Book of Mormon. I can think of few themes which are presented more clearly and more forcefully in the Book of Mormon than the danger of wealth. . . . How we acquire and use wealth is central to the challenge of living in the world but not of it.
>
> I am afraid, however, that as a people we are not doing so well at this. And the prophets "ancient and modern" support my observations. . . .[23]

New views of sexual identity and behavior have also become popular items for discussion.[24] The revolutionary "course correction" announced by the First Presidency in January of 1990, while presented as a new and more equitable "budgeting procedure" (centralization of Church finances), was in fact a response to affluence and hedonism; for the general authorities defended it as a spiritual antidote for "the expensive, even extravagant, activities to which we have become accustomed."[25] The conservative first counselor in the First Presidency, Gordon B. Hinckley, defended the loss of local financial autonomy by harking back to the tithing revelation of 1838. He noted the requirement of the old tithing revelation that "the Presiding Bishopric" (a term associated with the old United Order) shared with the First Presidency the responsibility for insuring the principle of economic equality.

And, he added pointedly,

> in allocating funds, we have not distinguished between so-called affluent wards and so-called poor wards. We have allowed an equal amount to all, and this same principle should govern in the allocations made by you.[26]

President Thomas S. Monson, second counselor in the First Presidency, expressed the concern more trenchantly:

> To measure the goodness of life by its delights and pleasures is to apply a false standard. The abundant life does not consist of a glut of luxury. . . . No one has learned the meaning of living until he has surrendered his ego to the service of his fellow men.[27]

D.
STAKES AND WARDS: THE ANSWER TO SPATIAL DILUTION

THE other great postwar threat to Mormon religious community was the challenge of spatial dilution. This may have been an even greater danger to Mormon community than American materialism and hedonism.

The threat here is not merely sociological, but scriptural, affecting the integrity of two fundamental communitarian teachings: the Gathering and the Center Place of Zion. Here we have a challenge that all the restructuring of Church bureaucracy in the 1930s, 1960s, and 1970s cannot meet; and the Church may well find itself turning, quite unconsciously, to protective devices and attitudes forged by the first generation of millennial Mormons.

This sudden spatial dispersion and diffusion of the Mormon people throughout the planet has posed the greatest of all the challenges to Mormon community: how could the Mormons preserve their peoplehood when, as late as the 1950s, they were no longer concentrated in what they loosely called then "The Valley" (around Salt Lake City) and now called "The Wasatch Front"? Although the state of Utah remains about 70 percent Mormon in 1990, it no longer counts as the heart of what Wallace Stegner and others called "Mormon Country" or what Leonard Arrington termed "The Great Basin Kingdom." Mormonism and the Mormon people expanded in every direction and in every place. This kind of spatial dilution endangered the social unity of the Mormon people and the administrative integrity of their church.

While the influx of Gentiles has been steadily weakening the concentration of Mormons in Utah for about a century, the sudden and dramatic spread of the Church throughout the world since the 1940s has also contributed to a spatial thinning out of the Mormon population. The Mormon community had always been overwhelmingly Anglo-Saxon Protestant American in culture and religious style. Thus, global dispersion presented the dangerous possibility of *cultural* dilution and conflict as the Saints moved into exotic areas like Lagos, Nigeria, Jackson, Mississippi, and even Wallingford, Connecticut. The explosive growth of the Church in the U.S. South, in Latin America, in Europe, and in Africa has astonished students of American religion. After considerable success in Japan, Korea, and Hong Kong, Mormon missionaries are now trying to penetrate the People's Republic of China, and will doubtless succeed, as they did, spectacularly so, in the defunct Eastern-bloc police state of the German Democratic Republic. By the 1970s, Mormons were beginning to grapple with new cultures light-years removed from their Anglo-Saxon Protestant heritage, like the Islam of West Africa and the Catholicism of Southern Europe. By 1990 the Mormons were no longer a racially and culturally homogeneous people concentrated in one place. Scattered throughout the world since World War II, Mormon peoplehood could no longer be defined by place.

But one old Mormon institution proved more than equal to the task of forestalling the dilution of Mormon community: the early Mormon system of wards and stakes. In 1955, for example, the Church administered all of New England through its most embryonic level of bureaucratic classification: the New England Mission. Back in the early 1950s Mormon missions were like the Louisiana Purchase; central authorities back in Utah drew a line around it, but didn't know exactly what was in it. By the 1970s the rapid growth of membership in New England allowed the Church to start dividing New England into regular stakes and wards.

Significantly, the Church earlier assigned this key role to the wards and stakes at two moments of crisis and adaptation to the secular world: 1877-80 and 1890-1914. In the earlier period, Brigham Young had begun assigning heavier religious duties to the ward, and after the wrenching Manifesto of 1890, the general authorities began to see the ward as the basis of the communal life of the Church, making it the locus of Scouting, athletic programs, drama, dance, genealogy, as well as prayer and worship. The First Presidency increased its printed instructions to the wards from practically nothing in 1890, to a distribution of guidance materials to all ward bishops by 1893, to a vast and uniform apparatus of instruction by 1913, that included fifty-page instruction handbooks for the ward-level administration of records, recommends, ordinances, buildings, quorums, transgressions, and the teaching of classes.[28] By 1914 the new standardized ward was more than equal to the task of supplying some of the communal solidarity lost with the abandonment of polygamy in 1890 and the decay of the Ordervilles before that date; and now, in the late-twentieth century, that communal cohesion seems further threatened by the success of Mormon internationalization and the spatial scattering of Mormons at home in North America.

Equally dramatic were changes in the daily life of the wards. Once a partly secular division for convenience in governing the first planned Mormon city of Nauvoo, much like the political wards of other cities, the local wards had by the 1940s become something like communes. While they did not share meals or property, ward members did enjoy intense personal interaction and interdependence. The general authorities could not have foreseen what might be called the Psychological Ward of the Church: the place for meaningful personal relationships as well as for study and worship.

Thus in the wards of Paris, provincials, African blacks,

Parisians, and Americans can all meet together and feel at home. Children of newly arrived families quickly make friends in the Church Primary program and in organizations for other age groups. Parents (fathers) may have to learn to conduct a sacrament meeting in French; they may have kind words for another recent member, a divorced mother of six, who sits uncomfortably in a husband-male dominated round of lively meetings for worship and study. In short, the Mormon ward community tames a possibly hostile alien culture.

No sooner had it begun to flourish than the Psychological Ward met a possible nemesis: the flood of non-English speaking converts that began to affect ward life in the 1950s and which came to a head in the 1980s. At first the general authorities made the right theological assumption: all races are equal and wards should be integrated; and thus by the 1960s "multi-cultural" wards appeared in stakes from Utah to California, mixing Hispanics, Anglos, Asians, Americans, and Europeans. Inevitably frictions arose and the Church has yielded considerable ground. In recent years some self-segregated black wards have arisen in places like Charlotte, North Carolina, but in general Mormons have succeeded much better than either the mainline churches or the sectarians in amalgamating with "different" ethnic or cultural groups: consider the standard Catholic ethnic parishes, the Korean Baptist churches, or the white lower-middle-class Assemblies of God.

Unlike the Catholic Church, the only other church professing to be the universal church for all peoples, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints has been trying for thirty years to deal with the difficulties presented by ethnic wards. The Catholic Church can appoint a minimally paid priest to minister to the needs of a parish, but Mormonism depends on the leadership of each and every member of a ward or branch. Thus, for a small ethnic branch to become a real ward, the foreign converts in that branch must have a minimal cadre of "priesthood leadership" trained in Mormon scripture, ordinances, administrative rules, and ways of life. Ethnic wards composed of untrained, non-English-speaking converts cannot take on regular ward duties until they build up the minimum of skills needed to staff a bishopric. By integrating converts into Mormon ward culture, the Church had some hope of preserving the unity and cooperation needed for peaceful communal life. Unlike the hundreds of Catholic ethnic parishes, many of them moribund, the LDS church has living, teaching wards that can acculturate foreigners. This ultimately strengthens Mormon peoplehood, a trait essential to the definition of Mormonism. The Catholic Church enjoys no such sense of peoplehood; it uses the common Christian phrase "People of God" only in a theological sense.

Since 1945 two developments have posed threats to the integrity of Mormon religious community. One is the widespread affluence, materialism, and hedonism of America since World War II. The other is the spatial dilution of the Mormon community throughout the world.

But the sudden influx of a huge number of Asian and Hispanic converts has forced the Church to compromise its goal of close fellowship and uniformity. In somewhat the same manner, the U.S. Catholic Church, without worrying much about community, had to accommodate the arrival of millions of Catholics during the New Immigration of 1865-1921. The Catholic Church faced a less daunting challenge. She did not have to deal with Asians and African Catholics, since none were allowed entry after the increasingly harsh exclusion and quota acts of 1886-1924. She did not have to teach basic doctrines, since newcomers had presumably learned the basic articles of their faith in their countries of origin. She did not have to train *every* boy to be a priest and a missionary, as do the Mormons, since the Roman Catholic Church had never accepted even a modified version of the Reformation doctrine of the "priesthood of all believers." The difficulty for the Catholic Church lay not so much in its polity as in the sheer numbers of new Catholics (millions as compared with some tens of thousands of Mormon converts) and inter-ethnic rivalries between differing national Catholic traditions, most notably the Americanist controversy.[29]

Moreover, since most recent Mormon converts were not Euro-Americans but non-English-speaking peoples of color, the LDS church found it much harder to integrate these more exotic groups into the daily life of a Mormon ward life than, say, the Catholic Church did in trying to incorporate Europeans like the Poles, Irish, and Italians who made up the ethnic parishes of Catholicism. Finally, the Mormons had to face a historical coincidence that had never disturbed the Catholic polity based on parishes-in-a-diocese: the explosive growth in foreign Mormon converts came at the height of a resurgence of American ethnic-group nationalism (the white "rise of the unmeltable ethnic" and the African-American "black nationalism") between 1972 and the late 1980s. Hispanic,

Native American, and African-American members of the LDS church were particularly conscious of their rights as minorities in relation to the white majority dominating their church. In fact, in 1989 the Church had to formally excommunicate its first Native-American general authority, Elder George P. Lee, who had protested the alleged racism of an oppressive caucasian majority.[30]

It was partly, no doubt, in response to wounded ethnic pride and troublesome ethnic rivalries—tiresome old stories in American history from which Mormons are not immune—that the Church began, bit by bit, to yield on the ideal of integration. In California, for example, the burgeoning number of converts among Tongans, Laotians, Vietnamese, Samoans, Cambodians, and Hispanics have forced the general authorities, willy-nilly, to go along with ethnic branches and wards, at least for the time being. Pressure from non-Caucasians in the United States, West Africa, and South America also reportedly prompted the "black priesthood revelation" in 1978, and the quiet expunging (as "misprints") from Mormon scriptures and religious discourse phrases like "white and delightsome." Catholicism was not burdened with such scriptures.[31]

The many new ethnic wards represent a de facto reversal of policy, though reversal may be too strong a word for the weak implementation of integrationist policies. At first it was the Church itself that suggested separate wards: in 1961-62, at the first flush of internationalization, two of the Twelve serving on the Church's Indian and Foreign Language Committee strongly favored a new policy of separate ethnic congregations (wards and branches) in the American West. The Church clearly intended to show respect for ethnic pride and cultural autonomy—certainly not to segregate in the racist connotation of that term. But in 1972 the First Presidency began transferring Lamanites (Native Americans) and persons of color back to geographically defined units (wards and stakes), adding special programs and high level encouragement to help with acculturation and religious education.[32]

Since the early 1970s the Church has vacillated between a compassionate understanding of converts' needs by allowing ethnic branches and wards and, on the other hand, the Mormon ideal of integrated wards: the community of like-minded, more-or-less equal Saints. More often than not, this vacillation has ended up letting ethnic convenience prevail over the ideal of a multi-cultural, integrated branch or ward. Thus, even a German branch that the Church organized in 1963 as a "temporary" unit in Salt Lake City—and which it could easily have integrated with other white groups—has remained German to this day.

The main arguments for ethnic units are (1) that they allow foreign converts to be "comfortable" with their own and (2) the desire of ethnic nationalists to object to assimilation and loss of inherited language and culture. Neither argument comports with the Mormon tradition of self-sacrifice and uniform subordination to authority. But such arguments may well justify the self-segregation of African-American wards, because African-Americans have an extremely powerful American subculture permeated by a special Christian tradition that is older than Mormonism.[33] Ironically, Mormon elders face an easier task excising Buddhist beliefs than in challenging African-American religious beliefs—whose late-eighteenth-century Protestant roots they share and whose Christian fervor they can view with ready empathy.

For all the vacillation and compromise, the communal ideal of integration persists. As recently as 1988, Elder Paul H. Dunn, then a member of the First Quorum of the Seventy, forcefully expressed it, asking, "Do you think when we get to the other side of the veil the Lord is going to care whether you came from Tonga or New Zealand or America? . . . No. . . . The color of skin, the culture we represent, the interests we have are all quite secondary to the concept of the great eternal family."[34] It is entirely possible that in some multi-ethnic metropolitan areas like the one covered by the Oakland California Stake, the far larger stake organization will act as the integrating unit for ethnically defined wards. But the stake, a large unit comprising up to a dozen wards, cannot be the basic unit of Mormon community, for it intrinsically limits the number of direct face-to-face relations. In the meantime, while the Church's roller-coaster policy on the issue of ethnic-ward-or-integrated-ward continues, the wards are still working as communal social units from the South Pacific to eastern Europe.

Some historical perspective on Mormon ethnic groups suggests that what seems to be vacillation is in reality a kind of American pragmatism. Mormon ethnic wards are not new, having emerged among the thousands of Scandinavian converts before the Civil War—almost as early as Catholic ethnic parishes. Although the Anglo majority did not perceive the earlier groups, like the Danes, as shockingly different, they did condescend to them as "ugly ducklings" in the Church, but still light-skinned birds of a feather.[35] In sum, the LDS church, measured against its own communitarian ideal of total communal integration and judged in the light of the ethnic crises of the 1970s, from the Mormon converts in Lagos to the Mormon converts among the thousands of Laotians in Fresno, had achieved a great deal more socially and religiously for its members than did the well-established Catholic Church.

The collapse, beginning in the 1960s, of the old Euro-Catholic ethnic parish throws light on the unique nature of the Mormon ward-and-stake system. The great difference between a so-called Mormon ethnic ward and the old Euro-Catholic ethnic parish was communitarian and religious. In the 1980s, the Catholic ethnic parishes, vibrant social centers for more than three generations, suddenly died a death caused less by apostasy and dearth of priests than by the success of immigrant sons and daughters, who "made it" and became super-Americans. During the 1980s, just when Mormon ethnic wards were multiplying, the archbishops of New York, Detroit, Chicago, and other cities were closing down scores of old ethnic parishes representing hundreds of millions of dollars in property and echoing with the sweaty lives and sacrifices of millions of immigrants. In June 1990 the Archdiocese of Chicago closed down twenty-eight parishes and eighteen schools. A few elderly grandparents, left behind in the flight to suburbia

of the post-World War II years, sat weeping in pews already up for auction. They protested and even took back statues bequeathed by their forbearers.[36]

The so-called "Euro-village" had served a primarily *social function* superbly, but failed as a religious institution. As I have already noted, since the Mormon ward achieves community—not through ethnic identity or by organizing mutual help (Euro-parishes) in a hostile society but through *communal religious activity* conceived in 1831 in Zion and grounded in a communitarian concept, however deeply betrayed, of shared or justly distributed wealth—it is hardly surprising that in the late 1980s converts among poor Lamanites (Native Americans) and some Third World branches have "discovered" Zion's old Law of Consecration and Stewardship by reading Mormon scripture, and have tried to put the old utopian economic plan into practice![37] Unlike Catholic parish boundaries, Mormon ward geographical boundaries can be, and are, redrawn *ad libitum* because the community of ward *members* and not the geographical lines define the local unit. Geographical lines are matters of administrative convenience, changing immediately when the addition of many new ward members pushes the envelope. At that point a natural, unforced mitosis begins. This mitosis, or splitting off, also occurs at the lower "branch" level; thus, when a branch of newly converted Laotians in Fresno becomes large enough and well enough versed in doctrine and Church rules, it becomes a ward.

One old Mormon institution proved more than equal to the task of forestalling the dilution of Mormon community: the early Mormon system of wards and stakes.

In short, the Catholic parishes were socio-political communities which expire when social self-interest ceases; whereas Mormon wards are communal societies which die their deaths only when religious activity ends.

GIVEN the transportability of the ward-and-stake system throughout the world and its effectiveness in creating communities of culturally variegated members, the Mormons no longer need a Gathering or concentration of Saints in the American West or even in the traditional "Mormon Villages," which have been called the "progenitors of the ward."[38] In contrast to utopian religious communitarians like the Hutterites who must continually face a search for new places of isolation and separation from "the world," the Mormons no longer need to escape to the geographical isolation of McGrath, Canada, or any other spot on the earth. They no longer need Utah or places like "Mormon Country." They can simply export the ward, and use it to bring different kinds of people together, face to face. The fears of a dozen years ago that the ward might be too American to be exported or that its communal functions might conflict with the Church's new emphasis on family life have proved groundless.

The early Mormon institutions of the ward and its ward bishop can bring the Saints together, face-to-face. Africans, Parisians, and Americans in a Paris ward. Tongans, Hispanics, and Anglos in a Salt Lake ward. As it enters the last decade of the century, the Mormon community can survive without resorting to a sacred Mormon geography and without spatial isolation, because the locus of Mormon community is now in their hearts and minds and because it has inherited certain institutional devices to cope with growth.

Now a huge ecclesiastical corpus known as The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, the Mormon community seems to have discarded the need of the early Church to segregate itself spatially and seems to feel little need in this day of individual wealth to share many things in common. But as we shall see, even these two ancient elements of communitarian life—segregation and sharing—have survived in not entirely vestigial ways. Moreover, the Mormons have expanded and perfected old institutional devices like the local ward system (as a way of preserving a good deal of their old face-to-face community) and the Church welfare system (as a way of sharing material things). Thus they have managed to keep a separation between themselves and outside "tribes." Anthropologists and sociologists call this institutional and psychological "boundary maintenance."

Above, I posed the question of whether the silence of the general authorities on the resumption of the Gathering to Missouri represented a betrayal of Mormon doctrine, and whether cessation of the Gathering and the world-wide dispersion of the Saints represents a dangerous dilution of the Mormons as a people or community. Doubtlessly the cessation of the Gathering to Zion (or even to Utah) in this century has weakened the communalism of the Mormon people, but it has not destroyed it. For one thing, the Mormons still teach the coming Millennium. For another, all the Saints realize that a

coming Millennium. For another, all the Saints realize that a massive return to Missouri was impossible after the murder of the Prophet in 1844, given the rabid anti-Mormonism of the period up to the abandonment of polygamy in 1890 and given the growth of the huge non-Mormon metropolitan area of western Missouri during the twentieth century. A scriptural solution for this seeming betrayal of the revelation of the Lord commanding the Saints to gather at the Center Place of Zion may eventually be found in the Mormon doctrine of continuing revelation.

In the meantime, the Mormons have been remarkably successful in maintaining their communal sense, their peoplehood, their community, without the emotional support of the doctrine of Gathering to the Center Place of Zion; for during the twentieth century and especially since 1945, the Mormon community, while maintaining a separation from the world, has become independent of place—either of Utah or the City of Zion. In fact, placing the Center of Zion in the United States seems embarrassingly ethnocentric to many internationalist Mormons. Still, no student of Mormon history and culture must ever forget that Jackson County, Missouri, remains a sacred Mormon place. In converting Catholics, Asians, or African Moslems, the Church has sometimes faced challenges to its teachings—like the embarrassing query of African Moslem polygamists about the Church's refusal to permit polygamy. And the almost unmanageable growth of conversion throughout the world has blindsided the Church to centrality of its millennial Center Place in the pedestrian state of Missouri, the Place that Jesus Christ may, any day, come to inhabit—with almost no Saints to greet him. But despite these theological problems the Church has so far preserved its feeling of community. It is the first post-Reformation religion to combine global extension while preserving primary relationships, doctrinal orthodoxy, and the psychological group-consciousness of being a special people. Thus, in a very real sense the Mormonism of 1990 has remained communitarian.

But the question now arises: Will the Church be able to preserve the kind of primary relationships and peaceful consensus that are characteristic of very small religious groups and utopian socialist societies? Having more or less survived the corrosive materialistic and moral currents of the Sixties, can the Latter-day Saints continue to safeguard their sense of peoplehood and community into the 1990s?

E.
THE PERSISTENCE OF MORMON COMMUNITY INTO THE 1990S

HISTORIANS are not time doctors or prophets, but they can perceive in past patterns of Mormon success certain devices and institutions that promise much for the future. The ward and stake system is only one of several such devices and institutions. The perceived loss of spirituality and the spatial dilution of the Mormon population are probably related; at any rate, both will benefit from the safety nets that imaginative Saints are weaving from the threads of their communitarian history. What are those threads?

In searching Mormon history, especially from the last years of Brigham Young to the 1950s, I conclude that the best hope for the persistence of Mormon community into the 1990s lies in the re-invigoration or creative recycling of that old set of institutions and attitudes inherited from early Mormon communitarianism, that is, from the City of Zion and its related United Order of Enoch. The City of Zion and its Order are of course practically defunct, but institutions and attitudes stemming from those millennial roots are deeply embedded in Mormon history and tradition. The old millennial mind emphasized the community of a saved people, a rough equality of status, and a burning faith in Zion.

I do not wish to exaggerate the influence of certain communitarian remnants, especially in light of the legendary Mormon reputation for prowess in the anti-communitarian world of business. No identifiable religious group in the United States loves capitalism more and succeeds at it better than the Mormons. How, one might ask, can the Mormons be communal and capitalistic at the same time? The answer lies in their ability to compartmentalize, to distance themselves from the greed of everyday business life and retain community among themselves. And they could never have retained that life of community were it not for the survival, almost 160 years after the founding of the City of Zion, of certain attitudes and institutions.

To fathom the strange survival of Mormon Peoplehood into the 1990s, we must return to that third and most ancient definition of community and then see how it helps explain how the social inventions of the Mormons have kept them together as a cohesive people. For those of us who study utopian communes like the Shakers, the Harmonists, the Benedictines, or the Mormon United Orders, the meaning is much more specific: Utopian communities are intentional communities, usually isolated, and often sharing a community of goods. Arthur Bestor Jr.'s standard communitarian definition of religious community depends on four notions:

(1) The *isolation from the larger society*, achieved at an earlier period by spatial isolation in Missouri, in the City of Nauvoo, in the far-off Utah desert, can now be achieved by various devices of boundary maintenance, like socializing and marrying within the Mormon group and enforcing the dietary laws known as the Word of Wisdom. Before the 1890s the geographical isolation of the Saints in the Great Basin guaranteed the preservation of primary group relationships, but that became increasingly difficult in the twentieth century. One central solution, or surrogate, for geographical isolation was the ward headed by that key to Mormonism, the local bishop, and designed both architecturally and in size of membership to facilitate primary group relationships. I am confident that the extraordinary vitality of the ward system will insure face-to-face relationships within the Mormon community well into the twenty-first century.

(2) A second aspect of the definition of Mormon community is *shared ideas about salvation and life on earth: particularly*

for their *commitment* to belief and their loyalty to the Church that teaches them; Rosabeth Kanter's well-known analysis of the longevity of certain utopian communities rested largely on the level of commitment,[39] as does the famous thesis of Dean Kelley, to explain why the conservative churches, including Mormonism, were growing during the 1970s, while the mainline churches were declining.

(3) The third criterion is some attempt *to share wealth or property*, however unequal the sharing may be. One of the modern Mormon remnants of this ideal is tithing.

(4) And finally, people belonging to a utopian community, like the Shakers after 1784 or the Mormons in the 1831 City of Zion, *regard themselves as a saved, elect, special people, chosen by God*—much as the Jews were chosen.

In highly modified form these four criteria may be applied to late twentieth-century Mormonism.[40]

1.
Isolation and Primary Relationships

IF we begin with the first of these principles—isolation and primary relationships—and if we attempt to apply it to present-day Mormonism, one may justly ask: How can seven million people enjoy close primary relationships, especially if many live outside the United States?

I have already suggested one answer: all Latter-day Saints live in highly-controlled wards. In that sense, Mormonism conforms to Bestor's definition of a small, isolated society. As small social units, Mormon wards are roughly comparable to the hundreds of small Hutterite communes of 100 to 400 persons. Like a Hutterite commune, the Mormon ward can never become just another half-dead, mainline Christian parish. Like the Hutterite communes, Mormon wards are not permitted to become too big for face-to-face relationships, as happens in the more successful evangelical churches of the South. Thus, the 10,000-member Hyde Park Baptist Church of Austin Texas, while wealthy and numerous, is, compared to the Mormon ward, a non-communal enterprise. To preserve group solidarity and community, the LDS church wisely limits the size of local wards, splitting them off like old Hutterite settlements when they get too big. The general authorities have not assigned a strict numerical cap, but there have been few wards of over a thousand members for any period of time before being divided. Similarly, the general authorities, having accepted inequality as one of the less happy side effects of capitalism, make no attempt to equalize wards. With the mushrooming of affluent suburbs after World War II, many Mormons now live in wealthy wards (jokingly called "good wards") with few working-class members. Increasingly, Mormon wards do not always preserve that "rough equality" of the earliest Mormons, and this incipient socio-economic stratification of wards is not a good omen for the future of Mormon community. But the ward and its hardworking bishop remain the backbone of Mormon community. In the words of one Mormon historian:

> The Mormon ward seems to be somewhere between the casualness of a congregation and the totality of a monastic order. It carries out the basic functions of most Christian congregations. . . . But there are essential communitarian functions also—the fellowship, the communion, the association. The ward has a distinctive Mormon mix that is beyond a congregation.[41]

Will the Church be able to preserve the kind of primary relationships and peaceful consensus that are characteristic of very small religious groups and utopian socialist societies?

There are of course several crucial differences between ward-level Mormonism and strict, old-style religious communitarians like the Hutterites, most notably asceticism and the common life. The Hutterites stress plain living and practice "consumptive austerity." While robustly comfortable in some 350 colonies in the western United States and Canada, they do not permit fancy houses or apartments in their communes. They steadfastly resist the temptation to enjoy the luxuries so readily available with their accumulating wealth. Mormons, of course, do not reject comfortable living. The Hutterites, numbering over 36,000 souls in North America, live in spatially bounded communes and take all their meals together; the last Mormons to live this way were the United Order members of late nineteenth-century Utah. The four main boundary maintenance devices of the Hutterites are spatial separation, distinctive dress, a modified German language, and uncompromising beliefs with internal consistency. Mormons have given up geographical isolation, but their speech and literature is permeated with a special rhetoric and vocabulary, they have always had some kind of moderate dress code (the most obvious to outsiders is the well-known Mormon missionary attire), and their beliefs are

as rigidly uncompromising as they are logically consistent. Not surprisingly, Mormon boundary devices have always found their strongest expression in their Ordervilles and other communes.[42]

THE everyday life of a Mormon ward compensates in part for the loss of the bygone ways of the United Order. Ideally, members of a typical ward all know one another (at least all the active members), though with the transient American culture there are always some who don't know everyone. Listening to testimonies given on Fast Sundays, ward members may even be privy to intimate and (rarely) to sinful behavior. Testimonies are almost never significant "confessions" in the sense of revealing personal sins, but they come close by indirection. A teenager may, with much weeping, state that she has been nasty to her mother but that in spite of difficulties she is "grateful to the Lord for all his love." A testimony of love and gratitude may go on for ten emotion-laden minutes, with the speaker naming the names of those she loves and often sobbing. More ritualized than most Latter-day Saints realize,[43] a testimony invariably ends with a standard phrase, usually some variant of "And I know this gospel to be true. . . ." Public confessions of love and, less often, of shortcomings strengthen group feeling and loyalty, and thus become an effective instrument of Mormon community. Kanter calls such expressions of emotional loyalty to group teachings and to other members of a cohesive group "affective commitment" and views them as a way of maintaining social control and group solidarity. Public confession (the word "confession" is perhaps too strong for what the Mormons do in testimony meetings) may also prove to be a constructive outlet for hostile feelings that may otherwise lead to extremism and conflict—as Boyer and Nissenbaum have shown in the history of Puritan witchcraft and the Great Awakening.[44] Mormon scholars may find examples of such emotional expressions as far back as the 1830s in the Far West Record, which contains the minutes of the High Council from 1830 to 1839. More than once they are related to the resolution of conflict among members and end with "extending the hand of fellowship."[45]

Mormonism dispensed with Protestant revivalism (as in the Great Awakening) with its public mourner's bench and its converting experiences. Since Mormons consider themselves a saved community, such revivalist practices were and remain meaningless. The nearest thing to a revival is the semi-annual, all-Church general conference. "Conference time" is a very exciting and faith-promoting event for pious Latter-day Saints.

Similarly, Mormonism, because it has other ways of resolving individual guilt or conflicts with authority, has nothing like the Shaker or Catholic practice of requiring the personal confession of sins to a leader. Nevertheless, Mormons do have a psychological parallel in their commonplace practice of meeting privately with the ward bishop to discuss ("confess") sins (or "problems") ranging from hatred and drinking to sexual transgressions and murder. The bishop, a "judge in Israel," has to power to "forgive sins for the Church" or to impose some kind of discipline ranging from informal probation (which might forbid taking the sacrament) to initiating a formal proceeding which can result in disfellowshipment or excommunication. This practice reinforces affective commitment and comforts the individuals involved, who, nevertheless, must also seek a personal revelation of forgiveness from God. Additionally, temple-going members must annually meet with the bishop and answer affirmatively a series of "worthiness" questions in order to continue attending the temple.

Theologically, Mormonism views really serious sin as a kind of apostasy that requires the full-blown formal ordinance of "baptism [or re-baptism] for the remission of sins." Baptism is, then, the formal procedure or "sacrament" for the expiation of sin. Historically, baptism has been both a rite of entrance and a way for the candidate to have his or her sins remitted. Twentieth-century Mormons get re-baptized only after being tried and excommunicated: the Church tries women and lower ranking men (who do not hold the Melchizedek priesthood) at the lower, ward level (bishopric), but men who hold the Melchizedek priesthood must stand trial before the high council (stake level). But for nineteenth-century Mormons, re-baptism served to heal individuals; earlier Saints often sought re-baptism as a common form of re-commitment (repentance) and even used it as a mode of blessing-seeking (e.g., re-baptism for their health). No rigid court system; just the communal cement of simple folk faith. In the twentieth century, as Mormon isolation in Utah broke down, the Church became increasingly formalistic, and re-baptism turned into a form of boundary maintenance.

The primary relationships that one can observe in Mormon wards resemble those that prevail in utopian communities, including those of the early Mormons. But the relationships are much less intense. The Church also helps maintain the uniformity that reinforces community by providing standard interior ward chapel plans. Mormons may thus travel to almost any corner of the globe and feel at home in a new ward. In this way the Church recognizes that uniform architecture can influence behavior in a positive way. Interiors are businesslike, devoid of decoration. In the words of a Church official long responsible for church architecture, "we turn people over so quickly" in wards that there is no need of decoration. Thus by its cheap but useful chapel design the Church dissociates the chapel's pragmatic function as a convenient set-up for committee meetings, testimonies, sacrament meetings, and scripture study—the maintenance of community—from mere location. The Catholic Church ties its parishes to sacred church buildings which often survive empty and without function. When, in the 1960s and 1970s, the highly-mobile population of Saints expanded and moved, the Mormons sold off their old chapels with little of the agony of Catholics who were simultaneously losing their inner-city Euro-churches.

The pragmatic policy of requiring colorless, replaceable ward chapel buildings stands in stark contrast to the lovingly constructed temples, sacred spaces designed to bind all Saints in one or more stakes to the larger, eternal community of the deceased, particularly relatives, with whom one can rejoin

after death. The Saints view their temple not as a businesslike jumble of meeting rooms but as a sacred space.

Faced with impossible funding demands of momentous growth in the 1990s, the Church has been using sub-standard chapels in third-world countries, not to accommodate to foreign cultures but to cut back in expenses. As Mormonism moves into other cultures like those in Africa or Asia, the look-alike architecture designed in Utah seems to have presented problems, at least to aesthetically-minded Mormon intellectuals. But given the pragmatic function of the ward chapel in Mormon community, neither the loss of architectural uniformity preferred by Church bureaucrats nor the bland and boring designs decried by Mormon intellectuals present any serious problem. In fact, there is evidence that the grass shack chapel in Samoa and the ugly storefront in Guatemala may actually help the image of the Church. Recently, in developing missionary areas, the Church has been experimenting with the "basic unit" plan which creates local units small enough to meet in members' homes. Some leaders speculate that the primary buildings the Church may build in these countries will only be temples.

WARD organization, ward chapel design, the practice of public confession (called "testimony bearing") at ward sacrament meetings, the watchfulness of the bishop over the daily lives of the Saints, and distinctive church architecture are but a few of the dozens of Mormon communal customs, organizations, and institutions that provide partial but effective surrogates for the face-to-face relationships of living together in the pioneer utopian communities. One could mention, for example, the various social groups for different ages and genders, the family home visits, the single adult wards, and even a ward containing over 300 widows. In each ward women are assigned as "visiting teachers" to other women. Their responsibility is more than a monthly visit where they pray or expound scripture; they also may bring food to a reclusive ward member or help find a job for another. Similarly, paired men are "home teachers" to assigned households. A teacher is one of the offices in the priesthood and is the ubiquitous assignment of all adult males. In these outreach duties, men are representatives of the ward bishop and their priesthood quorum leader, women of the Relief Society president.

> **The only group that comes anywhere near the Mormons in providing primary relationships at the ward level are the Jehovah's Witnesses. But compared with the Mormons, the communal achievement of the Witnesses is unimpressive, simply because they have not had to confront the variegated social and economic mix so striking in the Mormon church since World War II.**

Since Mormonism has no local paid clergy, all members are asked to accept assignments or "callings." Both men and women form bonds working with others in the various institutions of the ward, e.g., in Scout leadership, teaching youth or adult classes, or serving in a three-person presidency of an organization. All local callings are temporary so there is a constant rotation of personnel up and down the hierarchy; it is not uncommon for a president of an organization to be released and called as a subordinate Sunday School teacher. No Mormon feels this to be a demotion or loss of status in the Church. In this way it closely resembles the "release" of a Ph.D. manager of a typical Israeli kibbutz from "business manager" (leader) to kitchen duty in the kibbutz dining room. Experience in these support networks provides personal support and friendship, strengthens faith, and builds community.

The fundamental changes in the rhythm of Mormon life ordered by the general authorities in January 1990 for the upcoming decade may reduce the intensity of all this extra-familial interaction. These new rules for the "use of time" in the 1990s remind the historian of the preoccupation of the Mormons' Puritan ancestors with the "misspence of time." The general authorities hope to reduce the number of weekend hours spent in Church activities and increase the amount of religious energy expended within the family "where it belongs."[46]

The only group that comes anywhere near the Mormons in providing primary relationships at the ward level are the Jehovah's Witnesses. But compared with the Mormons, the communal achievement of the Witnesses is unimpressive, simply because they have not had to confront in their narrow demographic makeup the kind of variegated social and economic mix so striking in the Mormon church since World War II—a rich diversity of classes, races, and nationalities, and a high level of humanistic education—all characteristics of the Mormon people that make it hard to maintain community.[47] A sensitive historian of the Mormon ward has rightly concluded that "the Mormon ward embodies a communal religion that is utopian in many ways, even if it is not as millennial as it used to be."[48]

2.
Shared Ideas Like Perfectionism and Millennialism

A SECOND criterion in our definition of a religious community of chosen people has to do with shared ideas, e.g., the continual striving after *perfection* in their institutions. And certainly the Latter-day Saints are legendary strivers. To avoid the confusion that attends the use of *perfection* by historians and theologians of American Christianity, one may make a distinction between a *spiritual perfectionism* of the soul (sought by John Humphrey Noyes or the Shakers; a state of sinlessness) and a new kind of *behavioral perfectionism* (striven for by Mormons and by the liberal reformers of the 1830s who believed that Christians could perfect the behavior of the larger secular world). Behavioral perfectionism strives not for a state of sinlessness, but a sense of the power of free agency to change or better oneself and the society at large. Free agency is a powerful Mormon belief rooted in the second of the thirteen articles of faith.

To cite three Mormon examples: First, in their justly renowned missionary program the Latter-day Saints have tried to perfect their methods by exploiting all the latest techniques and devices in the mass media and by perfecting and expanding (since the 1950s) the superbly administered Missionary Training Center—probably the most effective institution of its kind in the world. Second, they have committed themselves with renewed fervor to find every conceivable means for preserving the integrity of the family by reemphasizing eternal temple marriages and the centrality of family life; by reinvigorating (since 1965)[49] the institution of Family Home Evening, and by expanding both visiting teaching (by women) and family home teaching (by men). Third, they have nurtured the Mormon mentality of individual perfection (within community) by means of dozens of customs and institutions, particularly the effective system of indoctrination from Primary in early childhood, through Cub and Boy Scouts, then the Young Men and Young Women auxiliaries (from 1875 to 1970 the Church officially called these two important organizations, in perfectionist style, Young Men's *Mutual Improvement* Association and Young Women's *Mutual Improvement* Association), and, finally, reaching that ultimate morally and intellectually demanding stage of perfection, the Melchizedek Priesthood (except for women). Each of these stages includes some form of progression *within* the stage. Particularly important is the transition from the three lower Aaronic priesthood orders (males age 12 to 18) to the full Melchizedek priesthood (ordinarily 18 and older); and even here the Church, in 1970, planted a little future-oriented perfection into the "lesser priesthood" (the Aaronic Order) by renaming its adult members "prospective elders" instead of "adult Aaronic." For young adults, there is the Pursuit of Excellence goal-setting program. For all adults the Church has outlined six areas of personal and family preparedness, supported by Church programs and publications, for which members are encouraged to set goals.[50]

The most powerful of the shared ideas of the early Mormons, their *millennialism*, is no longer the powerful source of communal cohesiveness that it once was. (I will discuss this below in Section 4, "A Special People of God.")

3.
Sharing Wealth or Property

A THIRD and problematic part of my definition of Mormon community is social and economic equality. It must be emphasized that neither Joseph Smith nor the original revelations setting up the Law of Consecration and Stewardship contemplated absolute economic equality among the Saints. Still, individuals were supposed to faithfully manage their stewardships to create a surplus which would be given to the bishop who would use it to set up others in self-sustaining stewardships. Certainly a kind of rough equality was intended, even to inviting poor converts from the Eastern states to receive their free, landed inheritances in the City of Zion—until too many began arriving to claim their small equalized farms.[51]

In most utopian communes, economic and social living arrangements are approximately equal. Individual "income," usually in the form of a personal cash allowance, is very rare; if earned outside the community, the salaried income is handed over to a common treasury. Members of the community share meals and living space. Wherever possible they share communal work. One may distinguish between economic and social expressions of communal equality. The modern Mormon surrogate for the social aspect of equality has been partly the large family and partly contributions of labor to the Church Welfare Program. The Church also uses egalitarian titles to soften the strong hierarchical structure of Mormon governance.

Turning to the first of these surrogates—the family—it may be postulated to anyone who has lived in a large family that is tied together by strong religious faith that such families become a mini-commune. If one connects this mini-commune-family to the powerful doctrines of eternal marriage, of countless spirits of unborn human beings clamoring for tabernacles of flesh; if one takes note of the fact that every married Saint can expect the reunion of his or her family in the afterlife; and if, finally, one recalls that social and emotional ties *between* families can prosper through a social system based on home and visiting teaching and other ward responsibilities, one realizes that the Latter-day Saints have created a *community* of families tied to one another in a complex network woven by ward chapel interaction and by "family home teaching" and "home visits." Even Mormon missionary companions thousands of miles from "Mormon country" get adopted by local Mormon families who give them moral support, provide meals, and share prayers—very different from the typical mainline Christian missionaries. The missionaries stay in the network by attaching themselves to the local ward and its families. So, in a sense, the Mormon families, bound together both here and in the afterlife, can, arguably, supply the same communal function of the old eating- and living-together

nineteenth-century United Orders. When President Spencer W. Kimball advised husbands that they must not rule their families but "preside" over them, he was assuming the need for father-husbands to take governing responsibility over his family-commune, for in the afterlife he will be king of a family kingdom. Nowadays most general authorities would include the word "queen" in speaking of the celestial kingdoms.

The analogy between large families and utopias is strained, but consider more closely the institution of family home teaching. This distinctive institution entails regular visits by two male members (often a father and son) to another ward family with whom they may not even be closely acquainted. They do not visit merely for chit-chat over non-alcoholic drinks but seek a prayerful meeting of minds over gospel truths and "watch over" the family as God's appointed shepherds; the intention is to help strengthen faith, to preach Christian living, and to improve knowledge of Mormon doctrine and scriptures. Often home teachers provide emotional support for dealing with family problems or depression over the loss of a job. The visitors are not acting as social workers for the Church, but they can often direct a suffering Saint to Church-sponsored help in dealing with an absent father or a wayward daughter. What the Germans used to admire as the typical American's *Hilfsbereitschaft* (immediate readiness to be of help) surely survives among the Mormons, who have added a religious dimension to it.

When freewill offerings are added to tithing, and much more offerings are expected from the rich than the poor, the overall funding system becomes progressive and redistributes monies from the rich to the poor.

Granted, home teaching visits are often missed or are perfunctory, and other friendships and relationships in the Church are more significant, but the intimate contacts in family home visits bespeak the communal need to unite with and care for fellow members, to share with persons for whom the teachers may, in fact, have no natural affinity. Their religion and not their mutual pleasure brings them together and creates a network of bonds between dissimilar persons, a communal task that utopians accomplished more effectively by sharing daily meals or sharing property.

The respect for social equality is also reflected in titles. Except for the three members of the First Presidency, Mormons address all ranks in the priesthood down to the lowliest, newly-ordained nineteen-year-old as "Elder" or "Brother." All women, no matter what they're president of, are "Sister." Even the president of the Church—the prophet, seer, and revelator—feels quite comfortable being addressed as Elder or Brother.

The development of the family as the central institution of Mormonism, has, together with the equalitarian local ward structure, enabled the formerly communitarian Mormon church to create a new social basis for community.

THE Latter-day Saint surrogate for rough economic equality is far easier to argue than social equality, and with recent events the trend appears to be toward increased economic equality.

Everybody knows about Mormon tithing. From its inception tithing has served as a test of loyalty, faithfulness, and commitment. When introduced in 1838, tithing was supposed to be a temporary, less-perfect law of the Lord—the minimum surplus amount one was expected to consecrate to the Lord. If the networking that goes on in family home visits speaks to the social aspect of communal equality, then tithing stands at the very center of the economic aspect of equality.[52] Tithing has enabled the Church to protect group integrity against the aggrandizement of particular families or against class jealousy, and no other group has ever made tithing succeed for so long, or on so a large scale, as the Latter-day Saints. As noted above, the Prophet Joseph Smith instituted tithing in 1838 as a simpler, easier, and more individualistic version of the Law of Consecration.[53] While tithing did not demand the giving of all of one's possessions, as did Consecration, it *has* required enormous sacrifices from millions of Latter-day Saints for over the last 160 years. Tithing monies cannot be retained by the local ward for its needs. Bishops must send all monies to the central administration, which now allocates operating expenses to each ward mainly on the basis of "active" members, as defined by sacrament meeting attendance. This recent innovation of financing all ward budgets equally through general tithing funds has significantly reduced the disparities between the richer and poorer ward activities while at the same time shifting the overall cost to the wealthier Saints.

In addition to tithing, ward members are expected to contribute additional "offerings" for missionary work and welfare, so that many Latter-day Saints contribute well over 10 percent

of their income. Recent changes in the financing of full-time missionaries shows a increased sensitivity to economic equality: the monthly cost of supporting a missionary is now the same Church-wide, whether he or she is assigned to London or to an Indian village in Bolivia. As with the equalized ward budgets, this means that richer Saints will subsidize poorer ones, especially since bishops are responsible for collecting the funds from the missionary's savings and family, and from donations from ward members. Clearly the burden of supporting missionaries is being shared more equally.

Besides sharing wealth through tithing, however incompletely, Latter-day Saints have also shared goods and services through their famous Church Welfare Program (which is subsidized by tithing donations), and until recently many have contributed the labor of their hands to local Church farms and canneries.[54] These economic arrangements have reinforced the Mormon sense of community and peoplehood, and the Church of 1990 has been restructuring its "Welfare Program" with a certain measure of pride.[55] The program has its roots in the Law of Consecration and Utah's United Orders, which required the relinquishing of surplus property in a millennial, egalitarian society with "no poor," in the phrase of Mormon scripture. Nowadays, it has the air of a bureaucratic program—only one that "takes care of its own." Even in its innocuous form of philanthropy for other Saints, the Welfare Program does contribute to community. Under the revolutionary new method of centrally-controlled funding inaugurated in January 1990, President Hinckley envisioned the expansion of current sources of individual freewill "fast offerings" outside of the structural requirement of tithing.[56]

In one sense, this renewed emphasis of special freewill offerings for the poor differs little from the eleemosynary practices of the mainline Christian churches and can be seen as indicating a weakening of the corporate order of Zion. From another perspective, however, it can be seen as an expansion of the collective economic order. Under the Law of Consecration and Stewardship, those with more would give a greater surplus to help "exalt" the poor than those with less. Since tithing is a "flat tax," the poor actually feel its pinch more than the rich—it cuts into their necessities but only into the rich's luxuries. However, when freewill offerings are added to tithing, and much more offerings are expected from the rich than the poor, the overall funding system becomes progressive and the redistribution of monies from the rich to the poor becomes a major result.

4.
A Special People of Zion, Chosen by God

ONLY one element of the old definition of utopian communes has fallen into disuse among the Mormons, and that is the fourth and final part of my definition of Mormon religious community: LDS millennialism. The chiliastic claims of early Mormonism, a vivid belief that the latter days were truly at hand—at any moment, perhaps tomorrow—provided the early Mormons with unlimited source of energy. As late as the 1960s, pious Saints prepared for the Last Days by stockpiling food and water in their basement shelters; and while general authorities still preach food storage (as prudent home management), most Saints are perhaps more worried about their mortgages.[57] The many injunctions of early revelations in the Doctrine and Covenants—"Wherefore, stand ye in holy places, and be not moved, until the day of the Lord come; for behold, it cometh quickly" (D&C 87:8)—have lost most of their urgency. The old "warnings" now inspire little more fear than the lukewarm eschatology of the mainline Christian churches.[58]

Still, one could even make a case for the continuing vitality of Mormon millennialism. Aside from the continued practice of food storage, I refer the reader to the return in the 1980s of many Utah Mormons to Zion, to that sacred Center Place of the Last Days, now surrounded by Independence, Missouri. They are also settling in other historically Mormon areas of Missouri abutting Zion, like Clay and Caldwell counties. In recent years, both individual Mormons and the Presiding Bishopric of the Church have purchased considerable amounts of land in Missouri. This is not part of a grand economic conspiracy of the Mormon church—nobody's going to get rich buying land in western Missouri—but it is evidence of that last crucial element of the definition of a primitive Christian community: the coming of the Lord. Unlike other American millennialists, the Mormons located a particular place as Zion: Independence, Jackson County, Missouri. The practical-minded Samoan converts, by some peculiar decisions, may be reminding their fellow Saints of their millennial roots; having studied Mormon scriptures that designate Independence as the place where Christ will come again, some Samoans have been settling not on the U.S. West Coast, but in Jackson County. They believe that they won't have to travel very far to reach the Center Place when the world comes to an end.

Today, as the Mormons disperse to the deepest recesses of Nigeria, to the once hostile East Germany and Sicily, and even to the most sacred precincts of Jerusalem itself, they can rely on the concrete location of Zion, the New Jerusalem, in Western Missouri, to give focus and definition to a scattered people. The old faith in the real Center Place of Zion in Missouri, however weak today (but still distributed on missionary cards bearing the slightly re-edited tenth article of faith[59]), still helps Latter-day Saints maintain the strength and unity of their enjoyment of religious community in a world torn by corrosive moral forces and unforeseen demographic changes. The existence of a tangible place of Zion to which to gather in some distant future gives focus to the Mormon feeling of being a chosen people in these corrupt latter days, just as the real Jerusalem of Israel is for dispersed Jews both a concrete goal and the focus of chosenness. Nevertheless, Mormons have customized the doctrines of Gathering and establishing Zion to the international Church. The Gathering is, and some say always was, to temples, and now that temples dot the globe the gathering place for Koreans is in Korea, Australians Australia, and so forth.[60] Similarly, President Spencer W. Kimball reiterated his belief that the mission of the Church was to

establish Zion as a precondition to the Second Coming. While he didn't counsel the Saints to form United Orders, he told them to eliminate selfishness, to cooperate completely, and to sacrifice whatever is required to help the kingdom of heaven come.[61]

In this matter of chosenness the Jewish People have had some experience. For millennia their special Chosen People theology, sharpened by relentless persecution, has served to hold them together as a people, if not as a community. A Jewish theologian pointedly notes that a disproportionate number of Jews in every country are lukewarm in their commitment to Zion: "Since they find their Zion everywhere, they are at home nowhere."[62] The scattered Mormons, mostly white, no longer cemented by persecution, and now widely respected (despite occasional snide remarks and smiles), still manage to survive as a people and as a community of Saints. Since they find their Zion in ward life, they are at home everywhere.

F. CURRENT THREATS TO MORMON COMMUNITY AND PROSPECTS FOR THE FUTURE

THE Mormon community is not immune to internal and external challenges to group solidarity. In the wake of the 1960s, every U.S. member of the Mormon community has had to face many fundamental changes in American society and intellect. Among the many new dangers, most of them shared by other American social institutions, we may briefly single out just a few: the demands of "marginal" groups for more power, an overly conservative leadership, the lure of Mammon, and—peculiar to the Mormons—a decline in the old anti-Mormon persecution that drew the Saints together for so long.[63]

At the beginning of the 1990s, the most notable sources of strain and conflict can be found in four restive groups: the Native Americans, African Americans, liberal intellectuals, and women. Consider for a moment only the women. Even though the Church incessantly heaps praise on them as wives and mothers, women may in fact be the most angry and frustrated of all four groups. During the great spurt in Mormon growth between the 1960s and the 1990s most converts were teenagers or young adults, and female converts outnumbered male converts almost two to one.[64] These young women, many now in their thirties, represent a leashed power, a reservoir of repressed energy, that will endanger Mormon community unless the Church can soon harness it. In the words of one professional woman in 1975, the first year of a decade of Mormon liberalism, "The Mormon work ethic has created very strong women with nowhere to go. . . . This is not a Sunday religion: it's a way of life."[65]

Gerontocracy may pose another serious threat in that age tends to be slow in addressing new realities. In 1985 the average age of the fifteen top leaders, including President Kimball, his two counselors, the president of the Quorum of the Twelve (Benson), and the Twelve Apostles, was sixty-six; and the top four leaders averaged eighty-five years of age. In this respect the Church seems to be emulating the only other comparable gerontocracy, the Church of Rome. The high average age of the Pope and the College of Cardinals has created a generational conflict between aged leaders and, below them, the younger, progressive Third World clergy and the young of all European nations. It can hardly be advantageous to resemble the present lumbering and ill-informed governing body of the Roman Catholic Church at a time when the Latter-day Saints are expanding at breakneck speed.

Then there is mammon, or money—always a danger to any spiritual entity or any socially cohesive group. For two generations the Latter-day Saints have enjoyed an unprecedented material well-being based on friendly cooperation with the military-industrial complex and on acceptance of the modern consumer culture. California and New York stand first and second in the number of federal military dollars received, but Utah, with its Morton-Thiokol aerospace industry, its military-funded Novell software company, its famous nerve gas installation, and its Air Force base, certainly rivals these two imperial states when it comes to per-capita military income. A relative abundance of money has always imperiled community. Because of some conservative but admirable cultural values, like good education, the veneration of the work ethic, and family stability, Mormons have been better prepared than other Americans to take advantage of the economic opportunities of the 1960s and 1970s. Will Mormons living in the affluence of the American West use the extra time provided by the new, "easier" Church meeting

A relative abundance of money has always imperiled community. Will Mormons living in the affluence of the American West use the extra time provided by the new, "easier" Church meeting schedule to go skiing in Alta? Or will they continue the strong tradition of collecting money for the poor on Fast Sundays? Latter-day Saints seem to be holding mammon at bay, but just barely.

schedule to go skiing in Alta? Or surfing at Laguna Beach? Or will they continue the strong tradition of collecting money for the poor on Fast Sundays—and even return to using Sunday afternoons for the study of scripture? As of 1990, the Latter-day Saints seem to be holding mammon at bay, but just barely.

Finally, I have briefly mentioned the near-disappearance of any serious anti-Mormon enemy. After about 130 years, the decline and disappearance of persecution may weaken that old cement of Mormon community: paranoia.

Even this long article must scant these and other sources of danger to community, most notably an erosion of millennial faith. Many pious older Saints think they can detect a decay in Mormon community. But from my outside historical point of view, for the moment most Mormons can afford to be optimistic. They still use many of the community-building institutions and practices inherited from the past: their ward-and-stake system, their ambitious and demanding system of in-church social and religious education, their continued faithfulness in tithing, and so on. The communitarian inheritance of the past may prove equal to the task of defending group integrity in the future. Also, the Latter-day Saints have developed several other community-building devices. Particularly worthy of mention are two indispensable, historic supports for Mormon commitment and community: (1) missionary zeal and (2) the doctrine of continuing revelation.

As for missionary zeal, it is clear to every observer that the Missionary Training Center in Provo and the subsequent experience of two lonely years of proselytizing, with only rare contacts with parents, are legendary supports for internal loyalty and interdependence.

The power of continuing revelation is less obvious to outsiders. It was the doctrine of continuing revelation, for example, that made it possible in 1978 for President Spencer W. Kimball to receive divine guidance to admit blacks to the priesthood. This crucial revelation defused the incipient conflict with African-Americans in the United States, silenced the internal criticism of liberal intellectuals, and opened up the entire African continent to new missionary triumphs. Moreover, on the popular level, traditional Mormon racist attitudes like the notion that the skin of colored converts will gradually turn white after conversion are rapidly disappearing under the impact of a new Mormon willingness to recognize the injustices done to blacks in American culture.[66]

The nature and function of these two community-building institutions, missionary zeal and continuing revelation, cannot be described and analyzed in detail here, but students of Mormonism have hardly begun to comprehend the way in which they nourish loyalty and assure continuity in the Church.

The historian of Mormonism could catalog a host of other Mormon institutions and practices that have helped the Latter-day Saints preserve a strong sense of community till this day—the long history of economic cooperation, youth groups, family life, modes of indoctrination, and so on. Above all, I have not examined some of the newer social inventions of the Church. These cursory allusions to other instruments of solidarity must suffice for the moment, awaiting the completion of a much larger work.

In the meantime, I make bold to suggest that late twentieth-century Mormonism, for all its American capitalism and consumerism and materialism, still approximates the utopian religious definition of community; and that the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints has been able to survive as a people and not just another religious organization. It remains a people in part because it has inherited a wonderfully effective set of social inventions from the early Mormon communitarians and also in part because it has become a fourth major religious tradition centered on Jerusalem. The continued institutional inventiveness of the Church, especially since 1890, will certainly insure the persistence of the unique peoplehood of the Mormons into the 1990s.

But no mere institution, no social device, can equal in power the primeval and still viable millennial Center Place of Zion and its attendant doctrines of 1831. Like forgotten seeds, ideas from the springtime of Zion may very well sprout again and enable the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints to survive and prosper as a community of minds and hearts well past the two-hundredth anniversary of the birth of Joseph Smith in the year 2005.

NOTES

1. *American Heritage Dictionary*, Second College Edition (1982).

I found the Plotting Zion conference horrifyingly instructive in its terminological confusion about community. Participants used the two fundamental terms that defined the nature of this whole conference, "Zion" and "community," in the most varied and undisciplined manner.

The best introduction to the definitions of community and to some of the historical realizations and failures of community in the United States is Robert V. Hine's *Community on the American Frontier: Separate but Not Alone* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1980).

2. *New York Times*, 29 May 1990.

3. Helen Vendler, citing with approval Iris Marion Young's brisk scrutiny of the use of the word "community" among feminists, in "Feminism and Literature," *New York Review of Books*, 31 May 1990, 21. Vendler goes on to say that:

> Anyone brought up in a tightly knit religious or ethnic community or who has had experience of an intense political group knows the xenophobia that is endemic to homogeneity [in small-town life]. Young's repudiation of the false pastoral of "community" is a necessary questioning of the historical idealization of its value in America, from Brook Farm on.
>
> For the hard-nosed New York critic, community is a bit of fake agrarian sentiment to be sneered at and feared.

4. Daniel Boorstin, *The Americans: The Democratic Experience* (New York: Random House, 1973), "Book One: Everywhere Communities."

5. My use of peoplehood is not to be equated with "ethnic group" definition of the Mormons persuasively argued by Thomas O'Dea and Dean May. See Armand Mauss, "Mormons as Ethnics: Variable Historical and International Implications of an Appealing Concept," 5, in B. Y. Card, Herbert C. Northcott, John E. Foster, Howard Palmer, and George K. Jarvis, eds., *The Mormon Presence in Canada* (Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 1990, and Logan, UT: Utah State University Press, 1990).

6. Rosabeth Moss Kanter, ed., *Communes: Creating and Managing the Collective Life* (New York: Harper & Row, 1973), xi. In 1990 the aging advocates of the counter culture were still searching for community. See, for example, the topical issue of the *Utne Reader: The Best of the Alternative Press* (May/June 1990) on "Roots: A Restless Nation Searches for a Place to Call Home."

7. Until recently no one has dared to defend the non-Mormon socio-political community. In most writings all non-Mormons merge with all anti-Mormons. The first reasoned analysis of the non-Mormon political culture in the Nauvoo

area was that of John E. Hallwas, "Mormon Nauvoo from a Non-Mormon Perspective," originally a paper delivered, courageously I think, before a largely Mormon audience and published in the *Journal of Mormon History* (1990): 85-100. The leading participants in the persecution of the Nauvoo Mormons were the five hundred citizens of Warsaw in Hancock County. Examining sympathetically for the first time the ideas of this "non-Mormon public," Hall rightly pointed out that the people of Warsaw did not react to Nauvoo simply "out of religious bigotry, political frustration, community competition, or frontier belligerence," but also out of their own passionately-held democratic ideals (87). The nub of the conflict lay in their conviction that the good society arose not through a covenant with God that created a people, as at Nauvoo, but through a contract among individuals that created a government (89).

Flanders saw "corporate Mormonism" as a new, more political, and less orthodox form of the New Jerusalem, a less simple form of Mormonism that went to Utah and became dominant. Robert Bruce Flanders, *Nauvoo: Kingdom on the Mississippi* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1965), vi.

8. This was the practice of intimidating a troublemaker by standing around him silently while whittling wood with large knives. See Thurmon D. Moody, "Nauvoo's Whistling and Whittling Brigade," *BYU Studies* 15 (Summer 1975): 480-90.

9. Heinz Schilling, "Sin, Crime, and Social Discipline in Calvinist Germany," a lecture delivered at a conference on "Constructing the Community: Colloquium on Early Modern Germany," University of Massachusetts, Amherst, 20 April 1990, to be published in English under the title "Church Discipline" in a special issue of four Schilling articles "Calvinism and Social Change in North Germany and the Netherlands," *The Sixteenth Century Journal* (Kirksville, MO). As part of his well-known investigation of social control in such communities, Schilling, of the University of Giessen, has done an exhaustive, sin-by-sin, quantitative analysis of Calvinist Emden from 1558 to 1825.

Schilling's findings on the relation between sin and community are instructive. The Calvinists defined the area for sinning far more extensively than the Mormons, including under "luxus," for example, what the Puritans called un-Christian "conversation" (behavior), including dancing, pleasure, intoxication, and so on. The Calvinists of Emden efficiently punished single women. While Schilling does not supply details on the fate of unchaste single men, the usual double standard prevailed in the meting out of punishment. The Calvinists from the same area who went to settle South Africa continued to use religion and whips to uphold apartheid and punish blacks as well as behavior among their own kind.

Mormons, on the other hand, have long taken pleasure in song, dance, and theater. In the matter of sexual sins, Mormon strictness in upholding the practice of chastity before marriage, together with the prevalence of polygamy before 1890 and low rates of pre-marital pregnancy and illegitimacy, reduced the need (which they rarely felt, anyhow) to punish single women. As for intoxication, all active Mormons obey the Word of Wisdom, a set of dietary rules which prohibits alcohol and thus precludes the sin of drunkenness in the first place. Although Mormons wryly boast of their church's efficient guilt mechanisms, they enjoy a general freedom from the sin-and-punishment syndrome of Calvinism. The Mormons have had other devices for preserving community.

10. Even Harold R. Isaacs's *Idols of the Tribe*, an influential piece of historical anthropology published in the 1970s in the heyday of "conflict theory," granted that religion has always "bonded people together in their many groups and cultures" and has always supplied "the strong cement of traditionally shared beliefs." Reacting like historians and other social scientists of his time against the deadening "consensus" views of the 1950s, Isaacs reduced all "tribal" activities to instruments of oppression and death. He described the ways in which differing tribes have justified conflict and killing: nationalism, skin color, language, and so on. See Isaacs, *Idols of the Tribe: Group Identity and Political Change* (New York: Harper & Row, 1975).

11. At the Plotting Zion conference I jotted down what seemed to me to be a record number of vague but well-intentioned uses of the term Zion. To cite just three: Zion is a good person, a "Zion person"; there is a "Zion concept of behavior"; Zion is feminism; Zion is the cessation of hierarchy. In the light of Mormon history and scriptures, such usages are at best HolyTalk, at worst silly. Back in 1954 the LDS historian William Mulder saw that with the abandonment of the doctrine of Zion the *place* in the late nineteenth century, Zion had come to mean " 'the pure in heart,' a people and a condition, and it meant the place where the pure in heart dwell [Utah?]." See Mulder, "Mormonism's 'Gathering': An American Doctrine with a Difference," *Church History* 23 (Sept. 1954): 259.

In a passionate sermon of 1973 against the surging greed for property and wealth, Hugh Nibley, the highly respected Mormon cultural critic, noted the final degradation in the usage of Zion as a label (as in Zion's Real Estate) but still uses it in the sense of "pure," or moral: a "type" of human existence, just as Babylon is the type of "evil." Brigham Young was the first to locate Zion "in the heart of each person" as well as in Independence, Missouri. See Nibley, "What is Zion? A Distant View," SUNSTONE 13 (Apr. 1989): 22, 30. Professor Lyman Tower Sargent of the University of Missouri—St. Louis has written a definitive survey of definitions of utopia and community, forthcoming first in Italian, then in English in 1992: "Political Dimensions of Utopianism with Special Reference to American Communitarianism."

12. Arthur Bestor, Jr., *Backwoods Utopias: The Sectarian and Owenite Phases of Communitarian Socialism in America, 1663-1829* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1950), 3 and first three chapters.

13. The tithing revelation came on 8 July 1838. President Gordon B. Hinckley has called tithing "the Lord's law of finance." The key passage provided that the Saints "shall pay one-tenth of all their interest annually, and this shall be a standing law unto them forever. . ." (D&C 119:4). See Hinckley, "Rise to a Larger Vision of the Work," *Ensign* (May 1990): 96.

14. See William Mulder, "Mormonism's 'Gathering': An American Doctrine with a Difference," 259. This article, vague in conceptualization, imprecise in its dating, and operatic in tone, nevertheless rests on primary sources and hits the main points. Mulder implies that the Gathering ceased somewhere in the latter part of the generation 1851-91 (259-260), attributing the cessation to a general decline in the literal interpretation of millennial scriptures and to less fear of Gentile persecution. He rightly concludes: "The great events which had seemed so imminent retreated into a future comfortably remote, and Mormonism settled down to an indefinite postponement of prophecy." And by making the Gathering a matter of individual convenience, the Church reduced the doctrine to something "most characteristically American."

15. Temple rites are so fundamentally important in Mormonism that fundamental changes made in temple ceremonies in April 1990 (according more equality to women and making oaths less gruesome) made front-page national news. In the Nauvoo Temple, women, under the leadership of Eliza Roxey Snow Smith, regularly performed fundamental temple ordinances and exercised priest-like rights. Some feminist Mormon women are now trying to recover these rights. One orthodox woman historian has written: "I believe it is impossible to overestimate the significance of temple work in the lives of early Mormon women." Carol Cornwall Madsen, "Mormon Women and the Struggle for Definition: The Nineteenth Century Church," one of three B. H. Roberts Society lectures, 24 September 1981, published in SUNSTONE 6 (Nov.-Dec. 1981): 10.

I am indebted to various Mormon friends for helping me recognize, if not completely grasp, the centrality of the temple in their lives, let alone the "high" that they experience in that sacred place.

16. Though he might be less naturalistic than I in drawing conclusions, Thomas G. Alexander documented the increasing strictness in the enforcement of the Word of Wisdom during the twentieth century in his indispensable work, *Mormonism in Transition: A History of the Latter-day Saints, 1890-1930* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1986), ch. 13.

17. The standard textbook history of the Church devotes a sub-chapter to the leaders' apprehension "that the railroad would bring a flood of non-Mormons who would undermine Latter-day Saint principles and attempt to destroy the Mormon way of life." See James B. Allen and Glen M. Leonard, *The Story of the Latter-day Saints* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Company, 1976), 327-34.

18. Appointed by Dwight D. Eisenhower in 1953, Ezra Taft Benson served as Secretary of Agriculture for eight years. Despite the staunch Republican faith of the Mormons, the real toleration for them as a group came from the Democrats, who promoted J. Reuben Clark Jr. (1871-1961) to high offices in the New Deal. Clark had worked in Washington since 1906 under six presidents. Franklin Roosevelt also appointed another prominent Mormon, Marriner S. Eccles, first as Secretary of the Treasury in 1934 and then almost immediately to the chairmanship of the Federal Reserve Board, where he served until 1951.

19. David O. McKay (1960-70), Joseph Fielding Smith (1970-72), and Harold B. Lee (1972-73).

20. The basic facts may be found in Allen and Leonard, *The Story of the Latter-day Saints*, ch. 20.

21. Richard O. Cowan, *The Church in the Twentieth Century* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1985), ch. 9, "New Strides in Church Activity," provides a good summary of consolidation and correlation; the Clark quotation is on 153. See also Allen and Leonard, 628-629. A generation after Clark's death one could find similar laudatory expression in a 26 May 1990 *LDS Church News* feature article.

22. Fawn M. Brodie, *No Man Knows My History: The Life of Joseph Smith, the*

Mormon Prophet (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1945). "Mormon theology," she wrote, "was never burdened with otherworldliness. There was a fine robustness about it that smelled of the frontier and that rejected an asceticism that was never endemic to America. . . . Wealth and power [the Saints] considered basic among the blessings both of earth and of heaven. . . ." (187-88). And: "[Joseph] created a book and a religion, but he could not create a truly spiritual content for that religion" (403). Brodie thought that there may have been some plain living demanded of the Saints before 1840, but "much of the asceticism of the Kirtland era disappeared in Nauvoo" (288).

23. *Student Review*, 23 November 1988.

24. For example, SUNSTONE, certainly faithful to the Church, devoted most of a recent issue to changing views on polygamy, homosexuality, and male gender role expectations. See SUNSTONE 14 (Feb. 1990).

25. Boyd K. Packer, of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles, in the Member Finances Fireside of 18 February 1990 and officially published as "Teach Them Correct Principles," *Ensign* (May 1990): 89.

26. Gordon B. Hinckley, "Rise to a Larger Vision of the Work," *Ensign* (May 1990): 97. President Hinckley did not name names, but in concrete historical terms he meant that a rich ward on the East Bench of Salt Lake Valley (from Federal Heights in the north through Sandy in the south) will get the same allocation as the working class wards of Salt Lake City or a depressed copper-mining ward of Magna, Utah. Or again, a densely packed two-block, middle-class ward in Salt Lake City will receive the same number of dollars as the ward of western Massachusetts that covers two whole counties (Hampshire and Franklin).

27. Thomas S. Monson, "The Lord's Way," *Ensign* (May 1990): 93.

28. Douglas D. Alder, "The Mormon Ward: Congregation or Community?" *Journal of Mormon History*, 5 (1978): 69-70. I had constructed my argument that the ward is the fundamental current expression of Mormon community before making the happy discovery of Alder's thoughtful article arguing essentially the same thesis.

29. See Robert T. Handy, *History of the Churches in the United States and Canada*, Oxford History of the Christian Church (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977), 314 ff.

30. *New York Times*, 3 Sept. 1989; *Salt Lake Tribune*, 2 Sept. 1989.

31. Though it ignores West African pressures on the Utah church, Roger Launius's recent survey of African-Americans in the early Mormon church and his own Reorganized Church provides an objective summary. The more liberal RLDS church faced the same problems of the "new ethnicity" of the early 1970s and established a special Ethnic Ministries Committee to deal with the problems of racism, segregation, congregation, assignment of preaching duties, etc. See Roger D. Launius, *Invisible Saints: A History of Black Americans in the Reorganized Church* (Independence, MO: Herald Publishing House, 1988).

32. See Jessie L. Embry, "Ethnic Groups and the LDS Church: The Role of Culture in a Religious Community," 3-4, ms. article to be published in *Dialogue*. I am much indebted to Embry's sensitive studies covering the new ethnic dimensions of Mormonism in the United States.

33. See Jessie L. Embry, "Developing an Integrated Community: The Experiences of African-Americans in the LDS Church," paper delivered at the "Plotting Zion" conference, audiotape available from the Sunstone Foundation. Parts of this paper appeared under the title "Separate but Equal? Black Branches, Genesis Groups, or Integrated Wards?," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought*, 23 (Spring 1990): 11-37. After careful descriptive analysis Embry comes down on the side of integrated, multi-cultural wards (34). If I were a Mormon, I'd also favor integration.

It is conceivable that the Church may be yielding unconsciously to another taboo argument for "comfort" or convenience, one made not by the minorities, but by Euro-Americans: the danger of intermarriage. Embry mentions one instance in the Oakland Stake of that old, familiar, interracial sexual rivalry between white and non-white youths at an interracial dance ("Ethnic Groups," 15-16). Such incidents may reinforce the common desire of parents to uphold racial endogamy.

34. Quoted in Embry, "Ethnic Groups," 4.

35. On the mild prejudice against Scandinavians see William Mulder, *Homeward to Zion: The Mormon Migration from Scandinavia* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1957), ch. 5.

36. The *New York Times*, 9 July 1990, attributed the Chicago closings to "a $16 million deficit and a shortage of priests." Journalists must deal first with the facts; but they as well as social historians know that deficits of money or of religious leadership are mere surface expressions of inadequate commitment.

37. See BYU Professor of Organizational Behavior Warner Woodworth's stimulating and highly idealistic paper, "Third World Strategies toward Zion," delivered at the Plotting Zion conference and printed in SUNSTONE 14 (October 1990): 13-23.

38. Douglas D. Alder used these words to characterize the ward in his article, "The Mormon Ward: Congregation or Community?", 63. Actually, the "convenience" ward of Nauvoo discussed above predated the standardized Mormon Village of the Great Basin, but Alder is right in seeing these village versions of the Plat of the City of Zion as stemming from the millennialism of the earliest Mormons: ". . . a heaven on earth." The villages, he noted, represented the Mormon "concept of Zion as a tangible network of communities . . . [but] the ward has become a more expandable unit than the village," 64, 65.

Romanticized between the 1930s and 1950s, the Mormon Village as a homogeneous economic and social unit was by then already disappearing. The survival until the 1970s of the last existing Mormon Village of Laie, asleep on the north coast of Oahu, was a freak accident of history. Established as a nineteenth-century outpost of Utah, Laie awoke in the 1980s to find mainland urban America crawling up the beach with fangs bared. In the late 1980s the Church reacted, divesting itself of its ownership of land and utilities there.

39. Rosabeth Moss Kanter, *Commitment and Community: Communes and Utopias in Sociological Perspective* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972), chs. 3 and 4. Kanter also collected a standard set of essays on modern communitarianism in her *Communes: Creating and Managing the Collective Life* (New York: Harper and Row, 1973).

40. A serious defect in the Bestor definition is the omission of institutions or beliefs for the control of what most historians loosely term "sexuality," i.e., reproduction and family polity, elements so fundamental to human societies that every utopian attempt to revamp the dominant society has made reproduction and family polity the prime objects of change. All communitarians have strictly controlled or drastically altered sexual behavior and marital structures: Shakers, Harmonists, and Benedictines were all celibate; Mormons were polygamous; kibbutzim removed food preparation and child care from the parents; Oneidans practiced complex marriage.

41. Alder, 63.

42. I am indebted to John A. Hostetler's well known works for all references to the Hutterites. In particular, his 8 October 1989 address to the annual meeting of the members of the National Historic Communal Societies Association, under the auspices of the Hutterites of Yankton, South Dakota, titled "Lessons We Can Learn from Anabaptist Communities," represented the summation of a lifetime of research.

In 1990 the mean size of North American Hutterite colonies was 94 persons per colony, and the maximum allowable size was 140.

43. See David Knowlton, "Belief, Metaphor, and Rhetoric: The Mormon Practice of Testimony Bearing," SUNSTONE 15 (April 1991): 20-27, for a discussion of the ritualistic aspects of testimony bearing and fast and testimony meetings.

44. Paul S. Boyer and Stephen Nissenbaum, *Salem Possessed: The Social Origins of Witchcraft* (Harvard University Press: Cambridge, 1974), 215-16. Perhaps expressions like *self-accusation* and *self-rededication* are more accurate expressions, since Mormon testimonies are rarely explicit about the expiation of sin. Rather, LDS testimonies usually express affirmation and rededication ("I know this Church is true" is the ritual refrain in almost all testimonies). Accusing oneself is a way of forestalling the accusations or hostile feelings of others. Both confession and self-accusation/rededication provide some of the psychological glue needed for true community and thus perform a function similar to that of confession.

Richard L. Bushman, cited by Boyer and Nissenbaum (216, note), has analyzed with acute sensitivity the unburdening of guilt and anxiety in the conversion experiences of the Puritans (Congregationalists) during the Great Awakening in *From Puritan to Yankee: Character and the Social Order in Connecticut, 1690-1765* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967), 187-95. But Bushman was dealing with a much grander process than the local, emotional testimonies in the communal setting of Mormon ward chapels. He pointed out that for pre-Revolutionary Puritans the external society and its rulers were religiously and culturally one with the local churches; thus, the Puritans "did not separate earthly clashes with authority from sins against God." To find a closer analogy with Mormonism one would have to examine the records of late eighteenth-century, local Puritan (Congregationalist) churches which required the confessions of wayward members.

45. Donald Q. Cannon and Lyndon W. Cook, eds., *Far West Record* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Company, 1983).

46. See the formal addresses by Elders Hinckley, Monson, and Packer cited above. The emphasis on the family as the main locus of church activity, espe-

cially on weekends, is from Elder Boyd K. Packer, "Teach Them Correct Principles," 90. See also Elder Packer's follow-up address, "Let Them Govern Themselves," and three commentaries by James B. Allen, J. Lynn England, and Marie Cornwall, in SUNSTONE 14 (Oct. 1990).

47. Alder, 77, provides an eloquent summary of the complex human interaction in the daily life of a ward.

48. Alder, 77.

49. For the renewed emphasis on Family Home Evening see R. Scott Lloyd, "Family Home Evening: A Tradition of Praying, Playing Together," *Church News*, 25 Aug. 1990, 5.

50. The six areas are: (1) Literacy and Education; (2) Career Development; (3) Financial and Resource Management; (4) Home Production and Storage; (5) Physical Health; (6) Social-Emotional and Spiritual Strength.

51. For more detailed explanations of early Mormon communitarianism, see Leonard J. Arrington, Feramorz Y. Fox, and Dean L. May, *Building the City of God: Community and Cooperation Among the Mormons* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Company, 1976); Lyndon W. Cook, *Joseph Smith and the Law of Consecration* (Provo, UT: Grandin Book Company, 1985), and Dean L. May, "The Economics of Zion," SUNSTONE 14 (Aug. 1989): 15-23. See also May's article, "One Heart and Mind: Communal Life and Values Among the Mormons," in Donald E. Pitzer, ed. *America's Communal Utopias: The Developmental Process* (Forthcoming; Madison, Wisc.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1992).

52. Many other Christian groups have recognized that the institution of the family can coexist all too happily with the grossest inequalities of capitalism, and that families do not freely share their goods even with fellow believers. Families tend to seek their own economic self-interest. Long before Marx, Engels, and the utopians, the Pilgrims of Plymouth Colony recognized the conflict between the commonweal and the self-interest of families when they tried economic communism for the first few months of their existence. In 1623 Governor William Bradford and the Colony did away with "that conceit of Plato's." See Samuel Eliot Morison, ed., *Of Plymouth Plantation, 1620-1647* (New York: The Modern Library, 1967): 120.

53. Doctrine and Covenants of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (Salt Lake City; many editions), Section 119 (8 July 1838).

54. The Church still assigns a few Saints to cannery work, but clearly the trend is away from supplying the welfare storehouse with Church farm and cannery goods.

55. See the feature article in the *Church News*, 26 May 1990.

56. President Hinckley hoped first for more generous fast offerings as a way of providing for "the poor and the needy—not only of the Church, but many others as well." Secondly, he noted that these monies could be augmented by "large and generous gifts from faithful people who have contributed freewill offerings far beyond their tithes. We hope that there will be no diminution of such giving." This contrasts with the corporate, United Order financial policy of Zion, where the poor shared equally in the general surplus created by consecrations and distributed through the bishop's storehouse—administered up to the 1980s by the Church's "Welfare Program."

Hinckley expressed the belief that two other sources could also be enlarged. First, all faithful Saints could work to expand the general missionary fund of the Church for families too poor to support their sons on missions; and, secondly, he noted that "less-active members and non-members have generously contributed through the LDS Foundation to assist various Church programs." See Hinckley, "Rise to a Larger Vision of the Work," 97. A few wards still independently support the missionary sons of poor families. This will become increasingly difficult now that the new "budgeting procedure" has eliminated the ward budget.

57. Up to about the early 1980s, wards held a separate Welfare Services session early on Saturday mornings. Since the early 1980s the general authorities have been silent on storing food to prepare for the Last Days.

58. The Mormon scholar Hugh Nibley tried to remind his fellow Saints that the end of this world of Babylon and the Second Coming were the "main message" of the Book of Mormon. But even his conservative appeal is less a voice of warning that the End is near than a passionate exhortation against materialism. See "Last Call: An Apocalyptic Warning from the Book of Mormon," SUNSTONE 12 (Jan. 1988): 14-15, 25, also in John W. Welch, ed., *The Prophetic Book of Mormon* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book and F.A.R.M.S., 1989), 498-532. Based mainly on the sermons of Brigham Young, this article provides an extremely useful compendium of Young's teachings on materialism, greed, and idolatry.

59. "We believe in the literal gathering of Israel and in the restoration of the Ten Tribes; that Zion (the New Jerusalem) will be built upon the American continent; that Christ will reign personally upon the earth; and, that the earth will be renewed and receive its paradisiacal glory." Articles of Faith, 10, The Pearl of Great Price, 1981 edition.

60. See Bruce R. McConkie, "Come: Let Israel Build Zion," *Ensign* (May 1977): 115-18.

61. Spencer W. Kimball, "Becoming the Pure in Heart" *Ensign* (May 1978): 79-81.

62. Pessimistic Jewish scholars question even whether American Jews remain "a people," given their intermarriage, their non-commitment (the non-observance by even nominal synagogue members), and their lack of readiness to gather to Zion (Jerusalem, Israel). See Seymour P. Lachman and Barry A. Kosmin, "What Is Happening to American Jewry?" *New York Times*, 4 June 1990; and Henry Feingold, "Rootless Cosmopolitanism: Defined and Defended," *Jewish Studies Network* (Dept. of Judaic Studies, Brooklyn College, N.Y.), 2 (Fall 1988): 1-7. These two short pieces stirred considerable debate among Jews.

Writing from inside the Mormon faith, Douglas D. Alder has compared the Mormon ward with the post-World War II Jewish "synagogue centers," replete with gymnasiums, youth groups, and the like. See Alder, 72. Alder saw the synagogue centers serving the same community-building functions as the Mormon ward, but in the dozen years since he expressed that view the mainline Jewish community has continued to decline: a meeting place with "activities" is not enough. Real community must be based on the kind of spiritual bonds that Alder skimmed over all too quickly with the words: "the traditional activity of study and worship by Jewish men that dominated synagogues for centuries has given way . . . to synagogue centers." Study and worship still dominate Mormon wards, and that is why they are still living, growing units. As Feingold points out of today's Jews (well supplied with comfortable "centers"): "Since they find their Zion everywhere, they are at home nowhere. They are Zionists who cannot settle in Zion, since their rootlessness denies them a sense of home from which they are exiled" (1).

Armand Mauss has persuasively refuted Keith Perry's arguments that Mormons may be defined as an ethnic group and has also cogently criticized facile parallels some writers like to make between Jews and Mormons. He offers a strong counter argument noting the ways in which Jews closely conform to the definition of ethnicity, while Mormons do not. See Mauss, 5.

63. I am of course aware of the ongoing murders of Mormon missionaries in Latin America, but while persecution of missionaries has drawn the Mormons closer together as a community, its communalizing effect has been tiny compared with the massive persecutions of the nineteenth century.

64. Howard M. Bahr and Renata Tonks Forste, "Toward a Social Science of Contemporary Mormondom," *BYU Studies* 26 (Winter 1986): 92.

65. *New York Times*, 28 October 1975.

66. Eugene England has noted that as late as 1989 some traditionalist Mormons still believed that a black convert's skin gradually turned white because of her spiritual change after she joined the Church.

In 1947, when a leading scholar, Lowry Nelson, complained about the Church's racial policies, the First Presidency wrote to him that racial intermarriage "has heretofore been most repugnant to most normal-minded people." But since 1978, when President Kimball promulgated the revelation admitting blacks to the priesthood, the Church has abandoned the old notion that God had cursed certain groups with dark skin because of their sins—even to the extent of altering the text of the Book of Mormon. Nor is there any implication in the doctrine of pre-existence that God was busy "grading" souls before they were born into bodies on earth. England, "Are All alike unto God? Prejudice against Blacks and Women in Popular Mormon Theology," SUNSTONE 14 (Apr. 1990): 18-19.

Under the aged but surprisingly responsive leadership of the Church, popular racist notions are also fading, and under the impact of multi-cultural, nonracist instruction in the Missionary Training Center, the younger generation should be relatively free of racist attitudes.

When deciding which show to go see,
The word from the Brethren's "PG."
So to friends I declare,
"To obey is my fare!"
(The "R" I'll soon see on TV.)

LLOYD V. CASTLETON