

EUGENE ENGLAND'S CALCULATED RISK:
THE STRUGGLE FOR ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND RELIGIOUS DIALOGUE
Presented at the 2010 Salt Lake Sunstone Symposium, 5 August 2010
Charlotte Hansen

EUGENE ENGLAND, who was a graduate of the University of Utah and whose papers are currently being processed at the Marriott Library, was an influential English and Mormon literature professor. He was also a pioneer in the fields of Mormon literature and studies who asked the hard questions in his writings, and helped to build faith through that process.

Through the process of studying England's papers and writings for my Honors thesis at the University of Utah I was able to see the development of his own personal voice, as well as track his thinking on his academic interests. I have found in his writings a deep commitment to respectful dialogue, academic freedom, and a determination to remain within the institution of the LDS Church. England wanted to create spaces where those who felt distanced from the LDS Church could feel accepted and loved, spaces where it was safe to question, and through the questioning find truth and come closer to God.

Krista Tippett, host of the NPR show "Speaking of Faith," said in a recent Sterling M. McMurrin lecture¹ on the University of Utah campus that religion needs a place in the public university. Religion in the latter part of the 20th century was done in private. People could not imagine intelligent public religious discussion without proselytizing. Now in the 21st century we are seeing changes. Academia is beginning to recognize religion and spirituality as essential to any discipline. There is less compartmentalization occurring in fields, and religious studies programs are getting established and expanding on American campuses. Krista Tippett and others are calling for and seeing realized today what England started to speak about in the 1960s—open dialogue between the secular and spiritual. By analyzing England's writings we can find ways to create a better dialogue now in the early 21st century, especially on university campuses. The University of Utah has just begun its own Religious Studies program. For this program to succeed, and to create a healthy dialogue concerning Mormon Studies, there needs to be a shift from polarizing attitudes and a desire for academic freedom that makes space possible for dialogue that builds community.

In 2009 I took a British Studies seminar from Prof. Mark Matheson where we discussed as a class John Milton and the prophetic voice. We defined a prophet as someone from the outskirts desiring to change society or religion from within and take the people forward. Matheson said one thing that resonated with me: "Milton realized that through a process of questioning and going into doubt you could emerge in some sense healed. He realized that it was not only from the pulpit that the word of God could be spoken. It could come from a poet like himself." At that moment I finally understood what England had chosen to do with his life's work—develop and serve as a prophetic voice. Let me explain what I mean by prophetic voice.

In an essay about prophets in America around 1830, Richard H. Brodhead defines the prophetic voice in this way:

A prophet is a person singled out to enjoy special knowledge of ultimate reality and to give others mediated access to that otherwise unavailable truth. A prophet is also a man with a mission, one whose relation to a deep truth both requires and entitles him to enact that knowledge against the grain of worldly understandings. To say this is not to declare that some figures actually are this rare, super-entitled kind of self. Though religious belief will confer the status of true prophet on some figures

and deny it to others (the decision that a Jesus, or a Muhammad, or a Joseph Smith was God's earthly messenger lies at the core of the choice of faith), the history of prophetism must include everyone who has envisioned and asserted himself on these terms. Apart from the designation of faith, the prophet is never just something a person is but also something a person *takes himself to be* and *demands to be taken as*. This means that in the prehistory of any act of prophetic identification, a person must have access to some concept of "the prophet," an image that circulates in the cultural repertoire of identities as one idea of what a self can be. When people "become" prophets, they identify with some concept of the prophetic self, project themselves into this concept, and use it to tell themselves and others who they are.²

The prophetic voice does not always come from one "true prophet." Many people consider themselves to be prophets in the way that Brodhead explains. The Old Testament is filled with the words of many different prophets, such as Isaiah having coal placed on his tongue³ for purification to speak the words of God. In history many writers, such as Milton and Emerson, spoke of feeling a calling to profess truth in their writings and call people to action. Brodhead focuses on Joseph Smith, Nat Turner, and Ralph Waldo Emerson as examples of prophetic voices in the 19th century. Martin Luther King Jr. served as a prophetic voice in the 20th century. At great personal cost, he challenged the norms that society had created, boldly calling for correction of values, beliefs, changed hearts and minds. Einstein spoke for the rights of African Americans as well, but he also spoke out against science being used to harm humankind rather than help. He believed that there was a moral stature of science itself, and said that all should have a positive responsibility for their own actions. Rachel Carson advanced the environmental movement with her writings on the ocean and synthetic pesticides, which led to the organization of the Environmental Protection Agency. Gandhi, called the Father of the Nation in India, participated in and promoted the use of civil disobedience, and also advocated for people to speak the truth. These amazing individuals indicate that prophetic voices can be found in many different disciplines and nations.

Brodhead compares Joseph Smith and Emerson in their different views of prophetic identity. Within both Smith's and Emerson's concepts of the prophetic there are elements of Eugene England. In 1838 Emerson addressed the Harvard Divinity School and spoke of the role of a preacher-prophet.⁴ Emerson "proclaims that the function of the great prophets of the past is to call us to our own prophetic careers."⁵ For Emerson God is revealed in "any strong display of self." Brodhead observes the effects of this concept:

Emerson's work...is to revive a prophetic conception of selfhood and rethink it in such a way that prophetic identity becomes virtually synonymous with selfhood itself. Personal identity is elevated in this process, made identical with the elect selfhood previously reserved for the prophets...Prophecy itself is also radically diffused through this reconceptualization, removed from the category of rarity and made widely available and familiar...The selfhood that is in touch with the sacred is reimaged by Emerson as something completely democratic, something open to each of us to the extent that we have an identity and *are someone*.

According to Emerson, the prophetic is within anyone who can identify and express their essential self. Part of our essential selves is our religious identity, and England saw himself as essentially Mormon. In the Emersonian sense, England developed the prophetic voice in his writings, especially his writing challenging and critiquing the academic institution and religious culture. England championed the personal essay, a literary form where there is discovery of true self through reveal-

ing it to the world. Prophetic voice is what makes the personal essay work. God is found through personal evaluation, and revelation and a call to action can emerge through such a process.

Both Emerson and Smith claim that revelation is not dead, and that direct access to divinity is possible.⁶ Unlike Emerson, Smith asserts absolute truths and also claims to be God's elect intermediary. Professing to possess authority direct from God, he founded a new institution of religion with a unique theology. In contrast, Emerson "having founded his career on the refusal of received rites, the last thing [he] has in mind is the creation of new ones."⁷ It is because of the institution of religion that Emerson left the churches and spoke of the discovery of God within. By accepting the religious institution's authority to define truth, England follows Smith. He believes in the importance of belonging and remaining committed to a religious community. Yet one must also realize the prophetic voice within, which is different than the prophetic leader. England's prophetic voice encourages community, without the extremes of blind obedience or disloyal dissent.

By identifying with and being loyal to his religious community, England is similar to Old Testament prophets and other religious writers, such as Isaiah and Milton. He is part of the institution, and has strong faith within it. But he feels that calling from God to improve the institution. He points out hypocrisy and failures, first within himself, and calls everyone to repentance and rededication to core beliefs. Just as in other writers, this powerful personal voice that develops can be traced back to England's early writings. There are many different issues that England emphasized in his writings and lectures. But there is one topic that England writes on more than any other, which was a central theme of his life: the importance of dialogue. One of England's favorite quotes from Joseph Smith is "By proving contraries truth is made manifest."⁸ He believes that in exploring opposing ideas and questioning assumptions, we come closer to God and find our true selves.

Just as Milton saw that in being a poet he could ask the questions that could heal the souls of those who read his works, England believed that in writing and promoting dialogue this same result could be reached. Dialogue will keep people within the institution. Academic freedom, or the right for a teacher to teach and a student to learn, was closely connected with England's concept of dialogue. As a professor he saw that a university was one of the best places to ask questions and find truth. England's deep commitment to dialogue led him to create spaces for those who identified with yet felt distanced from the institution to have a community to address their struggles, just as a classroom can be a space for constructive dialogue to occur. England had a strong case to make for the importance of dialogue, but it was also a difficult one to make to the institutions of secular and religious universities alike. Many people are uncomfortable with open dialogue, whether in a religious or secular context. But despite this opposition, England was strong in his convictions, and learned from his experiences of failure and success in creating constructive dialogue.

Greatly influenced by prominent scholars teaching at that time—including Lowell Bennion, Sterling McMurrin, and Jack Adamson—England's voice began to develop when he was at the University of Utah during the 1950s. England had a profound paradigm shift in 1964, when he was a Danforth Fellow at Stanford University, working on a doctorate in English, focusing on American literature. At this point England professes relatively liberal views that he found more aligned with the core doctrines of the Latter-day Saint faith. Employed as an LDS Institute instructor, he was warned not to teach ethics of violence if he wanted to keep his job. He was also serving in the Stanford bishopric. As he navigated the secular and religious worlds, England struggled with exactly where he fit:

As I served in these capacities, I saw more and more how relative are the terms liberal and conservative. I found I could change from one to the other simply by walk-

ing across Stanford Avenue from the university to the Institute building. On campus, among graduate students and anti-war and civil-rights activists, I was that strange, non-smoking, short-haired, family-raising conservative; at the Institute, I was that strange liberal who renounced war and worried about fair-housing and free speech. Of course, I was the same person both places; those terms reduced me to a stereotype, often marginalized me, and sometimes caused me real harm—but they did not touch my real self.⁹

In both the secular and religious institutions that England was involved in he did not fit the stereotypes that people had given him. He consciously rejects being reduced to these stereotypes; “they did not touch [his] real self.” But what was England’s true self that was not being touched? Through later writings it is evident that this real self is the authentic self; a self that recognizes its own shortcomings, cannot be contained in any one label, and does not allow others to be comfortable in their labels either. This reflection indicates to me how England at this time begins developing a prophetic voice unrestricted by the institution.

By 1965 it is evident which path England decides to tread. Rather than trying to fit into either stereotype, he begins to create his own path, along with others. Recognizing a need for a space where Mormon intellectuals can publish and struggle with their questions, he cofounds a *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* with several other graduate students. Even though this would generally be seen as a liberal thing to do, England saw himself as still basically conservative. He says that he helped to start *Dialogue* “for the express purpose of helping young LDS students, like those [he] taught each day at Stanford, build and preserve their testimonies.”

In England’s first editorial, “The Possibility of Dialogue,” his prophetic voice begins to emerge. England talks about the risk but also the importance of faithful questioning. He states: “The very principles I accept as definitive of my life warn me to be continually open to the revelation of new possibilities for my life from both God and man.”¹⁰ England finds revealed truth in all around him, and is open to that direction.

England believes “dialogue is possible if we can avoid looking upon doubt as a sin—or as a virtue—but can see it as a condition, a condition that can be productive if it leads one to seek and knock and ask and if the doubter is approached with sympathetic listening and thoughtful response.”¹¹ Dialogue is a condition or context, an environment that can be created. Within this condition of dialogue England says we must express ourselves in a certain way: “A dialogue is possible if, in trying to describe our findings and convictions, we can be honest with ourselves and each other.” Dialogue cannot reach its full possibilities unless there is charity, since dialogue is about engaging others in genuine conversation:

We must truly listen to each other, respecting our essential brotherhood and the courage of those who try to speak, however they may differ from us in professional standing or religious belief or moral vision. We must speak and listen patiently, with good humor, with real expectation, and our dialogue can serve both truth and charity.

This idea of dialogue is what motivated England to encourage academic freedom. Only by having opposing opinions can truth be found and society survive. England concludes the essay:

My faith as a Mormon encourages by specific doctrines my feeling *that each man is eternally unique and god-like in potential, that each man deserves a hearing and that we have something important to learn from each man if we can hear him—if he can speak and we can listen well*. Dialogue is possible to those who can. Such a di-

alogue will not solve all of our intellectual and spiritual problems—and it will not save us; but it can bring us joy and new vision and help us toward that dialogue with our deepest selves and with our God, which can save us.¹² (my emphasis)

England sees each person and their words as important. He encourages dialogue because it helps each person to have open dialogue with God. As England says earlier, dialogue cannot reach its full potential without charity. Only by having charity can God's word be heard. England's desire is to bring people closer to Christ and help them hold fast to good things. He challenges his readers to make the choice to listen with love and allow others to speak.

Soon after the start of *Dialogue*, England was invited to speak to the LDS Institute students at the University of Utah. In that lecture he states:

The burden of effort lies with the critic; that those who think they see something wrong with an institution—such as the Church—are the ones who bear the burden of doing something about it, something effective, something that takes cognizance of their responsibility to other people and how they can respond to them; that they have no right to withdraw and throw rocks.¹³

President Hugh B. Brown, one of England's mentors and an unwavering *Dialogue* supporter, says the following in an address to BYU students in 1969:

One cannot think right without running the risk of thinking wrong, but generally more thinking is the antidote for the evils that spring from wrong thinking... And we call upon you students to exercise your God-given right to think through on every proposition that is submitted to you and be unafraid to express your opinions, with proper respect for those to whom you talk and proper acknowledgement of your own shortcomings... We are not so much concerned with whether your thoughts are orthodox or heterodox as we are that you shall *have* thoughts.¹⁴

England was a disciple who thought, just as Brown urged BYU students to do. Like other prophetic voices, England did not have to fit in either category of critic or apologist, as many people had expected he would. England's uniquely Mormon voice and his method of faithful questioning make his words still relevant to discussions on campuses today.

England also wanted to help students understand what being a Mormon intellectual meant. In an address to BYU students in 1974 he states:

I use [the term intellectual] in an essentially neutral way, as descriptive of your gift from the Lord that makes you delight in ideas, alive to the life that goes on *in* your mind as well as outside it, that makes you question set forms and conventional wisdom to see if they really are truth or only habit... I use the term intellectual to refer to the gift from the Lord that makes you curious about why as well as how, anxious to serve Him by being creative as well as obedient.¹⁵

To England being an intellectual is a gift from God, and the term should not be viewed in a negative light.

England's journey at BYU and UVSC in the final twenty-five years of his life is one in which England's hope for more academic freedom is both realized and restricted. Just as they had at Stanford and St. Olaf, England's writings give a glimpse into these transitions that occurred. Despite the setbacks that England experiences at BYU, he is still able to see the calculated risk of academic freedom be realized later at UVSC, leading to his final lecture at the Sunstone Symposium where he continues to advocate for the rights of students and teachers.

In 1977 when England started teaching at BYU, he saw the university as having the type of

academic freedom that he saw as most important, since students and teachers could talk positively about their beliefs. He felt a deep shock of recognition at BYU, saying that it was home. During the 1980s issues with academic freedom arose at BYU and he spoke out, challenging the administration and calling the faculty and students to action. One of a few professors willing to take a public stand, England continued to publish editorials and give lectures advocating for academic freedom. In 1990, in an article in the *Student Review*, an independent student newspaper, England says there must be opposition in all things, even at BYU. He provides a model that BYU should follow:

The proper model for opposition in all things is...an open marketplace of ideas, where we *seek out* those who disagree with us as best helps in improving our research and thinking, where we *constantly create* opportunities for public clash of ideas through debates, open forums, independent publications and seminars.¹⁶

Dialogue is essential to the true academic freedom that England envisions. These two passions of England begin to coincide in a very powerful way in many of his essays.

In 1992 England writes an article about spectral evidence. He talks about the Salem witch trials, where the idea of spectral evidence comes from, meaning evidence that is based on the idea that people have devils doing their bidding. He says that Mormons do many of the same things that have occurred throughout history with spectral evidence:

We too make judgments of other human beings based on static, partial, even merely reported images of them that we take to represent their whole beings and therefore to constitute the basis for a fair presumption of their evilness or guilt which we and others must act on. When we do so we use evidence that is as spectral and devilishly dangerous as that which condemned the Puritan "witches."¹⁷

England says that when BYU students complain about a teacher to their church leaders rather than speaking with their professors, or when people are rejected from a teaching position or from publication because of their unusual beliefs or controversial reputation, that is spectral evidence. He continues:

Human beings cannot be reduced to an action, a political or intellectual position, a quotation in a newspaper, an essay or story they have written. Each of those, even if clearly and fully seen (which is impossible, since we always see only partially, from a particular point of view), is still only part, a static part, of what is a constantly dynamic, complex, failing, and repenting potential god. We are never less—and actually much more because of our infinite potential—than the complete sum of our history, our stories, a sum which is constantly increasing, changing, through time.¹⁸

England has had these experiences of being reduced to such things, but refuses to see others in this way and challenges everyone to look beyond this narrow view. He says the terms "liberal" and "conservative" are examples of this "mischief that reliance on spectral evidence can do to a community," especially since these terms once identified "two equally ethical and valued political perspectives."¹⁹

For the next five years England does not publish in *Dialogue* or *Sunstone* or participate in *Sunstone* Symposia by request of BYU Presidents Rex Lee and Merrill Bateman. It is during this period that many people are fired or being forced into retirement, especially in the English Department. During Merrill Bateman's administration, England is asked to retire without protest in 1998. The administration does not give England any justification for this action. England is humiliated but does not publicly lash out as he had after not being granted tenure at St. Olaf.

Even though England has this “forced retirement” from BYU, England is not ready to give up his passion for teaching college students. So England begins to teach at Utah Valley State College (now Utah Valley University) in the fall of 1998. He is named as the school's first Writer in Residence, and begins to teach Mormon literature classes at the college. England also helps in the development of the Ethics Center on campus, through which a Mormon Studies program is created, one of the first in the nation. Along with the Ethics Center at UVSC, England also participates in inter-ecumenical dialogues, one of which is published after his death.²⁰ England also promotes and participates in more discussions with postmodernists and feminists. England begins to publish in *Dialogue* and *Sunstone* again, continuing to promote the role of intellectual dialogue in the Mormon community

By 2000 the programs at UVSC are becoming well established, and are even receiving grants. England now argues for freedom in Utah higher education in multiple newspaper editorials as well as presentations. England's final Sunstone Symposium address, “Calculated Risk: Freedom for Mormons in Utah Higher Education,”²¹ is a powerful culmination of all that England has been fighting for on college campuses. England's argument in this paper is that in 1960, the University of Utah was the institution in Utah higher education with the greatest academic freedom, BYU was in 1980, and that now in 2000 UVSC “may be the place both faculty and students have the greatest opportunity for genuinely free and productive intellectual inquiry.” England mentions current articles that discuss the issue of Mormonism at the U, and how differences are not meshing there. England believes that people do not see these differences as an educational opportunity. Since the University of Utah has a majority of LDS students, it should take advantage of this by fostering healthy discussions that address Mormon culture and history. England comments on his experiences at BYU, saying that despite the “golden age” of the 1980s, many have now become defeated by the culture wars of the 1990s.

England gives the history of struggles for academic freedom, especially in the United States. He acknowledges that academic freedom is a risk, but one that is necessary:

Academic freedom is not an inherent natural right, nor a basic constitutional right protected under the First Amendment. It is a calculated risk, a privilege granted by society, which pays the taxes and gives the contributions which make possible our very expensive higher educational system, a risk taken because society has come to accept that academic freedom serves the long-term best interests of society. Both academic freedom and tenure have been recognized by most thinkers to have serious disadvantages, but most also believe the benefits accrued to society are well worth those disadvantages: it is a calculated risk and always fragile, in danger of being misused or diminished.²²

This calculated risk of academic freedom has been tested and challenged, but is still seen as important. While quoting Walter Lipmann's essay, “The Indispensable Opposition,” England actually gets emotional. His voice wavers. This is one of the few times in his recorded presentations that this occurs. At this point the brain cancer that caused England's death was probably affecting in his emotions, but I also think it shows how important this subject is to England: “We must protect the right of our opponents to speak because we must hear what they have to say...[England pauses]...because freedom of discussion improves our own opinions, the liberties of other[s] are our own vital necessity...Freedom of speech...may not produce the truth...But if the truth can be found, there is no other system which will normally and habitually find so much truth.”²³

England says that we are failing as Mormons and rejecting our heritage because of our

unwillingness to take the calculated risk of “free exploration and expression which Mormon theology itself claims is necessary for individual salvation—and which existed, even at the highest levels, in earlier times.”²⁴ England sees a 1969 statement to BYU students by Hugh B. Brown as the correct Mormon position on academic freedom:

“One of the most important things in the world is freedom of the mind; from this all other freedoms spring. Such freedom is necessarily dangerous, for one cannot think right without running the risk of thinking wrong, but generally more thinking is the antidote for the evils that spring from wrong thinking... Think through on every proposition that is submitted to you and be unafraid to express your opinions, with proper respect for those to whom you talk and proper acknowledgement of your own shortcomings.” If that is, as I believe it is, an accurate statement of the official Mormon position on academic freedom, then the place Mormons can in the year 2000 expect to find the greatest academic freedom is not BYU, certainly not the University of Utah. It just may be—UVSC.

England shares the hopes that he has for the future of academic freedom, and how teachers at UVSC are working with the challenges, “the Scylla and Charybdis that we must pass between” in their work to find the correct balance in their studies of faith and reason to have true dialogue occur. England finishes the paper with a final caution and obligation for students:

[Students need to] grow up... assume that college will challenge their thinking and cause them to reassess their culture values, because that is precisely what higher education is for. It is to move us from being provincial to being citizens of the world... Otherwise, our world and even our Utah society are condemned to continue in prejudice and discrimination and even violence.²⁵

This last comment to students, as well as the whole presentation, is the cautioning of one who has experienced much in life. England is bold in his assessment and confident in his hope for the future. Within a year of this lecture England died from brain cancer. This lecture becomes quite significant because of this, as it is the last large public presentation we have from England.

In a 1988 essay where England looked back on the beginnings of *Dialogue*,²⁶ he explains how the personal essay is the best literary form to express prophetic voice. The voice that England sees existing in the personal essay is the voice that the most influential prophets in the LDS tradition use. England believes that *Dialogue*, the journal, has made it possible for writers to develop this same voice. Even though England never declares himself as a prophetic voice—which would have undermined the power of such a voice—the fact that England links the prophetic voice with the “soft, piercing, and personal voice” of the personal essay, his favored form of expression, means he is prophetic. He purposely develops his own uniquely Mormon prophetic voice in his writings. England is best known for his development of the Mormon personal essay. Recognized as the “father of the Mormon personal essay,” England is one of the most powerful Mormon writers with a prophetic voice from the latter part of the 20th century.

England, in all of his writings and through his life, called for people to act. Even though England has been gone for almost ten years, his words and example are still influential. He serves as a prophetic voice within Mormonism. And like any prophetic voice, his words remain relevant. Today we should continue to fight for what England risked so much to defend: the calculated but valuable risk of dialogue and academic freedom on our own college campuses and within religious institutions here in Utah. At the University of Utah as we continue into the 21st century, we need to continue to create a campus where such opposition in dialogue can exist so that each side will

be able to come out with more truth than they had before. We should not ignore our history or the value of engaging with the dominant culture in Utah. At the same time all voices and cultures must have an equal opportunity to be analyzed and celebrated. Our cultural assumptions need to be challenged. It is only through this process that we can truly gain the type of education that will help us in such a diverse world. We are on the right path, and we are seeing the needed improvements to make this type of education possible. But we still have many ways we can improve. I believe that Mormon intellectuals have an important responsibility in helping these needed improvements to occur. We should never be satisfied with our current position. Only through struggling to express and understand our core beliefs can we come closer to creating the ideal learning environment that England envisioned on university campuses—both religious and secular.

NOTES

¹ Krista Tippett, "Speaking of Faith," Sterling M. McMurrin Lecture for the University of Utah, 10 November 2009 in Salt Lake City, Utah.

² Richard H. Brodhead, "Prophets in America circa 1830: Ralph Waldo Emerson, Nat Turner, Joseph Smith," *Joseph Smith Jr., Reappraisals after Two Centuries*, ed. Reid L. Neilson and Terry L. Givens (Oxford University Press, 2009), 13–29. This quotation from pg. 18.

³ Bible, King James Version, Isaiah 6:5–8.

⁴ Brodhead, 22.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 23.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 25.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 27.

⁸ *History of the Church*, 6:428.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 33.

¹⁰ Eugene England, "The Possibility of Dialogue," *Dialogue* 1:1 (Spring 1966): 8–11. This quotation from pg 9.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 10.

¹² *Ibid.*, 11.

¹³ Eugene England, "Dialogue—The Idea and The Journal," address given at the Salt Lake Institute of Religion, 30 September 1966. This quotation from pg. 8. Retrieved from BYU L. Tom Perry Special Collections.

¹⁴ Quoted in Eugene England, "'No Cause, No Cause': An Essay Toward Reconciliation," *Sunstone* 121 (January 2002): 31–39. This quote from pg 34.

¹⁵ Eugene England, "Great Books or True Religion? Defining the Mormon Scholar," *Dialogue* 9:4 (Winter 1974): 36–49. reprinted in *Dialogues with Myself* (Midvale: Orion Books, 1984), 57–76. This quotation from pg. 37.

¹⁶ "Opposition In All Things—Even at BYU," *The Student Review*, 13 April 1990, pg 8, 10.

¹⁷ Eugene England, "On Spectral Evidence, Scapegoating, and False Accusation," in *Making Peace* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1995), 23–42. This quotation from pg. 26.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 27.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 28.

²⁰ Dwight N. Hopkins and Eugene England, "A Dialogue on Black Theology," *Mormonism in Dialogue with Contemporary Christian Theologies*, ed. By Donald W. Musser and David L. Paulsen (Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press, 2007), 341–84.

²¹ This Sunstone presentation, which was given in August 2000, has never been published. Notes for this presentation can be found in Eugene England Papers, J. Willard Marriott Library Special Collections. You can listen to the audio of this presentation by going to the Sunstone magazine website, sunstonemagazine.com.

²² *Ibid.*, 13.

²³ *Ibid.*, 14.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 16.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 18.

²⁶ Eugene England, "On Building the Kingdom with Dialogue," *Dialogue* 21:2 (Summer 1988): 128–33.