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ABSTRACT

A case study of Utah's sex education debate of the late 1980s and early 1990s is the vehicle used to study the education and social policy process of Utah. Interest group influence is tested, and Utah history and Mormon sexual culture are discussed. The influence of historical and cultural forces on policy, through the medium of interest groups, is explored. Strong indications of group influence are revealed and groups are found to be representative of dissimilar, competing cultures in Utah. Migration is found to play a key role in social conflict in Utah.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This project is about interest groups, cultural conflict, and public policy. What this study is really not about is sex education. Although some details of sex curricula will appear in the course of the research, along with occasional data suggesting that one approach may be superior to another, it is not the author's purpose to decide what form of sex education is best for the children of the state of Utah. Rather, this is an investigation of social conflict and power in a unique and changing region of America. The Utah sex education debate of the late 1980s and early 1990s, which focused on the state's creation of a curriculum resource for teachers, is a vehicle for studying the social policy process of Utah and the influence of its organizations and interests.

Why Utah?

Although the author originally considered projects in other western states relating to education and social policy, the possibility of conducting a case study on Utah policy creation proved most attractive. Utah is on the
margins of American society in many ways (see Tables 1-3). Generally, the state's characteristics would be considered positive if quality of life issues were at the fore. However, among more comprehensive statistics on Utah peculiar contradictions will from time to time appear. Drawing conclusions of causation from these is a risky business in a state where national norms and assumptions may not always apply. Of particular interest to this study are the state's unwed pregnancy rate, teen birth rate, and abortion rate (Table 2) which, along with certain other numbers, seem to indicate a moral and reproductive culture apart from that of the American mainstream.

Statistical data on Utah raise a myriad of questions for researchers to examine—and many have been researched over the years. This study, however, will not be a quantitative analysis seeking to demonstrate significant correlations in social statistics. Here the author simply wishes to focus attention on Utah's unusual social climate. As the study unfolds it is likely that a substantial number of hypotheses will appear in the thoughtful reader's mind to help explain the Utah statistical phenomena. This is because it is assumed that many of the same forces that have shaped these numbers will make appearances in a case study of sex education conflict in the state.

Perhaps the two most important forces to consider are
Table 1

Select U.S./Utah Social Indicators, 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Comparison</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
<th>Utah</th>
<th>Rank^</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Population(^{b})</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth Rate per 1000</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons per Household</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Mortality/1000 live births</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart Disease Deaths/100,000</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancer Deaths/100,000</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder/100,000</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incarceration Rate</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicide(^{c})</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment(^{c})</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education $ per Pupil</td>
<td>5,574</td>
<td>3,218</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NOT High School Graduate(^{b})</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Aid Recipients</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorce/1000(^{d})</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Comparison</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
<th>Utah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Births to unmarried women (% of total births)</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Births to Teenage Mothers (% of total births)</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abortions (per 1000 women, 15-44)</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abortions (per 1000 live births)</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

Comparison of U.S./Utah Voting in Two Recent Presidential Elections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Nation</th>
<th>Utah</th>
<th>Rank(^a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>53.4(R)</td>
<td>66.2(R)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>43.0(D)</td>
<td>24.7(D)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\(^a\)Refers to how supportive Utah voters were of the winning candidate compared to other states.
history and culture. With Utah's unique history of social conflict one must wonder to what extent organized interests and the policy process were affected by these social forces. In order to answer this question some detailed exploration of historical and cultural circumstances will be required. Therefore, further discussion of these factors will be postponed for the more detailed examination to come.

Why the Sex Education Conflict?

The author began the study of Utah's sex education conflict with little pre-existing knowledge of what had actually transpired in the debate or who had been involved. However, it was hoped that a deeper understanding of social interest groups and the educational policy process would be gained by choosing this topic. There was also suspicion that the issue would allow for observation of the conflict alongside other issues, thus allowing for input from a larger context of social debate. As will be demonstrated, the author was not disappointed in this regard. The sex education battle was found to be strongly affected by and related to other policy debates being played out concurrently in the state.

Several advantages existed in choosing the sex education conflict for this study's focus over other issues on the state's social policy agenda. First, unlike the Utah abortion debate, which was almost
exclusively enacted under the lawmaking domain of the more familiar operations of the state legislature and governor's office, research on sex education enabled an introductory observation of a form of policy-making body far less frequently studied or understood—the state school board. Moreover, the strong ideological connection of abortion to sex education allowed substantial observation of the abortion conflict in Utah as well.

Second, many of the social, moral, and religious issues of our time appear to have coalesced around public education. Utah is hardly unique in this respect. The sex education debate provided an opportunity to observe a process that was intertwined with many of the most difficult and divisive issues of our age.

Third, because sex education was only one front in a war being waged on many fronts the question of how groups might react and prioritize in a complex policy process environment could be observed.

Finally, the sex education debate, with its attendant views on gender-roles and family structure, provided a platform for a historical comparison. Utah a century earlier was quaking with social battle, in substantial part brought on by colliding family and sexual views both between its inhabitants and between Utah's mainstream and the outside culture. With this rationale in mind the author may now bring forward the central issues of this study.
Research Focus

In a case study such as this it is common to begin observation without clearly defined predictions or expectations. The purpose of a case study, in fact, may be to generate hypotheses. According to Earl Babbie (1992, pp. 62-63), a specialist in methodology, this inductive model of research is not uncommon in the social sciences. Data gathered through observation may be used for identifying patterns and forming new hypotheses and theories.

This project was initiated by asking a question about the extent of interest group impact on the sex education policy process. The intention was to test for indications of interest group influence on the policy process. If interest groups were having a substantial influence on the process, then influence indicators would be present. Logical indicators to look for might include abnormal or unusual procedures in the policy-making body, changes in schedules of debates or votes, changes in proposed policy content, and sudden or unexpected personnel changes showing a relationship to group ideology. These indicators would be clearest when correlated with some observed group action.

A peripheral hypothesis proposed that the structure and position within government of the policy-making body would be a factor in the ability of interest groups to influence policy. The State Board of Education was the
central policy-making body involved, although not the exclusive body. Three factors allowed for a reasonably adequate testing of this hypothesis. First, the State Board of Education underwent structural changes part way though the period to be examined. Second, sex education proposals also were sent to the state legislature during this period, which allowed for a loose comparison. Third, the State Board of Education was elected as non-partisan, containing no official ideological divisions or leaders. In consulting the writings of sociologist Ian Robertson (1987) on groups and interest groups the author was intrigued by his suggestion that in nations with stronger political parties than those of the United States interest groups were less powerful and fewer. His explanation was that strong parties discourage interest groups from exerting influence on legislators because party members are expected to toe the party line and submit to party leaders (p. 493). If Robertson were right, then the State Board might be especially vulnerable to interest group influence. In any case, the author hoped to discover evidence of whether the Board's structure was playing a role in interest group influence.

A final question for examination was related to the influence of history and culture on policy. It seemed logical to wonder if it was not culture and history that were actually influencing policy, but through the mechanism of interest groups. This question was
originally conceived in relation to the impact of recent immigration trends in Utah, which it was hypothesized were bringing two antithetical cultures increasingly into contact. Initial research confirmed that this proposition had merit. As a result, given evidence of Utah's unique historical and cultural heritage it was hypothesized that:

(1) Historical forces would be found exerting influence on modern sex education and social policy in Utah.
(2) Interest groups in Utah social conflict would be found to be representative of dissimilar, competing cultures.
(3) Observed policy movement toward non-traditional ideology on sex-education would be correlated with observable inroads by the non-traditional outside culture.

Methodology

Approach

The author began the project without the burden of having to conform to some particular "sacred" methodology. The nature of what was to be studied seemed most agreeable to an approach from a journalistic and historical style and this is the basic form that was used.

From the very beginning it was hoped that the study would generate questions that could be explored in subsequent research, and that areas would be identified for hypothesis formation and future investigation. This, in fact, proved true. Many questions were raised that would be worthy of more detailed examination.
The genesis for undertaking this form of study was exerted by the public policy writings of Charles O. Jones (1984) who expertly makes a case for the value of studying process over substance and who provides a highly useful framework for doing so. According to Jones the process of policy creation can be divided into eleven activities: Perception/definition, aggregation, organization, representation, agenda setting, formulation, legitimation, budgeting, implementation, evaluation, and adjustment/termination. Jones, drawing on Harold Lasswell, explains that "who," "what," and "how" questions can be asked about each of these eleven activities. For example, one might ask how representation to government is achieved by a group, who supports a proposed policy solution, or how a perceived "problem" achieved agenda status (Jones, p. 28). According to Jones, it is his purpose to "...encourage study of public policy and how it is made" (p. 26). Jones, rather than attempting to determine which sex education proposal is best (i.e., best reduces teenage pregnancy, abortion, and out of wedlock births) would ask how the proposal was formulated, or who supports it, or what adjustments were made after the proposal was implemented. It is assumed by Jones that behavioral consistency and repetitiveness in the process may be discovered.

The author will make no attempt to comprehensively delve into each of the eleven activities as they relate to
sex education. This study is more exploratory in nature and seeks breadth more than depth. In other words, all eleven activities can be expected to be observed in this study, but detailed research into each one of the particular activities is not the purpose here. Such an undertaking would compose many research projects. The author is interested in evidence of interest group influence in the process. Jones provides a highly useful cognitive tool for the process observer.

Data Collection and Organization

From a preliminary review of possible sources of data it was determined that as far as the specific details of the sex education debate were concerned only two basic resources were readily available to this study—newspaper reports and personal interviews. Newspaper reports comprised the primary source of information on the policy process and its participants.

Utah has two major newspapers, both headquartered in the Salt Lake area. The Salt Lake Tribune, a paper with a liberal perspective is one. The other, the Deseret News, tended toward more moderate, unpredictable tones of reporting. In gathering data on the sex education conflict, however, the Deseret News was a far superior source. This is due to several factors. First, the Salt Lake Tribune simply did not cover the conflict with the frequency or detail that the Deseret News did. In
addition, the Tribune maintained a consistent ideological tone (liberal) where the Deseret News was found to be divided internally on the issue. Finally, the heart of this study spans a six year period. Deseret News articles were indexed and available on the Internet allowing for a much more efficient gathering of information than microfilm of the Tribune allowed. Even so, the Tribune played a vital role and the author was obliged to spend a substantial amount of time scanning Tribune microfilm.

In an effort to make sense of the vast amount of information obtained from these newspaper articles it was expedient to place them in chronological order, by heading, for ease of reading and analysis. This, of course, was also natural to an ordered description of how the policy debate unfolded and how events in time interplayed on the process. As questions were raised by new information (or lack of information) in the reports additional articles were sought to fill in the many gaps which existed. A sifting of over a thousand articles on the topic, and many related topics, was required in order to find those best suited to the purposes of the research.

Interviews with policy participants occurred intermittently throughout the research, generally after information found in newspaper articles suggested that a particular individual or organization might have additional insight that could be added. A total of 14 interviews were conducted. These interviews were all by
phone and were relatively informal in nature, generally occurring in the course of requesting information on one of the participant groups. Use of a more formal interview process including questionnaires requiring stricter procedure and approval was considered for application with members of the state's sex education curriculum advisory panel; however, this was ultimately abandoned because of the likely difficulty that would have been encountered in obtaining responses on sensitive items. The Associated Press, for example, sent questionnaires in 1993 to Utah's 104 legislators concerning church/state issues but had only about a 25 percent response rate (McEntee, 1993).

Although, as previously described, there were some important attractions to choosing the sex education conflict over other social and educational issues, there were also a few unavoidable difficulties in choosing the topic. The greatest of these concerned data collection. A project dealing in the issues of sex, politics, and religion is one that has the potential to tread on very sensitive ground, especially in a state where a substantial number of policy-makers have grown weary of academic attacks on their culture and religion, and repeated insinuations that they are puppets of a "Mormon dictatorship." It must come as little surprise to find that not every organization was eager to contribute information to the project. As will be seen, there were some good reasons for process participants to be cautious.
in providing details about how sex education policy was actually hammered out. Even so, all of the most significant organizations contributed to the research, even when enthusiasm was lacking.

Perhaps, as a final note on the study's primary source of data, it should be made clear that the newspapers themselves could actually be viewed as organized interests participating in the process. Their reporting and editorials certainly contributed to the conflict and in some cases attempted to shape public opinion (see Picard, 1985, for a recent critique on the elite participant nature of the press). Additionally, some of the reporters seemed to become process participants. One in particular, the Deseret News education editor, personally covered much of the conflict, and her reports and editorials became a major source of information for this paper. This fact was very helpful in the sense that her familiarity and currency on the conflict seemed to allow for more detail and depth than were otherwise available in other newspaper reports. Unfortunately, this also meant that the author was forced to rely in greater measure on the reports of a single individual for the heart of the conflict than what he otherwise would have been obliged to consider. However, the author found that a sufficient number of participants' and competitors' reports agreed with her observations as to provide confidence in those details exclusive to her.
Concerning the cultural aspects of this study a reasonably adequate volume of data was available to support cultural statements made in the course of the research. However, the author—having lived in several parts of Utah, attended Utah schools at all levels, participated in its culture, and lived in several other states and countries—was in a good position to check sources against his own unofficial participant observation on cultural and social matters.

Finally, historical information used in this study was collected from an ever increasing mass of research, and was available in plenty. However, like much of history, certain details are disputed today. The study of Utah history has a distinct advantage in that its Mormon inhabitants have exhibited a strong tradition of record keeping which means that historians have a good supply of information with which to work. However, there are some problems. Mormon, non-Mormon, and anti-Mormon authors do not always agree on historical details, especially, it seems, when it comes to interpretations of motives and attitudes. Add to this the mischief of certain Mormon dissidents who have on occasion manufactured history, as in the 1980s case of Mark Hoffman which will be discussed later, and it becomes clear why some caution in studying Utah history is advisable. Nevertheless, there is, as mentioned, a substantial scholarly sea of research from which to draw. To minimize any undue ideological sway the
author simply used information produced by a variety of scholarly individuals and publishers, both Mormon and non-Mormon.

In regard to the project's overall organization for purposes of presentation, Chapter One attempts to lay out basic ideas and theories that seem relevant to the project. Chapter Two explores the foundation of social conflict in Utah by examining important historical conflicts, events, and ideas. Chapter Three focuses on the ideals of the predominant culture as it relates to social/sexual issues and attempts to provide the reader with sufficient depth of understanding to have some feel for the stage on which social conflict in Utah occurs. Chapters Four, Five, and Six encompass the particular events relevant to modern conflict in this study. Their organization is basically chronological, as previously described. Chapter Seven, the concluding chapter, considers what was observed in the body of the study, against the hypotheses presented in Chapter One.

**Terminology**

Because this is not a quantitative study, strict operationalization of terms was not necessary and not even advisable since the participants in the process themselves largely defined the range of meaning attached to particular terms. However, there are some terms that should be clarified from the start. Among these are the
terms "conservative" and "liberal" which will come up frequently. While there are problems with these categorizations, their utility outweighs concerns.

Utah is generally found to be the most ideologically conservative state in the nation (Erikson, Wright, & McIver, 1993)—with a maverick streak that can make an overly confident theorist look silly—and so policy ideas that might appear moderate in a liberal bastion such as San Francisco would, relatively speaking, be seen as liberal by a number of Utahns. In the case of the sex education debate the author will generally refer to any curriculum program other than home/church or abstinence-only as "liberal."

Perhaps the most important terminology to be defined has to do with what is meant by "interest group." There are "special interests" and "public interests," "corporate interests" and "single interests," and many other labels and categories for interests. Graham K. Wilson (1981) decrying the definitional disputes which "bedevil the study of interest groups" explains that there is even a disagreement over whether the proper term should be "pressure" group or "interest" group (p. 4). According to Wilson, some attempt has been made to distinguish interest groups as those concerned with hard, material goals, and pressure groups as those less self-interested and more altruistic. Like many political scientists he rejects this distinction. He also notes that the term "interest
group" has been used to refer to broad groups of people possessing common interests, and even to government departments and agencies.

According to Wilson's preferred definition, an interest group is an organization that has officers, membership lists, and subscriptions, which only a proportion of the potential members with a shared interest join (p. 5). He eliminates government agencies from this definition and struggles to distinguish interest groups from political parties, which he claims, at least in this country, have broader interests than interest groups.

David B. Truman (1971), in his classic work on interest groups, also struggles with terminology. Truman worries that the term "interest group" has been used "so freely that it has acquired certain emotional connotations which may render it ambiguous when used in analysis." He explains that many important terms such as "politics" and "interest group" have gained "a connotation of selfishness and impropriety that almost denies them the neutral precision requisite for careful discussion" (p. 33).

It seems that to say that some organization is an interest group may be akin to calling it a dirty name. In this study to simply be described as an interest or interest group is not to minimize or label in a negative way.

Creating a broader definition than Wilson, Truman defines an interest group as
any group that, on the basis of one or more shared attitudes, makes certain claims upon other groups in society for the establishment, maintenance, or enhancement of forms of behavior that are implied by shared attitudes...[and] at various points in time....[develop] shared attitudes toward what is needed or wanted in a given situation, observable as demands or claims upon other groups in the society (pp. 33-34).

Truman's definition seems to fit well with a cultural perspective. However, in this study the term "interest group" is used in a fairly broad sense. Generally, it will refer to organized interests, those having at least a name, structure, and officers, or any organized social institution or group that attempts to exert influence on public policy. Distinctions between pressure groups, interests groups, public interests, special interests, and so forth, are not really necessary in this study. If a group or organization is involved in the policy process and has a policy preference or proposal it is trying to enact, then, however the group might be categorized, its function in the policy process is fundamentally the same.

A final issue of definition has to do with what is meant by "sex education." While the term will be defined by the participants and curricula in Utah's policy conflict the reader should be prepared to understand that the term refers to education on a wide variety of modern social issues: issues that have become attached to gender, reproduction, and moral decision-making.
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Who Rules Utah?

One of the questions that this study may shed some light on is who the major elites are in Utah social/educational policy. Who rules when it comes to moral and educational questions? While this issue is not directly within the scope of this study, it is certainly likely that a number of influential individuals and organizations will be identified in the data. What is relevant to this research is the review of major theories pertaining to interest groups and power.

In considering the theoretical question of who has the power over Utah policy, several classic works on national elites were consulted. Thomas R. Dye's Who's Running America? The Conservative Years (1986) is among the most important recent follow-ups to a classic political work on elite power in America. Dye writes that

Power is not an attribute of individuals, but of social organizations....Elites are people who occupy power roles in society. In modern, complex society, these roles are institutionalized; the elite are the individuals who occupy positions of authority in large institutions (p. 4).

However, Dye's elaboration on specifically which organizations have the power in America may be somewhat incomplete in the Utah case. While Dye convincingly includes among powerful institutions a variety of types of organizations such as corporations, major Washington law firms, select universities, political parties, government agencies, and so forth, he neglects any direct discussion
of the medical professions, labor unions, and, perhaps of special relevance to this study, religious institutions and leaders. Dye dismisses these with a wave of the hand admitting some "subjective judgements" and justifying himself on grounds that systematic research of elites is still in the "exploratory state" (p. 11). Thus he appears to purposely underrepresent certain social policy elites and organizations.

As data will indicate, in Utah over 70 percent of the population belongs to The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (termed LDS or Mormon), which incorporates a complex and demanding group of teachings as well as a clear hierarchy of "elite" authorities who govern Mormon affairs. As will be seen, nearly half of Utah's citizens claim to be "active LDS." One may wonder if Dye's focus is relevant in the state. Yet, given the LDS Church's considerable corporate holdings, Dye might see himself vindicated on this point were research to demonstrate Mormon power.

According to elite theory subscribed to by Dye and put forward by Peter Bachrach and Morton S. Baratz (1963, as cited in Dye, 1986), "individuals in top institutional positions exercise power whether they act overtly to influence particular decisions or not" (p. 6). The scope of decision-making may be limited to only those decisions that do not substantially threaten top elites.

In initiating a study of sex education policy debate
in Utah, the power or activity of the LDS Church concerning the issue was not known. A question as to whether Utah interests and the Mormon Church and its leaders would fit into these elite explanations of power was raised. Would Utah be a microcosm of Dye's theory? Would evidence that Dye's powerful national elites were exerting influence on Utah's policy process be found?

G. William Domhoff, like Dye, felt compelled to update for the 1980s. In a followup to his classic Who Rules America? called Who Rules America Now? (1983) Domhoff, similar to Dye, concentrates on the power of corporate elites in influencing policy, although he denies that he is favoring either elite or pluralist theory. Yet his thesis is one of a cohesive ruling class with similar backgrounds, values, and interests. Domhoff identifies ways elites influence policy, writing:

Members of the upper class and corporate community involve themselves in the policy-planning and opinion-shaping processes in three basic ways. First, they finance the organizations that are at the core of these efforts. Second, they provide a variety of free services for some of these organizations in the network, such as legal and accounting help or free advertising space in newspapers and magazines. Finally, they serve as the directors and trustees of these organizations, setting their general direction and selecting the people who will manage their day-to-day operations. (p. 83)

According to Domhoff, the corporate elites use policy-discussion groups, foundations, think-tanks, and university research centers—nearly all of which are
funded and directed by them—to take up the issues that the directors in the board rooms are interested in. They set the agenda and shape the debate.

Domhoff also raises the issue of the role of public opinion in the policy process. He sees elites taking interest in shaping public opinion because ordinary wage-earners, having limited wealth and power, may see things differently than the "corporate rich." Some organizations find "independent bases of power within the general populace" and work for policy ideas not in harmony with corporate-favored policy (1983, p. 83). This hindrance, Domhoff tells us, draws hundreds of millions of dollars every year to mold public opinion. Yet Domhoff believes that the importance of public opinion has been exaggerated and that the majority has differed with the elite on a wide range of issues for a number of generations without major impact on public policy.

Quite the opposite of this view and in a more democratic tradition is the research of Erikson, Wright, and McIver (1993) in their book *Statehouse Democracy*. Not only do they believe that public policy preferences are influential at the national level (citing recent research, p. 5), but offer some convincing evidence to dispute the commonly held notion among scholars that

because state politics is beyond the attention of most citizens, most of the time, there is little reason to expect state policies to reflect public preference. In fact, more reasons are usually offered for why public opinion is irrelevant [at the state level] than for why it is influential (p. 5)
Yet, Erikson, Wright, and McIver acknowledge studies such as the Campbell, et. al. classic *The American Voter* (1960, as cited in Erikson, Wright, & McIver) and subsequent research indicating that voters tend to be fairly indifferent and ignorant on matters of ideology and public policy. They admit that outcomes can be driven by a relatively small number of people (p. 4). However, their impressive research argues that public opinion, in fact,

is the dominant influence on policy making in the American states....Representation in the states works not necessarily in terms of government compliance with specific public demand (although this assertion is largely untested) but rather in terms of public opinion controlling the general ideological direction of state policy (p. 244).¹

It may be noted that this assertion could easily be cited as part of a cultural theory of policy influence. The relationship of public opinion to interest groups in the policy process should be among the issues observed in the course of this study.

Different from either traditional democratic theory or the notions of elitists, pluralist theory would minimize both the influence of public opinion and the power of a cohesive, ruling elite. Dahl (1956) stresses like Domhoff that on matters of specific policy the majority rarely rule (p. 124). But unlike Domhoff, Dahl writes of a policy process "in which all the active and
legitimate groups in the population can make themselves heard..." (1956, p. 137). There are many access points for these groups to seek representation to government and for competing groups to jointly hammer out policy.

It is the extreme form of pluralism, or "hyperpluralism" as it has been called, that has drawn concern from political scientists such as Theodore Lowi (1979). In "interest group liberalism," groups are powerful but the government's authority is weak and divided. Politicians may try to please every group, which can lead to policy that is contradictory and muddled. Further, groups have so many points at which to access America's fragmented governing system that even when policy is made it may be impeded and not implemented at all.

Critics of pluralism argue that victories won by pluralistic groups often are really only symbolic. Pluralism, they contend, is more a theory that holds true on the "little" issues while elitism is accurate on the "big" issues (Lineberry, 1983).

The author begins the project with little favoritism among these theories. In this study perhaps some clues may be found as to which of these theories best describe the case of sex education in Utah and related conflicts that may be observed.
Interest Group Behavior

At this point, the author has discussed what interest groups are and some of the theories of power which incorporate them. It may now be useful to briefly consider their behavior in the policy process.

Scarcely a social scientist disagrees that America has experienced a proliferation of interest groups in recent decades. Causation is disputed but there is at least one interesting correlation. Truman explains that a precondition for this rise in the number of interest groups was a dramatic change in communications technology (as well as transportation and job specialization, etc.). In the past, groups were much more dependent on face to face interaction. However, this has changed and with astonishing rapidity. Birnbaum (1992) and Cigler and Loomis (1986) describe a policy environment in which technology allows interest groups to rapidly mobilize against threats to their position. Through "phone trees," calls to action by group leaders to members can swiftly produce an avalanche of calls to decision-makers. Radio and television now serve purposes of aggregation for like-minded people a continent apart. At nearly the speed of light marching orders or group reaction can be transmitted. There are opportunities for group building on cable TV or through computers which enable mass publishing of newsletters in an activist's own home. And group formation via the Internet appears to have begun.
In other words, much of interest group behavior revolves around communication and its technology. According to Truman (1971) one of the major behaviors of interest groups is the dissemination of propaganda (although the word "propaganda" has recently taken on a negative connotation denoting falsehood, propaganda can be either true or false, and that is how it is used in the study of interest groups). Truman divides the propaganda process into three steps:

1. ensuring perception of the words and symbols presented by the propagandist; (2) stimulation of pre-existing attitudes appropriate to the propagandist's aim; and (3) production of a resulting new or modified attitude that will lead to the act the propagandist desires (p. 226).

While these steps may appear simple they can be extraordinarily difficult to properly carry out. Success involves placing or delivering the message in a format that will be noticed, and the boiling down of complex information to a brief and catchy form. Further, it should not offend a great number of those it is targeted at persuading. Dahl (1961) cautions that "...the political entrepreneur must not provoke so strong a counter-mobilization that he exhausts his resources with no substantial increase in his influence" (p. 309). While the tools and methods at the disposal of interest groups may have dramatically increased, theirs is still an art of persuasion.

Their communication may be aimed at the masses or it
may be aimed at the decision-makers. As Birnbaum (1992) describes, sometimes their persuasion is through lobbyists who helpfully act as a sort of second staff to agencies and officials providing campaign cash and workers, positive publicity for an official, information, technical support, and favors; and sometimes it is a rough, angry charge to defend their position.

In the case of sex education it seems that propaganda is churned out by the truck load, including by social scientists, and much of it is very conflicting.

Conflicting "Experts"

One of the fascinating aspects of the modern sex education controversy is the incredible divergence of professional or expert opinion on the matter. To see the confusion on the issue of sex education one only need turn to a book such as that published by Greenhaven Press's "Opposing Viewpoints" series entitled Teenage Sexuality (Bernards & Hall, 1988). Drawing from nearly four dozen experts in the book a rather impressive, although not comprehensive, list of disagreements can be assembled (see Table 4).

It appears that research and data are easily found to support one's viewpoint no matter what it is. Part of this, as is common to much of the social sciences, is no doubt due to the heterogeneous values and first precepts of the researchers themselves— even when they are
Table 4

American Teen Sex Confusion Curriculum

A select list of "expert" sex education viewpoints

1. Sex education belongs in the church.
2. Sex education belongs with parents, not schools.
3. Sex education belongs in the schools.
4. Sex is only for marriage.
5. Sex is only for adults.
6. Parents have failed to educate children to sexuality.
7. Parents have been undermined by liberal social revolutionaries.
8. Teens have a right to express sexual love.
9. Teens have a right to reproductive privacy from parents.
10. Parental authority is superior to teen privacy.
11. Parental control is beneficial to society.
12. Parental notification laws harm teens.
13. Teens do not have a right to sexual intercourse.
14. Sex education should teach abstinence only.
15. Sex education should emphasize abstinence.
16. Sex education should emphasize birth control.
17. Contraception reduces abortion, pregnancy and disease.
18. Contraception increases promiscuity, pregnancy, abortion, and disease.
19. Contraception is immoral.
20. There should be family planning clinics in schools.
21. School based clinics promote promiscuity.
22. Traditional values instruction can reduce teen pregnancy.
23. Traditional values are against female liberty.
24. Traditional sexual values are intolerant.
25. Intolerance against the new, dangerous lifestyles is good.
26. Sex education undermines parental authority.
27. Schools must assume parental authority.
28. Teen pregnancy is epidemic.
29. Teen pregnancy is not epidemic.
30. Sex education increases teen pregnancy.
31. Sex education decreases teen pregnancy.

Note. Constructed from viewpoints gathered from multiple experts and activists. See Bernards and Hall (Eds., 1988) for scholarly discussion of most of these.
attempting to be objective. For example, if teen pregnancy and abortion were viewed exclusively as an economic issue then very different research might be undertaken than were it viewed as a moral, societal, or legal issue. From a brief survey of the literature one can find difficulties in this regard. Since sexuality is general to all cultures, some organizations seem to have taken this to mean that the sexual culture of Boston or New York can be generalized to America's heartland, Native American tribes, and even Utah's Mormons (for an example of this, see Weed, 1988).

Further, no amount of scientific research is likely to settle the larger issues of morality and rights. It may be of interest in this study, however, to look for the role academic research played in the sex education conflict in Utah and to observe how interest organizations used it and reacted to it.

Migration

As previously indicated, among the questions conceived at the beginning of this project was one concerning migration. Stinner and Kan (1984) studied migration to Utah's more rural communities targeting a comparison of "returnees" with "new-comers" to the state. They found that newcomers were less likely to be satisfied with their communities than were returnees, which they traced to a relatively lower level of satisfaction with
social relations than returnees. Newcomers were less likely to be Mormon than were returnees. Returnees were found to have greater amounts of "location-specific capital...particularly...based in religious and family spheres of the community's institutional setting..." (p. 146). However, newcomers had higher incomes and, thus, superior socio-economic standing in the communities. Satisfaction appeared, therefore, to be more a function of religious and extended family capital, in Utah, than height on a community's economic structure, according to Stinner and Kan.

Both newcomers and returnees were found to face problems of acceptance in the new community. Both were more critical of their community's services, facilities, and governmental structure than were natives and long-term residents. Newcomers were more willing to make time and financial commitments to participate in the community than returnees, while both were more willing than long-term migrants and natives. One other finding worth considering was that while both newcomers and returnees intended to depart the communities in equal numbers, newcomers were much more likely to actually do so.

In another study, carried out by Stinner, Mobasher, Toney, and McKewen-Stinner (1987), attitudes of inmigrants, returnees, and long-term immigrants and natives were compared on four policy issues in Utah (nuclear waste repository, automotive safety device
legislation, nursing home co-payments, and group home siting). Data were drawn from a 1984 University of Utah consumer survey data tape. Returnees, natives, and long-term inmigrants were found to be very similar in their attitudes while larger differences existed between natives and recent and middle-term inmigrants.

However, the authors—forced to work with an available data set not of their own construction—admitted their regret at not having data on more significant social issues, "such as pornography, contraceptives to minors without parental consent, abortion, women's rights, state sponsored lotteries, and liquor by the drink, which have attracted considerable attention in Utah." The researchers then noted that "to the extent that inmigrants differ from natives in religious composition, more disparate postures might be evident between inmigrants and natives than were found regarding the issues observed in this study" (Stinner et. al., 1987, p. 69). A significant note in their research is that the recent inmigrants were nearly twice as likely as natives to identify themselves as politically liberal.

The author, in undertaking this study, hoped to find evidence of the effect immigration might have been exerting on the ideological content of the sex education debate.
Summary

This project is one in which the policy process rather than policy substance is the focus. A case study of Utah's recent sex education debate is the vehicle used to study the social/educational policy process of the state, and particularly the influence of its organized interests.

The influence of historical and cultural forces on the policy process, through interest groups, is to be tested. In the course of the research various questions relative to Utah's situation may be examined and items and hypotheses for additional study identified.
Note

Could this simply mean that elites share similar ideological values with the general population? Perhaps cultural factors similarly influence ideology for both kings and peasants, so to speak? Or have elites successfully shaped the values of the state in the first place?
CHAPTER 2

UTAH'S HISTORICAL CONFLICT

Utah has a rich history of political intrigue. The very beginnings of the Latter-day Saint people, who would finally come to tame the Great Basin wilderness is one of fantastic drama and conflict. A modest examination of this history will prove very useful in understanding the behavior of participants in the modern sex education conflict in Utah.

In undertaking this study the author originally had not intended to discuss historical issues. However, it soon became apparent that history was on the minds of many of the most important participants in the sex education policy process. While ignoring this peculiarity was almost irresistibly tempting in a project surging against bounds of space and time, the author chose not to abandon the quality or integrity of the project in favor of ease. This study is one of interest group conflict on social and educational issues. Utah, historically, has been divided into two major interests—Mormon and Gentile (non-Mormon). While this division was probably to simplistic, it is nevertheless the best place to begin.
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Further, Utah's social history is unique; making it impossible to assume that it is familiar to the reader or similar to that of many other states. As we will see, the threads of history weave into the modern tapestry of group conflict in very discernible ways (Shipps, 1985).

Mormon Theological Origins

The Mormon religion, which originated in up-state New York, was formally chartered in 1830 by the youthful prophet Joseph Smith. Properly known as the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (LDS) it claimed that the "fullness of the gospel" of Jesus Christ had been lost from the earth upon the death of the primitive Christian Church's apostles, and that a Great Apostasy, or falling away from the full truth, had occurred early in the Dark Ages (Shipps, 1985, pp. 1-2). The bold religion and its founders explained that God had prepared the world for the restoration of this lost authority and truth through the protests of Luther and Calvin and the creation of the inspired American Constitution (Benson, 1977, pp. 1-45). Christ had chosen Smith through revelation as His prophet to restore ancient authority, organization, and important lost truths preparatory to the Second Coming of the Messiah and His millennial reign.

Among Smith's earliest purported assignments as the divinely selected prophet of this restoration was the translation of a buried treasure of scripture engraven on
plates of gold by an ancient prophet-historian named Mormon. Published under the title *The Book of Mormon*, in prose similar to the Bible, it professed to be the writings of ancient Christian prophets who were among the ancestors of the American Indians. Their writings were ordained to come forth in the last days of the world to convince both Jew and Gentile that Jesus is the Christ, to stand as a "second witness to the Bible", and to provide divine warning and guidance for the unique problems confronted in the last days of the world (*The Book of Mormon*, 1981: "Introduction").

Convinced, upon studying and praying about its words that the book was, in fact, of Godly origins, thousands rapidly joined the new religion. Shipps (1985) explains that mainstream detractors dismissed the book as fiction, and Smith as a fraud, but were at a loss to hold back the flood of new religious and social doctrine coming from the young visionary, which attracted conversion.

The Latter-day Saint or "Mormon" vision was one of both a spiritual and earthly kingdom, much like that of ancient Israel. In fact, several authors suggest that it was this LDS attachment to Israelitish institutions of law, government, and society—of which polygamy was a part—that initially caused much of the anger directed toward the new religion and its people (e.g., Ericksen, 1922, pp. 15-17; Shipps, 1985, pp. 51-65). United under Smith's leadership they sought a home to act as a base of
operations for a message that they believed God had commanded be taken to "every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people" (D&C 133: 37).¹ Large amounts of land in Missouri were purchased from the U.S. Government and rapidly settled, while plans to build a great capital, the New Jerusalem of Christ's impending millennial reign, were laid.

The Mormons believed that Christ would--once the "restored gospel" had been preached to all the world--come a second time, just as predicted in the Bible. Those who rejected divine law (the wicked) would be swept away and Christ would personally assume the position of both head of government and religion. New Jerusalem would be the seat of world government, modelled on the early U.S. Constitution, (but apparently containing at least an absolute and very popularly supported power of veto for the divine monarch) while old-world Jerusalem would be the seat of the true religion of the Messiah (Crowther, 1962).

Among the many unusual doctrines taught by Smith was the idea that good people of other religions would continue to live on the Earth during Christ's reign. Smith revealed that obeying the basic divine laws of the Ten Commandments would be the requisite for living in Christ's Millennial Kingdom, rather than forced membership in His true church (Gospel Principles, 1979, p. 271). Thus, warning the world of the necessity of obedience to basic divine law was only one of the purposes of the
"Restoration" according to Smith. The greater purpose was to be found in individual "exaltation" and eternal life. It was here that the "Great Apostasy" of the primitive Christian Church had lost essential truths, according to Smith. Most important among these was that God the Father and God the Son were two distinct beings with perfected human bodies of flesh and bone (Oaks, 1995a). Together with the Holy Ghost, a being of spirit matter, they comprised a Godhead, or eternal governing tribunal, led by the Father to create and rule inhabited worlds so numerous to mankind they were "without number" (The Pearl of Great Price, Moses, 1: 33). The Father, Himself, complied with unchangeable, pre-existing, eternal laws from which He drew authority to govern creation (Leone, 1979, pp. 182-183).

Such an unorthodox teaching was not all. Smith revealed that humans were the literal spirit offspring of divine parents, had existed as spirit sons and daughters of this universal king before their birth, and were sent to Earth without memory of their divine origins as a test of their innate desire to seek truth and goodness. Once the truth was recognized with the aid of the Holy Ghost, the test was whether the individual would live in obedience to eternal and divine laws without the direct and awe-inspiring presence of their omnipotent Father (Gospel Principles, 1979, pp. 5-12).

Yet it was the Father's desire that his children, if
they proved their devotion to truth and law, be rewarded with all the power, dominion, and knowledge that He had. It was on Earth that they were to experience the hard lessons that would enable the understanding and individual conquest of sin necessary for advancement to divine government. The institution that could accomplish this basic training for movement into the ranks of eternal kings and queens was a microcosm of the divine institution used by the Father to create, govern, and populate the universe—the family (D&C: 132).

In order to achieve this supreme reward it was not only necessary for man and woman to marry, but to enter into an eternal marriage contract sanctioned by divine authority. Only the prophet and apostles of Christ's restored church had been granted the necessary legal authority, as God's authorized agents, to "seal" such a marriage and to represent the government of this universal king in other important matters, although Biblical prophets and the early Christian Apostles had also held it (Gospel Principles, 1979, p. 73).

In addition to strict compliance with divine and eternal laws, it was only through this eternal creative partnership between male and female that these rewards of dominion, creation, and joy could be granted by the Father. And, since all mortals would fall short at some point in their earthly test in adhering to the law, those who desired to repent and come into compliance with divine
law were provided a savior from the Godhead, who living a perfect life (never having transgressed divine or eternal law), and being part God, could reconcile the great eternal laws of Justice, which demanded severe retribution against those who broke the law, and Mercy. Christ had suffered the penalty for all those who sincerely repented of their disobedience to the law, while those who would not fully repent would have to pay according to the severe punishments mandated by eternal law (Book of Mormon, Alma: 34; D&C 19). Thus, the effort to proselytize in distant nations was seen as a profoundly important mission because of Christ's impending return to judge the inhabitants of the Earth.

Smith continued to claim numerous revelations from Christ in which Mormon divine and eternal laws were laid out, many of which deal with economic and political principles and all of which are inseparably tied to Mormon procreative beliefs and the sexual standards required to achieve the highest rewards of the faith. Both the highly legalistic basis to the LDS religion and the pre-eminent place of sexual purity seem scarcely understood by novice observers of religion, who instead tend to concentrate on individual peculiarities of doctrine such as Mormon abstention from alcohol and the discontinued practice of polygamy. The latter will be among issues briefly recalled in relation to Utah history as a point of possible insight into modern group conflict.
The History of the Mormon/Gentile Struggle

The causes of early hostility between the "Saints" and the "Gentiles" (generally meaning those not of the LDS religion, although both Jews and Native Americans are also considered Israelitish) are complex, but certainly were fueled by fear of the Mormons' growing economic and political power, active proselytizing, overtures of friendship to Native American tribes, the religion's general disapproval of slavery, and odd Hebrew-like institutions (Ericksen, 1922; Roberts, 1949; Dwyer, 1971; Shipps, 1985). Polygamy did not figure prominently in pre-Utah conflict. The published date of the revelation approving polygamy as divine law is 12 July 1843 (D&C 132), which is in the Illinois period, four years before migration to Utah. However, Roberts (1949, vol. 5, p. XXIX) offers evidence that Joseph Smith's belief in the practice may have originated as early as 1831, one year after the official chartering of the Church, while studying the lives of Biblical patriarchs such as Abraham and Jacob, who were polygamists. Roberts further suggests that polygamy had begun to be practiced at least as early as 1841 by Smith. The suspected rise of this peculiar social arrangement may have added some small amount of heat to the already intense inferno of anti-Mormon attitude in the Missouri-Illinois area, although the practice was not publicly acknowledged until 1852, five years after the Mormon arrival in Utah (Larson, 1993).
In the 1830s the Latter-day Saints had been forced from their lands in Missouri under an order by Missouri's governor to exterminate the Mormons from the state and kill their prophet, Joseph Smith. The resultant murder, rape, and grand theft (see Roberts, 1949, vol. 3, p. XVII) sent the adherents of this new religion fleeing for the mercy of Illinois, where they were at first warmly welcomed (Ericksen, 1922). After establishing the city of Nauvoo, which became the largest and most prosperous in the state, renewed political intrigue ensued, largely instigated by the Mormons' diehard enemies from Missouri. Attempts on Smith's life in his role as President of the Church (which incorporated substantial and growing religious, economic, political, and military power) were not uncommon, and frequent legal charges, few found by courts to have real merit (he was arrested and acquitted thirty-seven times!; Hinckley, 1979, p. 74) were brought in an attempt to bring down the leader and his unfamiliar religion (Roberts, 1949, vol. 5).

Smith's eventual assassination in 1844 at the hands of a mob composed largely of state militia members,² while having been jailed overnight on an unlawful warrant of treason, and his betrayal by Illinois Governor Thomas Ford, who had promised to protect him if he would surrender to the court, is of no small importance to the history of Utah or the psyche of its people (Roberts, vol. 6, pp. 453-631).
Following Smith's death the Saints soon endured a bitter division within their own ranks between the followers of Smith's son, Joseph Smith III, and the majority, who believed that the President of the Council of Twelve Apostles, Brigham Young, had been handed the mantle of power by God. By 1847 Young had led the Saints beyond the borders of the United States in search of a place where a more peaceful and prosperous existence could be secured, and control over their own fate maintained ("Winter quarters," 1986).

Upon the victory of the United States in the Mexican War the Mormons' new land became spoil to the United States, and Brigham Young the governor of the expansive territory of "Deseret" (a Mormon scriptural name for a honeybee, which denotes industry and unity. See Book of Mormon, Ether 2:3).

However, Mormons were not the only people interested in the land that came to be Utah. Robert Dwyer (1971) a Catholic archbishop and historian of Utah, notes that records show that there were actually a few Gentiles who entered the Salt Lake Valley with the Saints "and were suffered to remain as merchants and traders" (p. v). Many more would follow. In large part they sought the riches of mining and trade. Mormon leaders, fearing that the discovery of mineral wealth in the territory would bring an onslaught of the least desirable Gentiles, corrupting the Saints with greed and materialism, strongly
discouraged mining. However, their efforts, at least where the Gentiles were concerned, were in vain. Utah's mineral wealth was soon attracting substantial numbers of prospectors and miners as well as Gentile businesses, such as salooning, to service them. Mormons, in need of jobs, were soon working for Gentile miners by the thousands. The result was that the greatest amount of economic power came to be controlled by Gentiles.

By 1857 Utah Gentiles, often aided by the Federal Government, would initiate a series of high profile contests and subtle maneuverings for power in Utah. Dwyer, in his study of social conflict in Utah from 1862 through 1890, provides a detailed description of many of the complex political and social battles then seen as important. In this work only a brief outline of tactics identified by Dwyer is possible.

Anti-Mormon Gentiles used numerous devices in the struggle for power in Utah. Perhaps the most influential of these were letters sent to government officials in Washington and other federal outposts alleging Mormon designs of treason, revolt, and disregard for law (Dwyer, 1971, pp. 59-93). While certainly not all Gentiles were hostile to the Mormons, the reports sent by those that were encouraged the federal government to view the Utah situation and the Mormons with suspicion if not great alarm. Mormon dissidents, embittered towards their former church, were especially useful in the battle for public
opinion beyond the borders of the territory. The mass media, hostile to the Mormons, were used well by Gentiles to enlist popular opinion nationally and bring it to bear on national politicians.

The practice of polygamy among the Saints' leaders provided the tangible target for the opponents of the Mormons to focus fear and Protestant moral indignation. These fundamentalist Protestants could have scarcely imagined that a hundred years later they would be increasingly allied with the Mormons on social and sexual issues. Their strategy of character smears against Mormon leaders in a national forum proved convincing, especially when thundered from born-again pulpits. Further, the Gentiles organized their own political party, known as the Liberal Party, (Dwyer, 1971, p. 123) as a step to aggregate anti-Mormon power in Utah, while Mormons organized into the Populist Party. Voice to local criticism of the LDS Church was secured through creation of the newspaper, the Daily Tribune, which had its origins with excommunicated Mormons (Dwyer, pp. 56-57).

For Bishop Dwyer, the Gentiles' goals were clear: they sought to exclude Mormons from political appointments to the territorial executive and judiciary while promoting the appointment of officials hostile to Mormon majority power. In addition, they waged a campaign to deny Utah statehood, realizing that democratic rule would have meant devout Mormons occupying the vast majority of important
public policy-making positions in the state while achieving national political influence in Congress.

For the Mormons the issue of religious freedom was at the heart of the conflict. As has already been made clear, the Saints had reason to believe that their religious freedom was violently opposed by members of other religions, as well as their democratic right of majority and self-rule. On the other hand the Saints' determination to take their message of the "restored gospel" to the furthest climbs of every nation on Earth, reaping their harvest from the memberships of the other churches, was not to be viewed approvingly by the established religious powers of the nation. However, aside from Mormon threats to Protestant hegemony, polygamy was seen as severe immorality. Protestants were insistent that women in polygamist marriages might be held against their will in a life of abuse. Strangely, many modern writers appear to dispute this view (see Iversen, 1993). Modern feminists, such as Marilyn Warenski (1978), angry at the LDS Church for not succumbing to contemporary views on women serving in the priesthood, argue that these oppressed polygamist women had it better than modern Mormon women in many respects because they were allowed to share in certain minor priesthood activities and were encouraged to pursue vocations such as accounting and medicine by Mormon prophets, despite the popular Eastern perception of these women as being fully oppressed. This
latter perception helped prompt the confident Mormons of Utah to be the first among states and territories to allow women to exercise the right to vote.4

Beyond issues of polygamy and moral misconduct, it was widely perceived by Gentiles that the Mormons were violating American principles of church/state separation by having religious leaders serving concurrently as political leaders, a practice that Mormons widely continue, with some caution, today. Joseph Smith himself had concurrently held many roles of civil and religious authority. But the issue doesn't appear to have been defined or attached to polygamy and statehood until several years into the Utah period, and much of it coalesced around the schools.

The Origins of Modern Education
Conflict
Many modern writers have lauded the educational and scientific accomplishments of Utah and the Mormons in the twentieth century (i.e., Astin, 1962; Hardy, 1974), accomplishments which include the invention of both television and stereophonic sound to mention two of the more infamous for teachers and parents. If, in fact, these writers reflect a generally positive perception of Mormons and education, it certainly was not always so. In the latter third of the nineteenth century Utah was the battle ground of fierce conflict over schools, and the
Mormons portrayed nationally as promoting ignorance and barbarism.

Buchanan (1982, p. 448) explains that there was a presumption among many that the Mormons’ "barbaric" practice of polygamy was due to lack of education. Protestant missionaries, determined to penetrate Utah found that the Mormons were "virtually impervious to the first missionary efforts. Not even the sons of the Prophet Joseph Smith, then well on their way to Protestant conformity, made discernible inroads during missionary visits of the 1860s" (Petersen, 1980, p. 297). But the "twin-relic of barbarism"--polygamy (the other was slavery)--was too much of an affront to late nineteenth century morality to expect easy discouragement on the part of mainstream religious crusaders determined to enlighten Mormon youth.

The Mormons, fresh from government endorsed violence against life and property, were very distrustful of public education where teachings hostile to the Mormons and their doctrine might be thrust on their children. Buchanan (1982) writes that "Brigham Young was astute enough to recognize that schools are not value free, and during this period [late 1860s to 1870s] he made a concentrated effort to use schooling as a means of promoting unity and teaching Mormon values" (p. 448).

As if to confirm Mormon suspicions it was Protestant schools that finally established Protestant holds in Utah.
Saint Mark's Episcopal School, established in 1867, was the beginning. By the 1880s around 100 such schools, 300 teachers, and 9,000 students, many of whom were Mormon, attended lessons which Petersen (1980) explains had "assumed an increasingly evangelistic character as an attempt to capture the minds and aspirations of the young" (p. 297). According to Christian Educators in Council (1883), the stated aim of the Protestant schools was the "undermining [of] the whole system of Mormonism" (as cited in Buchanan, 1982, p. 441).

The territorial legislature, despite Governor Young's request for full funding of education in the 1850s (Buchanan, 1982) had found the rapid building of a civilization in a desert wilderness to be very costly, and had only partially funded public schools through taxes. Therefore, tuition was required (Dwyer, 1971, pp. 168-189). This provided the opportunity for Protestant school expansion. On the one hand the small minority of non-Mormons (probably 10 to 20 percent of the population according to estimates in Dwyer, p. 62, and Buchanan, p. 440) were able to grumble about being taxed to support Mormon controlled education. On the other hand, they were able to offer perhaps thousands of Mormon students tuition waivers to Protestant schools as part of their war against Mormonism (Dwyer, p. 166). Dwyer reports that some Mormons turned to vandalism of Protestant property and harassment of teachers (Dwyer, chap. 6). Catholics, the
largest of the Gentile religious bodies, took little part in the conflict. Local Catholic leadership was on generally friendly terms with Mormon leaders (Dwyer, p. 156).

Brigham Young, who at first had reluctantly welcomed Protestants with overtures of tolerance and friendship, was soon vigorously urging that their schools be avoided. Yet, his vision of what he had set out to build in the wilderness of Utah was one of a highly educated people. Young acknowledged that the Saints of Utah had few scholars and repeatedly encouraged education both to improve the mind and to improve one's usefulness to society (Walker, 1988, pp. 40-41). Beyond endorsing "useful sciences and arts," Young criticized preachers and parents who in the name of religion forbade novel reading, theater attendance, and dancing (Walker, p. 42).

**Divine Approval For Public Education**

In 1877, days before Young's death, John Taylor, President of the Council of the Twelve Apostles, was overwhelmingly elected as Territorial Superintendent of District Schools (1877-1881). Upon Young's death Taylor moved up to preside over the Church, while continuing to serve as Utah's chief educational official (Buchanan, pp. 440-441).

Anti-Mormons used this to focus attention on what
they considered unjust mixing of church and state. Taylor, did in fact, use his supreme position in the Church to further educational goals, but educational historians such as Petersen suggest that Taylor actually made vital contributions to education in Utah:

Mormondom's most prominent educators were selected to travel as Taylor's special envoys. Mixing church and state inextricably, they made hundreds of visits in which they met church leaders and school trustees, addressed public and church meetings, and conducted the business of the Young Men's Mutual Improvement Association, a church auxiliary.

[These] traveling educational authorities enjoyed the full benefit of Taylor's position. They also shared in the rhetoric of praise that Mormons lavished upon their leaders. Together with the tradition of gratitude and appreciation already accumulating around the persons of prominent educators, this deference contributed to the enviable and distinctive status that teaching and teachers were coming to enjoy in Mormon society (Petersen, pp. 307-308).

Mormons, Morality, and the Law

The Mormons' unorthodox and "immoral" behavior could not long escape the legal culture of the Victorian Age. They had been in Utah only a short time before the national government determined to forcefully regulate their morality, their society, and their Church. In 1852, ten years after the Mormons had publicly revealed the practice of polygamy as a tenet of their religion, the Congress passed and President Abraham Lincoln signed the Morrill Anti-Bigamy Act, "which made bigamy a criminal offence in U.S. territories, invalidated the Utah territorial laws that had sanctioned polygamy and had
incorporated the Mormon church, and limited the real estate of a religious organization in the territories to $50,000" (Larson, 1993, p. 3). The Mormons, believing the law to be clearly unconstitutional, and assuming that the Supreme Court would overturn it, took little notice. George Reynolds, Brigham Young's secretary, was eventually chosen by the LDS Church as a test case to the legislation. Reynolds was convicted in 1875. The Supreme Court upheld his conviction in 1879 determining in essence that religious "belief" was protected by the Free Exercise Clause of the Constitution, but religious "practice," repugnant to contemporary morality, was not (Reynolds v. United States, 1879). Juries were able to exclude anyone who might believe in the practice of polygamy, meaning all active Latter-day Saints (Hinckley, 1979).

By 1882, with the U.S. Congress and Supreme Court assaulting polygamy and moving to disfranchise practitioners of the vote, radicals among the Gentiles wanted even more. They demanded that all those who believed in the doctrine of polygamy (meaning all active Latter-day Saints) be disfranchised, and that Congress appoint an "election commission" exclusively drawn from Utah Gentiles. Dwyer observes that "the commission these Gentiles wanted was not merely one to superintend local elections, but to rule the Territory with an iron hand" (1971, p. 120).

In the end, these militant Gentiles, while not
gaining such complete political power, did in fact see, that very year, passage of the Edmunds Act (March 1882) which disfranchised polygamists, disqualified them from all jury service, made several state executive positions federal patronage spots, and replaced Utah election officials with the Utah Commission, a board of five presidential appointees (Larson, 1993, p. 4).

In 1887 the Edmunds-Tucker Act was passed, without President Grover Cleveland's endorsement. It allowed charges of adultery to be brought by someone other than a spouse, ordered marriages certified in probate courts, dissolved the Perpetual Emigrating Fund Company used to bring Mormon immigrants from Europe, abolished the territorial militia, disfranchised Utah women, initiated forfeiture proceedings against the Mormon church while reviving the property limitation of $50,000, and reaffirmed the withdrawal of the LDS Church's charter (Larson, p. 14). The Supreme Court upheld the Edmunds-Tucker Act, again validating the authority of the national legislature over such high matters (Cannon v. United States, 1885; The Late Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints v. United States, 1890). According to Larson (1993, p. 6), over 900 polygamist convictions resulted. Some Mormon leaders, not imprisoned, became fugitives in hiding.

The consequences of these legal decisions were more far-reaching than merely assaulting polygamy, since the
Holdings expanded the authority of the Congress and the Court over religion and social issues in general, not just the Mormons. Further, this historical battle, it can be argued, has had substantial impact on the world-wide success of the LDS Church, which has drawn from the lessons of history in order to achieve unprecedented success under a complete spectrum of legal and political systems, although the Gentiles' intent was clearly to the contrary. This bitter history remains as a lesson to Utah leaders of the present who wish to avoid the terrible contention of the past. However, although there was a great deal of suffering, one can hardly envision an outcome more beneficial to the Mormons in the long-run since it enabled them to expand and mingle into the American institutions around them even while maintaining doctrinal purity and a shared and binding appreciation of history and culture.

In any event, the facts show that Supreme Court jurisprudence had finally brought a logger-head between Mormon divine law and Protestant divine law, codified into human law, that could not be ignored. The Mormons' Hebrew-like earthly kingdom had been stripped from them. The time for a new Mormon strategy was at hand. What course would this religion, so inundated with divine legal and political theory at its foundation, choose?
Reconciling Divine and Human Laws
Mormon-Style

In 1890 the issue of polygamy was for the most part resolved with a declaration by Mormon prophet Wilford Woodruf (often referred to in the literature as the "Manifesto." See D&C Official Declaration One) that it was God's will that the laws of the land be obeyed in order that the work of taking the gospel to the whole Earth not suffer delay: "Inasmuch as laws have been enacted by Congress forbidding plural marriages, which laws have been pronounced constitutional by the court of last resort, I hereby declare my intention to submit to those laws...."

The vast majority of Mormons were able to accept the pronouncement for several apparent reasons: First, Woodruf as prophet/president legally had the authority under Mormon belief in divine law as the only person on Earth who could officially represent God in ordering changes in practice or doctrine (Benson, 1988, p. 134). And his order was given weight under the Mormon Twelfth Article of Faith in which Joseph Smith pronounced that Mormons "...believe in being subject to kings, presidents, rulers, and magistrates, in obeying, honoring, and sustaining the law." Second, only about 20 percent of members had been involved in plural marriage at its height (Warenski, 1978, p. 148). Third, under the Mormon law of eternal marriage, polygamy was endorsed by God, but not mandated as a requirement to obtain the highest rewards.
One wife was sufficient to ascend onto the thrones of the divine (see D&C 132). Polygamy, which was condemned in the Book of Mormon except under unusual circumstance requiring the rapid creation of a righteous generation (see Book of Mormon, Jacob 2), was not essential and could therefore be jettisoned, in practice, in order for the Mormon "millennial mission" to be accomplished. Finally, the carrot of statehood for Utah, if polygamy were discontinued, with its attendant nature of self-rule and Mormon movement into positions of national political power, dangled temptingly.

After interviewing policy-makers and activists in Utah, one is left with the impression that the LDS Church and its office-holding members have a feeling for the past which urges them to avoid the terrible confrontations and persecution found in history. However, the devout attempt to do this even while rapidly continuing the Mormon "millennial mission" into the future. It also provides a pattern which demonstrates Mormon willingness to sacrifice lesser principles for greater ones. They seem to have learned to adapt to the "real" while maintaining belief in the "ideal."

Where History Led

By the latter half of the twentieth century Utah and the Mormons were exerting their influence nationally and around the world.
The 1980s were a banner age for Utah and its predominant religion and culture. The LDS Church was expanding with unprecedented success worldwide. Its priesthood had been opened to blacks in the late 1970s (in fulfillment of Joseph Smith's prophecy or as a wise political move, depending on one's point of view) and new sources of leaders and converts were becoming available. On the public relations and diplomatic front the Church scored a series of amazing low-key victories (Heinerman & Shupe, 1986), becoming the first new church to officially penetrate the Iron Curtain (1983) as unprecedented permission was given by East Germany to build not just a chapel, but a temple, complete with its confidential rites. Additionally, friendly relations between the Mormons and China grew as Mormon and Chinese leaders maintained cordial visits even when U.S./China relations were rocky. Chinese elites were especially impressed with the BYU performing arts group known for good reason as the Young Ambassadors, allowing their visits even when other groups' tours were cancelled. In the Middle East the Mormons won a hard-fought victory in Israel to establish a BYU study center in a prime Jerusalem location, and in Saudi Arabia, in an unpublicized event, a Mormon stake was established with the help of a prominent and powerful Arab family.

In the United States the LDS Church, revealing its seldom used power in domestic politics, mobilized in key
states, including Nevada, to deliver the death blow to the Equal Rights Amendment. And its First Presidency sealed the doom of the MX missile system in the western desert when it officially denounced the project with the weight of scripture to the active LDS people, many of whom changed their opinion literally overnight.

In 1984 the Brigham Young University football team captured the national championship, and Miss Utah, Charlene Wells, daughter of a Mormon General Authority, was crowned Miss America. The same year Ronald Reagan, who was friendly to Utah and its religion, was reelected.

In addition, the global economy was becoming a boon to the educated population of Utah, which per capita had obtained the distinction of being the most linguistically diverse region in America due to the Mormon missionary program. It was a secret international business was beginning to discover and reward (Donnelly, 1992). Further, Utah was becoming home to numerous high-tech aerospace and computer companies with super-conservative Utah Valley (home of BYU) rising to be one of the major computer meccas of the world housing 175 software companies by 1992 including the headquarters of international giant Novell (Atchison, 1992). The forty mile stretch from Provo to Salt Lake would come to be known in computer circles as Software Valley, second only to the Silicon Valley in software production with over 1,120 information technology companies by 1994 and $5 billion in sales annually ("Technology in Utah," 1994).
With Utah's economy beginning to boom, the LDS Church also gained the spotlight, basking in what seemed scientific validation of some of its most important doctrines. For example, one major study of 10,000 highly active Mormons in Southern California by UCLA researcher James Enstrom (1989) found that the group had 72 percent fewer deaths than the national average for males ages 25 to 64 for all causes; females having 38 percent fewer deaths. Enstrom's research found that active LDS males who live the Mormon health code including exercise and proper sleep could expect to live eleven years beyond the national average while females could expect to live six years longer. The active LDS male thus had a life expectancy seven years longer than that of the highest industrialized nation (Enstrom, as cited in VanDenBerghe, 1994). And in other research those reviewing growth data, such as University of Washington sociologist Rodney Stark, predicted that the LDS Church--currently with 9 million members--would, by the year 2080, be among the world's major religions with over 250 million members. According to Stark, Mormonism "stands on the threshold of becoming the first major faith to appear on earth since the prophet Muhammad rode out of the desert" (Sheler & Wagnar, 1992, p. 73). The greatest growth was occurring in developing nations (Mangum & Blumell, 1993).

The LDS Church, which had lost its Israelitish kingdom a century earlier, and had learned the important
relationship of economic power to political power from the
Gentiles, had adapted to more American forms of power by
the 1980s operating a vast conglomerate of corporate
enterprises including banking, insurance, travel,
department store retail, real estate, television and radio
communications, and noncontrolling stock holdings in
several public corporations (Mangum & Blumell, 1993). In
addition, it operated a quality education system that
included seminaries and religious institutes as well as
four colleges in three states and a few primary and
secondary schools in developing nations.

A professional social services core, employment
services, highly successful welfare system, and even some
recreational holdings were provided to benefit members.
In addition, millions of dollars were being spent to
assist non-Mormons around the world, usually in the form
of food, disaster relief, and free technical advisers and
teachers for use by governments in developing nations.

Yet, by the 1980's, with the Mormon leap from
obscurity, hostility again began to grow more bitter.
Certain LDS academics were found criticizing the LDS
hierarchy for stands on sexual and historical issues,
often drawing the media spotlight and the displeasure of
the public relations conscious Mormon clergy. The most
vocal of these were regularly found in the pages of
Dialogue and Sunstone, periodicals produced by
associations of Mormons of a more liberal, less obedient
disposition.
Excommunicated Mormons, combining with certain Protestants hostile to the Mormons produced a professional looking film entitled The Godmakers (1985) which included out-of-context and less-than-accurate extracts of Mormon rites set against a black background, foreboding music, and the voice of a narrator whose tone was akin to those usually found in movies about the Devil's Triangle. The movie went so far as to suggest that Mormon missionaries used hypnotic power to control the minds of convert-victims, that Mormons believe that God had sexual relations with Mary, and that the LDS Church was a dangerous satanic cult intent on the dark, mysterious use of political and economic power to bring down true religion and civilization.

Although denounced by many non-Mormon clerics, the movie was, nevertheless, distributed and shown to congregations of Protestants around the world, even appearing in some retail outlets, which is where the author obtained and viewed it in 1985 in Bracknell, England.

Perhaps just as significantly to Utah and the Mormons was the mid-1980's case of historical documents dealer Mark Hoffman. Some of his documents, represented as being written by associates of Joseph Smith, appeared to contain information contradicting the official Church explanation of its founding. Critics within and without jumped on these letters as proof that their battle against Mormon
leaders was justified (Ostling & Arrington, 1985). One of these documents, known as the "Salamander Letter" suggested that Joseph Smith had been led to the buried plates of gold by "an old spirit [which] transfigured himself from a white salamander" (Wilentz & Riley, 1985, p. 48).

Many began to predict the demise of the LDS Church. Instead, Mark Hoffman was injured in an explosion from a homemade bomb he was carrying in his car. In a case showing that Utah intrigue is not ancient history it was revealed that Mark Hoffman was a document forger who had duped certain Mormon leaders who had purchased documents from him. The Salamander Letter was a fraud. Hoffman was on the verge of being discovered and had turned to murder. In a desperate cover-up attempt he had killed a bishop, and the wife of another bishop, whom he had sold fake documents to before becoming the victim of one of his own bombs (Wilentz & Carter, 1987). The world-wide publicity, at first negative for the Saints (until Hoffman confessed to being a life-long forger), turned more neutral and may have actually increased interest in speaking with LDS missionaries internationally for awhile (the author, while living in England, observed this phenomenon.)

Coinciding with the Mormons' growing prosperity and notoriety, Utah was increasingly confronted with major challenges to its social traditions from both within and without the state. Included among these was what was
perceived as a major teen pregnancy problem, low by national standards, but growing about as rapidly as the rest of the nation's. Further, the state's booming economy was attracting increasing numbers of newcomers, especially from the troubled state of California, who saw escape and opportunity in Utah's "happy valleys." Its schools, battling difficulties commonly found throughout the nation, were, nevertheless, perceived as a haven for troubled teens whose relatives in the early 1990s were sending these difficult youths in droves to Utah to live with in-state relatives who could take advantage of Utah's easy guardianship laws. By 1995 an estimated 3,000 to 6,000 of these rough young education immigrants were living in the state in what Newsweek called the "ultimate magnet school," costing the state about $20 million annually (Murr, 1995).

By the end of the 1980s Utah was about to be overwhelmed with a host of serious policy battles including graduation prayer, gaming, academic freedom, and the two most important to this study--abortion and sex education. While the latter is our focus, it should be realized that abortion, which is often viewed as a close relative to sex education issues, drew the more intense, overt interest and thus must occupy some attention in this study in relation to its impact on the sex education debate.

It is hard to calculate the effect that having these
issues debated concurrently may have had on the outcome of the state's sex education curriculum conflict. Yet it must be realized that much of the resources of groups that might otherwise have been concentrated on sex education were drawn into other social policy conflicts including the larger fight over abortion, which occurred in the more familiar legislative arena.

Summary

Utah has a rich history of political intrigue. Much of this had to do with Mormon beliefs and practices not in harmony with the national mainstream. Conflict between (and among) Mormons and Gentiles in Utah a century ago revolved around procreative issues, whose values would be incorporated in education, and the rightful relationship of religion and state.

The Utah majority, and their religion, were coerced by the federal government to conform to outside values found among the American mainstream. This was carried out by Gentile citizens and groups allied with national organized interests including business and especially moral/religious organizations, as well as Mormon dissidents.

With an understanding of relevant history we may now turn to examining the modern sexual culture of Utah.
"D&C" is standard notation for The Doctrine and Covenants of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints; the book of Joseph Smith's revelations accepted as official divine law and instruction in Christ's own words. It is divided into sections and verses and is very heavily legalistic, acting as a "constitution" for the Mormon kingdom.

Smith, himself, was a Lt. General in the state militia and commander of one of the largest military forces then existing in the states—the Nauvoo Legion—which comprised no less than 26 companies. His assassins were associated with a non-Legion company known as the Carthage Greys, although his writings show that he suspected a plot by one of his own officers at one point during a wargame exercise (Roberts, 1949, vol. 6).

The Mormons contributed a battalion to the war effort, known as the Mormon Battalion, which retains the distinction of having completed the longest infantry march in U.S. history. Many of these soldiers eventually settled in Utah, but others established LDS inroads in California. Source: U.S. Infantry Museum, Ft. Leonard Wood, Missouri.

The Wyoming Legislature preceded Utah in enfranchising women by two months, but Utah was where woman's suffrage was first exercised. Seraph Young, niece to Brigham Young, was the first woman to vote, 14 February 1870, in a Salt Lake City municipal election (Warenski, 1978, p. 144).

This "grand millenial mission" is far from forgotten, and was reiterated by the new Mormon prophet in his first LDS General Conference as the Mormon leader (Hinckley, 1995, p. 71).
CHAPTER 3

UTAH'S PROCREATIVE CULTURE

Utah consistently has among the highest birthrates in the nation (Hamel & Schreiner, 1989; Ludlow, 1992, p. 1523) with a teen birth rate near the national average. Yet it is a mistake to assume that this is because contraception and the anatomical process of reproduction is misunderstood by Utah's highly educated population. In fact, their birthrate, rather than an act of ignorance, appears to have recently become an economic boon.

Yet, it may be that for many in the state, population growth is neither a matter of ignorance nor economics, but of faith. As has already been described, the primary goals of Latter-day Saints are inseparably connected to the eternal marriage rite which Mormons believe empowers possible ascension to divine creative union and government. With this high aim comes the belief that God desires that all His children have the opportunity to accept divine law and learn their true royal nature. World-wide expansion, therefore, becomes paramount to the divine law's promulgation, as billions of dollars are spent and tens of thousands of missionaries marshalled to
"proclaim the restored gospel of Jesus Christ" in every nation. Both of these supreme purposes are chained with steel to Mormon divine laws governing the use of procreative power.

An examination of the details of a culture influenced by such lofty goals will certainly add important insight when viewing the sex education policy process in the chapters to come. To fail in this respect would render many events meaningful only to Utah insiders and perhaps a handful of non-Utahns such as non-Mormon University of Indiana Professor Jan Shipps who, through her studies of the Mormon culture, has come to classify herself as an "inside outsider" (Murphy, 1994).

The Shipps Analysis of Utah Culture

For Shipps (1985), who has devoted much of her professional career to researching the history, politics, and social behavior of Mormons, the dominant religion of Utah has achieved the status of a new ethnic group, complete with its own language, which she notes, like other languages, is constantly changing (for our purposes I will include only a sprinkling of Mormon terminology).

Shipps, like other authors, is very interested in the political struggles between Mormons and Gentiles. Much of the history of Utah, Shipps (1986) tells us, is the story of unending conflict between the two groups. But there is also the story of compromise and a surprising degree of
cooperation between the two groups. The truth, however, is more intricate than this. Shipps rightly reminds the student of Utah history and politics that conflict within, rather than between, these segments of Utah has frequently been the story.

Rather than a monolithic LDS community, Shipps is able to identify a spectrum of devotion among Latter-day Saints ranging from true-believers to those who are "extremely antagonistic" ex-Mormons "expend[ing] an enormous amount of energy opposing the LDS Church and everything it stands for" (Shipps, 1985, p. 19).

Shipps' observation of various levels of faith and activity is not surprising to Utah natives. Utah is not divorced from American culture and, relating this to our purpose, the same sexually-oriented artifacts common to other parts of the nation can rightly be expected to be found in substantial quantities in the state. There are topless bars in South Salt Lake, and contraceptive devices in many stores. The national mass media, carrying movies, weekly series, and printed material of a sexually explicit nature, penetrate nearly every household in Utah. Indeed, a student of communications might even be tempted to hypothesize that Utah's sexual culture would be little different from any place else in the nation, and that one could rely on common national assumptions in describing individual and group behavior within the state.

Yet the considerable population of devout Latter-day
Saints (as will be seen in later chapters about half of the state's inhabitants consider themselves to be "active" adherents of the LDS faith) may flavor the state's policy and interest group behavior away from national norms in important ways. The paths of policy creation in the state must exist within a structure where the LDS Church is—at very least—a powerful tool for aggregating opinion and serving as a network for interest organization, and on occasion, a powerful political player.

Keeping in mind Shipps' caution about assuming a Mormon monolith, it should, nevertheless, be very useful to identify the specific beliefs of the procreative culture of active or devout Latter-day Saints in Utah. Unless evidence is found to the contrary the author will assume that the values and beliefs of the remainder of the state's population are about the same as citizens of similar demographics beyond Utah's border.

Towers of Faith

Exploring Utah, occasionally one will sight a tall building of unique architectural design towering above summer greenery. These buildings, few in number and known as "temples," are the spiritual and moral centers of Utah's famous religion (Packer, 1995). Unlike the numerous Mormon chapels in both grandeur and purpose, their peaceful beauty draws thousands of non-Mormons to their grounds each year. However, should a tourist
attempt to explore the inside of a temple they would find that without a "recommend" (a signaturred pass issued in a two-part interview process by Mormon clergy) entry would be politely but most firmly barred and they would be directed to a separate, smaller building known as a "visitor's center" where information about the building and its purpose are available in designedly appealing format, free of charge.

To gain a temple recommend—a highly desirable thing to Mormons both spiritually and socially—requires that an adult, having been a member of the Church for no less than one year, first pass an interview with his or her bishop. In this interview, the bishop (see Ludlow, 1992, p. 117)—who is the key lay official in Mormon life, presiding over the spiritual, social, and material aspects of a "ward" (congregation) of about 400-700 members for an appointed term of five years—will ask the candidate a prescribed set of questions designed to determine "worthiness" to enter into the temple and participate in the "saving ordinances" unique to Mormondom. The most important of these ordinances, as previously indicated, is the eternal marriage rite, which differs from conventional ceremonies in several very significant respects, most notably that it is for "time and eternity" rather than until "death do us part" (Gospel Principles, 1979, p. 233).

Among the most important requirements of worthiness
is that one be living the "Law of Chastity," which means no sexual relations outside of lawful marriage (Gospel Principles, 1979, pp. 231-244). Even petting or masturbation (lesser, but serious transgressions) disqualify the candidate until the behavior has been repented of to the satisfaction of the guidelines administered by the bishop. Generally, several months must pass free of such behaviors before issuance of a temple recommend may be reconsidered. Where sexual intercourse outside of marriage has occurred, the passage of at least a year between the occurrence and the consideration of issuing a temple recommend is the norm.

"Disciplinary action" in cases of fornication or adultery is prescribed including "disfellowship," or the greater sanction of "excommunication," dependent on the circumstances of the action and the status and attitude of the individual (the higher the individual's position the greater the sanctions. See Melchizedek Priesthood, 1989, pp. 29-36). Those so disciplined remain welcomed at regular Sunday meetings, and other members encouraged to help them, yet they are left socially and spiritually excluded from the most important aspects of the Mormon community until such time as they meet the worthiness and time standards and return to full fellowship.

In addition to this strict law of sexual conduct the candidate for entrance to the temple must attest to a prescribed set of questions including the "payment of a
full tithe" (10 percent of before-tax income to the Church), that he or she "sustains" the prophet/president (currently Gordon B. Hinckley), is "living the Word of Wisdom" (the Mormon code of health), deals honestly with associates, does not associate with dissident groups, and has no divorce or serious sin that has not been cleared by "proper priesthood authority" (Gospel Principles, 1979, pp. 231-236).

Upon satisfactorily passing this interview, a meeting with a "stake president," lay leader of about 5-8 congregations averaging about 3,800 members ("Church Membership," 1995) is arranged where similar questions are discussed. This process, in similar form, must be completed yearly to retain a temple recommend.

The spiritual significance of temple marriage combined with its high social desirability, and the temple's rarely rivaled beauty, make its attainment extremely important to a great number of Utah's inhabitants. Meeting the worthiness standards required to enter the temple is of paramount interest to Mormons, both those who are to be married and those who wish to attend the marriage, as well as other high sacraments conducted exclusively within (Kimball, 1976).

Chastity and the Mormon Missionary

All "worthy" young men of the Mormon church are "called" to serve a two-year full-time proselytizing
mission, generally at age nineteen (Melchizedek Priesthood, 1988, pp. 205-212). These prospective missionaries, ordained as "Elders" in the Mormon priesthood, must enter the temple for special rites and instruction (the "endowment"), and meet very high standards of personal behavior, including the sexual standards previously described. The social and spiritual pressure to serve a mission is very strong in Utah Mormon culture and serving a mission is seen much as a rite of passage to manhood and a rich sacrifice to God. To the LDS Church, which entrusts its future, its reputation, and its leadership to these youth the imperative of their "worthiness" must seem great, indeed.

For those who answer "the call" affirmatively a two year ordeal away from friends, family, sports, education, material comforts, and girlfriends awaits. Written contact with home will be required but limited to once weekly and phone contact except on Christmas and Mother's Day will be strongly discouraged. A period of three to eight weeks (depending on whether a language must be learned) will be spent in the Provo Missionary Training Center (MTC), an ever-growing 4,000 bed training facility which appears to the observer part modern university, part military training post, and part worship facility.

Once out in the "mission-field" the missionary will be assigned to a two-man team, known as a "companionship," responsible for proselytizing activity in a specific
geographic area. The missionary can expect to have as many as a dozen companions and serve in half a dozen cities in his two years, routinely being given less than two days notice that he is being transferred. The LDS Church by the end of 1994 had marshalled an ever-expanding army of 47,000 missionaries serving in over 300 missions in approximately 160 countries and territories ("Church growth," 1995).

Working between sixty and seventy hours per week these young missionaries will attempt to find people who will listen to their message, which includes the law of chastity, by employing a variety of sophisticated, and some just plain arduous, contacting and teaching methods. Their primary conversion tool is the Book of Mormon which contains a promise as to how the truth-seeker can find out if the book (and the religion) are true for themselves rather than just relying on youthful testimony (The Book of Mormon, Moroni 10: 3-5).

Many of these young ministers will be given often-changing leadership responsibilities including assignment as district or zone leader of ten to thirty missionaries, assistant to the mission president (the highest leadership position held by a missionary), senior companion, or presidency over a small congregation of members known as a branch.

A considerable amount of myth and suspicion are attached to these young ministers and the religion they
represent. For example, one movie made by the British in the 1920s called *Trapped by the Mormons* was a horror flick about a possessed Mormon missionary holding hostages who, it seems, may have neglected to attend his temple recommend interview. Aged tales about Mormon missionaries stealing away young women through a sub-Atlantic tunnel running from Liverpool to the Salt Lake Temple demonstrates the degree of sexual superstition that once surrounded them.²

Such exciting old myths, combined with the peculiar social contrasts embodied in missionaries may explain the curiosity many young people exhibit towards them. Young women frequently are strongly attracted to these friendly, maverick, principled, and often athletic, young men in suits. Their role as teacher, counselor, and confidante may enhance the attraction. The large number of missionaries holding American citizenship in foreign missions is a fact not lost on aspiring female immigrants.

Feminine admirers offer a serious test of the young missionary's level of commitment to Mormon ideals of abstinence. Missionaries, however, are instructed to remain at arm's length from the opposite sex for the duration of service. While the majority of missionaries appear to avoid even so much as a shared kiss with a feminine admirer, the occasional instance of a missionary engaging in sexual intercourse is seen with profound social and official dissapproval. The missionary is
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immediately excommunicated and sent home without an "honorable release." To help prevent such occurrences, given the inordinate amount of opportunity for sexual favor a missionary receives, and for safety, missionaries are almost always required to be paired in "companionships" and to stay within sight of their companion, day and night, but for hygienic privacy (Missionary Handbook, 1985).

While Church studies show that only a third of young men of eligible age (18-26) "serve a full-time mission" ("Key to strong young men," 1984) families who have sons on missions are seen in very desirable social terms and parents of missionaries are recognized as having clearly been successful.

"Returned Missionaries" ("RMs") may be seen as having increased desirability by many young women in the Mormon culture, whose fathers have often indoctrinated them from an early age to marry "a good Returned Missionary in the temple." Recently deceased Mormon prophet Ezra Taft Benson, in speaking to young women who find two years of separation from boyfriends or fiancés a burden asserted the commonly held notion that "after he returns honorably from his mission, he will be a better husband and father and priesthood holder" (Benson, 1986, p. 83). The spiritual and social prestige is substantial for those young women who marry an RM in the temple. Returned missionaries are those who are much more likely to be
given future leadership positions in the LDS Church and often are seen as more mature, experienced, confident, and disciplined than their peers, leading to better educational and employment prospects.

For example, former Mormon Bishop Orrin Hatch, who served a mission in the mid-1950s, later, as a U.S. Senator, termed his mission experience "the most important two years of my life" (Roderick, 1994, p. 24). Such sentiment seems common among the Mormon faithful, even those who have climbed to the thrones of corporate or government power, and is indicative of the place of the mission in Mormon culture.

The Mormon Woman's Role

Young, unmarried females are barred from entering Mormon temples until near their day of temple marriage or until they are called to go on a mission. This latter point requires explanation.

For Mormon females temple marriage is to be given first priority. If no likely prospects have appeared by age 21, however, they are encouraged to serve an 18-month full-time mission. Standards of worthiness are the same as for males, as is the MTC and field experience but for aspects of leadership and priesthood duties.

Women cannot hold the priesthood in the LDS Church which amounts to being unable to perform ordinances, such as blessing the sick and baptism, or service in major
leadership positions. However, missionary service, giving sermons from the pulpit, teaching Sunday School, selecting music, and leading auxiliary departments within the Church (under loose priesthood oversight) has occurred as routine since the early history of the Mormons.

Despite the active role women have traditionally occupied, feminist dissidents have made headlines attacking the LDS Church for refusing women the priesthood (for an example of the common criticism of LDS priesthood leaders by feminists see Warenski, 1978). For them the issue of gender equality forms the root. As they see it, Mormon leaders refuse to be enlightened by the truths of modern feminism. However, Mormon Apostles, while seeking to include women to the fullest extent they believe allowable under divine law, dismiss most criticism and remain intransigent toward female priesthood ordination. The issue becomes complex and highly attached to other Mormon theology but the basic explanation probably understood by most active LDS would include a short list of propositions (these may be borne out by referring to Melchizedek Priesthood, 1989, pp. 181-191):

First, by eternal laws which not even God legally may change, male and female were created partially but significantly unlike in both physical and spiritual aspects from which flows their proper and most rewarding temporal and eternal roles.

Second, women are endowed with the capacity to bear
children, while men are not. This high calling of service and partnership with God in creating a body for one of His spirit children is seen as an honor reserved exclusively to women, much as the priesthood is reserved to men. Such a strange perception may be unfathomable to much of modern American culture, and feminist eyes may roll at such a sorry excuse, but there is little doubt that a substantial portion of Mormondom would accept the proposition as self-evident.

Third, in the devout Mormon view such important policy as priesthood and gender can only be determined by a being who is all-knowing and wise, who can see "the end from the beginning." To devout Latter-day Saints criticism of these policies is an act of astonishing arrogance and places one's own finite and impure wisdom above that of God's infinite, perfected vision.

Last, Mormon doctrine teaches that women hold the priesthood through their husbands and will one day be divine priestesses in an eternal governing and creative partnership—albeit as king and queen rather than king and king.

Gender role conflict in Utah has taken other interesting forms. The official position of the LDS Church is that the father should be the breadwinner and the mother should, if possible, not work outside the home until the children are grown (Relief Society, 1990, p. 109). Yet women participate in the Utah work place in
similar numbers as elsewhere (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1994, p. 399). Economic necessity seems to have impelled many to work, while others have simply chosen to commit the Mormon sin of "working mother."

Iannaccone and Miles (1990) conducted a study of the Mormon Church's response to social change between 1950 to 1986 focusing on changing women's roles and the extent of Mormon accommodation. They found that, while feminism was initially strongly resisted, over time the LDS Church moved to accommodate changes in women's roles, such as mothers being in the work-place under certain conditions. According to their study, the Church was able to continue to support the ideal even while conceding to the practical realities of the new American economy and culture.

Of importance to Utah culture is that all adult Mormon women are members of an LDS auxiliary organization known as the Relief Society which is organized in local units in each Mormon ward with the ward president chosen by the bishop (the world General President is chosen by the Mormon prophet). Among the oldest and largest women's organizations in the world, for many LDS women it comprises a very significant place in their social lives (Ludlow, 1992, pp. 1199-1206). Heavily stressed skills include homemaking, self-improvement, musical and artistic talents, female social interaction, and serving the needy. Even many young, career-minded Mormon mothers, most of whom have some assignment in the organization, seem to
enjoy its hands-on approach, which might include such things as tole painting (which appears to be the latest female Mormon craft fad) or "canning and freezing." The latter refers to one of the roles Mormon women often take in "home food production" and obtaining a "year's supply," terminology relating to the Mormon practice of storing away a year's supply of food toward a prophesied time of economic and perhaps political collapse (Cedar City West Stake, 1991).

While such prophetic warning may seem absurd to many Americans, even Utah's sex education curriculum dealing with gender roles asks students to evaluate whose role it should be for canning and freezing—a question the author doubts appears in any text beyond the Mormon geographic sphere. Yet even in this culture endorsing male and female role division, female missionaries routinely are as productive as their male counterparts (Benson, 1988, p. 83).

Gender Relations and Children

If missionaries are discouraged from fraternization before and during their mission, after their return strong official and social pressure to marry and have children is applied. Sexual worthiness before the marriage (which allows hugging and kissing in moderation) remains extremely important, and fidelity after marriage absolute. Contraception appears discouraged, but not prohibited.
(Ludlow, 1992, p. 116). However, large traditional families are seen as essential since Mormons believe that it is God's primary purpose to provide His "spirit-children" the opportunity to dwell on an earth, obtain a physical body, gain experience and have their faith, character, and obedience tested (Gospel Principles, 1979, pp. 9-33). Birth into a family "who has the gospel" both provides a body, which Mormons believe is indispensable for eternal union and procreation, as well as parents who, like missionaries, teach the child "correct principles." These families, sometimes referred to as "forever families," are believed to have been eternally "sealed" allowing eternal association and joy with worthy ancestors and posterity (Gospel Principles, p. 234).

Abortion is considered a most serious offense among Mormons, as both a display of sexual immorality as well as a sin "like unto murder" and is typically met with excommunication. The same applies to those who are actively involved in encouraging abortion in others. Missionary service for men who have encouraged or arranged for an abortion and for women who have had an abortion "resulting from their immoral conduct," is denied, unless it occurred before becoming a Church member ("Bulletin 1991-1," 1991, p. 3). Yet in circumstances of rape, incest, severe fetal deformation, or where the mother's life is in danger, abortion may be allowable under Mormon...
divine law. This is to be a decision between God and the
woman, with counseling from priesthood authority (Ludlow,

A potential convert to Mormonism who has had an
abortion cannot normally be approved for baptism by an
ordinary missionary-leader, but only by the
respective mission president—a non-lay official who
supervises about 180 missionaries and often several
congregations for a three-year appointed term—who must
verify the candidate's true attitude of repentance. This
applies to those who have murdered or had a "homosexual
encounter," and may be instructive in understanding the
weight of sin Mormons give such offenses. Even so,
forgiveness and baptism are generally granted if a sincere
change of heart seems to have occurred, especially in the
cases of abortion and homosexual experience.

In regard to same-gender attraction, homosexuals,
like heterosexuals, are to abstain from lust. If sex
occurs outside of "lawful" marriage, it is a serious
breach of the "law of chastity" whether homosexual or
heterosexual, although the former is even more serious
(Oaks, 1995b). Only male/female marriage can ever be
"lawful" in the Mormon sense. Given Mormon belief in the
supreme importance of eternal marriage (an eternal
creative partnership requiring both a male and female to
operate), rearing children, and obedience to the
"unchangeable law of chastity," it is not hard to
understand the irreconcilable conflict between the LDS Church and the practice of homosexuality.

Chastity and Mormon Youth

Teenage members, as has been explained, are strongly encouraged to be preparing for eternal marriage and missions. However, the American social culture which has placed sex in increasingly public terms, with shifting mores, often appears very enticing to young Mormons. Peer pressure from non-Mormon friends and "inactive" Church members, combined with the youthful body and mind's natural performance near adolescence, makes struggles between faith and physical desire common even to active Mormon teenagers in Utah.

The religion's solution to "strengthening the youth" is a multi-pronged program of considerable intensity whose roots go back far and whose consequences certainly have strong impact on the society, but not necessarily in easily identifiable ways. Teens submit to annual or semi-annual interviews with their bishop where sexual behavior, among other things, is discussed (Aaronic Priesthood, 1991, p. 14). While in high school Mormon students attend released-time "seminary" (one period daily in Utah during regular school hours in buildings always located across the street from high schools) where religious instruction and chaperoned social interaction occurs under direction of full-time seminary faculty.
For the faithful, dating is to be delayed until age 16 (Ludlow, 1992, p. 359), although 14-year-olds are welcomed at the popular Church dances without a date. The emotional struggles of the 15-year-old, two weeks from age sixteen, who is asked to a school dance, is a familiar petty tragedy of the devout Mormon teen. Among 16 to 18-year-olds who choose to date, double-dating is encouraged, and going steady discouraged. Kissing on the first date is warned against.

Special publications aimed at teens clearly outline "gospel standards," and a monthly magazine known as The New Era, which is full of articles showing attractive young people who are living worthiness standards while being successful as athletes, students, musicians, and leaders, contains both nonfiction and fiction aimed at the specific problems encountered by Mormon youth. Membership in the Boy Scouts is mandated for all males ages 8-15 (Aaronic Priesthood, 1991, p. 9). In addition, popular youth programs such as basketball, volleyball, softball, hikes, and service projects to the needy, comprise the Mormon solution.

Pursuit of rigorous activities such as athletics, traditional musical talents, and employment are encouraged, and parents are told to discourage idleness through regular chores at home (Parent's Guide, 1986). Teenage males are given the lesser Mormon priesthood and assist in various Mormon teaching and ordinances. Both
teen males and females serve in leadership positions over their respective age group and gender and help plan and organize activities (Aaronic Priesthood, 1991). Further, each teenage member is assigned to write and deliver a short speech before their ward at least yearly, and to participate yearly in a weekend away from parents known as Youth Conference in which peers are seen—in Mormon-style—strongly but quietly supporting their religious principles.

For those of college age, LDS "Institutes of Religion" offering university-level courses in scripture and doctrine, are located next to all Utah colleges and universities (as well as colleges across the nation). These "Institutes" along with "singles college wards" (congregations staffed and comprised nearly exclusively of young singles responsible for all aspects of the complex Mormon program) become the courting hub of the higher-education-obsessed young Mormon set. Additionally, a Mormon fraternity and sorority exists on many campuses (Sigma Gamma Chi and Lambda Delta Sigma) which are open to Institute students. Picnics, dances, and fixing up little old ladies' houses are some of the activities, but animal-house antics are unknown.

Once married, young college-age couples face strongly conflicting messages concerning the proper time to have children. Official Church policy counsels couples not to put off having children while in college (Benson, 1988,
pp. 540-541). However, frequently the economic advantages, and even urging from parents or other relatives, result in a plan to delay having children until a more convenient time. Yet, very commonly, this plan of delay is abandoned early on and Mormon couples without health insurance and economically destitute begin to build a family.

Utah Medicaid covering all pregnancy costs and insuring the children is easily available and strongly advertised to these young couples. Social stigma for use of Medicaid benefits for childbirth while in college appears nearly nonexistent in the state.

The Mormon solution, then, to sex among unmarried youth, appears to comprise a substantial amount of indoctrination, structured dating, early responsibility, and scheduled exhaustion. However, while a majority of Mormon youth seem to obey the law of chastity to a surprising extent, there are a considerable number who, at least temporarily, do not (more specific statistics will be provided in following chapters). A considerable minority of Mormon youth have had sexual intercourse before marriage. Many youth seem confident that they can repent in plenty of time before they reach missionary age or marriage, even given the difficulty of Mormon repentance. Others simply disregard the teachings of their Church in favor of the appeal of the national popular culture. Clergy appear to take into account these
youths' lack of experience and lesser spiritual oaths but still apply disciplinary action. The "sin now, repent later" attitude seems to cause the Mormon clergy considerable consternation and much of their energy goes into battling the appealing notion, especially among the young.

Single Mormon females who become pregnant face great embarrassment, and while the clergy encourages members to help rather than to judge, (only the high clergy has the authority to judge under Mormon divine law), the author has observed that some members react harshly.

For an unwed male who has fathered a child prospects for being allowed to serve a mission are void. The child and the mother are seen as his responsibility, and failure to marry the girl if possible, or at least provide support is seen as a severe act of corruption preventing missionary service, leading to disciplinary action, and in the case of Returned Missionaries, near certain excommunication.

The official Church position on children conceived out of wedlock involves a hierarchy of choices better to worse (Church Welfare Resources, 1991, p. 8). Marriage is the best choice, when feasible. Next, giving the child up for adoption to LDS Social Services, a professional core of social workers who place the child in an active, financially prosperous Mormon family, is considered a very good choice both for the child and for the mother who then
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retains better social, spiritual, and economic prospects. Lastly is the option of keeping the child oneself, considered infinitely superior to abortion, but not recommended because of diminished chances for temple marriage and economic security.

Dating between members and nonmembers is officially discouraged—not forbidden—the clergy using the reasoning that youth will marry whom they date. A marriage to a non-member cannot occur in the temple and is devoid of the eternal significance incorporated in the temple ceremony. Frequently these marriages result in conflict within the marriage due to the differing values and social pressures inherent. Conversion of non-members by way of dating, however, is not rare. Youth are told to tactfully outline their moral standards at the beginning of such an excursion with a non-member. This apparently has the practical effect of discouraging sexual advances while beginning the proselytization of an individual who may desire to know more about the peculiar beliefs and behaviors of a person to whom they are attracted.

Baptism before marriage is the ideal, although Mormons going into marriage hoping to see their spouse converted later are found in nearly every ward. Such hopes frequently are not fulfilled and the individual may eventually determine to make a choice between religion and spouse. Outcomes of such dilemmas seem to fall both ways.
The Non-LDS View of Mormon Sexual Culture in Utah

Not surprisingly, many of the non-Mormons in Utah find the state's procreative culture difficult and even frustrating both to understand and to accept. However, others, while disagreeing with many of the reasons behind Mormon chastity, nevertheless, support abstinence in youth for their own reasons of conviction and faith. Even so, some appear stunned when confronted with the size of Mormon families which among the most devout may routinely include half a dozen or more children.

Summary

Utah's high birthrate is not a fluke but clearly related to Mormon theology. The law of chastity and the highest rites of the LDS Church are inseparably connected, and the LDS culture is one keenly interested in promoting sexual behavior that conforms to strict conservative standards. If even active Mormons at times find the sexual pop culture enticing, and transgress Mormon law, they have cast anchors to a church that appears immovable on the most basic sexual issues. In order for the LDS Church to accomplish its mission of taking the "restored gospel" to every nation on Earth it will need a vast missionary force and this appears unalterably dependent on the extent LDS youth choose to live chastity rules. So also is the most sacred and important Mormon ordinance of
eternal marriage. However, it is clear that the continued persistence of the Mormon core culture is not entirely at the mercy of public sex education policy. The LDS Church operates what must be among the most sophisticated youth programs in the world, possessing substantial resources and institutions for teaching Mormon values to their young.
Notes

1 For a recent national story on the travails of the modern Mormon missionary see "A season for spreading the faith," 1985.

2 The author actually came across an old British woman in Bracknell, England in 1986 who believed this famous legend despite her country's difficulty in constructing a tunnel the relatively short distance of the English Channel.
CHAPTER 4

HOW THE SEX EDUCATION CONFLICT BEGAN

The clouds of conflict were clearly visible in 1988. It was a year that State Superintendent James R. Moss, already under attack for his strong past association with BYU and the LDS Church, surprised Home Schoolers and angered many educators by boldly endorsing home-schooling ("Moss' Support Surprises," 1988). Home schoolers, dismayed at what they perceived as increasing liberal domination of public education (even in conservative Utah) were on the verge of tremendous growth, drawing largely from active LDS families. Utah would soon become a regional center for the movement.

The year 1988 also saw the Planned Parenthood Association of Utah name a New York native, Penny Davis, as director of clinical services while celebrating their 18th year in the state ("Planned Parenthood Names," 1988). The small number of Utah natives leading the organization, even after nearly two decades, caused its image to suffer among many native Utahns who not only opposed its goals, but viewed it akin to invaders armed with federal money
who were coming to push alien values on Utah culture.

Most importantly in 1988 was the creation of the Governor's Task Force on Teenage Pregnancy Prevention. This committee, chaired by Republican State Senator Stephen Rees, included top representatives from the State Board of Education, Planned Parenthood, the Department of Health, and others, and was to become the catalyst for the conflict in this study.

It is important to note that the very creation of the task force may have been in response to pressure created by a misperception of the relative seriousness of the problem of teen pregnancy in Utah. A preliminary study released by a task force subcommittee found many misconceptions about teenage pregnancy among Utah's population. State Senator Stephen Rees, Task Force Chair, speaking to the Deseret News complained, "I've heard people say, 'Utah has the highest pregnancy rate in the country.' The report showed that we are 30% below the national average but up in the birth rate slightly because of Utah's low abortion rate" ("Teen Pregnancy," 1988).

Senator Rees, now the powerful chair of the Senate Education Appropriations Subcommittee which oversees half the state's budget, repeated this observation in an interview with the author, suggesting that people often confuse the significantly dissimilar terms of "teen pregnancy," "teen births," and "births to unwed mothers" (personal communication, March 10, 1995). As antecedote he
noted that his daughter-in-law, who was 19, had just made him a grandfather. She was counted as both a teenage pregnancy and birth, but is married to his son several years her elder and can expect a prosperous future.

Senator Rees, who once worked for a nonprofit Utah organization called the Institute for Research and Evaluation which received federal funds for studying sex education and related issues, criticized "certain groups" for having at times created a haze around the terminology by claiming to have reduced teen births--implying they had reduced teen pregnancy--when in fact they had substantially increased abortion rates to achieve lower birth rates.

The concern of terminology misused in the media adding to false perceptions among the public was repeated by several individuals involved in the policy process. Further, a problem of statistics appears to have existed from the beginning. For those interested in raising alarm in Utah about teen pregnancy rates, the urge to quote national statistics rather than the substantially lower Utah statistics seems to have been a temptation they often could not resist.

In other words, there is reason to suppose that the sex education project was partly born of unclear and inaccurate ideas about the situation in Utah among the public and probably a number of journalists and policymakers--many of whom seemed determined to cite
national studies and statistics in a state which, as we earlier saw, is statistically on the margins of American society sexually and socially. This misuse of terminology and statistics continued by groups throughout the study and the reader should be aware that they were constantly present. In the end national statistics intermingled in noncomparative form with Utah numbers would occupy several pages of the completed sex education "resource guide."

The Task Force Divided

This study is one of group conflict. Planned Parenthood occupied the "liberal" side of the battle, yet in interviews and articles, usually seemed savvy to the realities of politics in conservative Utah, demonstrating proficient public relations skills through much of the policy conflict and contact with the author.

For example, Karrie T. Galloway, task force member and director of Planned Parenthood in 1988 struck a moderate tone, while hinting of coming policy combat, stating in the Deseret News that "abstention is only one issue...We need to design a program to address all areas of teenage pregnancy. If I ruled the world, it would include a religious approach, a public service campaign and guidelines for the schools that would offer specific help in dealing with the issue ("Teen Pregnancy Panel," 1988). In Utah who would argue with that? Yet thoughtful reflection on her words make it clear that an abstinence-only curriculum was not her goal.
In October 1988 the task force released an 82-page report concluding that abstinence was the only plausible approach to the teenage pregnancy problem in Utah while contraception education was firmly rejected. For Senator Rees the recommendations were a compromise approach. The extreme right wanted sex education only in the home while the extreme left "would put contraceptives under every pillow," he concluded. The majority of task force members wanted the physiological aspects of sex taught in the schools, but abstinence as the only acceptable solution to sexually related problems, Rees explained (personal communication, March 10, 1995).

The task force report (Governor's Task Force, 1988, pp. 63-67) included ten specific recommendations, advising that the state should:

1. Firmly base all adolescent pregnancy prevention programs on the principle of sexual abstinence among teenagers. All programs based on principle of abstinence.

2. Encourage adolescents who have had sexual intercourse to refrain from further sexual activity.

3. Not support the use of contraception as an alternative to abstinence for teenagers.

4. Reauthorize the Governor's Task Force on Teenage Pregnancy Prevention for two additional years.

5. Incorporate a K-12 curriculum on family life and human development into the core curriculum requirements of the State Board of Education.

6. Initiate a public education and information campaign to increase awareness of teen pregnancy and to encourage prevention efforts.

7. Target appropriate and effective intervention strategies toward youth who are at highest risk of
teen pregnancy and early sexual activity.

8 Involve the teen's parents or guardian to the greatest possible extent in programs to prevent teen pregnancy.

9 Direct adolescent pregnancy prevention efforts at both males and females.

10 Provide continued or increased support for programs to prevent other problems among youth and to enhance their future life options.

The report did not entirely please either the far right or left of Utah. The possibility of the state taking an increased and more centralized role in sex education was not an appealing notion to many of the state's most conservative citizens, while the fact that topics such as contraception were not endorsed brought disapproval from Planned Parenthood and its allies.

Laying the foundation for future action two members of the eleven member task force—Planned Parenthood's Galloway and Kathleen McElliott of the University of Utah's Teen Mother and Child Program—issued a minority report (Governor's Task Force, p. 58) which included a call for contraception education. Galloway further criticized the task force majority for dictating lifestyle choices to teens (Funk, 1988, October 6).

However, Rees and other members of the task force viewed the report very differently. They believed that the recommendations had been well balanced given Utah's conservatism. Yet, Galloway continued to insist that the task force should have delivered a MORE balanced report by
incorporating recommendations for adolescents who would not choose to abstain. The leaders of the State Curriculum Office agreed with Galloway. Although the sex education program that would be developed by the state would frequently be billed as an abstinence curriculum as "recommended" by the governor's task force, Galloway's desire to provide sex education for teenagers choosing not to abstain, backed by other activists, would become the true driving force behind the development of Utah's sex education curriculum. To this end a "citizen's advisory panel" composed of educators and interest group activists would soon be created by the State Office of Education to work behind the scenes in developing a curriculum.

License or legitimation to even create a state-wide sex education curriculum (which was termed for public relations purposes a "resource file" by the State Curriculum Office) was drawn from task force recommendation number five which, it seems, was somewhat loosely interpreted since it refers to "family life" and "human development" rather than "sex education." However, it was neatly transposed to fit with the nationwide call by liberal interest groups, such as Planned Parenthood, for schools to adopt a K-12 curriculum on human sexuality ("Planned Parenthood," 1993, p. 3).

Despite the displeasure of Galloway, the task force report seemed to fit well with Utah's dominant culture and must have served its political purpose of "doing
something" to address the perceived problem. To expect the committee, which included mainly conservative politicians and governor-appointed department heads, to arrive at a conclusion endorsing "liberal sex education" (meaning something beyond abstinence-only) would be a near political impossibility, and defy the rules of political sanity in a conservative state. With abstinence validated and victory won as usual, some conservatives, later in the conflict, appeared ill-prepared and even at first disbelieving when it became apparent that a majority of the members of the State Board were wavering on the abstinence-only recommendation.

However, some members of the State Board, otherwise prone to social conservatism, may have had their hearts and minds on an even more explosive issue and how they might move to reduce it—abortion.

First Shots in Utah's Great Abortion Debate

In 1989, as the possibility of the state taking up the issue of sex education in an unprecedented way grew and a committee was about to be selected as an advisory panel for creation of a state sex education guide, the public's attention was locked on the much higher-profile abortion debate.

In April 1989 Planned Parenthood, striking hard at the LDS Church and the Mormon-dominated legislature,
produced a superbly publicized poll suggesting that even active Mormons were pro-choice in Utah. The results, presented at a news conference, were trumpeted toward Mormon political and religious leaders. The message was clear: Latter-day Saints were to take courage at the findings and join with the pro-choice majority of their faith; Mormon politicians going against this majority could lose office; and the Mormon clergy, losing discipline over the flock, were to be embarrassed at their lack of support among their own people.

The poll was reported to have had a margin of error of plus or minus three percent, claiming that 54 percent of active Latter-day Saints believed that "abortion should remain a private issue" ("Utahns In Poll," 1989). The results seemed impressive; yet in analyzing affirmative responses to this question one is left wondering whether the wording is not problematic in attempting to infer pro-choice sentiment. Mormons tend in general to see all sexual related issues as something that should remain private, although not necessarily legal. Further, upon examining the numbers, the author was impressed that a poll of only 504 people could have such a low margin of error. Depending on the confidence level it should have been around four or five percent. Some 305 respondents claimed to be active Mormons, or about half, which of course meant that for this group the margin of error was considerably higher than the suspicious three percent.
The poll reported that some 64 percent of Utahns believed that abortion "should remain a private issue."

Given the wording, and the small sample size, plus the fact that its findings were very favorable to the group that commissioned it, one is easily left fretting over what the numbers really meant. In interest group politics, where surveys are employed as salvos in a conflict, scientific reliability and validity seem to matter little. What the survey numbers really meant was plain—publicity and advancement for one side at the expense of the other.

If some state leaders did not take the poll too seriously, it seems it may have left doubt in their minds as to actual public opinion and certainly gave pro-choice groups positive publicity while placing their opponents on the defensive.

Liberal Sex Education as Abortion Cure

By September 1989 the Utah legislature was poised to take action on abortion while Planned Parenthood combined with the National Organization of Women, National Abortion Rights Action League, the American Civil Liberties Union, the Coalition for Responsible Choices, and the Utah Women's Health Center, in an attempt to scare the legislature away from tackling the issue. Media events were scheduled and telephone calls to legislators
encouraged. Liberalized sex education was repeatedly called for by the ACLU and other groups which insisted that contraception education was the realistic way to fight abortion, a sentiment that may have even swayed a few conservative State Board members later in the state's curriculum fight.

The immediate effect of these groups' lobbying is unclear, but major action was, in fact, delayed on the abortion issue by the state legislature for a year and half, suggesting that the influence of these groups was in some way felt and that uncertainty among state leaders existed as to the political cost of passing a bill limiting abortions versus the likelihood of the U.S. Supreme Court upholding the law.

Public Education As History

By 1990 several important developments were underway that would impact sex education policy development in the state. Among the more interesting group educational phenomenon occurring at this time was the continued growth of the Utah Home Schooling Association and movement. The year of 1990 marked their tenth annual convention and the keynote speaker, Glenn L. Pearson, an author and retired teacher, lashed out at public education asking, "If your children get drugs, where will they get them? If they become sexually active before they should, where was the source of the influence that brought it about?" (Morris, 1990).
Pearson claimed that state schools violate the principles of separation of church and state because their teachings on social issues were an established, state supported, state religion. "Humanism swept in to fill the vacuum when Christianity, Judaism, Islam, and other God-centered religions were banned," he explained. Turning his wrath toward the ACLU he asserted that "if the motives of the ACLU were honest and consistent, the main thrust of the ACLU would be to eliminate state schools altogether, not just prayer in public schools" (Morris, 1990). Yet he admitted that to attack public education in Utah might still be considered blasphemy, in reference to the position in Utah society public education had obtained through its early connection with religious leaders.

Possible Influence of Home Schooling
On Sex Education

Since home schoolers have withdrawn from public education the relationship of the Utah home schooling movement to the topic of this study may be less than obvious. But this is precisely the point. Home schooling is constructed mainly of socially conservative segments of Utah and appears to contain an extremely high proportion of devout Mormons who are generally disaffected with what is perceived as social liberalism and incompetence in the schools to the point of initiating a partial or complete boycott of the system. While reliable data are lacking,
observation by the author suggests that a reasonable hypothesis would be that a strong majority of Utah's home schoolers would oppose sex education in the schools in general, or at least favor a highly conservative, abstinence-only offering. Since these parents' conservative influence appears to be at least partially withdrawn from the policy process one may suppose that their withdrawal, in fact, may be aiding the advancement of the liberal policies they oppose, but their tax dollars continue to support.

The author does not wish to spend much additional space on this point, but the reader may be advised to keep it in mind. Additionally, there is one other tie-in of home schooling to sex education that may be mentioned. The author has observed, and had it reported to him by home-schoolers who attend the Utah conventions, that the Eagle Forum (as will be seen an important interest group in the sex education conflict) actively recruits among them. Many who do not join still may be found on Eagle Forum mailing lists. The Eagle Forum will play a key role as the study unfolds.

The Mormon Morality Curriculum

There were other actions in 1990 that may have had impact on the curriculum battles to come. One of these had to do with the LDS Church. In 1990 Mormon leaders, becoming increasingly concerned about what it perceived as
a rising tempest of immorality in society, no longer were content to leave significant sex education discussion to worldly activists and policy-makers. Since Joseph Smith's time Mormon prophets had instructed youth on strict principles of chastity, modesty, and integrity, but had felt hesitant to discuss much of behaviors they saw as dark and disgusting. Now they felt a need for greater steps to ensure they were being understood. The centerpiece of this renewed effort was the mass publication of a pamphlet entitled For the Strength of Youth (1990).

The pamphlet was short, teen readable, and specific in laying out a comprehensive list of moral standards expected of teens and the LDS people in general. Sexual morality as discussed in the previous chapter occupied the major thrust of the work. Striking a cordial but serious tone the pamphlet carried the clear and warm endorsement of the Mormon First Presidency and was to be kept and used by youth as modern scripture. However, the mere printing and announcing of the pamphlet was only the first step. Church-wide promulgation was sure to require substantial effort which would begin in earnest the following year.

Legislating Planned Parenthood

While home schooling was making gains and the LDS Church was attempting to make certain its youth knew what behavior was expected, liberal social interest groups were
moving ahead with their own agenda, only they were seeking it in the public forum. In an interview with Senator Rees he recalled that Planned Parenthood had in the past been ambitious enough to seek legislation allowing sexual counseling and clinics to operate in Utah's public schools. The organization continued to wish for success in the legislative arena, but it would remain only a wish.

In 1990 Planned Parenthood found the political cookie jar slammed on its fingers, then released in a most innocent way. The organization had been asked in the 1990 legislative session to write a piece of legislation for Democratic state representative Janet Rose. Apparently this was not considered unusual. However, the language of the bill included a segment mandating that all minors over 12 years of age were to receive free birth control counseling and devices, and that Utah's law requiring parental notification in case birth control were dispensed, be dropped (Bernick, 1990).

Representative Rose had meant for the language about minors receiving counseling and devices to be stricken and to this end instructed legislative attorneys to delete it from the broader bill's subsequent drafts. An apparent oversight caused the language to be retained. Rose's Republican challenger in the upcoming election (Wayne Rose--no relation) attacked her for the bill's content, until he discovered that its retention had been an error. However, Ms. Rose had never ordered deleted the language
repealing parental notification. When confronted about this language she claimed that she had not understood that portion of the bill because it was couched in legal language she could not understand and that she was not in favor of the repeal of parental notification.

According to Bernick, neither version of the bill was ever even considered by the legislature beyond printing, but its publicity left suspicions that Republicans had set up Representative Rose for embarrassment, while she had allowed Planned Parenthood too much influence and had not been fully honest in her intent toward the issues.

Protecting Utah's Children From Democracy

While the vote of Utah's socially conservative electorate had sent representatives to the Utah Capitol who balked at even considering Planned Parenthood's proposals, submitted under Representative Rose's name, the Utah Legislature was about to undertake reform of the State Board of Education designed to diminish the public's control over the state's educational leaders.

Senator Rees, a major leader in the effort, explained that the ideal would have been to make the State Board appointed by the governor directly, just as the higher education Board of Regents in Utah was (S. Rees, personal communication, March 10, 1995). The justification for this change was to "increase professionalism" Rees told
the author, which he felt was lacking on a Board too prone to controversy (he did not explain why the legislature, also prone to controversy, did not need to be more "professional," in a similar way). To accomplish this guard against citizens choosing unprofessionals, the Utah Constitution would have needed to have been amended since it mandates popular election of the State Board of Education. Not about to let either the state's constitution or democracy stand in the way of "professionalism," a system was created which, beginning in 1992, would rely on selection committees appointed by the governor. These committees, according to the State Board's secretary, would be composed of seven members including representatives of various educational interests such as the PTA and teacher's union plus three members representing economic interests (T. Affleck, personal communication, October 18, 1994).

The selection committee was to provide the governor a list of four or five acceptable candidates of which the governor would then select his favorite two for the election. In addition, the Board was to be increased from 9 to 15 members, "in hopes of better representing the outer areas of the State geographically" (or perhaps of decreasing the influence of certain democratically elected sorts who might have remained on the Board and been prone to "controversy?").

While "better representation" and "professionalism"
were the justification (the history of the Board shows that it had, in fact, retained an educated and occupationally diverse group of members in the past), the author must conclude that the result was to immediately increase the patronage of ambitious Republican governors, while concurrently pleasing the teacher's union (Utah Education Association) by giving them much greater clout in selecting who would serve on the State Board. Further, economic elites, often caring little for social policy issues, were granted greater control over state educational policy and its projects through the use of the selection committee system. And since the governor would hand out these plums, he would make new friends while being able to obtain political cover for policies outside the mainstream by blaming either the selection committee, the Board, or the electorate—the latter it seems mostly unaware that the people campaigning for the State Board had been pre-selected for them in a style uncomfortably similar to certain foreign political theories recently fallen into disrepute.

It remains too early to tell if the new system will in fact, relieve the public of control and relieve the governor of responsibility; however, it seems clear that the power of interest groups in influencing governors and committees must be both enormous and easily concealed under such an arrangement.
Another Try For Planned Parenthood

In the Legislature

As the State Curriculum Office and the sex education advisory committee began earnest work on a state sex education curriculum, liberal interests took another shot at passage of their agenda in the legislative forum. Meeting in the winter of 1991 the Utah Senate was introduced to a bill proposed by Democrat Karen Shepard (state representative from Salt Lake and soon to be one-term member of Congress) that would have mandated sex education for Utah students including information on contraception, with parental consent (SB 188, 1991). Shepard complained that the State Board had required some form of sex education for the state's students, but that many school districts were ignoring the State Board's wishes ("Sex Education Bill," 1991). However, a representative of the State Board objected to the legislature's becoming involved in curriculum decisions--something legislators were regularly guilty of when it suited them.

The liberal bill never made it out of the Senate Education Committee. Among the members of the committee who sealed its demise was Southern Utah's living political legend, Republican Dixie Leavitt. Senator Leavitt, father of popular Utah Governor Mike Leavitt (elected in 1992), founder of the prosperous five-state Leavitt Insurance Group, and former senate leader, had recently returned
from a three year stint as an LDS Mission President in England to provide an encore performance of senate wizardry--bestowing blessings on higher education in southern Utah--before returning to Church service. Sex education was a matter that "should be dealt with at home," Leavitt firmly announced ("Sex Education Bill," 1991). He and two others voted against the bill, sending it back to the Rules Committee, while a lone Democrat voted in favor.

Abortion Fight Renewed

While the State Curriculum Office and the advisory panel were steadily but quietly moving forward to develop sex education curriculum, and the legislature was tossing sex education proposals in the wastepaper basket, again public attention was strongly diverted towards Utah's abortion fight.

The governor and legislature, anticipating a possible overturning of Roe v. Wade (1973) by the U.S. Supreme Court, were finally prepared to take action. Richard Sherlock (1991) explained that although outside groups such as the National Right to Life Committee desired the most restrictive law possible and were able to initially win support from a highly conservative legislative committee, several factors served to moderate the outcome. In early January, near the beginning of the legislative session, the LDS Church released the text of its aged
statement on abortion, which is less than the NRLC's absolute position. Only days later the governor, who supported the LDS position, threatened a veto of any bill that was more extreme. It was the feeling of the Governor's Office that a less absolutist law, such as that supported by the LDS Church, would have had a better chance of being upheld in court and moving the country toward a pro-life position. Finally, conservative activists in Utah such as Gayle Ruzicka admitted that they had started out asking for more than what they knew they would get, but in viewing the final product announced "we support this bill wholeheartedly" (Sherlock, p. 86). The result was a law that outlawed abortions except in cases of reported rape or incest, serious jeopardy to the mother's life, or severe fetal deformation (Roche, 1991). Not surprisingly, the law very closely matched the position of the LDS Church. This fact was not missed by the American Civil Liberties Union and certain religious bodies, always on the lookout to raise the church-state issue and bring pressure to bear on Mormon clergy and lawmakers for whom such accusations were always guaranteed to make bristle.

The ACLU filed an anticipated lawsuit challenging the state in early April. Disregarding public relations concerns in Utah for the time being, the group flew in top-notch attorneys from New York to assist local attorneys in crafting the 300 page document, Jane Liberty
v Norman Bangerter, which contained affidavits from numerous physicians, counselors and religious leaders (Funk and Wells, 1991). While the lawsuit was expected, Utah government was angered, and some citizens embarrassed, when the ACLU took out a $57,000 ad in the New York Times which read: "In Utah, they know how to punish a woman who has an abortion. Shoot her" (ACLU, 1991).

Republican Governor Norman Bangerter's Chief of Staff, Bud Scruggs, who served on Ted Kennedy's 1980 presidential campaign staff, which he claims had the effect of turning him into a conservative Republican, suggested the issue should be "debated in the courts where advocates have a responsibility to tell the truth and not in the advertising section of newspapers [where] the ACLU has not been similarly restrained" (Roche, 1991a). The ad was directed at a provision in state homicide law which the ACLU contended would allow women who aborted to be executed for murder.

An additional $3,000 ad was run in the Salt Lake Tribune just as the legislature was returning for a special session in April to, among other things, make certain that murder charges could not be filed against women who broke the law. Utah's Pro Choice Coalition, which included mainly the ACLU, Planned Parenthood, and the National Organization for Women were behind the ad. Demanding that the law be repealed, they staged a protest
demonstration outside of Salt Lake's Little America Hotel where over 1,000 Republicans had gathered with guests for the annual Governor's Ball. Outside signs such as "Queers For Choice" were waved at the Governor's guests, while Molly Yard, national president of NOW, promised that a lot of people would be driven away from skiing Utah as a punishment for the state (Israelsen, 1991).

This was no small threat to many of Utah's elites. Salt Lake businessmen had lustfully eyed the Winter Olympics for many years and appeared to be making good progress toward capturing the lucrative games. The threat worried them.

On the public relations front Planned Parenthood used letters in newspaper public forums to attack state legislators who had displeased them, and also to repeatedly push for contraceptive education in schools as the solution to the abortion problem (see Carlson, 1991). In addition, the new theme in the major media became the cry that the cost of defending the anti-abortion law would risk "scarce state resources" in order to defend lawmakers' "personal moral philosophy." The author recalls that this theme seemed to play well among many in the state despite the fact that the state routinely ran budget surpluses, and the lawmakers clearly represented more than their own personal philosophies--choose either voters in their districts or as some critics contended, the LDS Church. The conservative Utah Association of
Women promised to counter NOW's boycott by appealing to conservative vacationers and by raising funds to help with the legal defense (Roche, 1991b).

Vocal Liberals and Deaf Teens?

The relationship of sex education and abortion which liberal interests were attempting to connect in Utah jumped to the national forum by the summer. In June 1991 pro-choice advocates launched a nationwide advertising campaign suggesting that "as a solution [to abortion], anti-choice leaders want to send doctors to jail and women back to the back alleys." Both the print ad and the television campaign contended that the solution was "better sex education, improved birth control, contraception, better prenatal care and stronger family leave" ("Pro-choice Advocate," 1991).

However, UPI earlier that same month had reported that Dr. Linda Meloy, Assistant Professor of Pediatrics at the Medical College of Virginia, testifying before Congress offered a more dismal view of programs aimed at teen sexuality--the advice given was falling mostly on deaf ears ("Is advice," 1991):

-1.1 million teenagers pregnant every year
-1 out of 5 AIDS cases reported was among young adults in their 20's
-3 million teens infected with sexually transmitted disease yearly
-78% of adolescent girls and 86% of adolescent boys having had sexual intercourse by age 20
While these may appear to be good reasons to have sex education, Meloy spoke discouragingly.

This explosion is [occurring] despite all the time and money that well-meaning people have invested in school-based clinics, sex education and safe sex...Over the past 10 years a 306 percent increase in federal funds spent promoting sexual responsibility corresponded with a 48.3 percent increase in teen pregnancy" ("Is Advice," 1991).

Personal Attacks Begin

While the abortion debate was raging, the spring of 1991 also brought several significant developments for groups involved with the sex education issue in Utah. Senator Stephen Rees found himself under attack for conflict of interest violations related to his involvement as a director of the Institute for Research and Evaluation which tested and evaluated various sex education and anti-pregnancy programs with the aim of promoting the abstinence-only approach. As chief fund-raiser for the Institute he had successfully solicited numerous corporations for donations, building the Institute from a reported $13,400 budget in 1986 to $235,134 in 1990, where he drew a salary of $65,000 (Bernick, 1991). Part of the money had come from research contracted by the federal government, a benefit of Utah Senator Orrin Hatch's committee assignments, and a major contract with the state of Utah. His power as member of the Executive Appropriations Committee, which adopts the final state budget, and chair of the Senate Health Committee and
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Public Education Appropriations Subcommittee allowed insinuations that donations to the Institute had purchased influence.

Further, the sex education programs evaluated by the Institute and recommended by him had actually been adopted by many districts. This implied to his enemies some form of corrupt influence, although Rees and the Institute had received no money from any of the sex education curriculum companies whose programs they had studied or recommended.

The allegations lacked proof. Rees had declared conflict of interest according to the law when required, and had warned donating companies not to expect favors. There was little doubt that he had been targeted for his partisanship in general and for his conservative success in the sexuality policy arena. The accusations were a payback. Rees, perhaps realizing that the issue would return again no matter how discreet he was, eventually found a new career in real estate development, while retaining his senate position.

Planned Parenthood's Enemies in Washington

With Rees and the abstinence-promoting Institute circling wagons, it was soon Planned Parenthood's turn to play defense. In 1988 the Reagan Administration had issued regulations barring family planning programs that received federal funding under Title X of the Public
Health Service Act from advising women on having an abortion. On May 23, 1991 the U.S. Supreme Court upheld the so-called "gag-rule" for Title X money, bringing the possibility of a major loss of federal funds to Utah's Planned Parenthood, which vowed it would continue to suggest abortion as a pregnancy alternative regardless of the ruling. In doing so they risked losing a third of their $1.5 million annual budget. The national organization immediately began planning strategy to lobby Congress to rescind the decision even while they sought ways to take advantage of the existing rules in their favor (Funk, 1991).

Already on the defensive, in July 1991 Utah's Planned Parenthood became the target of Senator Orrin Hatch's displeasure. In a move Planned Parenthood called "sneaky," but Hatch aides called "a master-stroke" Hatch added an amendment to a Senate bill aimed at giving the Utah Health Department control over all family planning money coming from Title X to the state, thereby stripping Planned Parenthood of the funds (Davidson, 1991). The Utah Health Department had lost control of Title X money years earlier as a result of Utah's parental consent law for contraception enacted by Utah's Legislature in the early 1980s. The Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals had ruled against Utah, determining that it was not the intent of Congress to require parental consent when providing birth control to minors. The decision led to the Utah Health
Department forfeiting the funds rather than violating the state's parental notification law. Planned Parenthood had ended up with the money (See Governor's Task Force, 1988, pp. 53-55).

Edward Kennedy, in an apparent deal with Hatch in July 1991, and with few senators on the floor, offered Hatch's amendment by voice vote. Its language exempted all states which had enacted parental notification laws before a certain date from the Tenth Circuit Court's ruling. Utah was the only state in the category.

Ironically, the bill Hatch's amendment was added to was the bill passed by the Senate that was designed to lift the "gag-rule," thereby allowing Planned Parenthood Clinics to keep Title X money even while continuing to promote abortion (Davidson, 1991). Planned Parenthood, angered and alarmed, was able to breathe a sigh of relief that the House of Representatives remained a liberal stronghold and would not allow Hatch's amendment to survive once the word went out.

Summary

By the late 1980s the issue of sex education had gained salience for Utah's leaders and had achieved state-level agenda status. Legitimation of the development of a state curriculum was drawn loosely from the recommendations of the Governor's Task Force on Teenage Pregnancy Prevention. The Task Force
recommendations were for an abstinence-only approach in the state. However, socially liberal interest groups were determined to seek a curriculum that included, at the least, contraceptive education. Unsuccessful attempts were made toward this end in the Utah Legislature. By the early 1990s the State Office of Education, with the assistance of an advisory panel composed of activists and health and education professionals from various organized interests, were quietly developing a high school sex education curriculum as the first component of a K-12 program in the state. This coincided with a major policy battle over abortion in which the issues of abortion and sex education were strongly linked. The outcome of the abortion controversy in Utah was further linked to the moral/cultural/political influence of the LDS Church. Conflict over sexual issues in the state included tactical maneuvers by various parties in an attempt to gain the upperhand. By the summer of 1991, with honing shots crashing at the periphery, the battle over a state-wide sex education curriculum was truly ready to begin.
Notes

1Use of the curriculum by local districts would not be mandated, but teaching the objectives developed with the curriculum would be required, whatever the local policy. However, because the state curriculum was termed a "resource file" it could be distributed to teachers in local districts for use as a resource or supplement. Thus, a broader distribution of the curriculum might be obtained.

2In partnership with Mike Leavitt, Scruggs has the distinction of having opened Utah's first professional political consulting firm, successfully running several high-level campaigns until signing on with Bangerter. Since the retirement of Bangerter in 1992 and the elevation of his former partner to the office of Governor, Scruggs has taken a position in the political science department at BYU. In recent times he has devoted his energy to defending LDS leaders and policy in the media, usually on his own initiative, and has humorously referred to himself as "defender of the faith" (Bernick, 1993).
CHAPTER 5

POLICY CONFLICT

August 1991 was one of the most important months for sex education in Utah. At a yearly gathering of scholars who study the LDS Church and culture, known as the Sunstone Symposium, research was presented suggesting that unmarried Mormons were more sexually active than some had previously thought.

Tim B. Heaton, Professor of Sociology at Brigham Young University, analyzed the results of national surveys of 20,000 women by the University of Michigan in 1982, 1987, and 1988 addressing sexuality, marriage, and children. He concluded that 58 percent of Mormon women interviewed had engaged in premarital sex, which was higher than expected (Stack, 1991). While the number seemed alarming to the researchers, the percentage for other religions was substantially higher, ranging from 70 to 90 percent (Spangler, 1991). The increase between 1982 and 1988, however, appeared to be greater for Mormons than for other groups. Further findings indicated that only 12 percent of Latter-day Saints had ever lived together without being married, as compared to 20 to 30 percent for
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most religions and 50 percent for those claiming no religion. Heaton found that only 7 percent of Mormon women reported giving birth pre-maritally (Stack, 1991).

More Mormon women were married than the national average, 69 percent compared to 52 percent nationally, and Mormon women were found to marry younger—20.6 years—than "all but Baptists and Fundamentalists" (Spangler, 1991). The average number of children desired by Mormon women was 2.8, or 40 percent higher than women in all other categories. Heaton, however, believed that this represented a decline.

Heaton's study, while probably not appearing either alarming or critical of the LDS Church to the reader, seemed to stun some Mormons and may have had an influence in policy discussions. The author, living in conservative southern Utah at that time, and paying little attention to the issue, nevertheless, recalls hearing that some Mormon leaders were displeased with the research concluding that it overstated the numbers (probably in light of issues of Mormon response rates and the fact that so many Mormons are converts who had very different values before conversion) and was demeaning to the many "virtuous" Mormon women. However, some parents were heard to express the view that there was no choice but to teach sex education in the schools since even many Mormon parents were failing to adequately do so.
As for the Sunstone Symposium, which had faced increasing disapproval from Mormon General Authorities in preceding years, it seemed that Apostles were losing patience. After facing an unusually antagonistic gathering of liberal Mormon intellectuals, the First Presidency and Quorum of the Twelve issued an official policy statement warning members against participating in unauthorized symposia and implying that to do so could put their Church memberships in jeopardy ("BYU Memo Highlights," 1992).

These symposia often included dissidents, and research frequently took issue with direction set by Mormon Apostles. The media typically yawned at Mormon-favorable studies and seemed to focus publicity on symposium papers critical of Church policy and leaders, or those things most sensational, such as Mormon sexuality.

Even research that General Authorities agreed was true often was viewed as detrimental to the Church and its members because of the "harmful" publicity to the Church that it might generate. As one BYU professor commented, "it's not what is said but where it's said" ("BYU Memo Highlights," 1992, p. 64). General Authorities found many of the symposium's papers counter to their efforts internationally, as well as on the home social and moral front, or prone to making light of the most sacred aspects of their religion. In the case of the Heaton study Mormon leaders may have recognized its inopportune timing for
those interests more conservative towards sex education in
the state. The State Board, in August, was poised to take
up consideration of the sex education curriculum which an
advisory panel, in conjunction with the State Curriculum
Office, had been quietly working on for over a year.
Stack reported that the LDS Church in its official
denunciation of the symposium had criticized those who air
matters in public that "are more appropriate for private
conferring and correcting..." (1991). Heaton, for
whatever reason, was soon called in by local clergy for
questioning about his research in relation to possible
future disciplinary action.

The Salt Lake Tribune jumped on Heaton's findings.
In a Sunday editorial it blasted the "irrational fears" of
conservatives who were critical of the state's proposed
sex education guide ("Time For State School Officials,"
1991). Then, taking aim at the LDS Church, the editorial
used Heaton's findings to blame Mormons for the rise in
teenage sexuality in society because they were reluctant
to support public sex education.

The end of August (perhaps not coincidentally) also
kicked off a major education campaign by the LDS Church
aimed at assisting parents in teaching sexual morality
(and other moral standards) to the young. The approach
taken by the Church, however, was not an endorsement of
public sex education. Instead, Mormon leaders attempted
to focus attention on the new pamphlet, For the Strength
of Youth, in an effort to remind parents of specifically what the Church's behavior standards were, and how to teach these standards to their young. This was initiated in the September edition of the official Mormon monthly known as the Ensign (pronounced N'sign, as in a banner that goes before an army). The first article was placed in the prime pages just after the First Presidency message which begins each issue. Its title announced a clear theme to the modern Mormon parent raising children in a changing world: "The Lord's Standards Haven't Changed." It was the first in a series that would run well into the next year (Goasling and Kapp, 1991).

This same month of August three researchers at Utah State University completed a $500,000 sex education curriculum project funded by the federal government, designed to reduce teen pregnancy. Composed of six 15 minute videos the program was scheduled to be sent to 3,500 extension agents and land grant schools nationwide, eventually reaching families, churches, and libraries. Two of the videos dealt with reproduction and physiological changes occurring in puberty while the others focused on values, choices, decision making, and assertiveness skills.

The bottom line was that abstinence was strongly endorsed while information on contraception was deliberately absent. Tom Lee, a professor who helped develop the program, noted that abstinence-only was a
requirement for obtaining the money under the National Institutes of Health's Adolescent Family Life Act (Grontage, 1991). However, Lee supported the abstinence-only philosophy. According to Grontage, Mary Carlson of Planned Parenthood was very critical of the program's lack of contraception information. The Adolescent Family Life Act, a Reagan program, was killed by Congress this same month of August, with Senator Orrin Hatch vowing it would return.

With such a costly abstinence curriculum already developed in the state, few were heard to raise a rather interesting question that seemed to nag from the shadows throughout the entire sex education conflict: Why with a program like that of Utah State University available, and most districts employing their own curriculum, were the state's efforts even needed? Again it was clear that the driving force behind the state's effort was coming from groups unhappy with abstinence-only programs.

One other significant event occurred in August of 1991. As already mentioned the work of the sex education advisory panel was nearly complete and members of the State Office of Education Curriculum Department had prepared a draft of a sex education guide for teachers, with a similar parent's guide approaching completion to be presented for approval to the State Board. According to Tribune reporter Katherine Kapos (1991) the guide would have allowed teachers to present a brief synopsis of both
pro-life and pro-choice positions on abortion, and proposed to discuss homosexuality under the heading of role perceptions. In addition information on contraception was included.

The State Board of Education, meeting on a Friday morning in the obscure Eastern Utah location of Roosevelt, found little opposition to the curriculum. From PTA president Joyce Muhlestein to Mary Carlson of Planned Parenthood came enthusiastic endorsements. Yet the Board hesitated, unable to find the political nerve to adopt the guide.

Beyond Utah's conservative nature, part of the reason for hesitation was a woman named Gayle Ruzicka, President of the Utah Eagle Forum and mother of twelve, who hotly objected to the guide, concluding that it was really a training manual to stimulate student questions about topics such as contraception and homosexuality "so that teachers [could] answer items normally prohibited by state law" (Hutchinson, 1991a). Her skeptical analysis was derived in part from the guide's extensive use of student discussion groups and the freedom of teachers to respond to any topic about which a student might inquire. Ruzicka insisted that public hearings be held, although some on the Board maintained that its procedural rules did not require hearings.

Another factor may have been the criticism of Board member Frances Hatch Merrill, sister of Senator Orrin
Hatch, whom Hutchinson reported had days earlier claimed that the guide went too far in explaining abortion and homosexuality. Whatever the cause, the Board blinked, deciding to delay a decision on the teacher's guide until the parent's guide was complete and more public comment gathered. It would be many months before the State Board gained the fortitude to make a decision.

The greatest overt opposition to the guide was Ruzicka's Eagle Forum. The history of the group traces back to the early 1970s as a national organization led by conservative social activist Phyllis Schlafly known as Stop ERA. Schlafly, "Republican conservative, former vice-president of the National Federation of Republican Women, founder of the Eagles are Flying, author or co-author of several books...and editor and publisher of Phyllis Schlafly's Report,...proved to be the most visible and effective leader of the anti-ERA forces," according to Mary Francis Berry (1986, p. 66) writing on why the ERA failed.

The 80,000-member Eagle Forum, ("People in the Church," 1992b) founded nationally on the wings of Ronald Reagan's victory in 1980, found a friendly habitat in conservative, Mormon Utah. The LDS Church had entered the political fray of the ERA (albeit as stealthily as possible) and gone to unusual lengths to defeat the amendment even outside of Utah, producing thousands of foot soldiers in such pivotal states as Nevada to
decisively overrun the ERA's supporters. In the West several of the Eagle Forum's state leaders were devout LDS including Utah's Gayle Ruzicka. Of course, with the demise of the ERA, the organization, in frequent interest group fashion, did not disband and readily moved to focus on other social issues including abortion, homosexuality, pornography, and educational issues including sex education.

When interviewed about what had happened at the state Board meetings, Ruzicka claimed the State Board had hoped to approve the curriculum without holding state hearings for fear of public opposition (G. Ruzicka, personal communication, August 1, 1994). With a decision on hold a public hearing was "suddenly" held with only hours notice—at least that was the Forum's perception—outside of Salt Lake County to the north, according to Ruzicka. The strategy of the State Office of Education was to catch the opposition off guard, not allowing adequate preparation or representation at the meeting. Rushing to the meeting, to the Forum's dismay none of the State Board members was on the four-member hearing panel. Rather, the liberal staff of the State Curriculum Office, antagonistic toward the Eagle Forum (which was antagonistic toward them) presided, including Bonnie Morgan, the State Curriculum Coordinator and Lauri Lacy, State AIDs Specialist, both of whom had been significant authors and advocates of the guide on which they were to hold hearings.
Newspaper accounts of the hearings, which took place around the state, recorded a variety of views both for and against the curriculum being expressed. According to the Deseret News account of the first hearing which took place in Weber County on September 12th, "Most of those attending the public hearing were women, and most of them weren't shy about expressing their opinions" (De Voy, 1991).

If the account is accurate, there was considerable expression of concern and opposition at the Weber hearing. The only mentioned representatives of any group to be in attendance was Robert Austin, associate director for the Utah AIDS Foundation, who urged the panel to teach more about sex including homosexuality, abortion, and contraceptives. Of course, several other groups had members in the audience, including the Eagle Forum.

The Salt Lake City meeting, which was held September 17th and lasted the entire day, appears to have received comments somewhat more supportive of the curriculum. However, several speakers complained of the absence of any members of the State Board on the panel (Hutchinson, 1991b).

One of the more spectacular revelations in the meeting was the fact that the State Office had chosen to exclude, for purposes of the hearings, the parent's guide draft on homosexuality, abortion, and contraceptives. The explanation, offered by panelist Scott Hess, "healthy
lifestyles specialist," was that the items were merely deleted from the hearing draft in order to focus needed comment on the other sections. Reinsertion was called for by speakers, as was combining of the teacher's and parent's guides. But Deseret News reporter Angelyn Hutchinson generously buried the questionable revelation of withholding the most controversial portions of the guide deep in her report and made little mention of it, but to allow Hess to acknowledge that "it sort of backfired" (Hutchinson, 1991b).

A former member of the Board who was involved with the creation of the curriculum, and who asked not to be identified for fear of renewing the bitter controversies of the past, called the project "staff driven," referring to the State Curriculum Office. Pointing to this incident this former Board member explained that the staff had purposely withheld some of the most controversial portions of the guide during the hearings as a means of being able to report greater parental support than actually would have existed had the controversial portion all been included. While the panel admitted to withholding some information for purely innocent reasons, one official source, who was involved with the process and agreed to speak to the author only on strict condition of anonymity, revealed that in a separate, unreported incident a conservative manuscript that had been generated by certain members of the Board working on the project had been lost
in its entirety by State Office personnel, but not by accident.

There was no way to verify this accusation. However, the fact that members of the State Curriculum Office did indeed have an agenda, and were willing to use some tough means to pursue it, was repeatedly made clear in the study—the purity of their motives only they might know.

Speakers cited in Hutchinson's article on the Salt Lake meeting included health and development teachers, an obstetrician who helped write the guide, and AIDS Foundation educator Sherrie Merrill who wanted more information included on homosexuality and contraception. Not surprisingly, the Salt Lake Tribune, which clearly took a position in favor of a more liberal sex education curriculum, unlike the divided Deseret News, had released a poll September 9th claiming that 86 percent of Utahns surveyed favored sex education in public schools and two-thirds wanted condoms discussed ("Utah School Officials," 1992). The numbers seemed to fly in the face of the many local controversies taking place over district sex education in the state.

On October 4th the findings of the panel were presented at the State Board's meeting. "Of 782 comments, 570-73% supported the State Office of Education materials," according to Bonnie Morgan, who had led the panel ("Speakers Favor," 1991). Such hearings certainly lacked scientific survey validity in determining what the
population as a whole believed, yet one could suppose that in some way they measured intensity of feeling, especially among activists. Clearly the fact that the numbers were tabulated and reported at all suggests that the State Office and the Board considered them more important than merely an activist straw poll in demonstrating popular support for the curriculum they had developed. It appears that the numbers were portrayed by state officials as if they did in fact represent the level of support among the State's population as a whole.

However, Ruzicka blasted the numbers. The Eagle Forum had counted "ten to one" criticism or opposition to the guide at the hearings, she told the author (G. Ruzicka, personal communication, August 1, 1994). Ruzicka's explanation was that in Mormon culture, before offering criticism, it is the custom to start by thanking leaders and educators for their efforts on behalf of those they serve. Ruzicka believed that Morgan took advantage of this fact and marked those observing this custom as being in favor of the sex education materials because their comment was not all criticism. More infuriating to Ruzicka is that she believes that many of the members of the Eagle Forum who were in attendance at these meetings and spoke must have been marked down by Morgan as being supportive, because they followed the Mormon custom of respect and praise before criticism. Ruzicka bristles at the fact that the person keeping score was one of the
primary authors of the curriculum and suggests that Morgan may have perpetuated an "outright deception" in order to pass the curriculum through the State Board.

A point of curiosity is that the report was made before the hearings were complete. This may indicate that some on the Board or in the State Office of Education were eager to have the "poll" results reported to shore up wavering support, or as a "shield of popularity" to hold against advancing opposition. Another possibility is that the hearings and public comment really were not very important to a Board which had tried to proceed without hearings, and had not bothered to attend the meetings themselves.

The report on the final hearing held five days later in Price indicates that a member of Planned Parenthood's Board of Directors and a resident recently moved from Virginia spoke in favor of the guide, while an LDS seminary teacher said that a greater emphasis on the traditional family and abstinence was needed. Fittingly for what was to come, a Mormon/Gentile rift thus ended the reports of the hearings (Smith, 1991).

Playing it Safe

While public hearings were taking place around the state, Salt Lake City's mayoral election was underway. In a debate before the Business Women's Forum of the Salt Lake Chamber of Commerce one of the questions asked the
four candidates was "their stand on the new prohibition against federal funds going to organizations that counsel on abortion - specifically harming Planned Parenthood in Utah and across the nation." Three of the candidates opposed the "gag-rule" and one, the only woman, Dee Dee Corradini (the Democrat who later won) said that she had not thought about it and couldn't comment. Certainly Planned Parenthood had friends in Salt Lake City during this time. Yet, one may suspect that few other cities in Utah could boast the same (Bernick & Evensen, 1991).

Not a Great Debate

In early November 1991 the battle over the state's sex education curriculum included a discussion panel held at St. Mark's Cathedral in Salt Lake City. The Episcopal Church had been on very friendly terms with Planned Parenthood and other liberal social groups for many years. Ministers of the Episcopal Church had served on Planned Parenthood's board of directors and had recently opened up facilities for a series of lectures which included such notables as Planned Parenthood's Director, Mary Carlson.

The discussion panel itself was composed of some of Utah's chief sex education advocates, and they clearly did not intend to debate the issue in a conservative versus liberal or for versus against sense. Members included Scott Hess, "healthy lifestyles specialist" for the state and major contributor to the curriculum; Melanie
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Sunderland of Planned Parenthood; Bill Wood, chair of the Episcopal Church of Utah AIDS Committee; Shirley Porter-Murdock, sex educator; and Ann Clawson, Salt Lake Board of Education; with KSL-TV reporter Shelly Osterloh acting as moderator (Henetz, 1991).

The event, as a clever interest group tactic, is worthy of note. It provided publicity for the view of these interests in a very legitimizing way. KSL (a CBS affiliate) is a well-known subsidiary of Bonneville Communications, a Mormon Church owned corporation, and has a very large geographic audience in the intermountain west. The panel, representing liberal interests, must have appeared diverse, while actually offering a consensus on the need for a state sex education curriculum. And having a church as host was frosting on a well-baked cake.

However, Scott Hess of the State Office of Education was taking risks by allowing his more liberal views to be so publicly identified. Demonstrating the incredible degree of security he felt in his job he was obliged to comment on the State Board of Education itself, stating that members of the Board "have some personal biases they can't go against" when voting on sex education. He then seemed to mock some members of the Board stating that "when they first read that resource guide, they discovered four or five body parts they'd never heard of" (Henetz, 1991). Perhaps Hess, who had served on the hearing panel which had travelled the state, was emboldened by the fact
that the hearing panel had been able to withhold the most controversial parts of the curriculum from the parent's guide and remain unscathed.

Professional Recommendations

A month earlier the National Guidelines Task Force had released its suggestions for sex education, informing all the nation of the "correct" sexual values to teach the nation's children. This privately funded group, which included a panel of twenty, determined that the reproductive capability of the body as well as the ability to give and receive sexual pleasure should be taught, including "sexual identity and masturbation," it was reported by the Associated Press ("New Guide," 1991).

Two months later in Utah top professionals had a very different recommendation. Arriving on the front page in early December 1991 the State Board of Education received the report of nationally known social scientist Stan Weed, Director of the Institute for Research and Evaluation, and past associate of Republican Senator Stephen Rees. Weed had concluded a survey of 7,000 secondary students statewide. The findings, though worrisome by Utah standards, were encouraging and suggested that problems of teen sexuality in the state, despite the teen birth-rate, had been blown out of proportion. For example, only 19 percent of high schools males and 17 percent of females reported ever having had sexual intercourse. Only about 6
percent of high school students reported having had sexual intercourse within the past four weeks. For junior high students in Utah the numbers were about half the sexual activity rate of the older students.

We have to be realistic about the nature of the problem to deal with it. Utah doesn't fit the stereotype of raging hormones in teenagers. The State is in a good position for primary prevention. Abstinence (as the ideal method of birth control) has come out of the closet. We don't need to throw in the towel and pass out condoms," Weed was reported to have said (Van Leer, 1991a).

According to Van Leer, Weed told the State Board that three sex prevention programs tried in Utah schools had had a positive effect—Sex Respect, Teen Aid, and Values and Choices—however, the Sex Respect Program was found to have had the greatest impact on teens in postponing sexual activity until marriage and ceasing current activity. It was reported that the greatest effect was on teens whose value biases, reported in pre-testing, were less strong. Weed had also found early sexual activity to be related to peer pressure, the use of alcohol, and early or steady dating. Combinations of these behaviors were reported to have had a culminating effect on an adolescent's sexual choices.

Van Leer reported that the Board listened to Weed's report then apparently jumped into an hour long debate on whether to accept the guide. Rather disheartening to the political scientist observing the policy process is that an extensive survey of 7,000 Utah students conducted by a
professional social scientist seemed to attract little more than a yawn from the policy-makers. A majority of Board members insisted that a decision to adopt the guide had to be made that day.

Board member John M. R. Covey, however, smelled opportunity. Covey, a devout Mormon and past employee of the LDS Church's Priesthood Department, whose world famous brother and business associate, psychologist Stephen R. Covey, had been an LDS Mission President in Ireland and LDS Regional Representative in Utah County (the next position below the rank of General Authority), led a conservative assault on the guidelines, determinedly insisting that contraceptive information be dropped from the guide. Frances Hatch Merrill agreed, asserting that "schools are trying to replace our families and our churches" (Van Leer, 1991a).

The legality of contraceptive information was questioned. Utah law forbids contraception to be taught without parental permission. Proponents of inclusion, however, argued that the curriculum was a resource for teachers and parents. However, conservatives were convinced that the guide would be used like a textbook by teachers who would allow students access to the information.

Over the objection of the minority who wanted the guide's adoption further delayed, the Board, dropping the contraceptive portion, approved the curriculum--suggesting
that refinements could be made later, thus ensuring that the conflict would not die.

A few days later, in an editorial providing substantial evidence that the LDS Church exercises very little control over the day-to-day content of the communications corporations it owns, *Deseret News* education editor, Twila Van Leer, delivered a rambling editorial arguing dizzily with herself about the need and proper content of sex education while criticizing the Board's dropping of contraceptive information in the guide. "To attempt to impose one standard on all parents in a diverse society may be short sighted," she pronounced (1991b). Then backtracking, she decided that the information must be easily available to parents in other places anyway, then lurching forward called it a "glaring omission," before conceding scientific evidence that the abstinence-only approach seemed to be working in the state, finally concluding that "ameliorating the consequences of the actions of those who choose not to comply should, I believe, be one of education's objectives." The *Deseret News* was characterized by generally liberal but waivering support, much as the Board could not make up its mind for such an extended period of time.

January 1992 brought renewed conflict over sex education in the state. Southern Utah's Washington County, which was engaged in a bitter, community-dividing
fight over sex education, threw its hands up and rejected existing programs including the state's, deciding instead to hire a person to write their own ("School Board Reject," 1992). Washington would not be the only district to display a lack of faith in the state's curriculum before it was done.

Protesting the "Puritan" Approach

If sex education had begun to draw more public attention it continued to be mostly eclipsed by the ongoing bigger and more public abortion battle. Holding a rally at the Utah Capitol, pro-choice Democratic representative Haynes Fuller called for an end to "the puritan approach to sex education" (Oberg, 1992), which she insisted would end the "need" for abortion. Cecilia Konchar Farr, a professor at Brigham Young University, was also in attendance as a pro-choice, feminist Mormon. Reportedly calling herself "faithful and believing," she insisted that the government should not interfere with abortion choice. Farr was among several Mormon intellectuals ("so-called intellectuals" according to Mormon leaders) with whom the Church would soon lose patience, resulting in high-publicity removal from employment and membership (Stimpson, 1993).

Parental Opinion

In February 1992 parents in the conservative Utah
County's Alpine School District took the initiative in seeking to know public opinion by commissioning a survey in the district concerning the state's sex education guide. Since little of public opinion on the creation of the state "resource file" was known, the numbers they obtained are worth reviewing. Some 392 parents were surveyed by the Parra Group which found that only 46 percent of Alpine parents were even aware of the State's development of the sex education guide (Rayburn, 1992). The results found that 58 percent of parents in the district favored some form of sex education while 22 percent were against any public sex education and 20 percent undecided. This survey, like others, suffered from small sample size; yet, the numbers, even if rough, are interesting and in certain respects were a counter to the Tribune survey mentioned earlier. The author in his observation of Utah during the project repeatedly found reason to suspect that, similar to Alpine, a very large number of the state's citizens were not even aware of any development, let alone conflict, taking place over sex education on the state level.

Conservative Victory Lost

March 1992 was the most important month in the curriculum battle. Conservative groups seemed on the verge of having their way. But what would actually occur would be far from a triumph.
Scott Hess of the State Office of Education who had been highly involved in writing the curriculum and had also made comments that could not have been pleasing to some members of the Board, found himself the target of conservative displeasure. First he was removed from his position in the Curriculum Office. Then, the following day, his removal was reversed and he was allowed to keep his position, but forbidden to have any further involvement in the sex education curriculum's development (Van Leer, 1992a). According to Van Leer, Steve R. Mecham, Associate State Superintendent, insisted the moves were out of fairness to Hess. "We felt he had taken enough heat and that we needed to share that heat" (1992a). However, according to Twila Van Leer's report, sources in the office say Hess was taken off the assignment because of personality conflicts with conservative State School Board members who felt the materials developed by Hess and the committee were too liberal...Hess and others in the State Office who were responsible for developing the sex education materials for parents and teachers wanted to include information on contraception and were supported by the Citizen Advisory Group.

John M. R. Covey and Frances Hatch Merrill strenuously opposed these materials and were able to convince a majority of the Board.

Hess was not the only story. In February the State Board had dismissed the advisory committee that had helped develop the resource guide over objections from many members of the committee. And in a clear giveaway of whom
the committee mainly represented, liberal interest groups such as Planned Parenthood and the ACLU became very distraught.

The State Board then chose character education consultant Wayne Brickey to revise the guide, with the intent of strengthening the values and abstinence portions of the curriculum. Brickey was completing a doctoral dissertation related to moral education and serving on the state's Character Development Committee (House, 1992). However, discussion of his academic credentials soon became a moot point for many. Brickey, who was recommended by John M. R. Covey, was much more than well educated. He was an LDS Institute instructor at Utah Valley Community College (name changed recently to Utah Valley College, denoting its move to four-year status). While most on the Board had seen little wrong with his hiring, liberal interest groups exploded with anger and moved swiftly for a counterstrike.

The media soon lit with attacks by people such as Sandra Adams, who was identified as being from a coalition of interests called Utahns Concerned With Adolescent Pregnancy (her employer was a group called Utah Issues which will be introduced later). She asserted that "the public's trust has been ignored and violated." Jane Edwards, executive director of the YWCA, called it a "travesty." Karrie Galloway of Planned Parenthood, who believed that the guide had been a workable compromise,
said she was "disappointed and angered" (Hutchinson, 1992). The Salt Lake Tribune rapidly denounced the Board's actions by producing a highly critical editorial which decried the dismissal of the sex education committee, Hess' removal from the project, and Brickey's hiring. Further, it sharply criticized the Board for suspending plans for sex education in the lower grades ("Utah School Officials Botching," 1992). Keith Checketts, Board of Education Chair, was left to repeatedly defend the action, insisting that Brickey was not contracted for a wholesale rewrite but only fine-tuning to strengthen the abstinence content and that he was hired for his academic qualifications rather than who his employer was.

By March 19th the problem of teen pregnancy seemed all but forgotten and the issues of LDS influence came roaring to the fore. The American Civil Liberties Union, holding a news conference, announced that it had sent a letter to the State Board of Education demanding that Brickey be removed and that no revision be done (Kapos, 1992). The longstanding hostility between devout members of the LDS Church and the ACLU, already hot from the issues of school prayer and abortion, seemed ready for an all-out eruption. The ACLU letter proclaimed that "most Utahns want accurate sex education information to be made available to Utah students so they can protect themselves and make responsible life choices....This is not possible
if what they are given is church doctrine in its stead" (Van Leer, 1992b). The ACLU, touching all bases, endorsed contraception, objected to dismissal of the curriculum committee, and hinted at the possibility of a lawsuit.

Some non-LDS clergy also entered the fray, including Donald Baird, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church in Salt Lake City, who was reported to have said that many non-LDS clergy believed the State Board was historically insensitive to the opinions of non-LDS religious leaders. Speaking to the Salt Lake Tribune he claimed "this is a 150-year-old issue in Utah" (House, 1992). However, it seems that some clerics also had more recent history in mind. They had not yet grant forgiveness to the Board over an incident several years earlier when the Salt Lake Council of Churches had objected to the appointment of James R. Moss as State Superintendent, claiming they had felt "ignored" by the Board. Moss had formerly been employed at Brigham Young University and had served in important administrative positions at the Mormon institution.

The State Board's legal counsel, Doug Bates, insisted that the revision effort was not aimed at promulgating LDS standards, but generally accepted moral values. Bates felt the controversy was inappropriate since many religions accepted abstinence outside of marriage and the belief was shared by a majority in the state. Bates added that Utah law prohibited sexual activity among unmarried
persons. He claimed that to stop pressing for the ideal of chastity would be a loss to society (Van Leer, 1992b). Brickey's non-competitive appointment was made possible because state policy required the threshold contract of $2,000 before mandating competitive-bidding. Brickey was being paid $1,800. In an attempt to throw water on the fire, Keith Checketts wrote a letter to members of the sex education curriculum committee telling them that their dismissal had been a mistake and that their expertise would be needed in the future. However, more liberal members of the committee were highly skeptical (Kapos, 1992).

While Brickey, Bates, and Checketts tried to explain, and tried futilely to convince the opposition to wait until they saw the revisions before making any judgment, Covey, who had recommended Brickey, was politically immobilized. It was he who had become the major target of the opposition's counterattack.

John Covey, as previously mentioned, was employed by Covey and Associates and the Covey Leadership Institute. This company successfully marketed character education materials and seminars internationally to education and business organizations. The Utah State Office of Education had purchased $10,445 worth of materials and time from the company since 1990 (Van Leer, 1992c). Although Covey had notified the Attorney General's Office of the relationship when he left employment with the LDS
Church to work for the Covey Leadership Center, screams of conflict of interest suddenly surfaced with unexpected force. Covey was found attempting to defend himself from Australia, where he was away for several weeks on a marketing trip for the company.

According to Van Leer, Covey immediately demanded that the Board look into the allegations of conflict of interest at their earliest opportunity, insisting that Utah was not even in his marketing area and that a Covey and Associates employee named Chuck Farnsworth was in charge of Utah accounts. Covey contended that he did not "even know what transactions have occurred [in Utah]. I literally don't know," he was reported to have said. Further, he was confronted with strong insinuations that the material from the company was based on LDS doctrine. Denying this, he explained that the company sells "universally accepted principles--common basic laws of human growth and development...They're just the things our mother taught us, the foundation of society. Everyone buys into them. They are non-ethnic, non-denominational" (Van Leer, 1992c). Apparently, "everyone" did not include social liberals.

With Covey, Brickey, Checketts, and Bates all held to defense, a large sign appeared overnight on the lawn of the State Board Offices. It read:

Jane Doe went to school. She was taught about grammar and mathematics. She wanted to know what
sex is about. There wasn't a course, so she just tried it out. Jane is a bright learner but had to quit school. 'Cause it's her child's turn to learn the school rules. When her child wants to know what sex is about, will there be a course she can take to find out? (Van Leer, 1992d)

The sign, in dramatic fashion, was accompanied by a letter blaming lack of sex education for the writer's ruined life.

Response from school officials ranged from indignant to embarrassed. State Superintendent Jay B. Taggart called the flap over sex education "a tempest in a teapot," reportedly saying that "there's nothing that can't be resolved for all the groups involved" (Van Leer, 1992d). Apparently not "all" the groups agreed with Taggart.

The Deseret News, no longer satisfied to leave the matter to the flailing pronouncements of individual reporters such as Twila Van Leer, produced a Sunday editorial on the subject, following the week of intense conflict. In comments almost certainly approved by LDS General Authorities it began, "Spiralling teen pregnancy rates, mounting divorce, crime and other social ills are bound to cause educators and others to be concerned about student values or lack of values..." It then went right to the heart of the matter. "This concern is expressed in public and private schools throughout the United States. But somehow, when such concerns are raised in Utah they often get blown out of proportion, becoming a religious issue—a church-state argument" ("Moral Values," 1992).
The editorial reprimanded the ACLU and its director, Michelle A. Parish, for claiming that Brickey's hiring was a violation of Utah's constitutional separation of church and state. Further, the editorial rejected the claim that the hiring of Brickey was "not in step with mainstream Utah," as the ACLU had written, countering that "honesty, chastity, self control, respect for others and similar themes are hardly LDS values alone but are shared widely by nearly all religions and in all states."

The editorial did concede, however, that "some procedural mistakes" may have been made in hiring Brickey; nevertheless, he was defended as a "competent professional," quoting Board Chair Keith Checketts. The editorial concluded that "the ACLU would wisely withhold its statements until Brickey completes his task--and until after the State School Board takes further action in either approving or disapproving of the educator's work."

The week that began with the editorial in the Deseret News saw a swell of Mormon anger directed at the ACLU. Yet Wayne Brickey suggested that he was willing to withdraw to quiet the controversy ("LDS Professor," 1992). However, Keith Checketts was not about to remove him, contending that to do so would set a dangerous precedent of religious prejudice.

In this heated environment it was clear that someone was going to have to give. March 30th someone did. The day brought the resignation of John M. R. Covey from the
Board, who wrote in his resignation letter that he wished to avoid "even the appearance of a conflict of interest"—a twist on the Mormon adage to avoid "even the appearance of evil."

My name is Covey. It's the only surname I have. Thus, my tie to Covey Leadership Center is clear and unchangeable. It is obvious, therefore, that any time in the future that I speak as a Board member about the need to encourage students to live principle-centered lives, others may indeed interpret this as an effort on my part to promote my employer (Van Leer, 1992e).

He hoped that the resignation would allow the State Board to proceed, "without any unnecessary distractions stemming from this question."

The resignation was a significant blow to conservative interests. The following day, March 31, Wayne Brickey withdrew from the project, leaving the liberal staff of the State Office to make any further refinements to the guide ("LDS Institute Teacher," 1992).

Scoldings For All

April was spent with the media mourning the unpleasantries of March. Letters to the editor of the Deseret News expressed disappointment that Covey and Brickey had withdrawn while the ACLU was accused of being anti-LDS, (religious bigots in less polite circles). The Salt Lake Tribune, which had led much of the liberal charge, was scolded by some of its readers for its seeming lack of objectivity and found it expedient to offer a
limited apology for not providing "a little more depth" in their coverage (Cummins, 1992).

Twila Van Leer, writing yet another two-sided, complicated editorial partly agreed with Covey's resignation, (1992f) yet the following day in a regular news article raised a significant question, which never seemed answered by state officials—why did the state need to go through all the hassle of writing its own curriculum when 75 percent of Utah's students were already being reached by two sex education courses produced outside the state; two programs which the research of the Institute for Research and Evaluation, in a large-scale study had found to be having success in Utah?

Senator Rees, former director of the Institute, reportedly identified the two wide-reaching programs as Sex Respect and Teen Aid, and asserted that by simply endorsing these two programs the controversy would have been resolved. According to the Van Leer's article, officials in the districts that were using the two programs claimed to be satisfied with their results and said that they probably would not abandon them in favor of the state's curriculum (Van Leer, 1992g).

The study of 7,000 Utah students which Stan Weed of the Institute had reported to the State Board of Education in December had found that students enrolled in the Sex Respect program, and identified as having low or medium "values," transitioned to sexual activity at a rate 42
percent less than a control group that did not receive the curriculum. The amount of information an adolescent had about human sexuality was found to be the weakest predictor of early sexual activity.

Nevertheless, the state was not about to scrap the project after so much time and effort, especially given the fact that it was the baby of the State Curriculum Office and so many prominent (and mostly liberal) social professionals, activists, and educators in the state.

The LDS Church, clearly disgusted with the turn of events, left it to Apostle Boyd K. Packer, then the second senior member of the Quorum of the Twelve and sometime Acting President of the Twelve to respond with its displeasure only days later in LDS General Conference. Although only the prophet (meaning the Church President) can officially state policy with the force of scripture (to devout Mormons this means it has 100 percent certainty of being God's will), Apostles are also considered "prophets, seers, and revelators" and their individual statements, always given great weight, seem to be traditionally elevated to near scriptural quality when made in General Conference.2

Packer, who holds a doctorate in education (Stack, 1993c), was assigned a slot for his talk during the Sunday morning session—which probably enjoys the greatest viewership. Although Church President Ezra Taft Benson (former U.S. Secretary of Agriculture) was absent from the
conference due to illness, the Sunday morning session was, nevertheless, slated with an unusually important cast of leaders. Not including Benson, the four highest ranking leaders of the Church were scheduled including Thomas S. Monson, then Second Counselor in the First Presidency; Howard W. Hunter, who became Mormon prophet on Benson's death in 1994; Robert D. Hales, Presiding Bishop of the Church who would be called as an Apostle in 1994; Packer, next most senior Apostle of the Quorum of the Twelve after Hunter; and Gordon B. Hinkley, then First Counselor in the First Presidency who in 1995 became Mormon prophet after Hunter's death (Packer now leads the Quorum of Twelve and is second in line to be President after Monson).

Packer's address was entitled "Our Moral Environment" and spoke to a number of policy issues that were of high salience to the Mormon Church including gaming, abortion, and sexual behavior. His comments were scathing towards many members and Gentiles alike and revealed a Mormon hierarchy displeased at having to repeatedly justify entry into social policy debate. Further, it was clear that Apostles were losing patience with members who criticized Mormon commandments and detracted from LDS moral standards. Packer's words were unusually blunt although spoken with the usual tone of dignified and reasoned conviction typical of Mormon authorities:

The deliberate pollution of the fountain of life now clouds our moral environment....With ever fewer
exceptions, what we see and read and hear have the mating act as a central theme...

That which should be absolutely private is disrobed and acted out center stage. In the shadows backstage are addiction, pornography, perversion, infidelity, abortion, and—the saddest of them all—incest and molestation. In company with them now is a plague of biblical proportion. And all of them are on the increase.

Society excuses itself from responsibility except for teaching the physical process of reproduction to children in school to prevent pregnancy and disease, and providing teenagers with devices which are supposed to protect them from both.

When any effort is made to include values in these courses, basic universal values, not just values of the Church, but of civilization, of society itself, the protest arises, 'You are imposing religion upon us, infringing upon our freedom.'

While we pass laws to reduce pollution of the earth, any proposal to protect the moral and spiritual environment is shouted down and marched against as infringing upon liberty, agency, freedom, the right to choose...

...The Lord warned members of his church, "Let not that which I have appointed be polluted by mine enemies, by the consent of those who call themselves after my name: For this is a very sore and grievous sin against me, and against my people" (D&C 101:97-98; emphasis Packer's; Packer, 1992, pp. 56-67).

Packer's words were biting, and written in a language that few educated Mormons could misunderstand. Perhaps most glaring is what appears to be the displeasure clearly aimed toward those members accused of consenting to moral pollution and acting disloyal to God and His Church.

Continuing, Packer offered a detailed discussion of eternal law and civil law, and the importance of eternal marriage and the family unit, concluding by issuing a call to repentance.

Gordon B. Hinckley (1992), pursuing the theme, answered a critic who had written a letter to the editor...
asking when the Mormons were going to stop being different and join mainstream America. Citing gloomy statistics about pregnancy, suicide, teen health, and preparedness for life among American youth, Hinckley made it clear that the LDS Church had no intention of conforming. Then turning to a more positive note, he praised the many obedient young people in the Church, calling them a "chosen generation" and challenging the young to "rise above the sordid elements of the world..." (Hinckley, 1992, p. 70).

If Apostolic bluntness had had effect on the general membership, it is doubtful it influenced the Mormon scholars and educational leaders who seemed to have most offended Mormon prophets. As will be seen, the State Board of Education would go on to produce a more liberal curriculum by 1994, and several LDS professors, overtly critical of Church leaders on feminist-related issues, would be removed from their memberships in high publicity actions. As for Packer—who in a later speech would identify homosexuals, feminists, and "so-called intellectuals" as the greatest dangers to the Church—he was to be singled out for special criticism and attack by social liberals who charged him with being the one responsible for encouraging the local clergy to "purge" the membership of outspoken activists.
Summary

Intense interest group conflict surrounded the creation of Utah's sex education curriculum. Proponents of the curriculum drew support from leaders and events involved with Utah's abortion debate. Personnel in the State Curriculum Office pursued a more liberal policy with daring and determination, taking advantage of opportunities presented to shape opinion and policy. Conservatives, however, responded with traditionalist additions to the curriculum, and personnel changes which nearly won them victory. However, liberal groups stopped conservatives short by turning the curriculum debate into a more intense and heated church/state issue. Further, they launched a major personal attack on the most influential conservative Board member, toppling him from office. Mormon Apostles responded with displeasure.
Notes

1 In 1992 Arizona's Eagle Forum President, Latter-day Saint Shirley Whitlock, would be honored for 14 years of service by the National Eagle Forum at age 100! ("People in the Church," 1992a).

2 General Conference, which is held semi-annually in Salt Lake City (October and April), draws thousands of leaders and members from around the world to receive instruction from Mormon General Authorities. Beyond specialized meetings for leaders and certain auxiliaries, it is divided into four two-hour general meetings, distributed between Saturday and Sunday. General meetings are televised on regular broadcast channels in Utah and nearby states such as Nevada and Idaho, as well as by satellite to Mormon stake centers in many part of the world. Mormons are instructed to attend or watch the sessions and to find time to read some of talks the following month when they are printed in the official Church periodical, which the vast majority of devout members subscribe to. Journalists and social scientists who study the LDS Church seem to view General Conference as a good indicator of what is happening in Mormon Society and often regard talks in terms they would those of diplomats and leaders of state. Many civic leaders can be found in attendance.
CHAPTER 6

"INVASIONS"

Although the high school portion of the sex education curriculum had been completed, there were many policy disagreements left unsettled. In fact, some of the most important and far reaching actions were yet to come. To begin, Covey was not the only conservative forced from the State Board of Education. Senator Orrin Hatch's sister, Frances Hatch Merrill, who had taken office in January 1991 and who opposed all but the most conservative sex policies, was only able to serve half her four year term.

The State Board of Education was being expanded from nine to fifteen members and the calendar showed that it was time for reapportionment. But when the lines were redrawn, Merrill found that she and another female Board member, Ruth H. Funk, had been placed quite "innocently" in the same district. To retain her position on the Board it would have been necessary for her to have sought reelection two years early, and run against Funk. This was not all. Before even being able to enter the race she would have needed the endorsement of the newly created nomination committee, and then have been selected by the
governor as one of his two preferred choices among those nominated by the committee.

With Merrill having one of Utah's most popular politicians for a brother it might seem that she would have had the nomination clinched. But Merrill was more than conservative. She had strongly endorsed the educational platform and candidacy of unusually popular Independent Party governor's candidate Merril Cook. Charges of improper conduct were leveled against her for using her position to endorse Cook. When no clear statute could be found to prevent her, the State Board moved to make a rule forbidding members from using their positions on the state Board to endorse political candidates. Merrill reluctantly agreed to comply (Van Leer, 1992h).

However, the Independent Party furiously attacked State Superintendent Scott W. Bean for using "up to 40 percent of his time" in trying to defeat Cook and his proposals. Bean, openly hostile to Cook, insisted that he was merely "developing accurate information," when confronted by Twila Van Leer on the issue (Van Leer, 1992h). Merrill reportedly made a formal, but futile, complaint to the Lieutenant Governor's Office of the gerrymandering. It seems that her early demise was the result of both her conservative social/educational stances (targeted by allies of the UEA, State Office, and perhaps Planned Parenthood in the legislature), as well as old-fashioned party politics.
Perhaps not by coincidence V. Jay Liechty, who along with Merrill, had consistently voted against the state's curriculum, was not renominated by the nomination committee and left office with Merrill in December 1992 (F. Merrill, personal communication, October 17, 1995). Board records show that Ruth Hardy Funk, whom Merrill had chosen not to oppose when redrawn district lines placed them in the same district, also left the Board in December 1992 ("Utah State Board," 1970-1995).

It is of some interest to discover that Funk was a woman of considerable reputation. She had served six years (a term and a half) on the State Board including once holding the position of chair. She had led the Utah Governor's Commission on the Status of Women and had initiated the compilation and writing of a book on Utah women and the law. Other awards and credits were hers. And not least, she had served from 1972-1978 in the Mormon Young Women's General Presidency, a position giving her responsibility for Mormon females ages 12-17 worldwide, and placing her at the head of one of three major Mormon auxiliaries led by women (Hill, 1995). Covey, Merrill, Liechty, and Funk comprised the entire list of those who were no longer on the Board at the end of the year.

A Precedent For Persecution?

In May 1992 LDS Apostle Dallin H. Oaks—formerly Dean of the University of Chicago Law School, President of
Brigham Young University, and Utah Supreme Court Justice--made a trip to Washington to visit Congress. His mission did not concern sex education or even abortion. Instead, he was there to testify strongly in behalf of the Freedom of Religion Restoration Act sponsored by Senators Hatch and Kennedy (finally enacted in 1994) in response to the Supreme Court's Employment Division v. Smith (1990) ruling which had overturned the "compelling interest doctrine" established in earlier cases designed to protect religious liberty from governmental intrusion. In the view of a great many, the Court had stripped religious freedom from the Constitution in the Smith case and tossed its future to the popular, shifting winds of Congress. Mormons had experienced those winds in the nineteenth century when their beliefs, especially on sexual/gender issues, had been found sufficiently out of line with national popularity to bring government endorsed murder, rape, disfranchisement, and theft against them. American religious leaders, along with the ACLU, often at odds, were jointly outraged by the Court's ruling. Oaks' visit marked only the third time in history that an official representative of the LDS Church had been dispatched to appear before Congress. With memories of extreme historical persecution by state and national governments as a result of their nationally unpopular practices and values (including gender and sexual issues), the LDS Church had turned the reversal of the Supreme Court's decision into a top priority (Idelson, 1993).
To some readers at this point the relevance of this case may seem just a bit hazy. For others, reflecting on America's loosening sexual mores as compared to those of an intransigent Mormon variety, and recalling Utah history, a sense for why the LDS Church reacted so strongly and why the author considers this case so important, may be forming. While the case is not in any way essential for the immediate discussion of sex education policy, it is vital for the conclusions of the study and so any further clarification will be delayed until that time.

Sexual Politics in Spring

Back in Utah the State Textbook Commission and State Board of Education had begun to deal with one of Mormondom's least favorite topics—homosexuality. The fight was largely symbolic, and of clashing semantics, although some real policy disagreement did take place. The early debate among the State Board had been over whether "the acceptance" of homosexuality or "the approval," should be denied. The Commission had proposed that the Board instead adopt regulations advising the selection of materials in the state that did not "advocate" homosexual practices, but accepted homosexuals as individuals (Van Leer, 1992i) It would be many months before the State Board would find courage to decide the issue.
While tricky wording was being pondered by education leaders, elsewhere in the state in May the local GOP Convention was underway. A group calling itself Utah Teens For Life released the results of a survey of half of the state's 2,500 delegates which found that 97 percent of those polled supported the state's anti-abortion law, with 94 percent calling themselves pro-life. The survey, conducted by youth ages 12 to 18, was heralded by Utah Eagle Forum President Gayle Ruzicka, in her capacity as President of the Utah Republican Coalition For Life, as a significant counter punch to ads being run by pro-choice Republicans who were implying pro-choice support among large numbers of the state's Republicans (Brown, 1992).

On a slightly more scientific level, according to Brown, a KSL-Deseret News poll the previous October had found that 61 percent of Utahns called themselves pro-life, with 34 percent preferring a pro-choice label. However, 79 percent of those claiming to be Republicans in the survey were pro-life.

Unclear Intent Means Liberal Intent

In July 1992, while presidential politics and national abortion battles seemed to be taking a clear turn against the desires of Utah's majority, the state legislature was running into difficulty for not more carefully considering the wording of sex education law. During the 1989 legislative session Senator Stephen Rees...
had sponsored SB 212 which, amended in 1992, appropriated nearly $700,000 for district-level sex education programs in the state (Van Leer & Bernick, 1992). When several Salt Lake area districts attempted to collect a share of the money they were told that because they were using a program called "Community of Caring" they did not qualify for the funds.

Senator Rees insisted that the State Office of Education could only dispense money to fund "Sex Respect" and "Teen Aid," the two programs given thumbs-up by the Institute for Research and Evaluation. According to Van Leer and Bernick (1992), Rees insisted that the legislative intent was only for the funding of these two Utah tested programs, although the law did not name them specifically.

Rees attacked Community of Caring, complaining that the program "includes a chapter that discusses contraceptive use and presents masturbation and sexual fantasies as acceptable." Further, "the program even has a page with pictures advertising different condoms" (Van Leer & Bernick, 1992).

The districts, bound by state law forbidding contraceptive education without parental permission, argued that the objectionable material was edited before use. However, "a private individual associated with Utah Issues [an important liberal social policy foundation in the state] asked for an attorney general's opinion." The
opinion, as reported by Van Leer and Bernick, held that "where legislative intent is not discernible, the choice among permissible interpretations is left up to the agency with authority to administer the statute" (Van Leer & Bernick). The requirement for funding under the statute was that the program had to have been evaluated and shown to have a positive effect on attitudes toward sexual activity.

Of course the organization which produced "Community of Caring" (Joseph P. Kennedy Foundation) confirmed that the program had been tested, with positive results, by an independent evaluator. Checkmated by the law's sloppy wording and the State Office's ideological leanings, Rees conceded that the State Office could dispense the funds but maintained that the three districts were taking a second-rate approach.

As for the group, Utah Issues—which boasted a large budget, staff, and board of directors—one would have expected that it would have appeared more frequently in the news stories since it was, unquestionably, one of the state's most important social policy organizations. In fact, when Lauri Lacy of the State Curriculum Office was asked by the author to name groups that supported the state's sex education curriculum, Utah Issues immediately came to her mind, followed next by Planned Parenthood which she said "would have liked it to go further" (L. Lacy, personal communication, July 13, 1994).
Besides the rare news snippet that very briefly mentioned the group in relation to sex education, where were they if important enough to be named first by a prominent member of the State Curriculum Office? In response to a question about lobbying and the State Board of Education which Senator Rees was asked as part of this study the answer may have been given. Although Rees did not feel knowledgeable enough to comment on the Board and lobbyists, taking a moment to think, he was able to name one group that he had observed enjoyed a special working relationship with "some of the staff of the State Office...especially on sex issues" (S. Rees, personal communication, March 10, 1995). The group he named was Utah Issues. Rees allowed that Utah Issues may have "some genuine interest" in the health and welfare of citizens but he asserted that on sex issues "they differ from the mainstream." Rees explained that Utah Issues followed more of a "Planned Parenthood approach" and was blunt enough to call it a "front-door organization for Planned Parenthood" on this category of policy. According to Rees the name and methods of the organization allowed it access where alarm would have been raised in Utah had Planned Parenthood been involved. Its role was a strong behind-the-scenes position, working closely with the State Office's friendly staff to achieve mutual educational goals.

When the author spoke with Sandra Adams of Utah
Issues, who had been involved in the policy process, she denied having a "close relationship" with the State Office, firmly insisting that they had only a "mutual working relationship" on issues of common interest, although she readily admitted that Utah Issues does "a lot" with education in the state (S. Adams, personal communication, September 1, 1995). According to Adams, who is a prominent activist on welfare questions, teen pregnancy is approached by the organization as a poverty issue and should not have been dealt with as a moral issue.

Adams explained to the author that Utah Issues attempted to influence policy through "education"—researching and presenting policy papers to leaders and decision-makers. However, she shied away, like every other group, from admitting to the "dread" behavior of lobbying (the politically correct term is "educating" rather than lobbying according to both Planned Parenthood and Utah Issues).

When probed by the author for information on how the organization was funded, Adams was hesitant to be specific but was eager to note that the organization had no government funding. Instead, Utah Issues was the benefactor of private donations from foundations and certain religions, she explained (personal communication, September 1, 1995).
Local Resistance

By September, controversy over sex education had been sufficiently intense to cause the Davis School District (a large district, northern Wasatch area) to cancel a planned survey of student sexual behavior as a means of evaluating their conservative Sex Respect program (Parkinson, 1992). The last time the state had proposed asking students detailed questions about sexual behavior, protest calls from parents had flooded the telephone lines of Davis school officials. They had no desire to deal with additional sex education controversy. In addition, the district rejected the state's new curriculum, seeing no advantage in state materials over what it already had. However, the State Office of Education was not about to let local superintendents and boards cut off their work so easily. According to the Associated Press, just weeks after Davis snubbed the new curriculum, the State Curriculum Office scheduled workshops around the state "to help secondary teachers understand how to teach the AIDS curriculum and use the new sex-education resource guide" ("Utah Teachers Shy," 1992). The Associated Press reported that Utah teachers were uncomfortable in teaching about AIDs and, although Utah law required that students have AIDs education, enthusiasm for teaching it was clearly lacking.

Perhaps the only place in the state that showed enthusiasm for such things was Salt Lake County. The last
day of September the Salt Lake County Commission voted 2-1 for a new ordinance prohibiting discrimination in county government based on sexual orientation. The ordinance was reportedly written by David Nelson, founder of a group called Gay and Lesbian Utah Democrats (Costanzo, 1992). Not surprisingly the action outraged the Eagle Forum which vowed to retaliate by working for a Republican majority on the commission to replace the offending Democrats. According to one anonymous source the Gay and Lesbian Democrats had been highly interested in the sex education debate and supportive of the state curriculum because they felt that its direction was moving their way. Gayle Ruzicka, in an interview with the author, claimed that gay advocates had been present at all the meetings to speak in favor of the curriculum (G. Ruzicka, personal communication, August 1, 1994). And according to Ruzicka at least one speaker at the hearings had identified himself as a member of a group called Queer Nation.

October 12, 1992 the Deseret News ran a guest editorial by Stefani Jones, a board member of Right to Choice, (yet another Utah group interested in reproductive issues and composed of many of the same people involved in other groups). Jones sharply attacked the State Board's abstinence curriculum as naive and demanded contraception education and "complete openness about sex" as the only solution to abortion and teen pregnancy. "Unwed teenagers in Utah become pregnant in shocking numbers," she wrote.
She claimed that the only real answer to abortion was liberal sex education (Jones, 1992).

A Contentious New Year

The year 1993 kicked off with renewed confrontation over sex education in Utah, and social policy interest groups came out swinging in all arenas. The Eagle Forum won several early legislative battles on educational issues even going so far as to mount a massive successful telephone campaign against "at-risk" legislation sponsored by Republican Nancy Lyon, who angrily complained that Ruzicka had never even contacted her to discuss objections in person ("Conservatives Win," 1993). Lyon's was not the only complaint that would be made about the conduct of the group. According to the Associated Press, some Democratic legislators at one point in the 1993 legislative session complained that members of the Eagle Forum, seated in the gallery, were using binoculars in order to peer at the notes on Democratic lawmakers' desks! ("Eagle Forum," 1993). The Eagle Forum reportedly put the binoculars away, but only after the implied message had been clearly received.

What may have most attracted the attention of the Eagle Forum, nesting in the gallery, was the fact that several freshman Democrats had made sexual issues a priority in the 1993 session, introducing bills that would have mandated human-sexuality curricula in the state's
schools, including "sexual self-esteem and birth-control alternative training" (Spangler & Bernick, 1993).

Representative Sara Eubank (D-Holladay) was among those proposing liberal sex education. However, she complained that she was having trouble even getting her bills printed for the other lawmakers to review. Planned Parenthood wanted free family planning funded by the state and found that its proposals had very strong approval from one newly elected legislator in particular, Mary Carlson, who it might be recalled was employed by Planned Parenthood as Director of Community Services.

These liberal measures were doomed from the start in the conservative legislature, the Eagle Forum taking swipes at them for good measure. But one bill, sponsored by Democrat Ronald Greensides of Salt Lake was too far out of step with modern reality for everyone (Riley, 1993). It attempted to close striptease clubs in South Salt Lake while even banning nude models for university art classes. This bill, with its more liberal companions, all went down in flames.

The Abstinence Religion

Far from Utah in another state battling over sex education an interesting court decision was handed down in March 1993. A Louisiana state district court judge ruled that, although the Sex Respect curriculum did not mention God, it illegally promoted religion because of its
abstinence-only stance. The suit, not surprisingly, had been brought by Louisiana's Planned Parenthood ("Judge Strikes Down," 1993).

In Utah, the decision, which equated teaching abstinence with teaching religion, baffled education administrators in the view of the Associated Press, and seemed not to be taken seriously by anyone in power ("Ban On Teaching Abstinence," 1993). Yet a year earlier Utah's attempt to take a firm abstinence-only position had erupted into a Mormon-Gentile scrap.

Debating Homosexuality

In mid-March, while Louisiana was fighting off encroachments by the "Abstinence Religion," in Utah the State Textbook Commission adopted a policy on homosexuality that had taken a year of discussion and meeting. According to Tribune reporter John Jordon (1993) the Commission two-years earlier had declined to adopt policy allowing homosexuality to be portrayed in a more positive light. However, with new Commission members and a more liberal looking State Board after the 1992 election the Commission had attempted to leap left, only to find it expedient to partly returned to earlier guidelines calling for tolerance but prohibiting advocacy of homosexuality in any texts used in the state. However, the modified policy still had to face the State Board's approval ("State Textbook Adopts," 1993).
In May 1993 the State Board of Education took up the issue of how Utah teachers were to portray homosexuality. Although the Board's Curriculum and Instruction Committee had voted to adopt the twice reworked recommendations of the Textbook Commission, the full Board, faced with the displeasure of the Eagle Forum, was loathe to make a final decision.

Originally the State Board had planned to allow no comment from citizens on the issue at its meeting, then under pressure acquiesced and allowed ten minutes of comment—a less-than-generous thirty seconds per speaker. According to Van Leer, the main citizen input was to attack the State Board for not allowing more public comment on the issue. She reported that "those allowed to speak during the meeting unanimously expressed the opinion that the guidelines would not act as a strong enough deterrent to discourage children from homosexuality" (1993a).

Part of the confrontation involved an ongoing dispute of semantics, this time involving whether the Board would "not endorse" homosexuality versus the preferred wording of the Eagle Forum stating that homosexuality is "not acceptable." Board member Keith Checketts, a psychologist, insisted that his wording of "not endorse" would have more power with teenagers than saying that homosexuality is "not acceptable." However, the Textbook Commission guidelines would have permitted districts to
use materials depicting gay lifestyles as acceptable and "healthy." Even given this fact, several Board members insisted that no one was suggesting that homosexuality be accepted in the guidelines, according to Van Leer, but only that they did not desire to pass judgment on homosexuals. A petition with nearly 800 names was submitted to the Board asking that they not accept proposed changes to the guidelines, which were more tolerant of homosexuality. The State Board, realizing that they had been tactically overrun by the Eagle Forum, bowed to demands for a public hearing and decided to put off a final vote for one month.

As might be expected the public hearing two weeks later involved fierce verbal battle. Approximately 40 people testified and many phoned or sent letters to the State Board.

On one side of the scales was the view that homosexuality is an aberrant, immoral and unhealthy behavior and that children should be protected against anything that suggests acceptance. On the other side, individuals and groups argued that failing to teach children tolerance of all kinds of differences in people is a serious breach in the mission of public education (Van Leer, 1993b).

Matt Hilton, a Spanish Fork lawyer, probably associated with the Eagle Forum which was based in his area, testified that sodomy was against Utah law and therefore teachers were required to teach against violation of the law. Further, Utah code required schools to teach morality.
However, Kathryn Kendall of the ACLU was present to insist that homosexuality was a result of biological destiny, not choice, and therefore should be tolerated. But Debbie Ashman, director of the Salt Lake Christian Action Council (not affiliated with the LDS Church) spoke strongly against even the least degree of acceptance. In disagreement, Bill Hamilton-Holway, Salt Lake Unitarian Universalist minister, asserted that any form of discrimination is wrong. Others were angry that their tax dollars might go to encourage a behavior that they insisted was morally repugnant and against their religions. However, gay private school teacher Doug Wortham was reported by Van Leer to have said that children needed to hear "the truth...from someone who knows" (Van Leer, 1993b).

On June 15, about 75 members of the Eagle Forum packed the Board's meeting room at Utah State University in Logan sporting yellow paper badges proclaiming "Uphold Moral Values" (Autman, 1993). The 12-2 verdict on homosexuality was that only a dictionary definition would be allowed and new conservative language was added to the existing state guidelines forbidding texts which portrayed homosexuality as "healthy" (Thomson & Edwards, 1993). The two Board members voting to liberalized policy were Kay McDonough and Daryl Barrett. Both were female, from Salt Lake County, and new to the Board that year. The Eagle Forum praised the Board's decision, commending them for
listening to the wishes of parents, but the ACLU was angry. Michael Bennet, principal of Salt Lake's Cottonwood High School and a member of the Textbook Commission, conceded that the Board had succumbed to tremendous pressure.

The remainder of 1993 saw little action on sex education at the state level. However, there were some other events worth reporting in 1993. For example, the week of May 30 through June 5 was declared "Utah Home Education Week" by Utah's governor. In early June the Utah Home Schooling Convention had grown to attracting over 2,000 people, a more than three-fold increase from 1988. The event's dramatic growth seemed to indicate continuing dissatisfaction with public schools (Kimot, 1993). And while public debate over homosexuality was occurring among state educational leaders and interest groups a much more significant and far reaching drama for future sex education in the state was unfolding in LDS Church government.

Battling Invasions

At the end of April, just before the State Board was to take up the issue of homosexuality, a very public rift among Mormon women took place. It was the week of the annual LDS Women's Conference at BYU where 6,000 of Mormondom's most prominent females had gathered to listen to over 130 presenters in 50 sessions. Although these
presentations varied in ideology and harmony with official Church doctrine, even the most liberal among them appeared moderate compared with presentations being made to 350 of their sisters gathered in Salt Lake for what they termed an "enhanced women's conference" (Stack, 1993a). This alternative gathering had been sparked when Pulitzer Prize-winning Mormon feminist and historical revisionist Laurel Thatcher Ulrich was excluded from the mainstream Mormon gathering because of her doctrinal dissent.

The theme of the Salt Lake gathering became accusations that Church leaders were attempting to silence women. Presentations included feminist attacks on Mormon history. And one presentation, by author Marion B. Smith, was directed at instances of sexual abuse among Mormons, on which she had written a sensational book. The Church, she claimed, refused to make abuse cases public. Instead, leaders insisted that victims "were to forgive their offenders, uphold the family unit, work for repentance for all involved, and--bottom line--keep silence," referring to Mormon policy of not publicly discussing specific causes of disciplinary action against members, or cases that might create negative publicity (Stack, 1993a).

Instead of succumbing to the will of its dissidents, by 1993 the LDS Church had begun turning up the heat on outspoken critics within its own membership. On the heels of the contentious women's conference, and as state education leaders were about to take up the issue of
homosexuality, Apostle Boyd K. Packer, in a May address to
the Church Coordinating Council comprised of department
heads and senior personnel of the Church administration,
warned against three "dangers" that had "made major
invasions into the membership of the Church: the
gay-lesbian movement, the feminist movement,...and the
ever-present challenge from the so-called scholars or
intellectuals" ("Elder Packer Names," 1993). Packer
announced that the "invasions launched by gays, feminists,
and scholars, [were] of the intensity and seriousness that
we have not faced before" and admonished his audience that
the educated should keep in mind that the policies and
"doctrines of the gospel are revealed through the Spirit
to prophets, not through the intellect to scholars."1

However, it was not just vocal liberal members with
whom the Church had lost patience. The winter of 1993 had
brought the dismissal of what by some estimates may have
been hundreds of right-wing survivalists from the ranks of
the Mormons--people such as Colonel Bo Gritz, who had what
Mormon leaders considered an undue preoccupation with the
end of the world, resigning from their jobs, pulling their
children out of school, stockpiling supplies (greater than
the normal Mormon storage program), and taking their
families to live in wilderness retreats ("Dissident
Mormons," 1993). These excommunications attracted
relatively little publicity, perhaps because they were
carried out in more rural regions such as Idaho and
southern Utah, and perhaps because liberal-leaning media had not yet taken much interest in the anger of members of certain ultra conservative movements which would literally explode into national controversy in 1995.

In September 1993 the LDS Church excommunicated or disciplined six liberal scholars who lit up media reports with their battle with Mormon Apostles mostly over leadership and feminist-related issues ("Six Intellectuals Disciplined," 1993). For General Authorities it was the highly public nature of the challenge to their authority and doctrine that had most upset them. In order for the Mormons to continue their world mission rapidly into the future there could not be open and public insurrection among the members, all of whom were charged with carrying on that mission in a church intricately held together by a hundred lay positions in each ward.

The disciplinary actions were carried out as required by Mormon law, under the control of local clergy. However, many critics insisted that Boyd K. Packer was behind the moves in what they probably overstated as a "purge" of the membership (Stack, 1993b). However, it was clear that if, as they claimed, Packer had taken a more active role in combating critics than others given his senior position, the excommunications were supported by the other Apostles and the final decisions had been made by local stake presidencies who conducted the disciplinary courts. The First Presidency and Quorum of the Twelve
Apostles soon issued a joint statement explaining and defending the policy of excommunication. October General Conference found the actions publicly defended from the pulpit by top Mormon leaders including Gordon B. Hinkley, James E. Faust, Boyd K. Packer, Neal A. Maxwell, and Dallin H. Oaks.

However, during the Conference weekend, supporters of the dissidents staged a rather interesting public relations ploy, delivering a highly publicized thousand white roses to a representative of the Mormon Church with a statement run as an ad in the Salt Lake Tribune reading in part, "Let the fear and reprisals end. Though the times are challenging and difficult, we find hope in the belief...that God cherishes diversity...and that He does not seek to exclude any who love him from membership in his Church" (White Roses Campaign, 1993). Each rose was said to represent a contributor to the ads and "gift." If the excommunications would eventually have the effect of discouraging public dissension, it was clear that many of the liberal academics of Mormondom were not persuaded to abandon their private ideas or to pull back from their embrace of more liberal social ideology on feminist and gender issues.

An Ending Without An End

The high school portion of the sex education resource file had been completed with considerable controversy.
Yet the State Office of Education was not entirely comfortable with its content. Further, its adversarial relationship with the Eagle Forum had increased as had determination to create a more liberal curriculum.

In creating the junior high portion of the "resource file" the state education leaders were determined to keep control of the process, something the Eagle Forum had thus far denied them. One of the tools leaders had been given to accomplish this was the State Board's removal from popular politics through the new nominating committees, ironically created by legislators who supported very conservative sex education ideologies. Another help was the appointed nature of the State Textbook Commission. Finally, no public timetable had been given for writing the junior high portion of the resource file. This allowed the curriculum to be worked on beyond public sight and denied the opposition time to rally and organize effectively against it.

Early in the 1994 legislative session Representative Reese Hunter, with the Eagle Forum's backing, sponsored a bill (HJR-11) designed to change Utah's Constitution to allow the legislature to mandate an elected State Textbook Commission rather than having the State Board appoint the Commission as had been the policy. The House Education Committee tabled the bill, proposing an interim study of the issue ("Election of Textbook Panel," 1994). Representative Hunter also sponsored a measure (HB 128)
designed to rescind the nominating committees for the State Board. "Such a method amounts to 'controlled democracy,'" Hunter complained of the new system, saying that he didn't believe voters were aware "that the school board candidates are being hand-picked by seven-member nominating committees that have strong representation from education special interest groups" (Van Leer, 1994a). However, leaders of the House and Senate who had created the new system refused to toss it away so soon insisting that time was needed to know whether the changes would be a benefit.

It was likely that the Eagle Forum and its allies did not expect that either of these bills would immediately pass. However, the symbolism was important. The Eagle Forum's message was that Utah's majority was on its side and that state educational leaders were afraid of democracy. Apparently they believed that the threat of an open election was necessary to intimidate the Board and Textbook Commission into more conservative behavior.

Even while the Eagle Forum was using democracy to threaten state leaders, it was also pursuing its agenda in local districts. For example, in conservative Nebo School District in Utah County's Spanish Fork, it was working with parents to establish a twelve-member curriculum review committee ("healthy lifestyle committee") to ensure that only those materials "promoting the importance of marriage and the family; abstinence before marriage and..."
fidelity within marriage; the preservation of decency..." be allowed (Vice, 1994). The committee would not permit any curriculum discussing "perversion, use of contraception, promiscuity, and having an abortion, except when presenting the negative consequences thereof," according to their charter.

While local districts were often friendly to considering the wishes of the Eagle Forum, the State Board of Education was in no mood to repeat the battle of 1992, nor for allowing the Eagle Forum to take control of the process. Gayle Ruzicka complained to the author that the State Office of Education refused Eagle Forum requests for information on the development status of the junior high component of the curriculum. Ruzicka was angered to find out about the curriculum's nearly completed status only after a television reporter called to ask for her comment on it. She learned that other groups already had copies of the draft junior high component and that the State Office had made every effort to screen its progress from the Eagle Forum's view. At first refusing, the state finally provided her organization a copy, she claimed (G. Ruzicka, personal communication, August 1, 1994).

Again the Eagle Forum attempted to knock the curriculum off track to passage by calling for public hearings and public comment at the State Board meeting. But the State Board was ready and would have none of it this time. Insisting that the junior high portion was
merely the continuation of decisions already made, and that curriculum was a staff assignment not requiring public input, the Board voted unanimously to adopt the guide (Van Leer, 1994b). This time information on contraceptives was included. The Board insisted that, because the guide was for parent and teacher use, the inclusion of this information was acceptable under Utah law forbidding contraception education without parental consent. However, Planned Parenthood, which supported the guide, would have liked much more explicit information available to adolescents than what the guide, which in theory would not be in the hands of teenagers, provided. Conservatives claimed that this policy was not kept very well, and reported that the guide had, in fact, been given to students. They vowed that on a local and state level, and even a national level, they would seek policy and leaders who would "uphold moral values."

Summary

The State Board of Education underwent many important changes between 1992 and 1994. Ideologically, some of its most conservative members were lost. Additionally, the Board went through expansion, reapportionment, and restructuring that all seemed to create cracks in conservative battlements. The results for the sex education conflict were that sexuality policy had a tendency to veer left as liberals vaulted the fractured
system. National abortion policy turned against Utah, even as pro-life forces in the state seemed to have been shoring up support. The Eagle Forum, however, was able to win educational and sexuality policy battles in the state in 1993 handily, throwing back charges made by homosexuals toward public educational acceptance. The LDS Church, under assault on numerous fronts, but especially grappling with runs by homosexuals, feminists, and intellectuals, moved to cut off their advances within the Church. Additionally, they were greatly alarmed by U.S. Supreme Court action that in their view had the potential to restore bitter persecution and moral conflict of historical proportions. By 1994 conservative interests and legislators were reconsidering changes made in nominating the State Board. However, the State Board, anticipating conservative strategy, quietly, and swiftly approved a junior high curriculum more liberal than before. With the second component of the curriculum approved the scope of this study was concluded. An analysis of the conflict and the findings is now possible.
Notes

1The ranks of the Apostles and other General Authorities now include a substantial number of scholarly professionals and Ivy League educated doctors, so clearly not all scholars were being criticized.

2Excommunications for apostasy had commonly, though not always so spectacularly, occurred since the earliest days of the Church even including General Authorities. Mormon doctrine teaches that only the President, as an individual, God will not allow to significantly error, along with Apostles collectively.
CHAPTER 7

ANALYSIS

A large amount of data has been presented. Because the sex education conflict was interwoven with other issues, both current and historical, a detailed examination of every identifiable pattern or correlation is not possible in this context. It should, however, be apparent that historical and cultural forces were exerting tremendous force on events as they unfolded. Although clearly not identical, the similarities between modern and historic conflict were remarkable.

Perhaps the most important part of a study such as this can be found in the effort to explain what was observed. A moderate amount of interpretation was provided throughout the body of the project. However, a more in-depth analysis is necessary. To accomplish this the author will discuss possible explanations in relation to the hypotheses of culture, history, interest groups, and the structure of the Board presented in Chapter One.

Immigration

As indicated in Chapter One some scientific research
has been done into Utah migration. Among the relevant findings in the studies were that newcomers were more likely than natives to be liberal, critical of existing government institutions and services, and willing to become active in the community. If they were non-LDS they seemed to have a more difficult time adjusting socially.

However, according to data provided by the State Office of Economic Development, while there were many immigrants entering Utah during the 1980s an even greater number of Utahns were leaving. Net migration between 1980-1989 saw out-migration total about 13,000 more than in-migration (Utah Office of Economic Development, 1994). However, in the three-county Salt Lake/Ogden metropolitan area a 17 percent population increase was experienced between 1980 and 1988 (Hamel & Schreiner, 1990). According to information provided the author by the Utah Office of Economic Development, beginning in 1991 net migration consistently hovered at an annual rate near 20,000. This number subtracts the "move-outs" from the "move-ins" statewide. The actual number of newcomers was much greater. For example, in 1992 the IRS reported 38,000 newcomers to Utah. Of that over 14,000 had come from California, the single largest contributor, with Arizona running a distant second at about 4,000. It appears that the Salt Lake metropolitan area was attracting a substantial number of these immigrants.

It may also be important to note that citizens of
Utah have the most conservative ideological identification in the nation, while citizens of California were found to be the most liberal (Erikson, Wright, & McIver, 1993, p. 16). Further, a University of Utah consumer survey in 1993 confirmed that newcomers are more critical of Utah's culture and institutions, and found that only 38 percent of newcomers (N = 238) were LDS ("Immigrants Change the Face," 1993). Although this subset was relatively small, it is consistent with other data. A potential for cultural conflict must be apparent. However, no reliable data yet exist suggesting that the overall percentage of Mormons in the state can be expected to suffer a significant decline anytime soon. The 2000 census may shed some light on what was happening in the early 1990s.

If immigration is, in fact, having an influence on policy ideology the data suggest that it may very well be in localized pockets (such as portions of Salt Lake County). Given the findings of Stinner, et. al. (1984, 1987) that newcomers were inclined toward greater community activity, and generally have higher economic standing than natives, liberal activists and interest groups may have received a boost in Salt Lake County from the immigration. This may have come in the form of donated time, money, and votes in elections.

The implications found for sex education in the immigration data suggest that the curriculum may have been influenced through a more liberal State Board chosen by a
more liberal electorate, especially in Salt Lake County. Activists in liberal interest groups, such as Democrat Mary Carlson and Daryl Barret, appear to be gaining influence in the Salt Lake area as they move into positions of official political power such as the legislature and State Board. The State Board, comprised of eight Mormons and one non-Mormon in 1992, now includes at least four non-Mormons out of fifteen members—at least two of whom are from the Salt Lake area (K. Checketts, personal communication, October 17, 1995). However, ideological conflict in the Salt Lake area clearly is not settled. For example, Democrat Karen Shepard, who it may be recalled sponsored a liberal sex education bill in the state legislature before being elected to Congress, lost her reelection bid in 1994 to a conservative, professional Mormon woman.

Additional research into newcomer/native divergence on major social issues, including sex education and related items, is needed. Research into how immigration may be affecting social policy, specifically through changing levels of interest group activity, membership, ideology, and financing, could prove very useful. Research into changes in party ideology in high immigration areas could be undertaken in Utah.

An Economic Explanation

It is likely that many of the inmigrants entering
Utah during the early 1990s were doing so as part of Utah's economic boom. Many of the jobs being created were in the modern gold mines of computer and information technology. As described in Chapter Three, Utah is second only to the Silicon Valley in these fields. Besides high-tech industry the author presented evidence that other employers were making moves to Utah in the late 1980s and early 1990s to cash in on Utah's high education levels, literacy rates, foreign language speaking population, relatively low wages, young labor force, and safe family environment.

Ironically, the culture of quality education, high birth rates, missionary service in foreign lands, low crime rates, and avoidance of labor unions which was attracting employers and newcomers to the state all seem strongly related to the influence of the Mormon religion on Utah's culture both historically and recently. Relating this to the liberalizing of sex education, immigration and economic explanations point to the fact that in explaining social conflict over sexually related issues the Mormon culture could partly have become the victim of its own success.

As related to history, Utah was struggling with immigration problems with its attendant social conflict over a century ago. As may be recalled from Chapter Two, many of the immigrants of last century sought work in the mines or opened businesses to service those who did.
Others came as employees of the federal government or as missionaries to combat the Mormon religion and culture. Many were hostile to Mormon beliefs on gender issues.

Unlike history, Mormons have built considerable clout in the national economy. Further, they now enjoy the company of outside religious allies on sexual issues, which they lacked in the past. However, these conservative religions, while seemingly retaining considerable power in the Republican Party, may have been left behind by America's mainstream on sexual issues.

The Sanctuary Hypothesis

This study identifies at least two major cultural camps, which might be described as traditional/conservative and outsider/liberal. Religion was clearly the wellspring for conservatives. Devout Mormons drew their ideology from a culture significantly different from other cultures—even conservative cultures. A few conservative activists and State Board members confided to the author that on their own initiative they had researched the writings of Mormon prophets on the issue of sex education, although the LDS Church never, on any issue, had contacted them.

Frances Hatch Merrill, for example, not one to be afraid of having her views known, told the author that she had researched sex education in past issues of the Ensign at the library (personal communication, October 26, 1995).
It was important to her that she represent the moral convictions of the majority in her district on such an important issue as best she understood them. She also took input from her neighbors and other "ordinary" people.

The most influential conservative organizations were led and staffed by devout members of the predominant religion and appeared to be attempting to defend not just their moral and religious beliefs, but Utah's cultural traditions and values from invasion. The author will suggest that some of these possessed what could be described as a "sanctuary belief" toward Utah. They seem to have felt that some newcomers were acceptable, but that others were disrespectful outsiders who, aided by disloyal natives, were despoiling the sacred culture and traditions of Utah.

If this were research in international relations, and Utah were a nation-state, their complaint might be categorized as annoyance toward cultural imperialism. However, the term "sanctuary belief" may better describe their actual mindset since they appear to have viewed Utah as sacred, and certain outsiders (not all) as unappreciative of the cultural cathedral of Utah. This cathedral, they are well aware, was built on the graves of their persecuted and reviled ancestors. Mormon culture is very concerned with genealogy, and with its own history.

It appears that for some the sex education curriculum was part of the looting of a shrine, so to speak. While
this hypothesis may seem a bit odd there is ample evidence and opportunity for researching this sanctuary belief in Utah at this very time. One need only read the continuing battle between Utah natives (or cultural natives) and newcomers that is being played out daily in the "letter to the editor" columns of Utah papers in order to find that the hypothesis of a sanctuary belief interjecting itself into public policy is not so insane. Further, recall the thousands of troubled teens sent to Utah's public schools under Utah's loose guardianship laws (Murr, 1995). Clearly not just inhabitants of Utah view the state as a sanctuary.

Perhaps the future researcher investigating the subject might want to look at St. George, Utah which is currently engaged in a bitter, community dividing fight over a proposal to limit growth to three percent annually. Many of the major reasons being given are "way of life," or in other words, possible sanctuary arguments (for an example see Bowcutt, 1995). Certainly many of Utah's home schoolers would suggest that Utah's public education is being invaded by a liberal, outside culture.

If this cultural sanctuary is, indeed, being invaded, then cultural change taking place on the campus of Utah's universities may prove to be one of the most significant sources. The struggles at BYU described in this study are evidence of the inroads of the secular culture. At the University of Utah in Salt Lake City,
which now has a non-Mormon president for the first time in history, a symposium was held in 1994 to discuss anti-Mormon prejudice among faculty. The major speaker was not a Mormon but a prominent Jewish professor and University of Utah faculty member, Robert Goldberg, who was concerned by what he perceived as many examples of significant prejudice against Mormons among faculty (Stack, 1994). By the fall of 1995 the issue would concern the new non-Mormon president enough that he would begin a public campaign to combat the anti-Mormon perception ("U of U Tries to Dispel," 1995).

At another state university the author found a political scientist confiding that he was tired of what he perceived as a "missionary mentality" among many of the new non-Utahn, liberal professors being hired who, not even attempting to understand or respect Mormon culture, seemed to feel it their duty to find employment in Utah in an effort to "enlighten us ignorant Mormons." The author, upon pondering on this perception, was mildly intrigued by the notion that professors may play the role of cultural propagandists. Drawing a hypothesis that college faculty in Utah are increasingly representative of outside cultures (but not necessarily hostile), or secondly, increasingly hostile to Mormon culture, would be an interesting basis for a study. If the data were to bear these hypotheses out, then, as these professors and their students move into more senior positions and councils of
power, a significant impact on public policy, over time, might be realized, especially in gender/sexual policy which forms the core of Mormon culture and often of social conflict.

Further indications of a scholarly charge against traditional culture in Utah were found. For example, Neola Brown, the State Board's longest serving member and chair during the early sex education conflict, explained to the author that she had been the only non-Mormon on the State Board when the original vote on sex education had been taken (N. Brown, personal communication, October 17, 1995). The vote had been 5-4 in favor of the curriculum. As chair, Brown had cast the deciding vote. In her view the LDS Church had strong representation on the Board through both Covey and Funk, and religious belief had played an important role in how members voted. Yet she revealed that in the intense lobbying that had surrounded the controversy the professionals, such as doctors and lawyers, who were contacting her were nearly all in favor of the curriculum.

Utah State University Professor of Psychology, Keith Checketts, who had been chair after Brown and during the time when Covey had left the Board, at first told the author that religious belief "didn't make a bit of difference" in the decisions--at least to him (K. Checketts, personal communication, October 17, 1995). However, Checketts then acknowledged that the conflict on
the Board had really been between conservative Mormons and liberal Mormons, while he described himself as "a moderate facilitator." When he had become chair he had used all his influence to push the curriculum through, he claimed.

One conservative activist, speaking confidentially to the author, claimed that before an important Board meeting he/she had confronted Checketts about how he could support a curriculum that contained information that might support behavior counter to Checketts' Mormon religion. He reportedly told the activist that "when I walk through the [board-room] door I leave my religion behind me." This is a sentiment not uncommon in mainstream culture.

Since many professionals and academics have probably lived away from Utah for substantial periods of time, and been trained in the ideology of non-Mormon culture, it may be that they have retained elements of the outside culture on sexual issues. While the author is aware of one study suggesting that, unlike many religions, the most educated Mormons are also the most actively participating members (Albrecht & Heaton, 1984) comparison of specific attitudes among members of varying educational levels and occupations would be interesting research. Perhaps the well known correlations between holding an advanced degree and possessing a more liberal social ideology applies in Utah, even to Mormons.
Mormon Trust/Apathy Explanation

The leader of the St. George Eagle Forum Chapter explained to the author in an interview that many people in the state feel that when they elect an active Mormon (or other religious person) to office that they can sit back and feel confident that the official will uphold moral principles (Y. Wall, personal communication, October 5, 1994). However, according to Wall, even if the candidate has been honest about his or her beliefs and values during the campaign, many are naive and tend to easily trust both educators and other Mormons. Wall's evaluation, if true, would fit well with the cultural and historical perspectives on the conflict, since respect and trust of education officials by Mormons can be traced back to the 1870s and Mormon Prophet/Superintendent John Taylor.

It is of interest to note that when Gayle Ruzicka spoke to the author concerning her explanation for why the Board had adopted a more liberal sex education policy she claimed that Board members had been "deceived into thinking that it was an abstinence program" (personal communication, August 1, 1994). The clear implication was that Board members had not studied the guides very carefully. Since the Curriculum Office and education leaders had labeled it an abstinence program, and said that it was necessary, they believed. After all, prominent Mormon educators, such as psychologist Keith
Checketts, said it was good, therefore, Board members
could cast their doubts aside.

If this hypothesis actually has some merit, then
Deseret News education editor Twila Van Leer, writing for
a Mormon paper--including editorials--may well have had
influence toward liberalizing policy if, indeed, Mormon
readers trusted her opinion as a fellow "Saint" and
education expert working for a Mormon paper.¹ Interest
groups and educational leaders, perhaps recognizing Mormon
trust and apathy, could have been tempted to take
advantage of this cultural peculiarity. It is at least an
interesting hypothesis.

Demand

A representative of Utah's Planned Parenthood
(Administration and Community Education Office, personal
communication, September 6, 1994) commented to the author
that "five or ten years ago [Planned Parenthood] would
never have thought it possible," that Utah would develop a
state sex education curriculum that included
contraception. So what made the difference this time?
According to John M.R. Covey, there is a tremendous demand
for sex education (personal communication, March 28,
1995). This assertion may seem obvious but it also goes
to evidence the influence of culture.

Fifty years ago sex education in public schools was
not much of an issue. Something appears to have changed
culturally. Data presented in Chapters One and Five showed that in the 1980s sexual activity indicators for Utah and the Mormons moved up. Certainly the increase in sexually oriented artifacts and communication in American culture cannot have escaped the notice of even the most determined hermit. Although the Utah rates were substantially lower than the national average, it may be recalled that rates of increase for out of wedlock births in Utah, like the rest of the nation, were substantial. Add to this the new sexually transmitted diseases such as AIDS, and liberal interest groups were given a powerful propaganda tool.

There is every reason to believe that Utah was influenced by issues in the larger American culture. The fact that national data were quoted by liberal activists and ended up appearing in the curriculum is strong evidence. The fact that national pro-choice and pro-life interest groups (the same organizations that work on sex education policy) made Utah an abortion battleground must have had some influence on the policy process. With the feminist focus on Utah, liberal interest groups may well have worked harder and received more money. The data reveal that national leaders in the feminist movement travelled to the state to assist in the abortion battle. Whether it was their tactical experience and skills, or perhaps their conviction and enthusiasm for the cause, they must have shed some sort of fuel to boost local
feminists leaders in their drive to place contraception education in the state curriculum. It may be recalled that the two issues (abortion prevention and contraception) were often packaged as one in both national and local actions by liberal groups.

A new cultural diversity had come to the state's policy-making center. Fear of AIDS, desire to reduce abortions, a growing immigrant community from more liberal states, reports of increased sexuality among single Mormons, support from Mormon scholars, and endorsement from education leaders all were used by liberal interest groups to bring pressure to bear on members of the State Board. The cultural collision had caught them in the middle, and liberal interest groups, with large full-time staffs, outside financial backing, and strong assistance from the State Curriculum Office, were determined to finally win. Some Mormons, told by their leaders to treat immigrants with kindness and respect, may have felt a compromise was in order.

The Mormon Exhaustion Hypothesis

Mary Carlson, who was Planned Parenthood's Director of Community Services and highly involved in the early stages of seeking a state sex education curriculum, told the author in an interview that it had seemed to her that the LDS Church had not resisted a state sex education curriculum in the early 1990s as firmly as it had during.
several short-lived attempts at a state curriculum in the 1980s (M. Carlson, personal communication, March 28, 1995). In the past, the Board philosophically had been unwilling to take up the issue. In Carlson's view, this had had a great deal to do with religion on a Board that was almost entirely Mormon.

The LDS Church, in 1986, had sent a letter to bishops stating that sex education was the responsibility of parents and could not rightly be delegated to others. However, where sex education was undertaken in schools members were instructed to endeavor to ensure that it conformed to correct moral principles (First Presidency letter, 1986, June 18). The Church concurrently had published and distributed a manual entitled A Parent's Guide (1986) to assist parents in teaching Mormon procreative standards. When the author contacted the LDS Church for comment on the issue, it responded by sending a copy of the letter.

In reviewing the data there are indications that liberal success in the sex education arena may partly have been a result of the Mormon Church and allied organizations being too busy on other (although related) crises and issues. In the period between 1988 and 1994 struggles faced Mormons on every side. Only a small portion was touched on this paper. A few other examples include the tremendous political changes taking place abroad, terrorist difficulties in Latin American, rapid
growth in developing nations, excommunication of a general authority, and a major campaign against gaming referenda in Utah and Idaho. The latter was a very important example of cultural conflict in which the LDS Church overtly, and with much criticism, entered the political fray to battle to victory (see Semerad, 1992). Combined with the abortion battle, a minor entry into the graduation prayer fray, and lobbying on behalf of the Freedom of Religion Restoration Act, one could hypothesize that the LDS Church, for public relations purposes, was precluded from more direct comment on the policy. Add to this major internal conflict with feminists, homosexuals, and Mormon scholars, which was drawing sharp public criticism, and further reason for lessened resistance may be found.

An interesting correlation is that in the midst of these crises the number of convert baptisms, which had shown steady increases for years, and had hit a high in 1990 of 330,000 annually, took a significant plunge in 1991 and 1992 (298,000 and 274,000, respectively), before showing signs of recovery in 1993 and 1994 ("Convert Baptisms," 1995). Is it any wonder that Carlson did not find as much resistance from the LDS Church in the early 1990s? Internal ideological collision with liberal Mormons alone should have been enough to keep General Authorities pinned down, especially with their leader having taken ill.
Even so, through the efforts of devout Mormons such as Covey, the final curriculum very nearly was settled by conservative members of the LDS Church. If not for the error of appointing an LDS Institute professor, Wayne Bricky, to "strengthen" the curriculum, rather than a devout Mormon of public academic experience, it is very likely that this study would have ended in an abrupt, conservative victory. Planned Parenthood could have bragged only that progress had been made by seeing a state curriculum passed at all. The author contends that the events surrounding the departure of Covey must be considered very strong evidence in support of both the cultural and interest group hypotheses. In fact, the appointment of Brickey may simply have been a miscalculation as to the growth and strength of the non-traditional culture in Utah.

A final important note about LDS influence is necessary. Of some relevance to a people and culture that are ultimately led by a single man is what can be termed the "ailing leader hypothesis." The importance of visible leadership during times of crisis must be a principle that has been recognized for thousands of years. Although his two counselors were active leaders in the early 1990s, Mormon prophet Ezra Taft Benson had fallen victim to a prolonged illness. His health had forced him to drop from public sight in 1991, unable to verbally communicate, but briefly, or make public appearances. This seemed to
embolden Mormon critics and dissenters, and take wind from
the sails of the Mormon devout who were left to play
defense during much of this study. However, in the long
run Mormon leaders may have gained since detractors,
coming out of the closet, were identified, and General
Authorities provided experience in social conflict that
could prove useful to them at some future point.

Findings

This project was initiated by simply asking a
question about the extent of interest group impact on the
sex education policy process. The intention was to test
for indications of interest group influence. If groups
were having an influence, then influence indicators were
expected to be present. Indicators that were proposed
included abnormal or unusual procedures in the
policy-making body, changes in schedules of debates or
votes, changes in curriculum content, and sudden or
unexpected personnel changes showing a relationship to
group ideology. These indicators were expected to be
clearest when correlated with some observable group
action.

Based on the data there were strong indications of
interest group influence in the policy process. All of
the projected indicators were present and with substantial
intensity. Further, liberal interests were able to see
some of their members elected to legislative bodies,
followed by further policy movement in their direction. Interest group personnel found their way into the sex education advisory panel, which worked behind-the-scenes, and into the newly created nomination committees, which further indicated influence.

A peripheral hypothesis had proposed that the structure and position within government of the policy-making body would be a factor in the ability of interest groups to influence policy. Among supporting evidence is the restructuring of the Board, which resulted in three conservatives being removed from power (Merrill, Liechty, and Funk).

The Board's subordinate position on structural issues to the State Legislature allowed for Merrill to be removed by what appears to have been behind-the-scenes interest group action. Merrill was convinced that had she attempted to run she would not have been nominated by the new selection committee, due to its interest group representation. Leichty, who was a former chair of the State Board and an ideological friend to Merrill (although he is now active in the Republican Party), attempted to run, but was not nominated by the selection committee and was a casualty of the new structure of the Board and the interest groups that had found their way in. Funk appeared before the nomination committee, but was not nominated. She told Merrill that she had asked them not to consider her. However, Merrill wondered if Funk had
discovered that it was unlikely that they would nominate her and decided to bow out gracefully.

The restructured Board included a member of Planned Parenthood's board of directors and, according to Merrill, a representative of Utah Issues. It also included several new non-Mormons. Research into whether major structural changes in a policy-making body generally lead to a more liberal composition would make an interesting study.

Comparing the legislature and State Board on sex education issues, the Board seems to have been more visibly at the mercy of competing interest groups than was the State Legislature. The legislature, it seemed, knew how to rapidly dispose of the issue, and in a traditionalist-favoring way. However, the author will not interpret the data to mean that organized interests were not substantially influencing the legislature on sex related issues. It seems that there were conservative groups and forces guiding them on abortion policy and in rejecting liberal sex education proposals. It also seems, as may be recalled from Chapter Six, that educational interest groups may have had a major role in creation of the nomination committees. The fact that Board members now owe their continued service to liberal-leaning, interest group dominated, selection committees may have some influence on how the Board votes. Fear of public opinion must be subordinate to fear of selection committee/education interest group opinion. Concerning an
explanation for the highly favorable vote given the junior high curriculum, this may have been a factor. It may be concluded that there is sufficient evidence to support the hypothesis that the Board's structure played a role in the ability of interest groups to influence sex education policy.

This study also developed and tested three basic hypotheses that were derived from the evidence of Utah's unique historical and cultural heritage. It was hypothesized that: (1) historical forces would be found exerting influence on modern sex education and social policy in Utah; (2) interest groups in Utah social conflict would be found to be representative of dissimilar, competing cultures; and (3) observed policy movement toward non-traditional ideology on sex education would be correlated with observable inroads by the outside (non-traditional) culture.

Evidence to support all three of these hypotheses has already been discussed. It may be concluded that the data were sufficient to support these hypotheses.

In addition, this project was undertaken to generate additional hypotheses and identify areas for further research. The author feels gratified in this respect. Several additional areas for research have been identified.

This study may be concluded by turning the gaze away from the past and instead looking to where the winds of
history and culture will take social policy conflict in Utah's future. There is reason to suppose that some of the battles described in this research are only a taste of what is to come. The author suggests that the American culture outside of Utah may be changing in ways that place it at an increasing distance from the traditional Mormon culture. While the author has presented strong evidence to indicate that Mormon religion and culture are wrapped around a core of strict procreative beliefs, it would seem that the mainstream American culture may increasingly be wrapped around a core of antithetical sexual beliefs. There is every reason to suppose that major changes in sexual attitudes and practices have occurred over the course of the past several decades in the mainstream culture. The data presented here indicate that Utah has not been immune to these "invasions" by the larger society. In fact, they have been the source of substantial conflict as interest groups, representing the opposing positions, have battled for territory.

However, although some changes in the positions of the established civil and religious governments in Utah may have been observed, much of the data indicate a Mormon Church and Utah government (at least the legislature) that are determinedly digging in against changing sexual mores. Nowhere is this better evidenced than on the issue of homosexuality. It may be recalled that even the restructured State Board voted 12-2 against officially
liberalizing policy in Utah's schools on this issue. In addition, the LDS Church now appears to be undertaking the beginnings of a major resistance to the acceptance of homosexuality, as well as other non-traditional lifestyles. In 1994 Mormon leaders in Hawaii, with the express approval of General Authorities, allied with local Catholic leaders to fight the legalization of same-gender marriages in that state. The Hawaii Supreme Court had ruled that a ban on same-gender marriages was unconstitutional ("Mormon Church Proclamation," 1995). The complicated conflict is still ongoing in Hawaii but has the potential to spread nationwide, depending on the outcome. The high courts of three states have now legalized adoption by partners in same-gender couples ("Adoption Open To Live-In," 1995).

In September 1995 James E. Faust, Second Counselor in the First Presidency, writing the official First Presidency message in the Ensign, forcefully countered common arguments made in favor of population control, abortion, and homosexuality, while speaking out against "homosexual marriages" (Faust, 1995, p. 5). Only weeks later, Mormon prophet Gordon B. Hinckley, speaking with unusual bluntness at LDS General Women's Conference (televised in Utah), rebuffed the acceptance of homosexuality, strongly criticizing the idea of same-gender marriage, immediately before reading a new official proclamation regarding sexual issues. It
amounted to a forceful recommitment to traditional Mormon standards regarding chastity, the family, and the roles of men and women. The proclamation declared that God's commandment found in Genesis to multiply and replenish the Earth "remains in force." In addition, the proclamation included a prophecy "that the disintegration of the [traditional] family will bring upon the individuals, communities and nations the calamities foretold by ancient and modern prophets" ("Mormon Church Proclamation," 1995).

Only days later in the October Ensign an article that must be the first of its kind for the conservative monthly, appeared. Its title was "Same-Gender Attraction," and was positioned in the prime pages found just after the First Presidency message that heads each issue. Apostle Dallin H. Oaks (1995b), who frequently represents the LDS Church on political and legal issues, was the author. Using his substantial intellect and scholarly talent, Oaks challenged liberal intellectuals by reviewing scientific research indicating that homosexuality is not simply of a genetic or biological base. Combining the scientific literature with LDS revelation on the subject, he made clear that the LDS Church is prepared to confront the issue even on a scholarly level.2 Indications are that the LDS Church may be gearing up for a possible future scrap over same-gender marriage, perhaps nationally.

Maybe not by coincidence October had been endorsed as
National Gay and Lesbian History Month by the National Education Association which encouraged its local affiliates to participate (Frost, 1995). However, the Utah Education Association adamantly refused, while the author observed that in one teacher education class at Southern Utah University the issue became an argument between the native Utah majority and newcomers from California.

All this provides evidence that the LDS culture in Utah may be retrenching. Hinckley appears to have regained firm control within the Church and dissension has been minimized to routine levels. Further, as the data have demonstrated, senior LDS Apostles who are in line for the Presidency are strongly committed to defending LDS principles of morality and are speaking with increasing bluntness.

In seeking to hypothesize the future of policy conflict in (and about) Utah it seems useful to turn to the past. Could Mormon cultural/religious beliefs, especially on gender and family issues, again become severely out of line with America's mainstream? If evidence has been found to suggest that the answer could be "yes," then what could be the legal ramifications for Mormons given Supreme Court rulings such as Employment Division v Smith, which turned many modern ideas about freedom of religion over to the will of a congressional majority?
Alexis de Tocqueville, more than 150 years ago, thought that by studying America's history and "point of departure" it was as if he could see America's whole future (Tocqueville, chap. 2). Mormon leaders, a century ago, must have felt much the same. From a scientific point of view, if one is to suggest the future of policy conflict then not only is it important to ask what has happened in the past, but also what the participants expect to happen in the future. It is rather interesting to note that the writings of Mormon Apostles a century ago indicate that they expected that

after a while the Gentiles will gather to this place by the thousands and Salt Lake will be classified among the wicked cities of the world. A spirit of speculation and extravagance will take possession of the Saints, and the result will be financial bondage. Persecution comes next, and all true Latter-day Saints will be tested to the limit. Many will apostatize, and others will stand still, not knowing what to do (Heber C. Kimball as cited in Crowther, 1962, p. 26).

From this, and many related items, it would seem that Mormons may expect both inmigration and persecution. In fact, they expect a time when many of their religious and cultural beliefs will become so far out of line with those of the outside culture that the current migration policy of the LDS Church will be reversed (Crowther, 1962, p. 58). In the nineteenth century the migration policy called on members to make their way to Utah. The current policy requires that members, in general, stay in their own lands (Larson, 1992, p. 673-676). Mormon leaders are
now very careful to say nothing that might indicate that a reversal of policy could be expected anytime soon. In order to accomplish their mission of taking the Mormon message to the entire world they need strong bodies of members far from Utah. Further, they seem to struggle with right-wing radicals, many of whom it may be recalled were excommunicated, who are only too anxious for some sign that the end of the world is near.

However, Mormon prophesy indicates that they believe at some future time, probably still distant, the outside culture will have become sufficiently hostile to Mormon beliefs that the policy will be reversed and devout Mormons will flee for safety and refuge in Utah (Crowther, 1962, p. 58). According to Larson (1992), a moderate flow of Mormon migration has continued for many decades. According to prophesies of Mormon Apostles collected in Crowther, the state (and region) is expected to become a refuge from violence and political upheaval that will increasingly sweep the world, and many Gentiles will flee to Utah to escape a time of prophesied internal crisis and conflict in America. Whether one believes that these are true prophecies, educated predictions, or foolish guesses, it would seem that Mormon leaders may ultimately hold a major cultural and political trump card in the form of migration policy.
Summary

The sex education controversy of the late 1980s and early 1990s enabled a case study of interest group influence on social policy conflict in Utah. Substantial evidence of interest group influence was found. It was also found that interest groups were divided along cultural lines displaying antithetical sexual practices and beliefs. Evidence that migration is a key component to social policy conflict, historically, recently, and perhaps in the future, was presented.
Notes

1The author is not aware of Van Leer's religion. It is the perception of her readers that matters for the hypothesis.

2Oaks, however, cautions that, like any other Mormon sin, it is the action not the individual that is to be fought.
APPENDIX

CONTENT ANALYSIS

The question arises as to whose position the curriculum most favored. In order to determine the ideological leanings of the sex education guides the author compared the positions of Planned Parenthood and the LDS Church to that of the high school curriculum on eight items of concern (Table A1). The results indicated that the views of Planned Parenthood and the LDS Church were separated by a wide gap in nearly every area of conflict. However, the content of the high school curriculum was moderate.

Ranking each of the eight items according to whether the curriculum matched the position of one side or the other "strongly," "mildly," or "no match," the results indicated that the LDS position was matched most often (Table A2). This method assumed, of course, that each item was equally important, which is not likely. However, it does provide a general indication of ideological content. The method also allowed for both sides to be given credit if the curriculum contained a dual message on a particular item. In order to determine a match the author re-read the curriculum carefully for each of the...
### Table A1

**Comparison of Ideological Positions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planned Parenthood: ^a Liberating, life-saving. Opposed by &quot;extremists&quot; and female oppressors who aim to eliminate &quot;all&quot; options for women (p. 7).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDS Church: ^b Promotes a violent, selfish society. Never right in response to one's own immorality. May be acceptable under rare circumstances.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.S. Manual: ^c Dictionary definition. No direct moral statement. Miscarriage treated as equivalent to abortion, and referred to as a &quot;spontaneous abortion&quot; in the same column.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Parenthood: &quot;Healthy, normal, and safe&quot; (p. 4).</td>
<td>Planned Parenthood: &quot;Healthy, normal, and safe&quot; (p. 4).</td>
<td>Planned Parenthood: &quot;Healthy, normal, and safe&quot; (p. 4).</td>
<td>Planned Parenthood: &quot;Healthy, normal, and safe&quot; (p. 4).</td>
<td>Planned Parenthood: &quot;Healthy, normal, and safe&quot; (p. 4).</td>
<td>Planned Parenthood: &quot;Healthy, normal, and safe&quot; (p. 4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDS Church: &quot;Not physically necessary...A perversion of the body's passions&quot; (p. 37).</td>
<td>LDS Church: &quot;Not physically necessary...A perversion of the body's passions&quot; (p. 37).</td>
<td>LDS Church: &quot;Not physically necessary...A perversion of the body's passions&quot; (p. 37).</td>
<td>LDS Church: &quot;Not physically necessary...A perversion of the body's passions&quot; (p. 37).</td>
<td>LDS Church: &quot;Not physically necessary...A perversion of the body's passions&quot; (p. 37).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Parenthood: Required realistically for those not abstaining in order to reduce unwanted pregnancy, disease and abortion.</td>
<td>Planned Parenthood: Required realistically for those not abstaining in order to reduce unwanted pregnancy, disease and abortion.</td>
<td>Planned Parenthood: Required realistically for those not abstaining in order to reduce unwanted pregnancy, disease and abortion.</td>
<td>Planned Parenthood: Required realistically for those not abstaining in order to reduce unwanted pregnancy, disease and abortion.</td>
<td>Planned Parenthood: Required realistically for those not abstaining in order to reduce unwanted pregnancy, disease and abortion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDS Church: Encourages sexual experimentation and pre-marital sex. Refusal by married couples to have children is a grave sin. May be used in marriage for organizational purposes.</td>
<td>LDS Church: Encourages sexual experimentation and pre-marital sex. Refusal by married couples to have children is a grave sin. May be used in marriage for organizational purposes.</td>
<td>LDS Church: Encourages sexual experimentation and pre-marital sex. Refusal by married couples to have children is a grave sin. May be used in marriage for organizational purposes.</td>
<td>LDS Church: Encourages sexual experimentation and pre-marital sex. Refusal by married couples to have children is a grave sin. May be used in marriage for organizational purposes.</td>
<td>LDS Church: Encourages sexual experimentation and pre-marital sex. Refusal by married couples to have children is a grave sin. May be used in marriage for organizational purposes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.S. Manual: Originally no mention. However, contraceptive pamphlet is now included.</td>
<td>H.S. Manual: Originally no mention. However, contraceptive pamphlet is now included.</td>
<td>H.S. Manual: Originally no mention. However, contraceptive pamphlet is now included.</td>
<td>H.S. Manual: Originally no mention. However, contraceptive pamphlet is now included.</td>
<td>H.S. Manual: Originally no mention. However, contraceptive pamphlet is now included.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Parenthood: One of several healthy, normal, lifestyles. Diversity of sexual expression should be taught for youth to choose from, consistent with their own values.</td>
<td>Planned Parenthood: One of several healthy, normal, lifestyles. Diversity of sexual expression should be taught for youth to choose from, consistent with their own values.</td>
<td>Planned Parenthood: One of several healthy, normal, lifestyles. Diversity of sexual expression should be taught for youth to choose from, consistent with their own values.</td>
<td>Planned Parenthood: One of several healthy, normal, lifestyles. Diversity of sexual expression should be taught for youth to choose from, consistent with their own values.</td>
<td>Planned Parenthood: One of several healthy, normal, lifestyles. Diversity of sexual expression should be taught for youth to choose from, consistent with their own values.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDS Church: Not genetically determined. Eternal significance to gender roles. Diversity of talents within each gender. &quot;Were homosexuality to prevail in the world the human race and all things proper would end.&quot;</td>
<td>LDS Church: Not genetically determined. Eternal significance to gender roles. Diversity of talents within each gender. &quot;Were homosexuality to prevail in the world the human race and all things proper would end.&quot;</td>
<td>LDS Church: Not genetically determined. Eternal significance to gender roles. Diversity of talents within each gender. &quot;Were homosexuality to prevail in the world the human race and all things proper would end.&quot;</td>
<td>LDS Church: Not genetically determined. Eternal significance to gender roles. Diversity of talents within each gender. &quot;Were homosexuality to prevail in the world the human race and all things proper would end.&quot;</td>
<td>LDS Church: Not genetically determined. Eternal significance to gender roles. Diversity of talents within each gender. &quot;Were homosexuality to prevail in the world the human race and all things proper would end.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.S. Manual: Most people are heterosexual. Some &quot;become&quot; attracted to people of their own sex. Some attracted to both. No moral statement.</td>
<td>H.S. Manual: Most people are heterosexual. Some &quot;become&quot; attracted to people of their own sex. Some attracted to both. No moral statement.</td>
<td>H.S. Manual: Most people are heterosexual. Some &quot;become&quot; attracted to people of their own sex. Some attracted to both. No moral statement.</td>
<td>H.S. Manual: Most people are heterosexual. Some &quot;become&quot; attracted to people of their own sex. Some attracted to both. No moral statement.</td>
<td>H.S. Manual: Most people are heterosexual. Some &quot;become&quot; attracted to people of their own sex. Some attracted to both. No moral statement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Parenthood: Realistic, normal. Abstinence is safest, but not the only acceptable choice (p. 5).</td>
<td>Planned Parenthood: Realistic, normal. Abstinence is safest, but not the only acceptable choice (p. 5).</td>
<td>Planned Parenthood: Realistic, normal. Abstinence is safest, but not the only acceptable choice (p. 5).</td>
<td>Planned Parenthood: Realistic, normal. Abstinence is safest, but not the only acceptable choice (p. 5).</td>
<td>Planned Parenthood: Realistic, normal. Abstinence is safest, but not the only acceptable choice (p. 5).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 (continued)

Organization, ideology, and issue

5. Pre-marital Sex (continued)

H.S. Manual: Irresponsible, dangerous, selfish, and not the norm in high school.

6. Family Type

Planned Parenthood: Acceptable as heterosexual or homosexual, married or single.

LDS Church: Homosexuality is never acceptable. Deterioration of traditional family will bring the destruction foretold by prophets. Fidelity within marriage must be absolute. Children are for marriage.


7. Universal Principles

Planned Parenthood: Principles are relative and changeable over time.

LDS Church: Universal, eternal principles exist which all people are subject to regardless of time or culture.

H.S. Manual: Universal principles of behavior provide an unchangeable core from which to act. "As related to sexual intimacy it involves a future orientation rather than immediate gratification."

8. Sex Education in Schools

Planned Parenthood: Should be K-12. Opposition "promote dangerously inaccurate, religiously based programs for brainwashing children" (p. 7).

LDS Church: Sex education is the responsibility of parents not schools. Where schools undertake sex education parents should work to ensure they promote correct moral values.

H.S. Manual: First component of a planned K-12 curriculum.


^B Quotes extracted from A parent's guide. (1986). Salt Lake City, UT: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

### Table A2

**High School Curriculum Ideological Favoritism**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Pl.P</th>
<th>LDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abortion</td>
<td>X 2</td>
<td>0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masturbation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contraception</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homosexuality</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-marital Sex</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Type</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal Principles</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex-ed in Public Sch</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Pl.P (Planned Parenthood) and the LDS Church were selected as representative of the liberal and conservative ideological positions, respectively. 0 = No match; 1 = mild ideological match; 2 = strong ideological match.
eight items, comparing the wording against the ideological messages in papers and interviews he had encountered. While such an analysis is unavoidably subjective, the fact that the author had gained substantial familiarity with both sides may have helped to diminish subjectivity. Further, some systematic attempt at weighing the curriculum seemed necessary given the reality that every interest group and process participant had weighed it in their own way, even if entirely on an emotional basis.

The results indicated that the conservative (LDS) position did better than Eagle Forum rhetoric seemed to allow. However, before dismissing conservative groups' evaluation of the curriculum as unfounded, it may be important to consider a ninth issue which, when projected into a classroom environment, could potentially have the effect of narrowing the gap considerably. The ninth item involves the curriculum's substantial use of peer discussion groups which bring teens together in small numbers to discuss varying sexual or moral decisions within case-scenarios contained in the curriculum. With very few exceptions no "right" answer is indicated. This "wild-card" effect is very difficult to evaluate. However, the potential for some member in a teen discussion group to offer support for non-conservative beliefs concerning, for example, pre-marital sex, homosexuality, or pornography, may be high. This possibility, combined with the ability of teachers to
offer non-conservative answers to student questions, was a major reason for the Eagle Forum's angry opposition to the guide. However, such an argument is speculative and ambiguous; therefore, its propaganda value appeared difficult for the Eagle Forum to capitalize upon. The author would suggest that a classroom-setting study of the "liberal peer hypothesis" would make a good research project. Such a study, if carried out objectively, could have a major impact on the curriculum's continued implementation or adjustment/termination.

Of final interest to analysis of the curriculum is the evaluation of the junior high manual. The author, in the summary of Chapter Five and during the course of Chapter Six, indicated that the junior high curriculum was more liberal than the high school version of the resource file. The reason given was that it contained information on contraception. However, Table A3 demonstrates more completely why the State Curriculum Office and liberal interest groups were so pleased with it. Of the eight categories perviously identified the Planned Parenthood position made gains in four, while suffering zero losses.
### Table A3

**Planned Parenthood Gains in Junior High Curriculum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Observed Deviations in Junior High Curriculum From H.S. Standard.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abortion</td>
<td>Same as High School.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masturbation</td>
<td>Same as High School.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contraception</td>
<td>Information on all common forms included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homosexuality</td>
<td>Eliminated wording implying that homosexuality is not genetic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Type</td>
<td>No appreciable difference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-marital Sex</td>
<td>Eliminated statement emphasizing that most adolescents are not having sex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. Principles</td>
<td>Deleted entirely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex-ed in Schs.</td>
<td>Same as High School.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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