14

The Church's Cultural Challenges in Europe

Gerald Hansen Jr., Hans Noot, and Medlir Mema

From its small beginnings in the early nineteenth century, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints has been a proselyting church, aiming to expand worldwide. Indeed, the Church has developed into a generally accepted organization in the United States and in other countries as well. This rapid growth has given us cause to stop and reflect on the challenges that the Church faces or is likely to face in the future. In this chapter, we will focus on the interaction between the doctrines and practices of the LDS Church and Europeans and attempt to explore some of the challenges the Church runs into as it tries to fulfill its mission in an increasingly secular Western Europe as well as in parts of Eastern Europe where countries are still coming to terms with their communist past.

Gerald Hansen Jr. is a faculty member in the Political Science Department at Brigham Young University–Idaho. Hans Noot is assistant associate area director for the Church Educational System in Eastern Europe, the Balkans, and Italy. Medlir Mema (PhD, George Washington University) is director of research at the Institute of Leadership in Tirana, Albania.

Working Out Our Salvation

One of the perennial debates in Mormonism, and indeed in Christianity, has been that of *praxis* vs. *doxis*, or practice versus doctrine. Although our understanding of doctrinal truth and access to it varies, its essential nature is unchanging. But working out how those truths are reflected in our everyday life takes time and often turns into a trial-and-error process. Sometimes error can be the result of incomplete understanding. However, more often than not, errors can be attributed to the environment in which these doctrinal truths are disseminated or from where they become disseminated. Cultural backgrounds, linguistic differences, and socioeconomic differences can then become important aspects of the acting out of one's doctrinal teachings and beliefs.[1] Swidler argues that "culture influences action not by providing the ultimate values toward which action is oriented, but by shaping a repertoire or 'tool kit' of habits, skills, and styles from which people construct 'strategies of actions.'"[2] Related to the impact that one's culture has on that person's understanding and practice of received knowledge is what Federici refers to as one's own "intertextual literary, linguistic and cultural 'baggage' due to [one's] 'location' and identity politics."[3] Meanwhile, the interaction between one's socioeconomic status and religious practices has been demonstrated through numerous studies, most of them following the publication of Weber's *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* in 1905.

Distinguishing between Doctrines, Practices, and Local Customs and Culture

For the purposes of this paper, when we use the term "gospel," we mean the doctrines and commandments, as taught by the prophets and the scriptures. When we speak of LDS practices, we mean a set of procedures that the Church and the Saints have accrued throughout

their history and that have been accepted generally by the Church at large, as they are taught by Church leaders. Examples of such practices include dress and grooming standards, prayer observances such as folding our arms and closing our eyes, the nonuse of crucifixes, the absence of facial hair for men serving in senior leadership positions, a lack of visible tattoos for missionaries, and the wearing of a white shirt and a tie when passing the sacrament.[4] By local customs and cultures, we mean those accretions which have little to do with the gospel and yet, at times, are as pervasive and risk becoming as distinctively "Mormon" as the previous two categories.[5] Of particular importance and consequence here is the association with and the attempt to justify and propagate one's ideological, cultural,[6] political, or socioeconomic views and preferences in the context of doctrinal truths. If we are to truly become an international church while keeping the doctrine pure from local practices and cultures, it is important that we distinguish between doctrinal truth or the gospel, Church practices, and local customs and cultures. It is with this distinction and understanding in mind that we offer the following observations.

The Early New Testament Church and the Modern Challenge

The challenge of disentangling the gospel teachings and inspired practices from local practices, cultures, and traditions is not new. Instructively, the Apostle Paul's fight against the Judaizers illustrates this well. After Christ's death, as the first-century Christian Church attempted to leave the law of Moses behind and expand past its Jewish culture into the Gentile world, it struggled to escape its more recent past. Even after a powerful revelation to Peter, the chief Apostle (see Acts 10), and an official declaration by the Church (see Acts 15) stating that new members did not have to first accept the Mosaic law before becoming Christians, these Judaizers continued to push their

Jewish culture onto the Church, making it more difficult to fulfill its missionary assignment to the non-Jewish world.[7]

In addition, the government of the Roman Empire, while offering the advantages of security and order to Christian missionaries, nonetheless adjudicated disputes involving the young Church in seriously disadvantageous ways, including the execution of its founder and many of its leaders, partly because the empire conflated the Christian Church with its Jewish roots and questioned the New Testament Church's political loyalty.[8] The modern Church still faces the same double-edged dilemma: it must take a pure gospel to the rest of the world—untainted by the cultural accoutrements which always collect around organizations—and it must also adhere to its own doctrines and practices without appearing disloyal and subversive to the world's governments and their citizens.

The Church's greatest modern challenge in this regard occurred towards the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century as it dealt with unrelenting pressure from the American government and society to conform to the dominant moral and cultural standards which existed in the United States at the time.[9] How the Church reacted to this challenge provides a good example of how the earthly Church of God, not yet part of the millennial kingdom of God, must accommodate itself to the various governments within which it must coexist, as well as explaining why the Church currently grapples with its American roots.

A Roman denarius, with the image of Tiberius Caesar on the front. He was the Roman emperor during the period of the Savior's ministry. It was his image that would likely have appeared on the coin that Jesus showed to the Herodians and said, "Render therefore to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's" (Matthew 22:21).

After being chased out of Illinois in 1847, the

Latter-day Saints settled in what was then part of Mexico, though within a year's time the United States had defeated Mexico in war and acquired the territory where the Church had settled. Mostly isolated from the greater United States, the Church over the next two decades developed a culture atypical of the American norm—one that was economically cooperative, politically oriented to God's kingdom, and socially unacceptable to most Americans because it accepted the validity of both monogamist and polygamist marriages.[10] After the American Civil War ended, as the nation's attention turned to other issues, the construction of the cross-continent railroad helped end Utah's isolation. The American government then began to insist that the Latter-day Saints adopt "American" values, meaning specifically that they become steadfast capitalists, patriotic and loyal members of the American republic, and strict monogamists.[11]

Map of Mexico in 1847 showing that the Utah Territory was not in the United States at the time that the Latter-day Saints first arrived there.

President Wilford Woodruff, 1894.

This insistence by the U.S. government moved the Church's leadership to petition the Lord for guidance. Their choice was, as President Wilford Woodruff put it, to choose between keeping the original commandment regarding plural marriage and thus maintaining the political, economic, and social culture that it had developed over its first few decades (and by so doing suffer persistent legal harassment and possible dissolution at the hands of the U.S. government), or adapt the kingdom of God to the traditions and laws of the American republic so that the Church could fulfill its primary mission of preaching to and administering the ordinances to the living and the dead.[12] Faced with this terrible choice, those who held the keys of the priesthood, the First Presidency and Quorum of the Twelve Apostles, wisely chose to seek new revelation which resulted in a change to the commandment as well as the cultural practices surrounding it.

Over time, the Latter-day Saints, following suit, adopted American patriotism, capitalism, and monogamy with great enthusiasm.[13] Reflecting on the difficulties of this transformation of the Mormon economic and social life following this turbulent period and the length of time it took to do so, one commentator questions Bloom's[14] assessment of Mormonism as a quintessentially American religion, at least initially, since Mormonism did not acquire many of its practices identifiable with the larger American culture until the twentieth century, once "the economic and political behavior of Mormons ha[d] mirrored that of 'middle America,'" leading to diminished tensions and partial assimilation.[15] Reflecting the indomitable spirit of the Church members and the indispensability of divine guidance, this

adoption served the Church well, allowing it to emerge out of obscurity and to obtain a level of respectability that helped it use its base in the United States to take the gospel to the nations of the world.

An American Church in a European Court?

The Church is sometimes referred to as an American world religion,[16] and not just because it was founded in the United States and because its headquarters are in Salt Lake City. While the principle in this quote by J. Reuben Clark Jr.—"This is not an American church. This is the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints and its destiny as well as its mission is to fill the earth"[17]—is a basic premise, unavoidably, understandably, and often beneficially, much Americanism exists within this global institution. Unfortunately, the necessary cultural transformation of the Church, while contributing positively to the kingdom of God, may risk, at times, becoming a liability. As the Church continues to move into other countries and has to deal with other types of republics and monarchies, as well as economic, social, and cultural loyalties, a sometimes excessive allegiance by the Church's membership and some of its leaders to American culture, tradition, and politics often generates counterproductive reactions—ranging from bemusement to frustration and even to spiritual confusion—in the souls of some Latter-day Saints. This does not mean that non-American members do not appreciate the role the United States played and continues to play in the restored Church, only that they sometimes find it hard to deal with the parochialism and ethnocentrism that at times accompanies the acknowledgement of that role.

Europeans can and generally do politely listen to the occasional sacrament talk by U.S. missionary couples promoting good government—complete with extensive quotes from Thomas Jefferson and James Madison. But the use of American political, economic, and cultural perspectives in preaching, teaching, and decision making creates

an inappropriate expectation for some members of the Church. An Australian member, Marjorie Newton, explains it as follows: "No Latter-day Saint would argue with the premise that America is a choice land, a promised land. Problems arise when American Latter-day Saints assume that America is the only choice land; that because the gospel was restored in America, American culture is also better than any other; and that, therefore, the Church has a mission not only to spread the gospel of Jesus Christ but to spread the gospel of Americanism."[18]

To spread this "gospel of Americanism" would imply that American capitalism and its vision for the role of government is superior, which in the European context often can become an impediment to the spread of the gospel. Typically, as John McCormick explains, "in terms of how they conceive political rights, Europeans stand in particular distinction to Americans; while the latter emphasize individual rights and place an emphasis on self-reliance, Europeans are more communitarian in their approach: they support more of a balance between individual and community interests. On the economic front, Europeans are committed capitalists and supporters of the free market, but they place a premium on the redistribution of wealth and opportunity, and on the responsibility of government to maintain a level playing field."[19]

It could be argued that this European willingness to lean toward community good and government and the social responsibility of faith communities on the ideological spectrum is an equally valid viewpoint. Conflicts and misunderstandings can arise from an insufficient self-awareness of these socioeconomic patterns and understandings. Another potential conflict exists between many American and European Latter-day Saints with regards to religious pronouncements on politics, war, and other important events. Many Europeans have a suspicion of religions in general and have learned through past experience that mixing church and state can lead to diminished freedom and rights by those who are not supported by a state religion. As a result, many Europeans are sensitive to the need for a strong separation between church and state.[20]

As the Church continues to expand its missionary efforts globally in places which face diverse, complex, and often unique political problems, any assumptions by Church members that America's political system is the only way to organize a democratic government, or that a particular American political ideology or party is the correct one, would accentuate the perception of parochialism, belying its claim to be a worldwide church. Moreover, at a time when most of the Church membership lives outside of the United States, official Church statements on American political matters carry greater risk than in the past because of the increased potential for adverse reaction outside the United States or because they would run against the grain of what the Church is actually trying to accomplish.[21]

These concerns have been evident for some time, even as early as the 1980s. For instance, although the Church gave very reasonable arguments against the U.S. government's plan to place MX missiles in Utah in 1981,[22] the statement still seemed incongruent to many Europeans,[23] especially because the Church did not similarly protest the placement of nuclear warheads in Europe during the same period, when demonstrations in Europe played an important role in the ending of the Cold War between East and West. The Church's MX missile statement may have been the correct response to the proposed policy, but the somewhat negative reaction to it in Europe emphasizes the Church's growing challenge to communicate its own policies and administrative decisions to an increasingly culturally and politically diverse membership in such a way as to avoid giving unnecessary offense[24] or promoting unintended viewpoints and consequences.

Other Cultural Challenges

Conflation with American culture is not the only challenge to sharing the gospel worldwide. Another dimension is communication between various cultures. What one thinks to have said and what others actually

hear often depends on their traditions. Language invariably involves interpretation and carries its own historical and cultural meaning. It comes preloaded with cultural and historical baggage, eliciting culturally specific memories and understandings, which endow certain words and ideas with different meanings depending on the context. Short of adopting a universal language for all its membership, we would be wise to keep these features in mind. At stake in this discussion is our ability to accurately teach and relay essential gospel principles, such as the "gospel plan," "baptism," or "repentance."

For example, some members of the Church in Belgium and the Netherlands debate how to understand the gospel term "plan of salvation." In the southern and predominantly Catholic-influenced part of the Netherlands and Flanders, members of the Church prefer Catholic terminology, *het plan van zaligheid*, meaning "plan of joy" or "plan of bliss." On the other hand, to members in the Protestant-influenced northern part of the Netherlands the term *heilsplan* is preferred, meaning "plan of saving/healing/making whole." The two different interpretations are culturally and historically significant and arguably transmit different facets of one doctrinal truth. Furthermore, the term *heilsplan* carries additional baggage in that it can evoke memories of World War II and the German salute, "*sieg Heil*." Some older Dutch people, therefore, take offense when they hear the term *heilsplan*.

In a similar dispute, some German Latter-day Saints argue that the Catholic phrase *buße tun*, meaning "penitence" or "paying the price", best connotes a true understanding of the gospel principle of repentance; others argue that the more typical Protestant term *umkehr*, meaning "turning around," more aptly interprets its true sense.[25] In this debate, the preference for which translation best fits an LDS understanding of the principle of repentance once again may hinge on one's Catholic or Protestant cultural heritage. Both examples demonstrate the influence that one's cultural and historical background,

and even regional origin, can have on one's understanding or conceptualization of what are considered basic gospel principles. As such, it behooves members and missionaries alike to pay attention to the impact of our own use of language and the potential effect it may have on how even basic gospel principles are taught and understood.

Another implication of the aforementioned examples is that as missionaries selflessly leave the comfort of their homes in the United States, they need to be extra sensitive to these cultural and historical differences. This is especially true in former communist countries where the term "loyalty," for example, carries heavy baggage because for decades the Communist government demanded total loyalty to the party, the proletariat, and the Communist regime. In language similar to the admonitions given to Mormons to be faithful, true, and consecrated to the kingdom of God, Communist leaders called on the party members to develop certain qualities that make for a good and loyal communist.

For example, outlining the characteristics a party member should possess, Mao Zedong said, "At no time and in no circumstance should a communist place one's own personal interests first. . . . Hence, selfishness, slacking, corruption, seeking the limelight are most contemptible, while selflessness, working with all one's energy, wholehearted devotion to one's [. . .] duty, and quiet hard work will command respect."[26] Likewise, Liu Shaoqi noted a true communist "possesses high communist morality; acts with [. . .] courage; seeks the truth from fact and distinguishes what is true from what is false; most sincere, most candid, and happiest of men; should possess the finest and highest human virtues; and consider it a matter of course to die for the sake of the cause, to lay down their lives for justice, when that is necessary."[27] The point of this comparison is not to suggest that one is the source of inspiration for the other or that they are interchangeable ideologies. Far from it; rather, it demonstrates the challenge the Church can face in making sure that it is not

misunderstood in its teachings and pronouncements, as well as the necessity for increased sensitivity to local cultures. Propagandized by this type of communist dogma, a member from former communist countries may react to talks on obedience, sacrifice, and consecration much differently than would a member from America or Western Europe.

Other examples of this challenge exist. In Albania, as well as in many countries in Eastern Europe, fears of government infiltration and spying on the Church and its programs are often the subject of gossip and discussion among the members. Some have suggested at times that the home and visiting teaching program suffers due to the members' suspicions about the true motives of the visit. Events like general sustaining votes, Church conferences either at the local level or beyond, and even visits from Church dignitaries enter the minds of some of these members through a very different filter than in Northern Europe or the United States. While these attitudes are not overly pervasive or long-lasting (and most Church members perform their responsibilities and attend their meetings with the same degree of devotion, safety, and comfort as any congregation in any other areas of the world), they do exist, especially among a very specific demographic.

Should the Church cease using such terms, language, or practices in any of its meetinghouses in former communist countries? Or should it do away with home and visiting teaching? The answer is clearly no. But as the Church expands the need to be sensitive to cultural backgrounds when teaching gospel truths or instituting Church procedures, members must understand that the local populations are not a *tabula rasa* and that such practices are not implemented in a vacuum. This phenomenon and therefore the need to increase our awareness as the Church increases its global reach is relevant in the case of Western Europe as well, where instead of the communist legacy, it is the religiously informed traditions and customs that influence a baptismal candidate's or a recent convert's thinking.

It should not be surprising, then, that even the basic idea of what it means to "go to church" can elicit different responses from individuals investigating the Church depending on their background. For some European Catholics, for example, going to church typically means going through the ritual of the mass and other Catholic sacraments in order to obtain God's grace and approval.[28] Priests are men who have studied extensively for their office, have dedicated their lives to the ministry, and are recognized by their black liturgical and clerical clothing, not sixteen-year-old boys who wear white shirts.[29] For some, being a Catholic is often just as much about being part of a long history of familial, national, and religious tradition as it is about learning and practicing one's belief system. As a consequence, for some former Catholics, part of the conversion process to the LDS Church means learning to see Church activity as a way to build the kingdom of God and develop personal spiritual inclinations and to learn about God in ways that were not part of the older tradition.

Some European Protestants, on the other hand, while typically interpreting religiosity as a way to learn about God and his expectations for good behavior, would not favorably view joining a church led by a dominant priesthood hierarchy. Protestants typically do not have a hierarchical priesthood (though Anglicans are an exception). For most Protestant congregations, ministers do not have or need any more priesthood than anyone else in the church, other than a personal call from God. Ministers are not authorized leaders, but paid servants to serve among the flock. Thus for a Protestant, the conversion process to the Church includes learning to sustain those who hold priesthood keys and discovering the reasons for receiving priesthood ordinances and keeping one's covenants.

Similarly, a candidate for baptism would approach an invitation to become baptized very differently depending on his or her religious background. Catholics often think of baptism as sanctification of a child. Protestants often think of it as accepting Jesus into their

hearts. For Mormons, it means committing oneself to follow Christ and enduring to the end. Awareness of the meaning of gospel terminology in the investigator's mental context can help a missionary or member explain the Mormon meaning more precisely.

The Church's close association and identification with the United States as a quintessentially American religion has additional drawbacks. Even in countries such as Poland and Albania, in which people generally love most things American, the identification of the Church as the "American Church" has been a mixed blessing. In Albania, for example, in the short run, the identification has proven helpful to the missionary and outreach efforts because it provides the Church with immediate prestige with the population and the government officials. However, a potentially long-term detrimental aspect of the association of the Church with the American culture and its body politic is the opposition that investigators encounter from their local communities who accuse them of selling out their heritage and national identity.

This sentiment has been especially pronounced in areas where national identity and religious identity have become interchangeable and where taking up the latter also implies, in the minds of many, the surrender of the former. Under such conditions, any religious affiliation other than the inherited national religion is seen as betrayal of one's heritage.[30] Recent events in Kosovo and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYROM) have raised concerns about the possible targeting of the LDS membership and especially of the missionaries in some areas by extremist elements associated with Islamic fundamentalism. In this regard, the more the Church can be seen as a universal church, rather than an American one, the safer it is.[31]

Anticipating Zion

Because the theocratic millennial kingdom of God does not yet exist, its precursor, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, must

by necessity navigate the legal and social constraints of the countries that it finds itself part of. The twelfth article of faith prescribes that we be "subject to" local governments in "obeying, honoring, and sustaining the law." In Europe, history has shown that as we give heed to this exhortation, the potential for accrued good to the Church increases in marvelous, if not miraculous, ways. The permission to build an LDS temple in Freiberg, Germany (dedicated in 1985), by the Communist German Democratic Republic government provides a supreme, well-known example for this argument,[32] as does this follow-up story that occurred three years after the temple dedication.

In the month of October 1988, Erich Honecker, who as the general secretary of the Socialist Unity Party led the East German government from 1971 to 1989, invited the three main LDS leaders in East Germany, Manfred Schütze and Frank Apel (both stake presidents) and Henry Burkhardt (the temple president) to his office. They were told by Honecker that the government was considering presenting a gift to the LDS Church and that they were to come up with an appropriate proposal on what this gift should be. Not wanting to abuse the government's offer and making sure that the Church presented itself properly, the Church leadership offered three options and suggested that German Democratic Government could choose whichever one it deemed best.

The first option was to allow East German boys to attend a Church-sponsored, Europe-wide, Boy Scout jamboree to be held in Brexbachtal, West Germany. The second was to allow young men from East Germany to go to the West and serve full-time missions. The third was to allow foreign missionaries to enter East Germany in order to proselyte. In spite of the fact that all three options were extremely sensitive issues at the time, Mr. Honecker, as head of the East German government, granted the Church all three in gratitude for the contributions and good behavior of the Church members who lived in his country. He said that he was impressed with the way the

The Freiberg Temple, 2006.

Church organized the open house for the temple in East Germany a few years earlier and the way the Church supported the family. In fact, on this last issue, Honecker said that if all East Germans were Mormons, the country would be much stronger, since the basis for strong society is the family.[33]

The Savior's admonition to "render . . . unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's" (Matthew 22:21) is more than a clever way for Jesus to fend off the Pharisees. It acknowledges the reality, which all institutions incorporated into a larger political entity must do, that God's Church must and will abide by the government rules and regulations of its resident political entity. Recognizing the political complexities that exist in a globalized world is important, remembering that on more than one occasion—notably Missouri in the 1830s, Illinois in the 1840s, and Utah through most of the later part of the nineteenth century—the

perception of the Church's over-involvement in politics unleashed serious backlash against it.

Erich Honecker, general secretary and chairman of the GDR's Council of State. May 1976.

The Church has, over the last few decades, attempted to maintain strict neutrality in partisan politics,[34] and it has advised its members that as a worldwide institution, it adopts no political party or ideology as its own. In fact, in its marvelous statement on political civility, the Church unambiguously declares: "As the Church operates in countries around the world, it embraces the richness of pluralism. Thus, the political diversity of Latter-day Saints spans the ideological spectrum. Individual members are free to choose their own political philosophy and affiliation. Moreover, the Church itself is not aligned with any particular political ideology or movement. It defies category. Its moral values may be expressed in a number of parties and ideologies."[35]

Minus an official Church political ideology, Latter-day Saints need not fall into the psychological trap of believing that the politics and culture of their particular country are the same as God's. Indeed, in making his case for government by God, John Taylor suggested that all governments are deficient when compared to God's: "Happiness and Peace are the gifts of God, and come from him. Every kind of government has its good and evil properties. . . . Our systems, our policy, our legislation, our education, and philosophy, are all wrong . . . and our present position is a manifest proof of our

incompetency to govern; and our past failures make it evident, that any future effort, with the same means, would be as useless."[36]

As the Church continues its push toward becoming a global institution, it will likewise continue to move past its American cultural underpinnings and, by so doing, flourish. Without having to change the doctrine or even its core essential practices, much can be done to find a way to get the message across in a diversity of cultures. Recognizing which elements of the Church need to stay centralized and which elements could be left up to the leadership of local cultures will be a crucial element of this navigation. Those who hold the keys of the priesthood have helped the Church traverse rough political and cultural waters in the past during difficult transitional periods. They will continue to do so through this globalizing period. In fact, in ways perhaps unnoticed by many members, many leaders have, over the last few decades, given talks meant to broaden the Church's cultural and political vision preparatory to greater international growth, none being any better than this statement by President Gordon B. Hinckley: "Let us be good citizens of the nations in which we live. Let us be good neighbors in our communities. Let us acknowledge the diversity of our society, recognizing the good in all people. We need not make any surrender of our theology. But we can set aside any element of suspicion, of provincialism, of parochialism."[37]

Notes

1. Max Weber, *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*, vol. 1 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978); Max Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism: and Other Writings* (New York: Penguin, 2002); Ann Swidler, "Culture in Action: Symbols and Strategies," *American Sociological Review* 50, no. 2 (April 1986): 273–86; Eleonora Federici, "The Translator's Intertextual Baggage," *Forum for Modern Language Studies* 43, no. 2 (April 2007): 147–60.

2. Swidler, "Culture in Action," 273.
3. Federici, "The Translator's Intertextual Baggage," 147.
4. For an excellent overview of different ways to look at "Mormon Culture," we refer the reader to Wilfried Decoo, "In Search of Mormon Identity: Mormon Culture, Gospel Culture, and an American Worldwide Church," *International Journal of Mormon Studies* 6 (December 2013); and Armand L. Mauss, "Feelings, Faith, and Folkways: A Personal Essay on Mormon Popular Culture," in *Proving Contraries: A Collection of Writings in Honor of Eugene England*, ed. Robert A. Rees (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 2004), 23–38.
5. J. M. Penning, "Americans' Views of Muslims and Mormons: A Social Identity Theory Approach," *Politics and Religion* 2, no. 2 (August 2009): 277–302.
6. For examples, see Decoo, "In Search of Mormon Identity," 32.
7. Armand L. Mauss, *All Abraham's Children* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2003), 4.
8. Robert L. Wilken, *The Christians as the Romans Saw Them* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1984).
9. K. D. Driggs, "Mormon Church-State Confrontation in Nineteenth-Century America," *Journal of Church and State* 30, no. 2 (1988): 273–89. See also Leonard J. Arrington, *Great Basin Kingdom: An Economic History of the Latter-day Saints, 1830–1900* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1958).
10. Leonard J. Arrington and Davis Bitton, *The Mormon Experience: A History of the Latter-day Saints* (New York: Vintage Books, 1980); Gustive O. Larson, *The "Americanization" of Utah for Statehood* (San Marino, CA: The Huntington Library, 1971); Gustive O. Larson, *Outline History of Utah and the Mormons* (Salt Lake City: Deseret News, 1958).
11. Thomas Alexander, *Mormonism in Transition: A History of the Latter-day Saints* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1986); Sarah Barringer Gordon, *The Mormon Question: Polygamy and Constitutional Conflict in Nineteenth-Century America* (Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 2002); Ethan R. Yorgason, *Transformation of the Mormon Culture Region* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2003); Lawrence Young, "Confronting Turbulent Environments: Issues in the Organizational Growth and Globalization of

Mormonism," in *Contemporary Mormonism: Social Science Perspectives*, ed. Marie Cornwall, Tim B. Heaton, and Lawrence Alfred Young (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2001)

12. Wilford Woodruff, "Excerpts from Three Addresses by President Wilford Woodruff Regarding the Manifesto," April 1893, www.lds.org/scriptures/dc-testament/od/1?lang=eng.
13. Arrington, *Great Basin Kingdom.*
14. Harold Bloom, *The American Religion: The Emergence of the Post-Christian Nation* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1992).
15. Young, "Confronting Turbulent Environments," 46.
16. Eric A. Eliason, *Mormons and Mormonism: An Introduction to an American World Religion* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2001).
17. J. Reuben Clark Jr., in Conference Report, October 1937, 107.
18. Marjorie Newton, "'Almost Like Us': The American Socialization of Australian Converts," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 24, no. 3 (Fall 1991): 9–20. www.dialoguejournal.com/wp-content/uploads/sbi/articles/Dialogue_V24N03_11.pdf.
19. John McCormick, *Understanding the European Union*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), 41–42.
20. S. V. Monsma and J. C. Soper, *The Challenge of Pluralism: Church and State in Five Democracies* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2008).
21. Tad Walch, "LDS Conference Talks May Be Given in Native Languages," *Deseret News,* September 8, 2014, www.deseretnews.com/article/865610540/LDS-conference-talks-may-be-given-in-native-languages.html?pg=all.
22. Joann Jolley, "First Presidency Statement on Basing MX Missile," www.lds.org/ensign/1981/06/news-of-the-church?lang=eng.
23. Personal conversations between European members of the Church and Hans Noot.
24. The Savior strongly suggests that we cannot simply tell the "little ones"—probably new members or those still weak in the faith—"Don't be offended." Instead, he warns the Apostles that they must not give offense (see Matthew 18:6). Paul taught the same principle when he advised those who could make

the distinction between the actual worship of idols and simply eating sacrificed meat, to refrain from such a meal if it would spiritually injure those who could not make the distinction (see 1 Corinthians 8:8). By so doing, he placed the burden of cultural assimilation into the church on the spiritually strong members rather than the weak.

25. ReversoContext, "Repent," http://context.reverso.net/%C3%BCbersetzung/englisch-deutsch/repent+1.
26. Mao Tse-Tung, "The Role of the Chinese Communist Party in the National War," *Selected Works of Mao Tse-Tung*, vol. 2 (Beijing: Foreign Languages Press, 1965), 198, cited in Liu Shaoqi, "How to Be a Good Communist," 1939, available at http://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/liu-shaoqi/1939/how-to-be/ch01.htm. Shaoqi was chairman of the Chinese National People's Congress Standing Committee (NPC) from 1954 to 1959.
27. Liu Shaoqi, "How to Be a Good Communist."
28. For more examples on Catholicism and Mormonism, see Wilfried Decoo, "'As Our Two Faiths Have Worked Together'—Catholicism and Mormonism on Human Life Ethics and Same-Sex Marriage," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 46, no. 3 (Fall 2013): 1–44.
29. The idea of white shirts as a formality started in the Highland Park Ward in Salt Lake City in 1928–1940. Instead of neckties, bowties were used, because they "do more to build morale and pride in organization-membership, than a 10,000 word lecture." See Justin R. Bray, "Excessive Formalities in the Mormon Sacrament, 1928–1940," *Intermountain West Journal of Religious Studies* 4, no. 1 (2013). http://digitalcommons.usu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1021&context=imwjournal.
30. Albanian cultural loyalties strongly exemplify the complexities and challenges faced by the Church on this issue. For many Albanians in Kosovo and the Former Republic of Macedonia (FYROM), even though the United States is seen as sympathetic to Albanian interests in the region, conversion to the Church would signify the submerging of their national identity to that of the (Christian) Slavic populations around them.
31. See Milos Teodorovic and Ron Synovitz, "Balkan Militants Join Syria's Rebel Cause," *Radio Free Europe*, January 29, 2014, http://www.rferl.org/content

/syria-balkan-militants-join-rebel-cause/25011213.html. According to a *Salt Lake Tribune* report in November of last year, two sister missionaries were attacked by two ethnic Albanians who were also "suspected of planning an attack on an unidentified target with four other suspects, allegedly inspired by extreme Islamist ideology. . . . The six men were arrested Nov. 5, two days after the missionaries were attacked in Pristina." See Erin Alberty, "Two Mormon Sister Missionaries Beaten in Kosovo," *Salt Lake Tribune*, November 13, 2013, http://www.sltrib.com/sltrib/news/57125799-78/police-kosovo-suspects-official.html.csp.

32. David F. Boone and Richard O. Cowan, "The Freiberg Temple: A Latter-Day Miracle," in *Regional Studies in Latter-day Church History: Europe*, ed. Donald Q. Cannon and Brent L. Top (Provo, UT: Religious Studies Center, 2003), 147–67, http://rsc.byu.edu/archived/regional-studies-latter-day-saint-church-history-europe/8-freiberg-germany-temple-latter-day.
33. Manfred Schütze, then stake president of Dresden Germany Stake, to Hans Noot, email, June 14, 2014.
34. The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, "Political Neutrality," http://www.mormonnewsroom.org/official-statement/political-neutrality.
35. The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, "The Mormon Ethic of Civility," October 16, 2009, http://www.mormonnewsroom.org/ldsnewsroom/eng/commentary/the-mormon-ethic-of-civility.
36. John Taylor, *The Government of God* (Liverpool: S.W. Richards, 1852), 24–26, https://archive.org/details/governmentofgodb03tayl.
37. Gordon B. Hinckley, in Conference Report, April 1997, 116.