

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

time for arts?

I read the "Smoother Letters" with a smile of admiration, but it was often a rather crooked smile as the Chief hit the nail on the head time after time.

It may be that I am geographically too far removed from BYU symposia and such to realize what great things are happening in Mormon arts. I have been close enough to *Dialogue* to know that there has been a real outpouring of both historical scholarship and literary creativity among some Mormons in recent years. I believe, however, that before such an awakening can include or affect many people in or beyond the Church, two things must happen. Mormons who want to create music, art or literature must have encouragement, and they must have time.

The Church itself needs to use its hierarchical organization to encourage creativity among the members—not just road shows and family talent nights, but serious creative endeavors. For the church publications to sponsor an annual church-wide literary, musical or artistic competition is good, but only a small number of people will feel brave enough to enter such a contest, and none but the winners will have their work seen by anyone except the judges. Stakes and wards also need to sponsor creative competitions, "commission" works of art and literature, hold art exhibitions and literary readings, and so forth. The attitude needs to be disseminated that these things are at least as important as, say, an athletic program. Church sponsorship of such events might result in some stereotyping of the work produced, but there is still much to be gained by it. Think of the possibilities if, instead of a hundred productions of "Saturday's Warrior," the stakes and wards could come up with a hundred new plays in the course of a year. Two or three of them might be genuinely good. Such a movement could be set rolling by a wave of the wand, so to speak, in Salt Lake City. We have become a people not much inclined to individual initiative, but we are good at carrying out the church program.

The time problem is more difficult, especially for active members who want to serve the Church and must hold down a job, but also want to do creative work on their own. Members who are attempting serious artistic, musical or literary work, particularly if they are not professionals who are being paid for their creative time, need to be given enough freedom from church assignments that they have time to create. It is much easier to look a bishop in the eye and decline a demanding church assignment on grounds of work or family obligations than it is to say, "I want to write a play" or "I want to paint a portrait this year," especially if one is not already an established artist. I was recently impressed by something in a magazine article on Susan Roylance, a Washington State politician. When she decided to run for Congress, she asked her bishop to release her for the time being from assignments in her ward. He agreed, stating, "We can do everything but take care of your family for you." Bishops are men under pressure to keep a large number of positions staffed and a great many balls in the air, and I am afraid that Mrs. Roylance's bishop is a rarity. But unless we have more bishops who are willing to gamble that the work of a creative ward member may, in the long run, result in a greater contribution than if the member spent the same amount of time carrying out the assignment the bishop had in mind, we are not going to see many great artistic accomplishments by committed Mormons. Ultimately, as most bishops are good men but not mind readers, I suppose it is up to the artists or would-be artists themselves to summon up their courage and discuss openly with their bishops this conflict between personal and institutional needs.

We have to face the reality that much great art has been produced by people who had neither family responsibilities nor a regular source of income which depended on their non-artistic labor. Few Mormons are in that situation, and few of us want to make that kind of sacrifice

because we know the importance of families. Something, however, has to go, as artists are given no more hours in a day than anyone else. If it cannot sometimes be Church service that goes, then of necessity it is going to be the art that goes. For most of us, family commitment is not negotiable, and neither, therefore, is the time and work required to maintain that family. This leaves a narrow range of choices for the Mormon artist when it comes to budgeting time.

It may be that our strong Mormon commitment to families does preclude our ever producing much great art. I hope this is not true. There are things our leaders can do for us and we can do for ourselves that may help us discover we can have both.

Margaret R. Munk
Silver Spring, Maryland

they're everywhere

Wayne C. Booth's article in the Winter 1980 Dialogue was most appreciated. I have for some time been concerned with the reproachful state of LDS Arts in Albuquerque. Church members who have lived here longer than I insist that athletics is the cause. I have demurred until now not knowing just what may be causing this unfortunate situation. Armed with Brother Booth's article, however, I removed myself to the Rare Book Room at the University of New Mexico Library. There, after a short but diligent search, I too found a dull red envelope similar to that described by Brother Booth. The contents are enclosed.

Dear Jock:

Congratulations on your outstanding successes in Albuquerque. The preempting of artistic events with sports activities has proved to be a masterful approach. We have also noticed some important side effects. For example, group artistic opportunities such as choruses and plays which encourage family participation are discouraged in favor of group sports such as basketball. Here women and children are relegated to the sidelines and are led to believe that cheering is somehow an important and rewarding activity. The

encouragement of such values is critical to our success. Keep up the good work.

I must remind you of the importance of continual alertness, however. I'm sure you recall a couple of years ago when we almost lost the ball game, so to speak. You allowed a bi-stake performance of the *Messiah* and a classics concert by local members both in the same year. Fortunately, the comments of the Regional Representative that the classics concert was the best thing ever done by the Saints in Albuquerque has been forgotten. More important, you managed to get artistic decision making away from the women and back where it belongs—with men. Since then, we have done much better. However, until you can get that pipe organ in the Montano Chapel replaced with one of those electronic junkers, it will be a constant temptation to quality performance.

Your request for the invention of new competitive games is being assessed. Preliminary indicators are that we will approve those which have the highest potential for disruptive factors. We note with pleasure that the ill feelings generated between individuals and wards by the competitive sports continues. We suggest that you do all you can to increase such feelings and keep people away from artistic events which, as you know, promote harmonious relationships. Incidentally, getting that local LDS artist and teacher to move out of town was a masterful stroke. It has left both disarray and discouragement among her students. The situation will bear watching, however, as we have been receiving reports that some of those students are still painting and trying to improve their skills and the quality of their work.

You must also keep alive the fiction that athletics is the prime promoter of conversions. Should it ever be understood that the potential for conversions through quality art is far higher than with athletics, we could lose a great deal of ground. Be especially sure that the local leadership never understands the high spiritual qualities of artistic activity and their greater potential for family based conversions.

Finally, we may need to make a change in your assignment. There are disturbing rumors that the BYU Humanities Symposium has begun to have a positive impact on some LDS thinking. With Albuquerque essentially under control we may need you to troubleshoot elsewhere.

Keep dribbling,
The Chief

Well, as you can see, the fears of artistic minded Latter-day Saints in Albuquerque have been confirmed. Among those of us who struggle with and for the arts, I have drawn the assignment to check the Rare Book Room from time to time in the hopes of finding a letter transferring Jock.

Dee F. Green
Albuquerque, New Mexico

the Source

The most recent "Personal Voices" struck deep chords within me. Like Edward Hogan, I have been forced to "come to grips with the spiritual aspects of the gospel." I had joined the Church while attending a California university, partly in order to marry a deeply committed member, and later found church life in a nonacademic, missionfield setting difficult. However, I too can say that "many of the people who helped me the most to gain a testimony—people whom I now most admire—are of comparatively limited education."

I also felt great empathy for Mischel Walgren, who lay "crying that winter evening." How well I remember my feelings when my husband quietly (it had not been an easy decision) said that he no longer believed in the Church. I remember the effect his years of inactivity and periodic hostility had on our relationship. And I remember when it seemed as though my "agony of fasting and prayer" would be "met with heavenly silence" forever. I too ceased such efforts for a time.

As I look back I am amazed that eleven years have passed since my husband's shattering decision—and I find myself astonished at what has occurred during this time. I look back with gratitude that something, or often someone, kept me

somehow connected to the Church, even during times when doubts, harsh questions, confusion, hostility and depression were affecting all phases of our lives. I am grateful that I did not sever ties even when the "possibility of the downright falsity of Mormonism" was being contemplated at various times in our home. (Is Brother Walgren suggesting that one has not really asked this "ultimate question" unless one reaches a negative conclusion?)

I am also glad that I overcame a stubborn refusal ("What! Another thing for my list?") to keep a journal, as I now possess a personal record which contains an ongoing account of spiritual influence, guidance and affirmation. I cherish this record of sometimes painful and sometimes uplifting experiences which allow me to join Brother Hogan in saying: "Well, I came to realize!" I find, in these pages, a valuable record of the confrontation, study and ultimate prayer involved in dealing with (not necessarily answering completely) difficult questions and challenges regarding the validity and value of Mormonism. I can relish those many gospel-related experiences with peace and love—often surprising ones—which make the absence of the "amiability of coffee, beer and wine" inconsequential. I can enjoy again those experiences, some based upon persistent human effort and some made possible by spiritual influences that still astound me, which made our marriage strong again despite religious differences. And I can marvel at the unexpected changes and events—and see the Spirit's touch behind them—which led to my husband's and my somewhat sudden return to the temple only four days ago.

Brother Walgren feels that people like me are living a "fiction." However, too much of my story was beyond self-engineering. I must conclude that another author has been involved—and that He wants me to be a Mormon in a very real and active sense. Brother Hogan is right. There is a "source that is available to all of us" which can make our lives "far richer and more abundant than we ever dreamed possible."

Name Withheld

struggling

I guess all of us at various times have harbored some of Kent L. Walgren's thoughts, criticisms and views about Church policies that appear to run counter to scripture.

Surely, through, his accusation or perception that Messrs. England, Poll, Bushman, etc., "are a coterie of intellectual chickens," and that *Dialogue* has compromised itself in order to survive, demonstrates an adolescent yet undeserved harsh critique, accompanied by a measure of sour grapes and immaturity.

Some of his viewed contradictions indicate a lack of historical knowledge. His perplexing question, "How could God be no respecter of persons and deny blacks the priesthood?," illustrates a possible forgetfulness about who held the priesthood during the advent of the Savior on this earth. Only the Jews and a few worthy souls were chosen by God to hold the priesthood, and yet this does not indicate or conjure up any contradiction or imbalance in the Lord being no respecter of persons. All will be accomplished in the Lord's time.

His questions concerning "When and where the temple ceremony had been written," and "how Joseph had received these sacred rites," perhaps deserve some scholarly investigation by a member of the above-named coterie.

There is a blending and justification for some of Mr. Walgren's and Mr. L. Jackson Newell's ("Personal Conscience and Priesthood Authority") concerns and observations, regarding the hypocrisy of some church leaders. Missionary work may be required from the membership, for instance, but very little effort is given by our local priesthood leaders.

Mr. Newell's view that we are perhaps substituting various church duties and programs, instead of developing a genuine Christian character, is sometimes justified. Doubts are created, annoying some of the thinking membership.

Having read both articles, I respond with positive feelings about the gospel. Freedom of the mind and the need to question and express our views in church should be encouraged.

My own experience counsels me that anything worthwhile requires a struggle for acceptance be it in or out of the Church.

Dialogue, I love you—

Leon Lambert
Ontario, Canada

belief v. activity

I was about to let my subscription to *Dialogue* lapse when the Winter, 1980, issue arrived. I found the articles by Edward Hogan and Kent Walgren most refreshing.

These men have brought to light and eloquently articulated thoughts had by many men and women in the Church today. These are the people who spend a great deal of time actively involved in Church assignments while harboring serious doubts about the Church's claims to divine origins. In Hogan's case these doubts were resolved in the Church's favor. In Walgren's case they progressed to ultimate disbelief.

The fact that both these men were actively involved in the Church during their respective struggles points to a narrowness in our traditional view of our members. We usually discuss members' relationship to the Church in only one dimension—level of activity. We speak of people being "active," "marginally active," and "inactive." But Hogan and Walgren's articles point to a second, often ignored dimension—level of belief.

While belief and activity are correlated, they are definitely not synonymous. My experience as a very active nonbeliever has taught me that there is a substantial body of people at my same position on the activity/belief grid. We talk a lot to each other in private and keep our mouths shut a lot in public. Most of us subscribed to *Dialogue* back in the early days and have continued, hoping that some day it would publish an article showing what Walgren did—that it is possible to reject the Church's claims to divine origin but still love the people and the institution. We remain active and committed to the Church. We serve in MIA's, in Sunday schools, and some of us

are even hypocritical enough to serve in bishoprics and on high councils. Many of us rejoice at the candor of Hogan and Walgren. But most of us prefer to remain anonymous for we have had neither "a mighty change of heart" nor "thoughts on leaving the fold."

Name Withheld

new feelings

This latest issue of *Dialogue* has a new feeling about it. I hope you can continue along these less conservative lines. I was especially moved by Kent Walgren's article. I appreciate his sharing his experience with us, an experience that held no anger or bitterness but much insight and sincerity.

Anne Cullimore Decker
Salt Lake City, Utah

we was framed

Winter 1980 is a very fine issue all round. I've devoured it in two days and am ready to reread some articles. Might you have extra covers available? I'd like one for framing.

Dick Butler
Menlo Park, California

spiritual liaison

Either I am mellowing or this last issue (Vol XIII, 4) has focused on my peculiar sensitivities. So far, Calvin Grondahl's graphic wit, Edward Hogan's personal expressions and L. Jackson Newell's pulpit metaphors all refresh my hope for a real "at-one-ment" with each other and others.

In this vein I would like to relate a story about some friends of mine. Last year a middle-aged, divorced LDS man married a young Soviet woman in Russia. Finally, a couple of weeks ago, she came to join him here in southern California. (Neither speaks the other's language yet!) The adjustments for her to our totally new world have been and are overwhelming, and we are all trying to help reduce them to manageable levels.

After a recent local symphony concert she exclaimed, "Wouldn't it be wonderful if our two countries could become united and share our best things with each other

rather than remaining separated by hostile ideologies?" I heartily agreed and thought again of what a millennial event it would be to witness a "marriage" between Mother Russia and Uncle Sam! Can my two friends' adventure be prototypical?—a Mormon spirit and a Slavic soul?!

Eugene Kovalenko
Long Beach, California

once is enough

Your latest issue nearly gave me heart failure—my first thoughts: "Had Mary Bradford packed it in?" or "Maybe the editorial staff left town with the Carter folks." Then, I realized that the embossed cover must have prevented you from printing the normal "Who's Who of Dialogue" page.

The cover was different, but please don't do a body, especially my body, like that again. Besides, the staff of such an excellent publication deserves recognition ad infinitum.

Ric P. Brady
Oakton, Virginia

means v. ends

After nine years the Equal Rights Amendment is still being debated in the halls of legislatures and in the columns of *Dialogue*. It hardly seems possible that people would object to the principle that: "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex." But the Constitution is not a statement of principle; it is an instrument to distribute power. Such is the nature of the ERA: it explicitly grants greater decision-making powers to the federal government and implicitly gives greater power to the judiciary. And on what basis will policy be decided by the judiciary? According to former Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes: ". . . ninety percent of all decisions is emotional. The rational part of us supplies the reasons for supporting our predilections."

Of course, this basis does not necessarily result in bad law. Since the current ERA was proposed in 1971, the Supreme Court has significantly altered gender-

based law, assuring women's rights under the Fourteenth Amendment's equal protection clause. Incidentally, the First Presidency did not make its official statement opposing the ERA until 1976, after the Court had established strong precedents for applying the Fourteenth Amendment to gender-based law.

But the ERA—unlike most of the Constitution—would impose limitations on policies, and the proponents' major argument is that the amendment would limit or eliminate economic discrimination against women. Eleanor Smeal, president of the National Organization of Women, claims that the amendment would do more to help women earn as much as men than any other single law or political act. Showing greater understanding of the ERA's limitations than most proponents, Susan Taylor Hansen (*Dialogue*, Vol. XII, 2) claims only that the ERA "would reinforce existing laws which require equal pay for equal work." But we need enforcement of such laws now, not reinforcement in the future. Even with rigorous enforcement and repeal of all protective legislation, however, women would still be disadvantaged economically since the problem is more social than political. Almost two-thirds of women with young children choose not to take jobs; and this disruption of careers puts such women at a disadvantage economically. And women more often work part-time than do men, almost fifty percent doing so for family reasons. The problems of combining a career and raising a family have not been solved for a majority of women because we continue to shape our jobs around our families.

Most of us do believe women should have equal opportunity; however, one issue affected by the ERA goes well beyond equal opportunity and enforces one view of equality upon all women. That issue is the draft. Opponents and proponents alike agree that the ERA means women will be subjected to the draft; and at least during military service, identical roles for men and women in society would be enforced by law. Because this violates the values of most Mormons, the Church's opposition to the amendment is in essence a defense of

minority rights (though whether opposition to a women's draft is a minority position is questionable). Hansen believes that Congress could so structure the draft for women that it would be compatible with Mormon values. That the draft would be so structured after ratification is based on faith; others may perhaps be forgiven for putting faith elsewhere. But even economically women would suffer greater disadvantages than at present because most women who eventually have children would suffer two disruptions of their careers: one when they are drafted and one when they have young children.

Moreover, under a qualified absolutist standard of judicial review, women would be ordered into combat. An influential article in the *Yale Law Journal* claims: "Neither the right to privacy nor any unique physical characteristic justifies different treatment of the sexes with respect to voluntary or involuntary service, and pregnancy justifies only slightly different conditions of service for women." Women would thus go into combat whether or not privacy could be assured, further violating Mormon values.

The differences between proponents and opponents of the ERA extend to the philosophical underpinnings of each position. Feminists are individualists who believe society can best be served by each man and woman pursuing his or her self-interest. Their opponents who emphasize family believe society is best served when individuals work together for the social good. Certainly a family is not individualistic since its success depends on all its members subordinating their interests to those of the entire family. Nor does a family stress merit, as does the woman's movement, since family members are recognized and rewarded regardless of their merits. In the words of historian Carl Degler: "The central values of the modern family stand in opposition to those that underlie women's emancipation."

But such a characterization implies unity in the women's movement when in fact there are internal contradictions. On

the one hand, feminists seek the resolution of women's problems by obliterating legal differences between men and women. On the other hand, they acknowledge that women have special problems, such as the difficulty of combining a career and child care. The distinction between equal rights and women's rights was made by Philip Kurland, professor of law at the University of Chicago, ten years ago. Both are solutions to discrimination against women, but they are different solutions. The emphasis of equal rights is to eliminate distinctions between men and women. The focus of women's rights is to eliminate discrimination against women while acknowledging women's special needs.

Paul Freund, professor of law at Harvard, wrote a decade ago that: "The issue has always been choice of means, not over ends." The consensus that something must be done about removing legal disabilities from women has not changed. Even those who argue for the ERA often do so in terms of women's rights, not equal rights, and have in fact equated the amendment with women's rights. This equation is faulty because equal rights ignores many issues important to those in the women's movement. Moreover, with or without the amendment, laws adversely affecting women will have to be repealed by legislatures or be declared unconstitutional by the courts, or else they remain in force (whether enforced is another matter). It lies in our power now to eliminate such laws. That we have not done so is due to the diversion of our efforts by the debilitating fight over the Equal Rights Amendment—a means that is publicity-oriented rather than result-oriented. In 1971 Professor Kurland warned that the amendment would indeed divert our energies from the substance and direct them toward the means. He then added: "Only martyrs enjoy Pyrrhic victories." Thus far it is the defeat that is Pyrrhic, for we all have been losers. And the tragedy is that we are in essential agreement on many fundamental goals we want to achieve.

Kathryn M. Daynes
Greencastle, Indiana

intellectual snobbery

I have been of the opinion that *Dialogue* has had, since its inception, a strident, elitist, liberal leaning tone. This was caused by the frequent publication of articles by authors such as Eugene England, Duane Jeffery, Robert A. Rees, Marvin Rytting and Richard D. Poll, who, as a group, seemed to set the mood for the journal because of their condescending and belittling attitude toward anyone who would dare question the superiority of their intellectual powers. I perceive them to be a bunch of snobs.

In recent years, to your credit, I have seen less of the shrill voice coming through. It still does, of course, and *Dialogue* continues to live up to its heritage, much to my displeasure. But judging from some recent letters to the editor, others would say that you are not shrill enough. The editors have an impossible job, just as Robert A. Rees himself outlined in a letter to *Dialogue* in the Winter 1979 issue concerning striking an editorial balance. The present editors are doing somewhat better than he did, however.

As far as the kind of content that bothers me, a subjective observation on my part is that many of *Dialogue's* "featured" writers seemed to have had a preoccupation with themes that, however obliquely, were critical of what they perceived to be the Brethren's reluctance to push for social change. I for one am comfortable with letting the Brethren do what they are called to do: run the Church by revelation of the Spirit.

Best wishes for a successful walk on the tightrope.

Kenneth W. Taylor
Burbank, California

mutual respect

Thank you for your letter explaining the problem of the recalcitrant computer which thought my subscription expired a year early. I would hate to miss an issue of *Dialogue*.

I find *Dialogue* to be a stimulating and thoughtful journal, not only for Mormons, but for those like myself who are interested in the spiritual struggles of people of all religions. You know, in the end, whatever our religious background,

the deepening of our spiritual knowledge comes through struggle, suffering, testing until in the unknown reaches of eternity we come out purified as gold from the fire. I learn from what the Mormons are doing, as I think Mormons could learn from what the Bahá'ís are doing. While I have chosen the Bahá'í Faith as the vehicle best suited to my own spiritual development and to the establishment of world unity and order, I still learn from all other faiths, Mormonism included. Such mutual respect I believe to be the fruit of our belief in the Fatherhood of God.

William P. Collins
Haifa, Israel

uneasy feeling

I have quite an uneasy or at least unpleasant feeling over Mark Hofmann's discovery of an 1844 paper on which a blessing given by Joseph Smith to his son Joseph III is written. Is it another fact of life I should face as a Mormon? I read articles about the news both in *Time* and *Newsweek* magazines.

I doubt I can expect clear and crisp explanations or apologies on this problem, but still I want to read voices on this issue in your next issue.

Jiro Numano
Kudamatsu, Yamazuchi
Japan

an author's reader

A couple of Sundays ago I was sitting in my ward's chapel trying to contour my body to the contoured pew—I never seem to succeed—when a young, 20+, man approached. He gestured toward the vacant space on the bench beside me and mumbled something about being “alone today.” I nodded, noting the wide gold band on his wedding ring finger. He seated himself and a collection of books just as the meeting began. After the sacrament, I was aware that he pulled the latest *Dialogue* from his collection of books and began reading. The speaker

was not that bad—entirely. I was somewhat distracted by the reader alongside me. My mind often wandered to my bench companion, trying to formulate his nature. Well, the meeting ended. My bench companion gathered his collection of books, turned toward me, flashed a missionary-smile, extended his hand, and mentioned his name. I flashed my missionary-smile, offered my Mormon-handshake, and told him my name. He repeated my name, adding “I've read your book.” I thought, it figures. And it does.

Béla Petsco
Provo, Utah

disappearing dialogues

I thought I'd relate to you an incident that occurred re: *Dialogue*. About two years ago, I was in the LDS “Thrift Store” in Santa Ana. While browsing in the large used book and magazine section, I noticed numerous issues of *Dialogue*. They meant little to me at the time, and I was in a hurry, so I paid no attention. Later in the week, I ran across several references to *Dialogue*, and learned the nature of the publication. I telephoned the Thrift Store, and asked one of the male employees to please pull all issues of *Dialogue* for me, and indicated I would be in later to collect and pay for them. He told me, “No problem, I'll do that for you right now.” The following week, I drove the 35 miles to Santa Ana, and went to the Thrift Store to pick up my many back issues of *Dialogue*—a gold mine, I thought! The three male store employees all denied any knowledge of such a publication or my telephone request.

The *only* conclusion that I can reach is that one (or more) of the employees scanned *Dialogue*, and decided no decent person ought to read such a publication, then destroyed them. Thus, we have both lying and book burning.

Richard D. Terry, Ph.D.
San Clemente, California

dum spiro, spero

Readers may be interested to know about the formation of Por-Esperanta Mormonaro, an independent organization devoted to the promotion of the international language Esperanto, especially in conjunction with the goals of the LDS Church. Those who are interested in the language or the work of P-EM should write it at P.O. Box 7222, University Station, Provo, Utah 84602.

Scott S. Smith
English Language
Media Representative
Thousand Oaks, California

call for proposals

for the Mormon History Annual Meeting,
May 7-9, 1981,
at Weber State College, Ogden Utah.
Send one-page typewritten proposals to
Program Chairman:
Dennis L. Lythgoe, Department of His-
tory, Bridgewater State College
Bridgewater, Massachusetts, 03234
Deadline: Oct. 1, 1981.

CONGRATULATIONS!

To our *Dialogue* authors and Board members who received the following awards at the Mormon History Association annual meeting in Rexburg, Idaho, May 1-3, 1981:

Best Article by a Senior Historian, awarded to Thomas G. Alexander, member, *Dialogue* Board of Editors, for "The Reconstruction of Mormon Doctrine: From Joseph Smith to Progressive Theology" (*Sunstone*, August 1980);

Best Article by a Junior Historian, awarded to Gary James Bergera, for "The Orson Pratt-Brigham Young Controversies: Conflict Within the Quorums, 1853-1868" (*Dialogue*, Summer 1980).

Outstanding Graduate Student, awarded to Michael Guy Bishop, member, *Dialogue* Board of Editors.

Erratum

The review of Carol Lynn Pearson's book, "Will I Ever Forget This Day?," reviewed by Mary L. Bradford in Vol. XIV, 1, was reprinted by permission from the Newsletter of the Association for Mormon Letters.