

LeGrand Baker
7071 University Station
Provo, Utah 84602
January 7, 1999

Dear Dil,

Thank you for your letters. I appreciate your concerns about our country, its morality, and its teetering stability. Even though I watch with horror the cultural deterioration which plays out all around us, I am at peace with it all. Not with the events or the immorality, but with the assurance that there is a God in heaven who holds the reigns of world events in his hands.

Some time ago I promised to send you a copy of a letter I wrote to Beverly Campbell in June of 1987. I am now belatedly keeping that promise. I no longer have a copy of page 3 of the original letter. That page dealt with the years 1887-1889. I have supplied that information in brackets in the following copy. There are a few other additions, also in brackets, but the rest of the letter is reproduced here as I wrote it in 1987. After the letter, I have added some other ideas which I did not express to Beverly at that time.

Provo, Utah
June 25, 1987

Mrs. Beverly Campbell
National Press Building, Suite 995
14th and F Streets, N. W.
Washington, DC 20045

Dear Sister Campbell,

Twice during our visit you suggested you would like me to re-tell you the chronology of the years '88. Each time I declined by diverting the conversation. Even though I have told this story to select people, I have always been fearful of being quoted, or rather misquoted, so I liked the notion of your only being able to say you could not quite remember what I had said. I have to admit I would like seeing an article in the Ensign announcing that the last major step preparatory to the establishment of the Kingdom is about to be taken by the great nations of this world, but President Kimball and President Benson have both said that as well as it needs being said. I fear saying it my way would generate more speculation than it would stimulate faith. However you have been so kind to me, and you asked so graciously, I have decided to write it for you.

As a graduate student at the University of Wisconsin I focused my research on the period of the American Revolution and the writing and ratification of the Constitution. My major professor was Merrill Jensen who had a federal grant to do a comprehensive study of the ratification and I was one of his

research associates. In the course of my work I read many (probably most) of the newspapers which were printed in the United States during the period from the writing of the Constitution in 1787 to the beginning of the new government of April 6, 1789.

(Incidentally, since we are playing with dates just now, here is another: The Declaration of Independence was a statement asserting legal justification for Congress's pulling America out of the British Empire. There are three important dates in that connection: The 6th of April, 1776, when Congress actually asserted its independence by closing American ports to British shipping and opening them to every other nation of the world; the 2nd of July 1776 when Congress adopted the Declaration as the statement of why they had left the Empire; and the 4th of July when Congress ordered that the Declaration should be printed. The printer unknowingly establish America's Independence Day by putting only the date of the printing order on the document. [Several years later, on April 6, 1789 the new American government began under the Constitution, when Congress first met as a quorum and opened the ballots of the Electoral Collage and declared George Washing to be our first President.]

But to come back to my story. While I was reading those newspapers I kept finding an interesting article. It was reprinted in newspapers all over the United States. (I enclose a copy which appeared in The New-York Journal. [Dil, a typescript is attached at the conclusion of my letter to you.]) When I first read it, I thought it was interesting but shrugged it off as only that. Such a list can be drawn for any year.

Then, after I had seen the article half dozen or so times, it occurred to me that my observation was not true. A list might be made for any given year, but it would not be a list like this one. The last three events in that sequence (beginning half a millennium ago in 1588, but inserting the ratification of the Constitution in place of the Declaratory Act) were the single most important events in their century. I am defining "important" as meaning the watershed events, those which defined and plotted the course of the establishment of freedom, and which, therefore, lay the foundation for the establishment of the political Kingdom of God.

Those events are these:

- 1) The defeat of the Spanish Armada, 1588. Had the Armada succeeded it is reasonable to assume the inquisition would have defeated Protestant Christianity and along with it, the protestant Work Ethic. It would have also have had a major impact upon the development of the political and legal systems of England and would have precluded England's colonizing North America. But these things did not happen. Spain was defeated and the consequences were: Catholic Spain did not extend beyond the territory it already

controlled, but the empire of Protestant England expanded over much of the world. That, in turn, meant that the principles of English law and freedom were nourished wherever the avarice of English commerce planted the seeds of English colonization. The principles were: Protestant Christianity; the ideals of the Protestant Work Ethic; the ideals of political and religious freedom. In America, it meant that the principles of English law and political philosophy would have a chance to mature into those ideas expressed in the Declaration of Independence and made functional by the Constitution.

- 2) The Glorious Revolution, 1688, was glorious because it was a revolution without bloodshed. The British Parliament staged a rebellion and the king, believing it was a real threat against his life, escaped to France. Parliament then declared his leaving England was an act of abdication and invited William and Mary to come to be joint monarchs of Britain. This established that the king ruled by the invitation and consent of the people and that the elected representatives were the actual governors of Britain. The following year, 1689, the British Parliament passed the Bill of Rights, some of the most important legislation in the history of the Empire, and the pattern for our own Bill of Rights. Thus, in terms of constitutional history, those two years, 1688-1689 were not only the most important in their century, but were among the most important of the last thousand years.
- 3) The same can be said for the years 1787-1789. Throughout the American Revolution, many Americans considered their revolt against England as an American re-play of the Glorious Revolution. It is not true that people like Washington, Jefferson, and John Adams thought of themselves as radical liberals. In fact, they did not consider themselves as liberals at all. They were constitutional conservatives who were determined to retain their rights as Englishmen even if they had to get out of the Empire to do it. After they had proven their point, and it took a war to do it, they set about making their own government. The Declaration of Independence is their statement of ideology; The Constitution is their formula for making that ideology work. The Constitutional Convention submitted the Constitution for ratification by the states in 1787. During 1788 the Constitution was ratified. The new federal government began in 1789. Here again, the most important constitutional events of that century, and in world history, happened during and around the year 1788.
- 4) Well, in my thinking, then, that was that. Statisticians say three or four events are a chance happening, and it takes more than that to make a series. Besides that, even a cursory look at U.S. or world history shows that nothing of that importance happened in 1888. So I let the matter

drop as interesting, but nothing more. Then one day, when I was teaching Institute in Madison, Wisconsin, I heard myself say something like this, "This year, 1888, was the most important pivotal year in the history of the Kingdom of God. In 1877 the prophet died and most of the leaders of the church were in prison or in hiding. In 1888, from all external evidence the church did not exist. It had been dis-incorporated by the government. Its property had been taken away. It held no general conference. It had no president, and the Quorum of the Twelve was rendered dis-functional. But the next year, 1889, everything changed. There was a prophet and that prophet, Wilford Woodruff, set the church on a new and completely course than it had been on up until that time. Before 1888 the Kingdom was a provincial organization whose first object was to stay in existence. After 1888 the provincial church no longer existed. A new church had emerged whose object was to fulfil Daniel's prophecy and convert the entire world." After I said that, I just stood there for a minute or so while I took it all in. The year 1888 was a part of the series. In terms of constitutional history (this time we are talking about the Kingdom of God while before that we were talking about preparations for the kingdom.), the most important juncture of the century (except the restoration itself), and the most important event of the past almost two thousand years occurred in 1887-1889.

It is interesting to me that this 100 year cycle does not go back any further than the Protestant Reformation and the invention of the printing press. But that fact also makes all that I have written mathematically meaningless. I have described a series of only four events: 1588, 1688, 1788, 1888. That number, four, is so small that a statistician would shrug his shoulders and discount it. A series of only four events is statistically as apt to be four random selections as it is to be an actual series. If it is a random selection, it is irrational to draw any titillating conclusions from it. If it is a series, it is as rational to conclude it is a series of only four, as it is to conclude it is the beginning of a longer series, and can therefore be used to make projections about the nature of the rest of the series. I do not pretend to know which of those options is truth.

Notwithstanding I insist I do not know, I will speculate with you. It may not be reasonable to suppose we know when the next watershed event in the history of the development of the Kingdom will occur, but I, at least, feel quite confident about what that event will be.

A hundred years ago many nations were closed to the Gospel because of the traditions of the fathers. In a few instances, Japan and Korea for example, those traditions were weakened by the outcome of war and the gospel was permitted to get it, but most of those nations are still closed. But there is a

difference. Now they are not closed because of the traditions of the fathers. The great majority of those countries which were closed to our missionaries a hundred years ago have been taken over, or are being seriously threatened by Communism. It has challenged, undermined and eroded the traditions which kept us out, but has offered their people nothing to replace the old beliefs except that vacuum of hope which must be the final product of functional egalitarianism. While there are pockets of Communism (such as China) which are not under Russian control, most of the Communist nations are still under Russian domination or are struggling under a Russian financed revolution. So it is only slightly simplistic to say that it is Russian political and international policy which is keeping the missionaries out of most of those parts of the world where they cannot go.

Years ago President McKay said the time would come when the Russian people would over through Communism. From my perspective it appears that is the only way the Russian people will ever be freed from that yoke. I have difficulty with the notion it will be by war. America has not yet fought a successful war against any Communist nation.

Stalin left the Russian government so that one man could have almost absolute control. If such a man wished to restructure the Russian economy he must first unlock that nation and let in the economic ideology and the political prerequisites of a free marketplace. But before any Russian leader could achieve that he would have to find a way to relax the world wide tensions and revolutions which Russia has sponsored for so long. Its the butter and guns thing. Supporting little revolutionary wars all over the world, and trying to obtain military superiority over the free world are too expensive. Continuing those policies must preclude any major alterations of political or economic life at home. It is encouraging to note that the kind of arms limitation treaty the Russians seem to be working for now would be a necessary prerequisite to any honest internal political or economic reforms. If such reforms took place and Russia opened its doors to the ideas and products of a free marketplace, the Church could get in also - probably not only into Russia, but into most of the rest of the now tumultuous world, as well.

I have not the foggiest idea why I have written so long a letter. That certainly was not my intent when I began. But as I wrote, the words kept coming so I guess I will send them. Please do not ever quote me as saying I even think I know what will happen next year. In the first place I can not imagine why it would be any of my business to know. In the second, I do not suppose it will be all that obvious even if it happens. None of the other events were.

For many years after the defeat of the Spanish Armada the English feared another invasion. The outcome of the Glorious

Revolution was not settled until Prince Charles came of age and was defeated in his attempt to invade England and reclaim the throne. Even as late as Jefferson's administration people were saying the "Glorious Experiment" of the American Constitution was destined to failure. In 1888 few people in the church, and fewer yet outside of it, would have supposed they were seeing the birthing pains of the international Kingdom of God. So even if it is true that 1988 will bring with it events which will ultimately reshape the world. You and I may grow old and be out of this world before the significance of such a time is fully realized.

However one thing is sure. If it is true that a momentous event is about to occur which will ultimately make the blessings of freedom and the Gospel available to all the world, then it is also true that Darkness will muster all its agents to try to prevent it, not only in Communist countries, but in the United States as well.

May we and those we love be equal to the times.

Sincerely,

LeGrand Baker

[end of letter to Beverly Campbell]

Well, Dil, as you know, what I suggested was going to happen, did happen. In 1988 Russia wrote a new Constitution. As a result, on November 10, 1989 the Berlin wall came down. Surely those events were the most important events in the constitutional history of the world, as well as in the continued expansion of the Kingdom of God, during the present century

When I was in high school I wanted to know "all things" about our religion and believed the key to knowing was to know the future. So I read the books which were popular then about the last days and the end of the world. As I grew older I discovered two relevant things. 1) that the key of knowing is in the accounts of the Council in Heaven, and the bit about the last days is only a subsection of the decisions of that Council. 2) I have a good enough understanding of the "last days" to satisfy my needs, and the particulars of those events, like trying to put the prophecies in the correct order in which they will be fulfilled, is a fruitless exercise, because their precise sequence won't be made known until the events occur, so I no longer bother to try to figure them out.

Nevertheless, I think the basic outline is important to understand. I also think I have a enough handle on the dynamics of the events if not on the events themselves. That understanding makes me at peace about the future. I would like to tell you why I am appalled at what I see -- and yet am at peace, so let me "prophecy" a little — NOT "as the spirit giveth me utterance," BUT as an historian who knows a little of the undercurrents which dictate the events of human history.

First a little background. The coming of the Saviour at the beginning of the millennium is a unique event, but probably not unique in its type. By that I mean there have been events which

are analogous, in not similar, in history. The two examples I wish to call attention to are the birth of the Saviour, the restoration of the Gospel by the Prophet Joseph.

It took the better part of two thousand years to create the political / economic environment into which the Saviour could be born and his church organized. But lets review only the last 700+ years of that time.

- 5) In 721 BC the Assyrians conquered Israel and transported its people to an area “north” of Jerusalem, probably the area just south of the Black Sea. Some of those “ten lost tribes” were still identifiable in the first century AD when James wrote his epistle “to the twelve tribes which are scattered abroad.” (James 1:1) James letter suggests that members of those scattered tribes were converts to the gospel. If this is so, one may assume that their scattering had put them “in place” in many lands to be the recipients of the gospel in the meridian of time. If that is true, it may be asserted is apparent that the Assyrian conquest and displacement of Israel can be seen as a seeding of those lands of the gentiles with the Children of Israel — and therefore as a necessary part of the preparations looking forward to the success of missionary work in the dispensation of the meridian of times.
- 2) In 587 the same thing happened with the Jews when Jerusalem was destroyed and Nebuchadnezzar removed the people from their homeland. Not long after that, 537 BC, Cyrus decreed that the Jews could return and rebuild their city and temple. Only a few did return, but most had come to feel comfortable in their new homes. They remained outside of Palestine and prospered there, for they were not persecuted in the Persian empire. The result was that at the time of Christ, it is probable that the great majority of Jews lived outside Palestine and had been assimilated into the Persian, Greek and Roman empires. The result of that was that by the time of Christ there were large Jewish communities in all the major cities of the Roman empire. The timing of the introduction of Christianity to the world was extraordinary because at that time the Roman Empire permitted more religious freedom than had ever been permitted before, or would be again until relatively modern times. Consequently Paul and the other missionaries were permitted to preach almost without restraint. When they went to a new city, they first taught in established Jewish synagogues, thus, once again, the scattered people become the seeding of the gentile nations so the gospel could be preached among them.
- 3) During those same 600 years there had been a religious revolution all over the ancient Near East. When Nebuchadnezzar was king, the ancient Near Eastern religions were very diverse, with local gods being worshiped by each city and town. Even though the local names of these gods were different, they all had essentially the same functions and their mythologies were essentially the same. The power of the gods was made manifest when the worshipers got what they asked for, when the worshipers didn’t get what they wanted it was evidence the gods were angry. One tried to get good things from the gods by bribing them

(that's what the idea sacrifices had evolved into) but the idea of getting good things by repenting and turning from evil was unknown to the non-Israelite religions of the ancient Near East. However, that changed soon after Nebuchadnezzar, with the coming of Cyrus. He and his successor kings of the Persian empire were Zoroastrians whose theology was marked by a belief in a cosmic war between good and evil. With this new religion, the idea of repentance came to supplant the idea of bribing the old gods with sacrifices. Even though the Persians were tolerant of other religions, the old-style gods could not survive in the climate of Zoroastrianism, so, with no one left to believe in them, the old gods simply ceased to exist. Even the Jews (who did already have repentance as a part of their old theology) changed their religious beliefs. They abandoned Elohim, Jehovah, and the Council in Heaven, and worshiped only Jehovah in a kind of undefinable monotheism which looked like the later Christian apostate monotheism. The Jews apparently changed to monotheism so their religion would fit better into the political and religious context of the Persian empire.

The Persians were conquered by the Greeks whose gods acknowledged that people could think logically but who were capricious and only occasionally made men responsible for what they thought and did. The Roman empire, which superseded the Greek, recognized the legitimacy of participatory government and equality before the law. But while it was reasonable to have persons make decisions based on law, the Roman gods did not act consistently, according to law. People could worship (sometimes, still bribe) them, but the religions posited no personal relationship between the masses and the gods. So there was a sort of vacuum in the religion of the people. Their culture acknowledged that men could think and act rationally, participate in their own government, and be equal before the law. But their religions did not contain those same ideas. In our day, historians have recognized that Christianity answered needs which the other religions had only created. The Christian religion filled those vacuums because those ideas were a part of the earliest Christian religion. Early Christianity recognized that people could think, and it also taught that they are responsible for their actions. Repentance was both possible and necessary. The god of the Christians was a personal god.

- 4) During those same years there were major political changes as well. The Greek emphasis on logic, human ability to think, and the idea that people should be responsible for what they thought, opened the way to the practical political conclusion that people ought to have a say in their government. Greek democracy was reserved for the elite, but its ideas created a powerful and unanswerable question. If people can be responsible for their actions in this life, and that has a direct bearing on the way they are governed, why does it not follow that an individual's considered thoughts and actions have a bearing on his relationship with the gods. (The Greek religions gave no answer.)

As time passed, the Romans developed a different kind of participatory government. In their system the people were governed by their representatives — a republic rather than a democracy. In the Roman system the law was supreme, and every man was (in theory) equal before the law. That principle also

asked a serious theological question. Why is not law supreme in heaven and all men equal before that law and before the gods. (The Roman religions provided no answer.)

In the meantime the Jews had scattered throughout the empire. Their religion posed a question which was as difficult as the others: If men have individual worth before God, why are men loved by God only in accordance to the nationality of their birth and according to their strict obedience to traditional rules, rather than according to their individual worth. (The Jewish religion could provide no answer.)

Christianity answered all these questions. Thus the rise of Christianity can be seen as a kind of cultural revolution as well as a religious one. Indeed, Christianity answered all the questions, filled all the vacuums, which the other religions could neither answer nor fill. Many historians have recognized this. The usual interpretation is that Christianity was simply the natural product of its times. I don't believe that. I see that whole sequence of events which led up to western culture's accepting Christianity as evidence that the Lord prepared that part of the world for the Saviour to be born, and for his church to spread throughout the nations.

- 5) In addition to those religious, governmental, and philosophical questions, there was one other very practical and necessary prerequisite to the establishment of Christianity. That was peace -- the *pax Romana*. The Roman empire had brought peace to its world. It was not a "peaceful" peace, because it was imposed by a very powerful Roman army and an unbending Roman foreign policy. But it was peace without war. Christianity's growth may be seen as a by-product of the military power of the Roman empire. Because of the power and pervasiveness of the empire, all national boundaries had broken down, so Paul, who was a Roman citizen, could freely move from Palestine to Britain without being prohibited by petty kings, and national borders.
- 6) Another product of the Empire which was important to the rise of Christianity was that there was one currency which was accepted throughout the Empire. The fact of that one standardized currency made unrestrained commercial interchange possible throughout the empire. Commercial interchange is a powerful force in the erosion of local cultural norms ("tradition of the fathers"). It also tends to create the necessity for a universal language, which Latin became. Free commerce throughout the empire was important to the rise of Christianity because it caused an erosion of cultural norms and made it easier for individuals and communities to embrace the new Christian religion.

If anyone of those major factors had not been in place, the explosive growth of Christianity could not have happened.

Using the above as a pattern and also as a guide, we now address the question, what were the necessary prerequisites for the restoration of the gospel by the Prophet Joseph. The list is easy to make. It begins with the Renaissance and Reformation in Europe, then focuses in England, then

concludes in America. Lets begin in the middle again, with the printing of the Gutenberg Bible, about 1456.

- 7) The printing press restored to western culture the best thinking of the ancients by re-introducing the ideas of the Greeks, the Romans — and by restoring to Christianity the Bible of the Jews.
- 2) Political freedom was the evolutionary product of a thousand years of British history. It not only gave people the right to participate in their own government, but it also gave people the right to be what they wished to be, and in the place where the wished to live.
- 3) There was peace. That is, the world was free of major wars so Joseph Smith's missionaries could travel. In the most important missionary fields (America, Britain, and northern Europe) missionaries were permitted to travel with almost no legal restraint.
- 4) Freedom of religion which began in England and Europe, was actualized in America before the American Revolution, and became a part of the American Constitution.
- 5) The “new world” gave people an economic advantage they had not known for thousands of years. Throughout human history, ownership of land has always been the basis of political and individual power. In America, very cheap (later free) western land, gave the people who joined the church the economic possibility of gathering to Zion. It also made a reality the principle that a man was responsible for what he thought and what he did, by giving each individual a chance to make something of himself if his health held, and if he was willing to work.

That is a simplistic list, but I think it is enough to make the point.

The principles in those two lists look different in their particular, but they are fundamentally identical. In order for the church to grow there had to be: 1) an appreciation of great ideas and the freedom to exchange those ideas. 2) political freedom. 3) religious freedom. 4) international peace with freedom to move about. 5) a stable and relatively fluid economy.

Now we have taken a quick look at some prerequisites necessary for the establishment of the gospel in the meridian of time, and also the cultural and political foundations laid for the restoration of the gospel by the Prophet Joseph, lets project those principles into the future and ask what will be necessary for the people of the earth to prepare for the second coming.

Our answers will be similar in nature to the above, but strikingly different in scope. We are no longer talking about how to prepare the Mediterranean world for the introduction of Christianity, or what European ideas had to be transported to America and grow there in order to create the proper environment for the Prophet Joseph to restore the gospel. We are talking about how the

entire world must change so that every person in every nation may hear the gospel. That is very, very big concept!

- 6) People all over the world must be able to think. "Able" is a very big word which requires three separate but integral elements.
 - 7) Their brains need to be able to work. Brains of children who are malnourished before birth and during the first two years after birth, do not develop the same number of brain cells as children who have enough to eat. That is critical to one's ability to think because after age two the number of cells in a human brain is established for life. Since that number does not change, people who were malnourished as tiny children have a limited ability to think when they become adults. Before the gospel can be taught to the whole world, there must be an economic revolution which will make it possible for children in third world countries to have enough to eat, so when they grow up they will be able to understand the gospel and function in correct and productive priesthood and family roles.
 - b) People in every part of the world must be in a political / religious environment which will permit freedom of thought and freedom of religion. Before the gospel can be taught to the world there must be a social/cultural/political/economic revolution which will give everyone the right to think, and the power to be responsible for what they think.
 - c) They must have a teacher. In order for the gospel to be taught to the world, the Saints have to become spiritually ready, and numerically strong enough to teach the world.
- 2) National boundaries must be broken down so the missionaries can move about the world unencumbered by regulations imposed by unfriendly nations.
- 3) There needs to be a cultural blending which not only gives people an opportunity to think independently, but also the desire to do so. Otherwise the "traditions of the fathers" will stand in the way of conversions. The most efficient way of removing national boundaries and encouraging a cultural blending would be to create a one-world economy.
- 4) There needs to be world wide peace. The most powerful impetus for world peace would be a world-wide economy. Such an economy would encourage -- actually require -- a international peace. I believe wars fought hereafter will be to bring nations in line with the new world economy, rather than being wars of national aggression. Commercial exchange not only stimulates trade in goods, but also in ideas. It both erodes and enriches the traditions and thinking of the people.

- 5) As happened before the time of the Saviour, the old local gods have to be shown to be false so they won't get in the way of people's being converted. I suspect that will happen rather dramatically in about 25 or 30 years at the battle of Armageddon. Then everyone on this earth will have a vivid testimony that Christ is God. *Remember, what you are reading is a prophecy by an historian, not a prophecy by a Prophet.* I will not bother to justify that dating now, but as you read on, it will probably be clear to you why I think 25 or 30 will be about the time when, in the sequence of events, the Lord will announce to the world that He is God, and that the Mormons have his legitimate authority.

I'm sure it has been obvious to you that I have not only tried to show the necessity of a one-world government, but also something of how it will be accomplished. Before you abandon me as a raving liberal, let me say a bit more about what I think of the coming one-world government.

I have taught American Constitutional History at BYU for many years. During those years I have pointed out to my students the way (pattern of rationale, sequence of steps) the powers which originally belonged to the individual states in the United States have been transferred to the federal authority.

The rationale for this transfer is usually quite simple. All one has to do is define a problem as bigger than a state, and its solution must become the property of the federal government. The first problem to be defined that way, regulation of the rail roads, resulted in the creation of the first federal bureaucracy, the Interstate Commerce Commission. Now a multiplicity of other "national" problems, ranging from acid rain to the way used needles are disposed of in doctor's offices, have resulted in a multiplicity of federal bureaucracies.

The methods by which state and local governmental authority has been absorbed by the federal government are also simple and can be reduced to two basic principles. 1) Create a bureaucracy which exercises state and local authority but which reports to a federal authority. 2) The federal government gives money to support programs carried out by the states -- but which have to conform to federal standards or the money stops. Using that rationale and those two methods, the federal government has acquired much of the power which originally belonged to the states.

I have also watched the same thing happen on an international level. Under the pressure of the rationale that many problems are global rather than national ("global warming" being one of the best examples, global economy is another) those two methods have been applied and nations have transferred bits and pieces of their national sovereignty to the United Nations, NATO, and international organizations which control and enforces large regional trade agreements. The rationale and pattern for transferring national sovereignty to international organizations is the same pattern and rationale which has been used for transferring state and local authority to the national government. And when it occurs, both the patterns and the rationale are recognizable. The transfer of power from the state to the nation, or from the nation to an international agency is always accelerated when a crises occurs which is too big for the smaller government so the larger must obviously step in. Local wars which disrupt world economy are the most readily accessible example.

My political philosophy is, by my own definition, that of a “constitutional conservative.” I learned the principles of my politics from the men whose writings I read when I was in graduate school. Men like Madison, Washington, Jefferson, and John Adams were my tutors. They would have been horrified at the idea of turning over American sovereignty to a one-world government, and the *idea of a one-world government is repulsive to me*. Yet I believe it is inevitable and necessary if the gospel is to be preached to everyone on the earth. And I am not afraid. Even though the concentration of world wide power into the hands of a few unelected persons is full of danger, my belief in two principles overrides my long-term fear of such power. First, there is a God in Heaven who will use natural means to order world affairs so that his promises will be fulfilled. Second, there is a God in Heaven who will never let any earthly power get so big it will destroy his Kingdom. Still I can’t help but be somewhat apprehensive — not about the end result, but about the trouble between now and then.

I suspect that in the next 25-30 years we will see the UN take on all the characteristics of a powerful world wide government. That is a danger because its officials are appointed by the member nations, they are not elected by the people, and do not have to report to the people. Most of the structure for a one-world government is already in place, but one necessary power still is left to be transferred to the UN. It is the power to tax. This is the most fundamental power of any sovereign government. It will bring with it independent military power by which the UN can impose its decisions on nations, and police power to impose itself on their domestic affairs. The UN already exercises limited military powers and some authority over international affairs. Police power is not that critical to its sovereignty just now, because the UN can get on for a time without it just as the American federal government did before it had the FBI and the IRS. But the UN will continue to have only limited military and diplomatic authority until it also has the authority to raise its own money. When it has the power to tax it will also have the power to exercise at will its powers of coercion. On the day the UN gets the power to tax the one-world government will be an accomplished fact. (If the United States paid its obligations to the UN, there would be less of a need for the UN to get the power to tax. I have wondered if that is the reason the US withholds money from the UN.)

A number of international trade treaties, which are the beginning of a one-world economy, are already in place. The next step is a single world currency. When the Europeans show the advantage of their unified monetary system other nations in other parts of the world will want to get into that or a similar system. I noticed in the 16 Jan. 1999 *Deseret News* a Reuters report that in Buenos Aires, the Argentine president has “directed his economy minister to study the possibility of adopting the U.S. dollar as a common currency throughout the Americas.” The object, said the newspaper, is to have such a system in place by the year 2005. It is not likely that Americans would give up part of their national sovereignty by abandoning their own currency in favor of a new monetary system like the one being worked out in Europe, but that same end could be accomplished if the smaller nations would simply adopt our money as theirs.

When one observes how far we have moved in those directions in the last 30 years, it leaves one bewildered to contemplate what might happen at an accelerated rate in the next 30.

It takes three generations to change a people. The first generation are the prophets of the new order. The second generation make it work. The third generation abandon its fervor in favor of

some practical kind of compromise between its most attractive parts and the most attractive parts of the cultures around them. Just two examples are 1) It took three generations between the coming of the New England Puritans and the demise of that religion. 2) It took about three generations from the rise of Communism in Russia until the time of the political collapse of Communism. A major exception to that rule is the continuance of the LDS church. The reasons the LDS church does not follow that pattern are: First, there is always a first generation in the great numbers of new converts; and second, each individual, no matter how long his family has been in the church, when he is converted by the Holy Ghost takes on the characteristics of the "first generation." There are people who drop out of the church with third generation syndrome, but that does not impact the LDS church like it did the Puritans because there are many more coming into the LDS church than there are going out.

I see the events of Third Nephi as the pattern for the Second Coming of Christ. If that pattern holds, then one might expect two major events to happen before that final event. The first would be analogous to the time when the sun went down and it did not get dark. In America, that was so well publicized in advance, so obvious, and so universally recognized when it came, that no one could doubt it was real, or that it was a testimony of the Divinity of Christ and of the truthfulness of his one authorized church. In Third Nephi, after that sign, there was a time during which the people had sufficient opportunity to either repent or decide not to repent. After that time, the second major event which preceded the coming of Christ was the natural catastrophe when both earth and heaven revolted at men's wickedness and nature itself cleansed the earth. That catastrophe set the stage for the coming of Christ.

I suspect we will see that same pattern again.

I suppose the event analogous to the night of light in Third Nephi, which will be so dramatic that everyone on the earth will know for himself that Christ is God will be when the two prophets spoken of in Revelation are resurrected in the streets of Jerusalem at the conclusion of the battle of Armageddon, and the Saviour will come to be seen by the world, therefore they will know for themselves. It is my opinion that the battle of Armageddon will happen at least three generations before the second of those two events because there is a whole world which needs changing. It is also my opinion that after those three generations, an event analogous to the earthquakes and darkness in Third Nephi will occur. I do not believe the Second Coming will happen without those two warnings for the following three reasons.

First, it seems to me that the appearance of Christ after the battle of Armageddon because I do not believe the Second Coming will happen without sufficient warning, and I think the nature of that warning will be sufficient for everyone on earth. That is, everyone will actually be warned in a way he cannot disregard. The dramatic conclusion of the battle of Armageddon would be such a warning.

Second, I don't think the Second Coming will happen before the world is ready, and since more than half the world's population is not even Christian, I don't think those of people are going to join the church in great numbers until they and their leaders have unqualified evidence that Christ is God. So, if the world needs to get ready for the Second Coming, it seems to me that it will require an event which everyone will recognize to show them what they have to do to

prepare. It is my opinion that the events described in Revelation surrounding the battle of Armageddon will be that declaration and that warning.

Third, I do not believe the Second Coming will occur until after the earth has been cleansed, and I do not believe there will be such a cleansing until after the people have been sufficiently warned.

Now, putting all that together, the following is the pattern of events which history suggests to me one should expect in the years following the dramatic announcement that Christ is God.

The people of the first generation (20 years) will probably show all the enthusiasm which is typical of new converts. Some of those converts will join the church because they truly believed, others for the same reason everyone became Christians when the Roman Empire adopted Christianity as the state religion -- because it seems the proper and advantageous thing to do. But no matter the reason, the new members will be characterized by enthusiasm for their new faith.

The second generation will make it work. It will not be the millennium, but it will look like one in its peace and prosperity. (I think Isaiah 2-5 is a prophecy of the time we are discussing.)

The third generation (if my timetable is correct, that is the third 20 years, or about 60 years from the battle of Armageddon. If Armageddon happens between 2025 and 2030, then the first generation would be between 2030 and 2050, the second generation between 2050 and 2070, the third between 2070 and 2090 — and 2087, 88, 89 is right at the end of that time.) That third generation, the one between about 2070 and 2090 is the one which is frightening to me.

When the people in Fourth Nephi began to fall away from the truth, they fell very fast. Self confidence and pride, brought about by riches without recognized responsibility, seems to have been the root of their downfall. Then “they did deny the more parts of his gospel, insomuch that they did receive all manner of wickedness, and did administer that which was sacred unto him to whom it had been forbidden because of unworthiness.” (4 Ne. 1:27) I think that means the apostate church looked just like the true church, except it was easier to get a temple recommend in one than it was in the other. My personal belief is that when that happens again the Book of Mormon prophecy will be fulfilled that there will be only two churches, and the larger will try to destroy the smaller.

Consider the scenario I have presented: a one-world government which “rules” in “conjunction” with a one-world church. It sounds like a millennial reign, except, characteristically, in that third generation some who exercise power in government and church will love that power and will look upon the Prophet and his followers as old fogies who are in the way of total world domination. When that happens, I suspect, the Prophet and his followers will be excommunicated by the power mongers, and plans will be put in operation to eliminate them completely.

So what will happen in 2088? The single most important event of that century: the heavens and the earth will revolt at the wickedness of the people and a natural catastrophe will bring about

the total destruction of the wicked who control the one-world government and threaten to exterminate the faithful. How will it happen? The same way it happened in the Book of Mormon, the powers of heaven and earth will combine to conquer and destroy the wicked. (That, by the way, was also how the wicked were symbolically defeated and destroyed during the pageantry of the ancient Israelite New Year's festival.)

I think when it happens, it will happen like this:

v. 14 But, behold, I say unto you that before this great day shall come the sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall be turned into blood, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and there shall be greater signs in heaven above and in the earth beneath;

v. 15 And there shall be weeping and wailing among the hosts of men;

v. 16 And there shall be a great hailstorm sent forth to destroy the crops of the earth.

v. 17 And it shall come to pass, because of the wickedness of the world, that I will take vengeance upon the wicked, for they will not repent; for the cup of mine indignation is full; for behold, my blood shall not cleanse them if they hear me not.

v. 18 Wherefore, I the Lord God will send forth flies upon the face of the earth, which shall take hold of the inhabitants thereof, and shall eat their flesh, and shall cause maggots to come in upon them;

v. 19 And their tongues shall be stayed that they shall not utter against me; and their flesh shall fall from off their bones, and their eyes from their sockets;

v. 20 And it shall come to pass that the beasts of the forest and the fowls of the air shall devour them up.

v. 21 And the great and abominable church, which is the whore of all the earth, shall be cast down by devouring fire, according as it is spoken by the mouth of Ezekiel the prophet, who spoke of these things, which have not come to pass but surely must, as I live, for abominations shall not reign. (D&C 29:13-21)

The biggest question in that prophecy is this: What about that "great hailstorm sent forth to destroy the crops of the earth." Weather patterns of this world make it impossible for a single hailstorm to destroy all the earth's crops. There is not that much water in the air at one time, besides that, no matter what the time of year, there is always more than half of the earth which is experiencing weather too warm to produce hail storms.

I wondered about that until I learned that the head of comets are huge blocks of ice. If a comet passed between the earth and the sun, it would appear that the sun had gone dark. The particles in the air would give the moon a red appearance, and as the fragments of the comet fell, it would look like all the stars in the sky were falling. When the head of the comet enters the earth's atmosphere the comet explodes, perhaps there will be a series of explosions over different parts of

the earth. Those explosions would cause electromagnetic waves would wipe out all electrical communications and all electric machines (everything from telephones to automobiles.). Thus bringing to a stop all electrically based forms of communication. The pieces of ice which are large enough to survive the heat of the fall through the earth's atmosphere would cause a world wide catastrophe which will destroy cities, people, economies, and the government of the wicked. Great and small chunks of ice hitting the earth will cause destruction where the ice lands, but will not cause the same sort of enormous dust cloud and total destruction which would result if a single huge rock from space collided with the earth's surface. I think (remember this is only me, the historian, speaking) that sometime between 2087 and 2089 when the forces of evil have announced their plans for the utter extermination of the righteous, the a comet will collide with the earth, wipe out the wicked, and leave the earth cleansed so that final preparations can begin to be made for the Second Coming of Christ. How long after that those preparations will take, and when that looked for event will be, I haven't the foggiest idea.

Dil, as I watch the world I live in deteriorate into a chaos of wickedness, I feel concern for my children, grandchildren, and beyond. Not because I think they will not be strong enough to get through it, but because I do not like the idea that they have to wallow in so much filth. But that is the limit of my concern -- even for that third generation I spoke of. I suspect that of my descendants, those who will come in that third generation will be the ones who will suffer the most, and I suspect it will require all their faith -- and much effort on the part of those of us who have already died -- to get them through that mess. But they will be OK, because at the Council in Heaven they were promised they would be OK. They will be on earth then, because they were assigned in the Council to bring off triumphant, righteousness in this world.

Well, Dil, for what its worth, that's the way I suspect things will happen. I don't pretend to *know*, but in those notions I find beautiful peace. I see the past world history as a living testimony that God is the Lord of heaven and earth, and that he orders the affairs of men according the best interest of the righteous, and according the plan agreed upon by the gods in Council. I also see the remainder of this world's history as a continuation of that testimony.

With my Love,

LeGrand

A typescript of the newspaper article I mentioned to Beverly follows:

The New-York Journal, and Daily Patriotic Register, Saturday, July 19, 1788

[This article is copied] From the London Evening Post, May 5 -

The history of this country [England] for the last thousand years — points out the year eighty-eight in every century within that time, as a remarkable aera. — The following selection of facts, while it establishes this position cannot fail of being entertaining.

DANISH INVASION.

In the year 788 the Danes first invaded England, in a large body — At the close of the preceding summer, a few Danish adventurers landed: — but they were not formidable until about the middle of the year 788, when they made a descent in military array, and waged war against the Saxon Monarchs.

888

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE MILITIA and NAVY.

Alfred the Great, who will ever be the boast of this country, in 888 laid the foundation of English glory — he divided the country into hundreds and tythings — he ordained that his people should be armed and registered — he assigned them a regular rotation of duty — and formed, for the first time, a militia, for the defence of the kingdom. — His marine was formed on the same wise principle — and as Hume observes, “the whole kingdom was like one great garrison.”

In this year Alfred launched the first ships of force ever constructed in England — by means whereof he subdued the Danes, and protected that commerce, it was so much his object to establish with the neighboring nations.

988

DANISH DEPREDATIONS

This year is not made remarkable beyond any other of the reign of Ethelred — during which it was the practice of the Monarchs of Denmark to land, and require large tributes of money.

1088

CIVIL WAR

William Ruffus, was in the year 1088 called to protest his right to the throne by arms. Odo, bishop of Raveux, with the earl of Kent, and large bodies of the English nobility, appeared in the field in favor of Robert, William's elder brother. — This conspiracy was not quelled until a great number of lives were lost — it ended, however in a treaty between Robert and William, that the survivor of those two should possess both the Duchy of Normandy, and the Crown of England.

1188

CRUSADES

On the 21st of January, 1188, Henry the Ild. of England, met Philip of France near Gifors — and kissed the cross, in confirmation of their intentions of uniting in the Crusades, against the Saracens. — All Europe was incited by their example, to assist in the holy wars, which were, for the first time, thus set on foot. [In 1187 Jerusalem had been lost to the Saracens. Sometime in the early part of that century the Knights Templar seem to have been organized as an arm of the Order of Sion, but in the year, 1188, there was a formal separation between the Order of Sion and

the Knights Templar, making the Knights Templar an independent organization.]

Towards the close of this year, the French King excited Prince Richard of England to revolt against his father, which occasioned a general disturbance through the land. — The army of Richard was so formidable that the good old king was compelled to submit to the terms that his son proposed.

1288

PUNISHMENT of the JUDGES

Edward I, in this year, took a review of the conduct of his judges; and in the succeeding one called a parliament, before whom he made a representation of the abuses they had made of their high trust. — They were brought to trial — and all, except two, who were clergymen, were convicted of taking bribes: the amount of the fines levied on them, is, as Hume observes, “an argument of their guilt; being above one hundred thousand marks; an immense sum in those days, and sufficient to defray the charges of an expensive war between two great nations. The king afterwards made the new judges swear they would take no bribes!”

1388

INSURRECTION of the LORDS

According to Hume, on the 3d of February 1388, the Lords appeared at London with an army of 40,000 men, and obliged the king, Richard II, to summons a parliament — before whom five of his stare ministers, were impeached, and found guilty of high treason — two of them, sir Nicholas Brambre, and sir Robert Tresilian were executed. — The judges who were seized at the beginning of the insurrection, were banished, and the king compelled to renew his coronation oath and pass a general pardon.

1488

INSURRECTION of the PEOPLE

After the rebellion of their preceding year, in which Lambert Simnel was made an instrument, was suppressed, a violent insurrection broke out in the north. — In Sept. 1488, it appeared most terrifying to Henry VII. — The commissioners deputed to collect a tax the king required, were violently opposed — and the earl of Northumberland interfering, the people headed by sir John Egremont, flew to arms, attacked the earl in his own castle, and killed him — and it was with difficulty the rebellion was quelled. [Some historians have suggested this rebellion was sponsored by an underground society which had once been the Knights Templar, and would become the Masonic Order. It is also suggested that the teachings of this underground society were a major factor in establishing the idea of democracy and freedom of religion in England.]

1588

SPANISH ARMADA.

The Spaniards sent out their great Armada this year, to invade England; but meeting first with a violent storm — and afterwards being attacked by the English navy — and their vessels

destroyed by our fire ships, they returned home in disgrace, and felt England the triumphant power.

1688

[THE GLORIOUS] REVOLUTION

On the 28th of January, 1688, the commons resolved, “That king James II, having endeavored to subvert the constitution by breaking the original contract between king and people! and having violated the fundamental laws, and withdrawn himself out of the kingdom — hath abdicated the government — and that the throne is thereby vacant” — which resolution being confirmed by the Lords — the Prince of Orange was in consequence invited over: — who acknowledged the rights of the subject, and received the crown.

1788

DECLARATORY ACT &c

The present year is marked by the force and energy of the declaratory bill, followed by a nervous and violent protest of the peers, and the trial of Mr. Hastings, last governour general of the East-Indies.

[end of newspaper article]