Robert L. Millet, review of Bruce C. Hafen’s *The Broken Heart*. SLC: Deseret Book, 1989, in *BYU Studies*, Vol. 30:4, pp. 62-64. Those of us in the U.S. have developed a preoccupation with excellence during the last two centuries. Books and tapes and seminars abound. Counsel, advice, directions, charts, schemes, and planners fill the earth. Organization and effectiveness are fine. But too much goal-setting, inordinate structure, and planning can cause us to focus on ourselves unduly—on our views, our desires, our abilities, and our strengths. Such things can, if unchecked, militate against a trust in God... “I cannot help wondering,” [Bruce Hafen] writes, “what we are doing to each other in the Church these days, as we subtly but continually reinforce in one another the assumption that tangible and visible ‘rewards’ and ‘success’ are promised those who do what is right or even those who work their hardest. Where does that assumption come from? It certainly is not taught by the gospel.”

Charity is not bestowed, however, simply to motivate us to serve others, noble as such a cause is. “Those whose religious purpose only in terms of ethical service in the relationship between man and fellowmen may miss that divinely ordained possibility [to become as Christ is].”

In short, social gospel programs, though ostensibly beneficial, are in the end woefully deficient.

President Ezra Taft Benson, *Conference Report*, April 1988, pg. 4. When we put God first, all other things fall into their proper place or drop out of our lives. Our love of the Lord will govern • the claims for our affection • the demands on our time • the interests we pursue, and • the order of our priorities.

President Ezra Taft Benson, “Beware of Pride,” General Conference, *Ensign*, May 1989, pg. 5. Would we not do well to have the pleasing of God as our motive rather than to try to elevate ourselves above our brother and outdo another?

Glenn L. Pace, General Conference, *Ensign*, May 1986, pg. 24. At the conclusion of a General Welfare Services Executive Committee meeting, where I felt I had waxed eloquent in discussing farms, trucks, silos, and canneries, President [Marion G.] Romney invited me into his office for an unscheduled meeting. He asked one question: “Brother Pace, why is it we never discuss principles and doctrines anymore?” I have not been the same since I heard that penetrating inquiry.... Did they [the poor, humble folk of South America who relied on family help, not institutional help] have the welfare program? Yes—in its purist form.

I fear we have learned too much over the years about programs at the expense of insufficient understanding of principles. If we had learned more principles, priesthood leaders all over the world would be solving local problems with local resources without waiting for something to come from Church headquarters. Members would be helping each other without waiting for an assignment.

Programs blindly followed bring us to a discipline of doing good, but principles properly understood and practiced bring us to a disposition to do [or to be] good.

Dean L. Larsen, Regional Representatives Seminar, 1 April 1983. I would like to share with you some information from a study that has just been completed by the Church among young men ages 12-18. While the findings from this study relate specifically to the young men of the Aaronic Priesthood age, there is good reason to believe that they have relevance for young women as well.

This study presumed that there are outcomes or results in the lives of young people that have special importance. These outcomes are determined in part by the extent to which young men engage in private religious behavior.

### GOAL SETTING & SERVICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Probability for Young Men Engaging in Private Religious Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participating in religious group activities</td>
<td>5 times more likely to engage in private religious behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in religious group activities</td>
<td>3 times more likely to engage in private religious behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in religious group activities</td>
<td>2 times more likely to engage in private religious behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in religious group activities</td>
<td>1 times more likely to engage in private religious behavior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study attempted to determine what factors in the lives and experiences of young men seem to have the greatest influence upon their achievement of the objectives we have just named. I presume that when we know what these factors are, we will be in a better position to instruct those for whom we provide leadership in how better to bring them to bear in getting the necessary results. My purpose, then, is not simply to present you with some interesting facts, but to give you some tools to work with. How effectively we use them will be reflected in large measure by what kind of difference occurs during the next months and years with regard to how many more Aaronic Priesthood young men in our areas, regions, and stakes qualify for the Melchizedek Priesthood, then receive their temple endowments, serve missions, and marry in the temple. That will be the real measuring rod.

The study gave consideration to the importance of the influence of public and private religious behavior in the lives of the young men. As you will note on this chart, public religious performance is related to participation in meetings and activities, such as attendance at priesthood meeting, as show on the left-hand side of the graphic. Private religious behavior has to do with those kinds of religious experiences that are not measure or counted on correlated reports, such as personal scripture study and private prayers, as shown on the right-hand side of the chart. You will see that the involvement of young men in public religious performance is much heavier than it is in the private religious experiences in their lives.

This discrepancy between public religious performance and the involvement in private religious experience is of tremendous importance in determining whether or not the youth achieve the desired outcomes in their lives. The study among young men disclosed that private religious behavior is much more powerful in this regard than is in performance. This finding tells us something of great importance about where we should be placing emphasis. If we communicate to our young people that their participation in meetings and activities is the most essential part of their religious lives, and they do not feel our constant concern for the influences that work in the private religious experience, then we will not be as effective as we should be in helping them achieve the ultimate objectives. It would appear from the findings in the recent study that our youth are presently under the general impression that what matters most is their participation in the public religious performances. If this is true to any degree, we have a reason for bringing this emphasis into better balance. This is one of the things we can do to make a difference in the outcomes.

The factor that has by far the greatest effect on the private religious life of our youth and upon their achievement of the desired outcomes is home religious observance. If a young person lives in a home situation where there is regular family prayer, regular family study of the gospel and the scriptures, and agreement on basic values, the likelihood of his going on a mission and being married in the temple is greatly enhanced.

This home and family influence is much more significant than that exercised by peer groups or by program participation. In fact, the influence of the home, whether it be positive or negative, is overwhelming. It is more powerful than all the other influences combined.

Young men born in homes where a temple marriage is intact are five times as likely to serve missions and receive their temple endowments, three times as likely to be ordained to the Melchizedek Priesthood, one-third as likely to marry non-members as young men not born into these circumstances.

Young men born in homes where a temple marriage is intact are five times as likely to serve missions and receive their temple endowments, three times as likely to be ordained to the Melchizedek Priesthood, one-third as likely to marry non-members as young men not born into these circumstances.
we will make a great deal of difference in the levels of service and activity among our youth until we make a difference in the spiritual environment in the homes from which they come. Now when we decide our own lives if we feel that we are going to make any substantial difference in the present level in the performances of our young people until we have made a significant difference in their home life. Now I don't wish to diminish in any way the importance of program participation and that kind of activity, about the arrangement of, or re-emphasis upon, programs and activities will not produce the results that we so much desire. It is almost impossible to overcome the influence of a home whether for good or evil, and that's an important fact that has been validated emphatically in this new study.

Outside the family, the most potential source of influence in a young person’s life is a trusted, adult adviser. With Latter-day Saint young men, this influence has more potential for positive outcomes than that of peers or of Church programs and activities. As the young man reaches the age to become a priest, this relationship with an adult leader outside his immediate family becomes increasingly important.

The recent study among the young men of the Church indicated that the person most likely to fill this role at the present time is the Aaronic Priesthood quorum advisor. His influence is even more potent than that of the bishop. This fact may have two important implications for us. One is that our bishops have been increasingly diverted from the youth of their wards. We need to ask ourselves whether this fact has contributed to the lack of activity and service among our young people. The second one is that we need to give great care to the selection of Aaronic Priesthood quorum and Young Women class advisors. This is a matter about which we can all inquire as we meet with stake and ward leaders. The study showed that age, education, occupation, management skills, etc., have low impact on whether these adult advisors have the kind of influence with youth that it is possible and desirable for them to have. The important qualities that must be possessed for the right relationship to exist are as indicated in the graphic. The advisor must be trusted, admired, respected, caring, a confidant, etc.

Dean L. Larsen, “Self-Accountability and Human Progress,” transcription, nd., np. Regimented behavior is incapable of producing the level of spiritual development required to qualify one for eternal life. A necessary range of freedom and self-accountability is essential to one's spiritual development. One must, with an understanding of correct principles and an intrinsic desire to apply them, be motivated from within to do many good things of his own free will, for, as the revelation says, the power is in him wherein he is an agent unto himself.

We must have a deep concern for preserving an environment which fosters a spirit of freedom and self-determination. We cannot ignore the need for carefully ordered structure and procedure for group action within government or any other organization. This is not an argument for anarchy. It underlies, however, the need for careful balance between that which is programmed for the group and that which is reserved for the conscience and incentive of the individual. It is a concern which may touch any sector of our lives in matters of politics and economy as well as in religion and morals.

It would appear that the same balance of freedom and restraint spoken of by the Lord with respect to the Constitution and national government has application to many other areas of our lives. It can apply to relationships within families and communities, and it cannot be ignored in our assignments of responsibility within the Church. I have often pondered the term “unrighteous dominion” as it was used in the cautionary expressions of Joseph Smith which appear in the 121st section of the Doctrine and Covenants. We are warned “that it is the nature and disposition of almost all men (and I presume we could add almost all women), as soon as they get a little authority, as they suppose, they will immediately begin to exercise unrighteous dominion.” (D&C 121:39.)

How do men, or women, unrighteously dominate the lives of others? How can the principle of balanced freedoms and restraints apply to our relationships within our families and within our Church responsibilities? Is there reason to be cautious in this area of our lives? Remember that the Lord said with respect to national government that anything “more or less” than the ideal balance he had provided would have an evil effect and would be detrimental to human progress.

In March 1940, President J. Reuben Clark made the following remarks for the First Presidency in a meeting with general auxiliary leaders. He recognized the need for restraint, even within the framework of the Church and its design to help members perfect their lives. President Clark said: “… the work of the Church in all fields is standing in grave danger of being regimented down to the minutest detail. The result of that is that not only will all the initiative be crushed out, but that an opportunity for the working of the Spirit will be eliminated. The Church has not been built on that principle… It will be a mistake to assume that there is not a great and sufficient reservoir of initiative in the Church to carry on if that reservoir be drawn upon. Such initiative existed in the past; it exists now.” (From a memorandum of the First Presidency to general auxiliary leaders.)

I have pondered the injunctions that have come to us in recent months from leaders of the Church to simplify and reduce the amount of programmed activity that has been prescribed for the members. There seems to be a sensitivity to the need for maintaining the essential balance previously alluded to. We have heard increased emphasis given to the need for individual initiative and accountability within families. In April 1979 in his concluding remarks at the General Conference of the Church, President Kimball said: “… the basic decisions needed for us to move forward as a people must be made by the individual members of the Church…. The major strides which must be made by the Church will follow upon the major strides to be made by us as individuals…. Our individual spiritual growth is the key to major numerical growth in the Kingdom…. Only as we see clearly the responsibility of each individual and the role of families and the home can we properly understand that the priesthood quorums and the auxiliary organizations, even wards, and stakes, exist primarily to help members live the gospel in the home.”

Occasionally we may hear expressions of concern that giving the members of the Church too much self-determination in their application of gospel principles will lead to a relaxation of compliance with these principles. We must realize, however, that optimum individual progress can occur only when conditions are ideal for it. These conditions must include the necessary degree of freedom and self-accountability. Anything less will guarantee stunted spiritual growth.

Programmed behavior and performance may have some temporary value as a defense against overt negative behavior, since it fills one’s time with “constructive” activity. It has never been demonstrated, however, that programmed behavior, even when it is correct, has the power to lift one to the level of self-motivation and commitment associated with celestial life. There is an essential element of individual freedom and initiative that must be present for this type of development to occur. To argue that people generally cannot be entrusted with this kind of freedom is to argue against the very purpose of mortal life.

As the freedom for unrestricted development is enhanced, the possibilities for failure are also increased. That is one of the jeopardies of the Lord's plan. The risk factor is great. The ideal cannot be achieved otherwise. Celestial attainment can be reached in no other environment. In such a system there are likely to be more “called” than “chosen.” (D&C 121:34.) Such was the anticipation from the beginning.

We have inspired leaders today who are reconfirming with us the fact that there is no ultimate safety in programmed security where others assume accountability for our direction and performance....
It is the role of the Church to teach the gospel of salvation and redemption through Jesus Christ, to administer the sacred, saving ordinances by proper authority, to provide the basic order within which essential group action can occur, and to preserve purity and correctness of belief and practice. This should not require a complexity of organization and procedure which makes it difficult for a person to be a freely participating member of his family and community. Those who insist that the Church provide for every contingency and need are as much in error as their counterparts who demand that government intervene in every aspect of our lives. In both instances the balance between "more" or "less" is destroyed with the resultant detriment to human progress.

It would seem that it is no more the proper role of the Church to set up an artificial structure of prescribed activity and performance to test our willingness to conform than it is the proper role of government to regulate and manipulate our commerce and communication for the good of government. When either of these agencies is invited or required to step beyond its proper bounds, opportunity for progress among the people is hindered. Freedom and spontaneity within the regular daily transactions of family and community life, when guided by an understanding of gospel principles, are both necessary and largely sufficient for us to prove ourselves and achieve celestial qualities.

These are the essential truths which our leaders are reinforcing for us today. They are challenging truths. They demand much of us. They do not make it easy for us to be complacent nor to bask in a false sense of programmed security. They press us to make our lives better by our own initiative and by our own efforts. They make no unconditional promises.

At the same time, our obedience to them preserves for us the elements of life which make individual progress possible. They make life purposeful and keep it full of promise. They lead to eternal progress. Humanity cannot fulfill its destiny when these truths are disregarded and abused. I cherish them with all my soul and am unreservedly committed to their promulgation among all the peoples of the earth.

Dean L. Larsen, Conference Report, Apr. 1980, pg. 105-6; or Ensign, May 1980, pg. 77-78. We are told in the scriptures that prior to the creation of this earth, fully one-third of all the hosts who contemplated the challenges of mortal life allowed themselves to be deluded into thinking that there were acceptable alternatives to the essential risks that accompany the exercise of agency and free will (see Abr. 3:27-28; Rev. 12:4). The price they paid is beyond comprehension. Today we are being encouraged to accept greater responsibility for the allocation of our time, for our spiritual development through personal and family study of the gospel, and for giving loving Christian service. We must be willing to respond to this new challenge. Our willingness to accept this added accountability will exert an influence that will reach far beyond our Sunday worship service and religious life.

Unless we retain a vibrant desire to be free, and unless we understand and practice the principles that give life to essential freedoms, we have little reason to hope they will endure. If we allow ourselves to accept dependency and regulation and to cease valuing independence and accountability, then we are vulnerable to the forces that destroy freedom. If righteousness is judged primarily by the degree to which one responds to programmed activity, then a condition develops within which opportunities for progress decline. The resulting tragedy affects the mortal potential of man and has a profound effect on his eternal possibilities as well.

Programmed behavior cannot produce the level of spiritual development required to qualify one for eternal life. A necessary range of freedom and self-determination is essential to one’s spiritual development. With an understanding of correct principles and an intrinsic desire to apply them, one must be motivated within himself to do many good things of his own free will; for, as the revelation says, the power is in him wherein he is an agent unto himself (see D&C 58:27-28).

In preserving our freedom for self-determination, we cannot ignore the need for carefully ordered structure and procedure within government or any other organization. A careful balance must be maintained between that which is ordered for the welfare of the group and that which is reserved for the conscience and the incentive of the individual.

This necessary balance of freedom and restraint is essential to right relationships within families and communities, and it cannot be ignored in our assignments within the Church.

I have pondered the injunctions that have come to us in recent months from leaders of the Church to simplify and reduce the number of programmed activities prescribed for the members. There seems to be a sensitivity to the need for maintaining this essential balance. We have heard increased emphasis given to the need for individual initiative and accountability within families. In his concluding remarks at the April 1979 general conference, President Kimball said:

"The basic decisions needed for us to move forward, as a people, must be made by the individual members of the Church. The major strides which must be made by the Church will follow upon the major strides to be made by us as individuals . . . . Our individual spiritual growth is the key to major numerical growth in the kingdom" (Ensign, Mar. 1979, p. 82).

I rejoice in the spirit and intent of this instruction from a living prophet. I see in it the purposeful effort to preserve our individual accountability in the context of our Church membership and religious life.

When members of the Church exercise self-determination in their application of gospel principles they need not relax in their compliance with these principles. In fact, optimum progress can only occur when conditions are ideal for it, and these conditions must include the necessary degree of freedom and self-accountability. Anything less will guarantee stunted spiritual growth.

We must understand that as freedom for unrestricted development is enhanced, the possibilities for failure are also increased. The risk factor is great. The ideal cannot be achieved otherwise. Celestial attainment can be reached in no other environment.

We have inspired leaders today who are reconfirming the fact that there is no ultimate safety in programmed security where others assume accountability for our direction and performance.

Those who insist that a Church program exist for every contingency and need are as much in error as their counterparts who demand that government intervene in every aspect of our lives. In both instances the ideal balance is destroyed with a resultant detriment to human progress.

These are essential truths which our leaders are reinforcing for us today. These are challenging truths. They demand much of us. They press us to make our lives better by our own initiative and by our own efforts. They make no unconditional promises.

At the same time, our obedience to them preserves for us the elements of life which make individual progress possible. They make life purposeful and full of promise. They lead to eternal progress. Humanity cannot fulfill its destiny when these truths are disregarded and abused. I cherish them with all my soul and am unreservedly committed to their promulgation among all the peoples of the earth. In the name of Jesus Christ, amen.

Boyd K. Packer, "A Plea from the Brethren," Leadership Session, 1 April 1988. . . . there is another classification of members who may not be described as poor or destitute, but, who, nevertheless, earnestly need relief. Parents struggle to raise families on marginal incomes. They desperately need the gospel, and they need Church programs and activities as well. But if activities cost more in money or time than they can reasonably give, they may be pushed away from the gospel into inactivity.

As I reviewed the many times a message was sent from the First Presidency and the Twelve in recent years, I thought on...
entitled my remarks “A Message Unheeded.” Instead, I entitled it “A Plea to Stake Presidents.”

As early as 1939, the First Presidency expressed concern over “the mounting burdens and demands upon the people both as to their time and energy and their financial requirements.” Ten years ago the First Presidency wrote: Dear Brethren and Sisters,

We are seriously concerned over the demands made upon the people of this Church in carrying forward its many programs. We are most anxious that these requirements not become so heavy as to have an adverse affect on family life, vocational pursuits, or the pursuit of needed educational undertakings. We are concerned about the financial requests made upon our people. We have reason to feel that these requirements are becoming unduly burdensome for many.

The Presidency asked for “a reduction in the requirement of time and money.” The following year, President Kimball said, “Brethren and Sisters, this is a shocking thing to come to a realization of what we have been attempting to do, all with the best of intentions.” He said the cost of membership was “becoming prohibitive for members, and they find it very difficult. Sometimes we lose members of The Church because they do not want to admit that they cannot afford the many things we expect.”

For years President Benson has expressed that same feeling to the Brethren. The First Presidency then sent a letter entitled “Reduction of Time and Money Required for Church Programs.” I will read it to you.

We are very anxious that the cost of participation in Church activities not become unduly burdensome to our members. There is concern lest some who are not able to meet the costs may withdraw themselves from full participation in The Church. Particularly, the youth programs of The Church should be so managed that all of our young people may enjoy full participation.

Local leaders in stakes and missions are asked to carefully review their budgets together with those things not included in the budget that require donations of time and money from our people. Determine if some reduction in these costs may be made. Some less essential activities of The Church may have to be curtailed somewhat. These may include travel or frequent contributions from our members some reduction in these costs may be made. Some less essential activities of The Church may have to be curtailed somewhat. These may include those activities that require travel or frequent contributions from our members.

Our members face increasing costs in providing food, clothing, shelter, and other necessities of life for themselves and for their families. It is a time that will require very wise and prudent budgeting on the part of local leaders so that the cost of Church membership will not be burdensome to them.

Signed, The First Presidency

That was in 1978. In April of 1982, they printed that in the Priesthood Bulletin. It was repeated verbatim in 1984, again in 1985, and for the fifth time in 1987. I know of no other message repeated with that frequency.

Brethren, as President Romney was want to say, “How many tellin’s does it take?”

... Remember, the faith of our youth does not depend on how much money we can spend on them.

Boyd K. Packer, “Let Them Govern Themselves,” Regional Representatives Seminar, Friday, March 30, 1990. Both Alma and Helaman told of the Church in their day. They warned about fast growth, the desire to be accepted by the world, to be popular, and particularly they warned about prosperity. Each time those conditions existed in combination, the Church drifted off course. All of those conditions are present in the Church today.... The revelations tell us that there are limits to what mankind will be allowed to do. When those limits are reached, then comes destruction. And, the patience of the Lord with all of us who are in leadership positions, is not without limits.

The most dangerous side effect of all we have prescribed in the way of programming and instruction and all is the overregimentation of the Church. This overregimentation is a direct result of too many programmed instructions. If we would compare the handbooks of today with those of a generation ago you would quickly see what I mean....

“Teach them correct principles,” the Prophet said, “and then let,” “let” a big word, “them govern themselves.” (See Messages of the First Presidency, pg. 54.) Our members should not, according to the scriptures, need to be commanded in all things. (See D&C 58:26.)

... it is possible that we are doing the very thing spiritually that we have been resolutely resisting temporally: fostering dependence rather than independence, extravagance rather than thrift, indulgence rather than self-reliance.

... We need a sensible balancing of and a careful withdrawal of this medication of overprogramming. It can begin simply by restraining ourselves from writing more prescriptions, and by counseling local leaders not to replace the ones we phase out. So, the problem, Regional Representatives! There will be a tendency, we have seen it already when we began to phase out and withdraw, for the local leaders, conditioned as they are, to want to use that time and build up more detailed programs on their own.

... It [the change in budgeting in the Church] will set a better balance between families being assessed time and money to support Church activities, and Church activities complementing what families should do for themselves and backing away to an extent so they can do it. That is, if all of us will understand and will do it. I repeat, perhaps for one time only we have the opportunity to adjust that balance so that Church activities sustain parents and families rather than the other way around.

Now, there will be smaller budgets and fewer activities, fewer programs. That will leave a vacuum. Nothing likes a vacuum.

We must resist, absolutely resist, the temptation to program that vacuum. That space belongs to families. When we cut down on Sundays to the block plan that consolidated our meetings and left some time open, you know what happened. Now brethren, it is their time. Let them use it as they feel to do—for better or for worse. That is the risk. If we fail to teach them correct principles, teach them the doctrine, they will not know how to govern themselves.

If we do, then that vacuum will be filled with prayer and work and study, study for school, study the gospel. ... Another point: Some of us have missed the point that this is a reduction in both time and money. In fact, the letters that came to the First Presidency over the last years, one of them issued five times, for instance, emphasizes the reduction of time required of Church members first, not just the money.

Something else we must watch: already there grows up commercially oriented activities. Resourceful members of the Church saying, “Well, if the Church is going to back off on this, we can provide that” and you can see the obvious. Be careful of those. Be alert to them; beware of them.

Gordon B. Hinckley, satellite broadcast, 18 Feb. 1990; in Ensign, May 1990, pg. 97. Perhaps we have gone too far in providing [activities] for some beyond what is needed or what is best in terms of the individuals and their families. It should be recognized that this Church is not a social club.... Perhaps we should be less concerned with fun and more with faith.

Thomas S. Monson, satellite broadcast, 18 Feb. 1990; in Ensign, May 1990, pg. 93. Priesthood leaders should reduce and simplify activities wherever possible.
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Activities can be an effective tool in accomplishing the mission of the Church. Committees that plan activities to help Church members come to Christ are a valuable resource to the members they serve. When planning, remember that the mission of the Church is often best carried out in the home. For this reason, activities committees and ward leaders should concentrate efforts on activities that will strengthen the family.

Gene R. Cook, Raising Up a Family to the Lord, pg. 279. "How can I provide all of these family activities," some parents might ask, "when my children have so many other activities outside the home?" And that is a valid question indeed. A greater focus on home-centered activities would reduce the number of demands on active families but still reach the less active who have more of a need for help from the Church.

Perhaps our family has a different perspective than most because we have lived outside the United States for so many years. In some of the countries in Latin America, there are almost no school or other activities to which the children could go that were not very worldly and that didn't involve the use of tobacco and alcohol. The Church in those countries was in a basic developmental stage and thus offered few activities. My wife and I soon saw that we would have to be the "activities committee" for our family.

When we arrived home in Utah, we returned to a very active ward. In fact, in our first three months, we counted thirty-nine activities to which we were invited as a family or as individuals--Young Women's activities, the annual Relief Society anniversary, the high priests’ ice-cream social, Scouting affairs, and on and on. If I'm not mistaken, we went to about three of those activities as a family, and some of the children attended a few more. Soon after that, our good bishop told me he was worried about my family, and some of the children attended a few more.

I said to him, "Well, I might be mistaken, Bishop, but my understanding is that the Church is supposed to support the family.

I asked him if he'd ever seen our children miss priesthood meeting, sacrament meeting, Sunday School, or Mutual. He said he had not. I continued, "I understood that all those other were electives, that they were optional, and that we could choose which ones we wanted to attend. Is that not true?" He wasn't too sure.

Then I said to this good bishop, "Do you know what my biggest problem has been since I returned home from Latin America?"

He said, "No, what is it, Brother Cook?"

I said, "It's been the Church itself, and perhaps the school here to some extent."

He said, "What do you mean?"

I said, "Because I travel a lot on the weekends, the week nights are very important to me, as are Saturday and Sunday if I'm home. I must have that time with my own family. In Latin America we had family home evening almost every night. I don't mean a lesson; I mean just a fun time.

Sometimes we carved things. Sometimes we built things. Sometimes we took walks around the block. Sometimes we helped the widows or ministered to others in need. Sometimes we had lots of fun with other families. But since I've come home it's been difficult because some group has my children on Tuesday night, another group on Wednesday, and somebody else on Thursday, and they are with their friends on Friday night. My biggest challenge has been all of these activities going on outside the home."

This faithful bishop was quite shocked at my response, but I'm sure he understood. I suggested there might be wisdom in having the family heads in the ward determine how many activities there ought to be, and then in helping parents understand that they--not the Church or the school--were primarily in charge of the activities in their family.

In the following months, with the planning and involvement of parents, this good bishop greatly reduced the number of activities in our ward. He also retaught the principle that parents were to hold activities with their own children, and that in its support role the Church would sponsor some group activities as well. (It should also be mentioned that he knew, as did we, that we had to provide more activities than "the ideal" to help families who had greater needs than we did.)

President Harold B. Lee said: "It seems clear to me that the Church has no choice—and never has had—but to do more to assist the family in carrying out its divine mission ... to help improve the quality of life in the Latter-day Saint homes. As important as our many programs and organizational efforts are, these should not supplant the home; they should support the home."

"Preparing Our Youth," Ensign March 1971, pg. 3.)