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INTRODUCTION

The political views of J. Reuben Clark, Jr. have been of interest to the membership of the Mormon Church\(^1\) since the year 1933, when he was appointed second counselor to Heber J. Grant, then President of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. This interest was generated in part by the various political positions of importance which Clark held since 1906 and by the numerous politically-oriented speeches which he gave from time to time throughout the Church and the nation.

The purpose of this study is to describe and examine certain political ideas expressed by Clark which reflected his views as a political theorist. This topic was warranted due to the lack of any thorough or detailed study that examined the political concepts of Mr. Clark.

The only study which indicates to any degree the political views of J. Reuben Clark, Jr. is Richard Vetterli's *Mormonism, Americanism and Politics* (1961). Vetterli compared certain political views of Mr. Clark with other Church leaders in an attempt to establish the policy of the Mormon Church with regard to civil authority. However, his study does not adequately develop Clark's political ideas.

\(^1\)Hereafter in this thesis the titles Mormon Church, the Church, Latter-day Saint Church, and the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints will be used interchangeably.
The sources of information used to write this thesis were limited to: (1) general reference material which gave a background for those areas with which Clark dealt; (2) the *Semi-Annual Conference Reports of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints* 1933-1961, which contained addresses given by Clark to the general membership of the Church; (3) other addresses given by Clark before various civic and religious groups; and (4) his published books and articles.

The intent of the writer was not to critically evaluate Clark's political views, but to state Clark's political ideas in a logical and well-organized manner; thus providing a view of his opinions concerning the areas mentioned and leaving the reader to either agree or to disagree with Clark.
CHAPTER I

BIOGRAPHY

In reviewing the story of the lives of prominent men, the frequent occurrence of success under seemingly unfavorable conditions overturns the apparent anomaly of the isolated case, and thus the exception often proves the rule. For example, out of an environment of ignorance and superstition arose a Luther; from poverty and obscurity came forth a Lincoln; from a carpenter's hut emerged Jesus Christ to teach the world.

Joshua Reuben Clark, Jr., the son of Joshua R. Clark and Mary Louisa Woolley Clark, was born in a small rock house three miles north of Grantsville, Tooele County, Utah, on September 1, 1871. His parents were among the early settlers of Tooele County and both belonged to a race of rugged, freedom loving, God-fearing people. His grandsires fought in the War of 1812 and in the Revolutionary War. His father, Joshua R. Clark, served in the Civil War.

While still in his youth, young Reuben learned the many duties associated with the rigorous life of a pioneer family. When sickness struck, it became the responsibility of each member to minister to the needs of the infirm. His mother reported that "while we were living in the Seavie home, the children had the whooping cough. Frank was a baby four months
old. He would lose his breath and go blue in the face. I had to have Reube sit by the cradle while he slept. And Reube was to call me (because I was doing my work) when Frank started to cough.  

Responsibilities were common for young boys on a farm.

Reuben, with great pride, accepted the challenge of caring for his father's small band of horses. He spoke with enthusiasm of the days when he rode a sure-footed, long-winded saddle pony and helped round up range horses. There was something fascinating about corraling wild horses--something that appealed to a boy. It was full of action, adventure, and danger which warmed the blood of romantic youth. His mother described one near mishap in this manner:

This was when we were on the farm. Reube was just a young boy. He was going to breed a pony to ride for Uncle Samuel. He went down to his home to get it, riding a horse we called "Ginger". The horse was gentle but quite high-lifed. Reube was leading the pony with the rope wound around the horn of the saddle. The pony hung back and that turned the saddle and, of course, Reube fell off. The horse immediately got frightened and started to run and kick. He kicked himself loose from the saddle and came home with the bridle reins flying. Reube said he could hear the horses hoof whiz past his head. When I saw the horse coming without Reube I knew he was lying on the road dead, and I started off to find him. But Pa kept his head, and called to me to wait until he could catch the horse so if the boy was hurt he could bring him home. We found Reube at the end of the farm with his saddle on his back, leading the pony.  

J. Reuben Clark's education began at home under the strict

\[1\] Diaries and Records of Joshua R. Clark and Mary Louisa W. Clark, Vol. I, 1940, p. 397. (Typewritten copy by the Brigham Young University Library, Special Collections).

\[2\] Ibid., pp. 399-400.
discipline of a loving mother. In the midst of her other duties, she taught her son to read and to write so that when he entered the public schools he was placed in the third grade. Upon completion of the grades, there being no high school in Grantsville at the time, he went through the work of the eighth grade three times.

Having completed the work of the schools in Grantsville, Clark entered the Latter-day Saint College in Salt Lake City, Utah. While there several occurrences took place which had a lasting impact upon his life. First, shortly after entering the Latter-day Saint College, Clark learned a great lesson in frugality when his father was called on a mission to the Eastern States. His mother reported the incident in this way:
"Reube was about nineteen. He going to Business College and Edwin running the farm. Pa was gone over two years. We had no ready money to keep him there so Reube went to school and worked on the side and kept his father on his mission."\(^3\)

Second, Clark came in contact with Dr. James E. Talmage, then President of the Latter-day Saints College in Salt Lake City. For two and one-half years, Reuben served as clerk of the Deseret Museum under Talmage's direction. "The duties of this clerkship were to act as janitor, 'showman', stenographer to the Curator, and to arrange for exhibiting the specimens of the museum."\(^4\) Dr. Talmage was quick to

\(^3\)Ibid.

discover in this serious-minded and industrious young man from the country, the qualities that win success. He was attracted to him and encouraged him in all his endeavors.

In 1894 Clark entered the University of Utah. His desire was to become a specialist in mining law. While a student at the university, he was editor of the Chronicle (the student newspaper), president of the student body and valedictorian of his class. He received the degree of Bachelor of Science from the University of Utah in 1898.

Shortly after completing his college course, on September 14, 1898, he married Luacine Savage, a daughter of the pioneer photographer, C. R. Savage. The succeeding five years found the newlyweds engaged in educational work in Utah. The first year Clark served as principal of a small rural high school at Heber City. He then taught English and Latin in the Latter-day Saints College and commercial courses at the Salt Lake Business College. After a year as acting principal of the Southern Branch of the State Normal School at Cedar City, he returned to the Salt Lake Business College and continued to teach there until that school was absorbed by the Latter-day Saint College in the spring of 1903. During the latter part of this time, he acted as principal.

In reference to his years as a school teacher, Mr. Clark made this statement: "Furthermore, for a time I tried, without much success, to teach school, so I know also the feelings of those of us teachers who do not make the first grade and must rest in the lower
Because of Clark's experience as a professional educator, he had great respect for teachers. "I wish to pay a humble but sincere tribute to teachers", declared Clark. "Having worked my own way through school, high school, college and professional school, I know something of the hardship and sacrifice this demands; but I know also the growth and satisfaction which comes as we reach the end." 6

For sometime the desire to study law had been gnawing at his soul and in the spring of 1903, Clark entered the law school at Columbia University at New York City. The three years spent at Columbia were difficult. Clark, usually without sufficient funds, had a wife and two small children to support. He gave a great deal of credit to Joseph Nelson, a former employer and a life-long friend who advanced money when necessary until Clark graduated. Although school proved difficult, Clark attained great success even after the first year. One of his professors at Columbia, Dr. George D. Parkinson, said this of Clark: "His work was of such a high quality that in the beginning of the second year, he was elected one of the first three Second Year students to the editorial board of the Columbia Law Review, an honor bestowed only in recognition of the highest attainments in scholarship." 7

5J. Reuben Clark, "The Charted Course of the Church in Education," An address delivered to a group of Institute and Seminary Teachers at Aspen Grove, August 8, 1938, p. 10. Found in Special Collections, Brigham Young University Library.

6Ibid.

7Parkinson, op. cit., p. 559.
During the vacation months between Clark's second and third years at Columbia, he was hired by Dr. James Brown Scott, a professor from the university, to assist him in the compilation and annotation of a case book on quasi contracts. In September, 1906, Clark graduated from law school. Dr. Scott, who in the meantime had become Solicitor for the Department of State of the United States, employed Clark to compile and annotate the major portion of two volumes of cases on equity jurisdiction. Later the same year, Elihu Root, then Secretary of State, appointed the young lawyer to the position of Assistant Solicitor.

In July 1910, President Taft appointed Mr. Clark to serve as Solicitor. The Solicitor was technically an officer of the Department of Justice, ranking as an Assistant Attorney General, and designated for work in the Department of State. In practice, he was the chief law officer for the State Department and all legal questions affecting the United States and foreign governments were referred to him for opinion. The work done by Clark in this position was of such high quality that Parkinson, Clark's former professor, offered these words of praise:

> During the period covered by Mr. Clark's incumbency, the science of international law had perhaps made greater development than during any period of similar duration. Mr. Clark, in his capacity of Assistant Solicitor and of Solicitor for the Department of State, has been called upon to set many precedents and to decide many new and novel principles, and as a result it might be safely said that he is the best authority in the United States today on modern international law.  

---

8Ibid., p. 564.
It was during this time that Clark handled the diplomatic negotiations with Chile in the famous "Alsop" case. 9

On January 15, 1913, Clark was appointed General Counsel to represent the United States before the Mixed Claims Commission, sitting to adjudge claims between the United States and Great Britain. It was at this time that Mr. Clark became acquainted with Mr. Dwight Morrow. A delightful friendship developed between them which ultimately resulted in placing Clark in a most important diplomatic position.

During the years 1917 and 1918, Mr. Clark became a member of the Judge Advocate General Reserve Corps. He was assigned to duty under Attorney-General Thomas Watt Gregory. Later, he was assigned to be Adjutant of the Provost Marshal General and received a commission of Major. Because of the great service Clark performed for his country in this position, General Enoch H. Crowder recommended to Congress that Clark be awarded the Distinguished Service Medal, which he received in 1922.

After the close of World War I, at the request of the State Department, Clark made a careful study of the Versailles Treaty in 1919.

---

9Foreign Relations of the United States, (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1911), p. 38. Mr. Clark handled the diplomatic negotiations with Chile which led to the framing of an agreement upon a protocol under which the whole matter was referred to arbitration, the King of England acting as Royal Amiable Compositeur. The King of England gave an award in favor of the United States for $905,000 which is one of the largest international awards ever made.
One of Clark's biographers reported the opinion that: "No other man in the United States had a clearer understanding of this historic document and no one was better able to interpret it in the light of international policies pursued by this government." ¹⁰

In December of 1918, during the great senatorial debate over the proposed League of Nations, Mr. Clark supplied the senator from Pennsylvania, Philander C. Knox and his associates with data to support their views opposing the League. Knox, a former Secretary of State from 1909 to 1913, praised Clark as follows: "I am doing him but justice in saying that for natural ability, integrity, loyalty, and industry, I have not, in a long professional and public experience, met his superior and rarely his equal." ¹¹

In 1921 Charles Evans Hughes, then Secretary of State, called Mr. Clark to Washington to serve as a special counsel to the State Department in preparing the agenda for the conference on the Limitation of Armaments to be held in Washington D. C. During this conference Clark served as technical advisor to Secretary Hughes, who soon thereafter appointed him counsel for the British-American Claims Commission. Due to his skillful performances in the past as an adjudicator of Claims, he was appointed a member of the Mexican American Claims Commission in 1926 and soon became General Counsel for the commission.

¹⁰ Bryant S. Hinckley, "Greatness in Men," Improvement Era, XXXVI (September, 1933), 646.
¹¹ Parkinson, op. cit., p. 564.
He served as agent for the United States on the General and Special Claims Commission during the same period. While performing these duties, Clark developed a knowledge of and love for the Mexican people which led Mr. Dwight Morrow, then Ambassador to Mexico, to call Clark as his legal advisor. Upon receiving this assignment, Clark and his family moved to Mexico City where they lived until President Calvin Coolidge appointed him Under Secretary of State in 1928.

Shortly before his nomination for Under Secretary of State was submitted to the senate for confirmation, Mr. Clark, at the request of Frank B. Kellogg, then Secretary of State, prepared a remarkable memorandum on the Monroe Doctrine. This document reflected Clark's isolationism as it played down the idea put forth in the "Roosevelt Corollary" that the United States should take action in Latin American affairs in order to prevent European intervention. In particular wrote Mr. Clark of the Monroe Doctrine: "It does not apply to purely inter-American relations. Nor does the declaration purport to lay down any principles that are to govern the inter-relationship of the states of this Western Hemisphere as among themselves. The Doctrine states a case of United States vs. Europe, not of United States vs. Latin America." In 1929, the State Department made the Clark memorandum its own, and in identical

\[\text{\textsuperscript{12}}\]

notes to the governments of Latin America indicated that it would be guided by the principles therein laid down. This memorandum was one of Clark's greatest contributions to American foreign policy.

In August 1928, Clark aspired to become United States Senator from Utah. However, he was defeated at the Nominating Convention in Ogden, Utah, by Ernest Bamberger.

When Dwight Morrow was elected to the United States Senate in 1930, President Herbert Hoover named Mr. Clark to become the next "Ambassador Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States to the Republic of Mexico". Mr. Clark returned to Mexico City on November 21, 1930, accompanied by his wife and daughter. A great number of Mexican dignitaries were on hand to greet the family upon their arrival. Mrs. Clark was heard to make this comment: "Such a reception as this alone makes it worthwhile to return to Mexico." A week later President Ortiz Rubio received Ambassador Clark at the National Palace, at which time Clark's official credentials were presented and accepted.

On this occasion Clark stated:

History records and experience demonstrates that there are no questions arising between nations which may not be adjusted peaceably, as well as with reciprocal advantage, if such questions are discussed in kindly candor with mutual appreciation of and accommodation to the viewpoint of each by the other and with patience and desire to work out a fair and equitable settlement. It is in that spirit that I take up the performance of my official duties.

---

This spirit characterized Mr. Clark's relations with Mexico during the two and one-half years he spent as ambassador. The New York Times states that Mr. Clark was having success in his work. He was showing a "democratic spirit" and was being accepted by all those with whom he came in contact.  

During the time Clark spent in Mexico as Ambassador, it became apparent to those who worked closely with him that he possessed certain traits of character not always associated with persons in diplomatic circles. For instance, upon being asked if he would serve liquor on the embassy premises during his term in office he said: "I have decided not to serve alcoholic beverages in the embassy during my term in this post." His integrity as a statesman cannot be found to have ever been questioned; on the contrary he was heralded by such men as Henry L. Stimson, Philander C. Knox and Dwight Morrow for his straightforwardness in all his dealings as a government worker. The New York Times recorded that, "If Mr. Clark has any peculiarity, it is dietary. Breakfast means nothing to him. Luncheon is his first meal. Between meals he drinks fifteen or twenty glasses of water and a number of beakers of milk."

These traits were indicative of his loyalty to the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, of which he was a member all his life.

---

16 Ibid., November 29, 1930, p. 8.
17 Ibid., October 12, 1930, p. X2.
It was due to this religious nature, so ingrained in his character, that promoted Clark to submit a request of resignation from the State Department on February 24, 1933, to Henry L. Stimson, then Secretary of State, in order that he might accept a position of responsibility in his church. In a letter written in response to Clark's resignation, Mr. Stimson had this to say: "I desire to take this occasion to express my deep and sincere appreciation not only for your distinguished service as Ambassador to Mexico, which has reflected signal credit upon the Department of State, but also my personal appreciation and gratitude for the aid of your wise counsel and loyal cooperation at the beginning of my service in this office."\(^{18}\)

On April 6, 1933, J. Reuben Clark, Jr. was sustained as second counselor to Heber J. Grant, President of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Upon receiving this call from the First Presidency, Mr. Clark said:

I am keenly aware of and am deeply grateful for the great honor the people have bestowed upon me. I am also aware that a responsibility equally great comes with that honor. May I say that just now I am thinking more about the responsibility than about the honor.

Should any of you have hopes about my work in this high office to which I am called, I trust I shall not too much disappoint you. If any of you have misgivings, I can only say that your misgivings can hardly be greater than my own. I am keenly conscious

of my own deficiencies. I come late in life to a new work. But whatever shall be the outcome of my humble service, whatever shall overtake me, there shall be yet abiding with all of us eternal truth, which is light and life, even life everlasting.19

These few statements exemplified the great humility and desires of the man to serve his fellowmen and his God.

For a period of twenty-eight years, Mr. Clark served the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints with all the dignity and loyalty which a man of his high character was capable. It was his unique calling to serve as counselor to three different presidents of the Mormon Church. Each president held him in the highest esteem.

Even after Clark accepted this church assignment, he was still sought after for special governmental assignments. From 1934 to 1938 he served as president of the Foreign Bondholders Protective Council, Inc., and was chairman of the executive committee of this organization from 1938 to 1945. In 1934 he was a delegate of the United States to the Seventh International Conference of American States at Montevideo. He served on the committee of Experts on Codification of International Law and on the committee for Study of International Loan Contracts under the League of Nations.

On October 4, 1961, Joshua Reuben Clark, Jr. passed away. His wife Luacine had died on August 2, 1944. They were parents of four children: J. Reuben Clark, III, Louise (Mrs. Mervyn S. Bennion),

19Semi-Annual Conference Report of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, (Salt Lake City: Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, April, 1933), p. 102.
Marianne (Mrs. Ivor Sharp) and Luacine (Mrs. Orval C. Fox).

In a statement to the press upon hearing of Mr. Clark's death, the former president of the United States, Herbert Hoover, made this comment, "J. Reuben Clark, Jr., was one of America's noble men--strong in his religious faith, his devotion to the principles of freedom and his service to his fellowmen. He was my steadfast friend for 35 years. I grieve with all of his friends at his passing." 20

The First Presidency of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints remarked, "He was a man of profound faith, strong in his testimony and powerful in his appeals for righteousness and unity among the members of the Church everywhere. He put the Church and its welfare first in life." 21

Clark was a man of nobility, a man of greatness who loved freedom. He was a man devoted to service--service to State--service to God. He was a man honored and respected by all with whom he came in contact. He was a man many times criticized for his beliefs, but one who voiced without fear these beliefs relative to his political and religious life.

During Clark's fifty-five years of devoted service to his country through which he had vast experience in almost every phase of political life, and during the twenty-eight years he served in the First


21Ibid., p. 1.
Presidency of his church working with individuals and their problems, Clark had an excellent opportunity to observe man and his relation to the State. All of these experiences helped mold J. Reuben Clark's significant political ideas.
CHAPTER II

MAN AND THE STATE

For centuries the study of the nature of man has been of primary interest to the theologian as well as to the political theorist—-to the theologian because of a belief in man as a spiritual creation of God; to the theorist because of a desire to understand man's relationship to man in society. J. Reuben Clark, theologian and political theorist noted some differences between the two areas of thought concerning the nature of man--on the one hand Clark ascribed to man a spiritual character; on the other hand he considered man as physical. He then integrated the two elements into the "true man" suggesting that man's activities in society were a result of his kinship to deity. 1

This kinship with God began with a society of intelligences which were unequal in capacity, God being the most intelligent. 2 According to Clark, God created spiritual bodies to house these intelligences, 3


2 "And the Lord said unto me: These two facts do exist, that there are two spirits, one being more intelligent than the other; there shall be another more intelligent than they; I am the Lord thy God, I am more intelligent than they all." Pearl of Great Price, Abraham 3:19.

3 J. Reuben Clark, Jr., On the Way to Immortality and Eternal Life (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Co., 1950), p. 34.
thus, deserving the title "Father of spirits" as spoken of by Paul the Apostle to the Hebrews. A "great council" was held during which God informed the intelligences that further progress required that they have earthly experiences in order to learn for themselves the difference between good and evil. The plan that they unanimously selected required one of their number to act as representative for God. Two of the most notable of these intelligences volunteered. Lucifer proposed to harvest every soul. Christ offered himself as an atonement for all sins to be committed, leaving every person the moral right to choose for himself whether or not to obey God's commandments. The authoritarianism of Lucifer's proposal led to its rejection and when he and one-third of the "hosts of heaven" resisted, they were cast out, thus forfeiting the opportunity to have mortal experience on earth and ending their quest for "eternal progression" which was promised the most successful.

Clark described the "council in heaven" and the positions taken by Lucifer and Christ in this way:

Then the question arose with the Father, 'Whom shall I send?' The plan called for redemption. One stood forth and said, 'I will redeem all mankind. Not one soul will be lost. I will surely do it. So send me.' That plan, when analyzed, involved, as the Lord has told us time and again, the destruction of our free agency. Just how we were to be redeemed under the plan and yet destroy our

---

4 Hebrews 12:9.

5 An account of the Council held in heaven can be found in The Pearl of Great Price, Moses 4:1-2; Abraham 3:19.
free agency, we are not told. The proposer of that plan said to our heavenly Father, 'Give me thine honor.' And our heavenly Father has told us that that meant that he should surrender to the proposer, his power, and he, the Father, become more or less a nonentity, I suppose.

Then the other Personage said, 'Send me, and the honor will be thine.' The heavenly Father chose the latter, the Only Begotten (Jesus Christ), who was to be sent to this earth.

Following the selection of Christ as the Redeemer and the rejection of Satan and his hosts, the earth was created. Satan and his followers were refused the right to receive mortality, being cast down to earth without physical bodies, there to wage eternal war on God by soliciting the souls of men to the cause of wickedness. Of Satan's intentions Clark said: "Satan was 'cast down', and with him went one-third of the hosts of heaven. He declared by his rebellion eternal enmity toward the plan that was adopted, and from that time until now, he has constantly sought to build the empire, the kingdom for which he planned, by leading us astray."

The spirits of those who were in agreement with the plan of Christ were allowed to come to earth and receive mortality in their progression toward becoming gods. Adam, one of the most intelligent spirits, was the first of the group to be created in mortal form and placed on the earth.

---

7 Ibid., p. 39.

8 "And the Gods formed man from the dust of the ground, and took his spirit (that is, the man's spirit), and put it into him and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul." Pearl of Great Price, Abraham 5:7.
Clark believed that at this point the true nature of man began to unfold. He recognized man's dual nature. Man was the spiritual offspring of God, susceptible to God's influence for good, capable of choosing for himself, and was an intelligent being capable of great wisdom. On the other hand, Clark saw "physical man" with his mortal weakness and his capacity for evil precipitated by the influence of Satan. Clark could not separate the two elements. He said, "The true man, the man we know and deal with, is an intimate and inseparable combination of both concepts. Separate the duality and true man no longer exists. On the one hand is a residuum of organized earth, on the other an intangible, imponderable essence, force, power, intelligence." Thus Clark combined theology and political theory in that he accepted the position that man's actions relative to society were a result of man's spiritual background--comprising both the inspiration of God as well as the temptation of Satan.

Clark believed that in general Lucifer seemed to dominate men's actions during this life on earth. It was difficult for Clark to see any escape from the great evil exerted by Satan: "It seems sometimes as if the darkness that surrounds us is all but impenetrable. I can see on all sides the signs of one great evil master mind working for the overturning of our civilization, the destruction of religion, the reduction of men to

---

9 Clark, Man--God's Greatest Miracle, p. 10.
the status of animals. This mind is working here and there and everywhere.”10

Clark felt that one of Satan's primary goals was the destruction of man's "free agency". This was to be accomplished by the establishment of institutions throughout the world which would infringe on the rights of the individual. In no way could Clark accept such a situation as he considered "free agency" to be "the foundation stone upon which all of our existence is built."11 Not even God had the right to compel the minds of men. Clark stated: "God himself does not coerce the will of man; why should puny fellowman think he may do what God does not?"12

Clark considered the principle of "free agency" as it related to several areas: (1) law, (2) worship, and (3) governments. First, Clark felt that all laws were instituted by God for the benefit of man and that from the beginning men were to be governed by law. God had given certain laws or commandments that were to be followed by the individual. Yet Clark observed that even God did not command men in all things.13


11Ibid., (April, 1936), p. 64.


13"For behold, it is not meet that I should command in all things; for he that is compelled in all things, the same is a slothful and not a wise servant; wherefore he receiveth no reward." Doctrine and Covenants 58:26.
"If he undertook to tell us each time what we were to do in every detail--and the saints of the early days of the Church thought, as I have stated, that he should do so and the Lord reproved them for it--two things would happen. In the first place we would virtually destroy the free agency of man, . . . And in the second place we should be under great condemnation if the Lord had to reveal to us His will and then we failed to follow it."

Clark divided the laws of God into two categories; the laws of command and the laws of blessings. God gave the laws of command with specific penalties or punishments attached. These punishments were to come when the laws were violated. Clark said, "All the great laws of nature are of this type, and there are certain great spiritual laws--the commission of the unpardonable sin, the commission of adultery, and other things--which carry with them their own punishment, whether or not we like it." On the other hand, the only penalty associated with the laws of blessings is the forfeiture of that blessing through disobedience to the law. Clark suggested that an example of this was when the Lord attempted to give the Melchizedek priesthood to the Israelites but they would not receive it, thus refusing the blessings of the Higher Priesthood.

Clark recognized that in order to preserve "free agency" laws must be framed by mortals relying, to some degree, on the Almighty.

---

14 Semi-Annual Conference Report (April, 1936), p. 64.
16 Ibid.
Clark confirmed this attitude with this statement:

The people must live and have a right to live under laws which they wish and which they help to frame, these laws must be drawn through a sympathy with and an understanding of the needs of the people whose welfare they are framed to meet; they must be enforced by local citizens having that same sympathy and understanding of both needs and welfare.\footnote{Clark, "Washington Birthday Address," p. 5.}

This would allow the individual in society to think and act for himself within the framework of the laws which he helped to create.

Second, it was the opinion of Clark that men should have "free agency" in worship. He showed great concern over any attempt to compel men in their religious activities. Clark commenting on the subject of "free agency" said: "Personally, I would not in any way, and in the lightest or slightest degree, hamper anyone's free agency. Literally, I feel and believe that men should worship how, where, or what they may."\footnote{Semi-Annual Conference Report (April, 1949), p. 161.}

It annoyed him to suppose that men in their weakness would consider the controlling of human religious activities, when as Clark suggested, "God himself does not compel the intellect, nor does he attempt to overthrow it."\footnote{Ibid., Further consideration of Clark's views on religious freedom can be found in Chapter III, Communism.}

However, Clark recognized certain limitations involving "free agency" in the worship of God. He felt that religion could be compared to civil society, even though men had their free agency, this did not give them any authorization to infringe on the rights of others.
Clark had reference to those teachers in the Mormon Church who might pervert the minds of their students by teaching them false doctrine about the Church. Clark gave vent to his feelings against such teachings in this way: "The Lord gave us our free agency, as you know, and we may think and we may talk as we wish, but we may not teach false doctrine for that is no part of free agency. In the spiritual domain, false doctrine is the equivalent of libel and slander in the civil domain. Those things we may not do."  

Third, any government established by man which would attempt to destroy the free agency of the individual was of an evil nature. In this category Clark placed Communism, Socialism, Fascism, and the Welfare State. Of these the most dangerous was the Communistic State.

In referring to the force of Communism Clark said: "The principle of free agency has been virtually blotted out among 140 to 150 millions of people, and that virus, the destruction of free agency, has been scattered over the world as if by the wind until today it affects us here in increasingly growing proportions."  

Clark spoke out strongly against those autocratic governments who were attempting to make slaves of mankind: "The Master speaking

---


21 Clark's criticisms of the Welfare State are discussed in Chapter IV, The Welfare State.

with spiritual intent, said to Simon Peter: 'Feed my sheep'. This command of the Savior makes it greater and nobler by infinity, to feed the mind and the spirit of man than to crush his body or break his will."  

On another occasion, Clark observed with a note of humor attached, "I have always thought that that was rather an interesting opiate, to call the fellow you were enslaving a 'comrade'."  

Closely related to Clark's concern over Satan destroying individual freedom through totalitarian government was Clark's basic concept of the origin, nature and purpose of the state.

The political philosophy of Clark concerning the state seemed to be based on two fundamental concepts of government: first, on a complete acceptance of the state and its government within the framework of the American Constitution; second, on the theological attitude accepted by the Mormon Church regarding the state.

The greatest state and system of government existing in the world, according to Clark, was the United States of America. Clark attributed America's position of importance to the fact that the Almighty had accepted the Constitution and the government which it created.

The Founding Fathers committed themselves to certain theories of government to which Clark ascribed wholeheartedly. Many

23 Ibid., (April, 1933), p. 104.
24 J. Reuben Clark, Jr., Some Political Blessings, (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1957), p. 35. For a more complete discussion of Clark's views on Communism see Infra, Chapter III.
of these theories were drawn from the great political theorist John Locke (1632-1704). In particular, the text of the Declaration of Independence was Lockean in nature, and several of the main elements of the American political system such as inviolability of property, limited government, and the inalienable rights of individuals are all directly traceable to Locke. The fourteenth amendment to the Constitution embodies this Lockean idea, that no state shall "deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law."25 Above all, Locke's defense of the right to rebel seemed reasonable to the makers of the American Revolution. Thomas Jefferson, in many respects a Lockean rationalist and lover of freedom, expressed the American version of Locke's theory of rebellion in the classical phrase that the "tree of liberty must be refreshed from time to time with the blood of patriots and tyrants."26

From the French philosopher, Jean Jacques Rousseau, the Founding Fathers acquired the principle that good government was self-government.27 Clark accepted this theory as shown by his statement that, "Local self-government is vital to human liberty and free institutions;

25U.S., Constitution, 14th Amendment.


27Ibid., p. 418. Rousseau is the first modern writer to attempt, not always successfully, to synthesize good government with self-government in the key concept of the General Will: the realization of what is best for the community is not enough; it must also be willed by the community.
free man cannot live still free without it . . . . The people left to their own free wills never finally go wrong. I have an unshakeable, abiding faith in the mass wisdom of the people." 28

The government of the United States, according to Clark, was not a democracy but a republic. Clark expressed his views in this way: "There is much talk nowadays about democracy. I do not know of any democracy in the world. There are liberal monarchies, and there are republics. 29 The government to which Clark belonged was to be a representative body, "governed by people chosen by the free, untrammeled, and uncompelled will of the people." 30 These representatives were to be governed by the basic laws laid down in the Constitution.

Even though Clark believed the United States Government to be the most perfect existing on the earth, yet as a Christian he hopefully anticipated the return of Jesus Christ to the earth, at which time the Savior would establish his own government to rule the world personally. 31 To this theocracy with the Savior at its head, Clark pledged complete support. He felt that the American system now in use would simply be replaced with a perfect government headed by a perfect king, Jesus Christ.

31 For a discussion of the Mormon belief concerning Christ's coming reign on earth see James E. Talmage, Jesus the Christ, (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Company, 1951), pp. 788-789.
As observed in the foregoing, Clark's Mormon faith had a profound influence on his views regarding the nature of man and the state. Clark's attitude regarding the relation between the individual and the state was influenced by the Apostle Paul and the Mormon Prophet, Joseph Smith. Paul, in his epistle to Titus, recommended certain gospel teachings that were to be given to the Cretin saints. One of these was regarding the position of the saints with respect to the state. Paul said, "Put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates ..."32

Joseph Smith, in a statement of the basic beliefs of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, reiterated Paul's remarks in this way: "We believe in being subject to kings, presidents, rulers and magistrates, in obeying, honoring, and sustaining the law."33 In a revelation given to Smith in 1831, the Lord directed the saints with respect to civil authority: "Wherefore, be subject to the powers that be, until he reigns whose right it is to reign, and subdues all enemies under his feet."34

In a declaration of belief regarding governments in 1835 at Kirtland, Ohio, the Mormons made this statement: "We believe that governments were instituted of God for the benefit of man; ..."35

32Titus 3:1.
33Pearl of Great Price, Articles of Faith, Art. 12, p. 60.
34Doctrine and Covenants 58:22.
Clark realized that although governments were established by God for the benefit of man, it required men to see that governmental machinery functioned properly. Since men were not always in harmony with the will of God, it was probable that on occasion those individuals who controlled the state and its machinery would use their power to destroy the rights of society. Sensing that this situation could arise, the Mormon Church issued a statement to the world in which it declared:
"We believe that no government can exist in peace, except such laws are framed and held inviolate as will secure to each individual the free exercise of conscience, the right and control of property and the protection of life."36 Thus the Mormon faith agreed with the Lockean theory of the right to rebel under certain conditions. Clark gave complete support to this concept and expressed his own views concerning it in this manner:

Thus we can stand for no cause and can support no state fostering a cause that would seek to compel the consciences of men, that would set up the state as deity, that would destroy private property, that bulwark of a peaceful, stable ordered society, indeed of civilization itself, that would make men slaves of the state to the destruction of all safety, due protection of life and limb, and all individual liberty, that would blot out the Christian home.37

To those individuals who sought public office, Clark offered this comment: "Therefore, every man who takes on a responsibility by by virtue of assuming office in worldly government, is responsible to the Lord himself for the way in which he carries it out . . . whether a man

36Ibid., 134:2.

37Semi-Annual Conference Report (October, 1939), p. 11.
takes office in the legislature, or in the executive branch of government, or in the judicial branch, he becomes, by virtue of that assumption of office, responsible to the Lord... "38 The individual was responsible to the Lord, according to Clark, because of a charge given to man in the Doctrine and Covenants, in which God holds men accountable for their acts in making laws and administering them. 39

In summary, Clark saw man not only as a sociological and political entity, a biological phenomenon but a child of God raised under the discipline of a wise and loving Father in heaven. Because of this inherent greatness within, man was actually capable of becoming a god. The force that could deter the realization of man achieving godhood was again spiritual. It was Satan, the rejected son of the Almighty, who in the role as the tempter of mankind delighted in causing men to do evil. One of Satan's goals was the destruction of man's "free agency", which he hoped to accomplish by the establishment of institutions designed to make slaves of men. Clark was aware that of these institutions, two seemed to be the most dangerous to man's freedom and to government under the Constitution--Communism and the Welfare State.

38Ibid., (April, 1935), p. 94.

39Doctrine and Covenants 134:1.
CHAPTER III

COMMUNISM

To say that J. Reuben Clark opposed Communism is an understatement of fact. His true feeling was one of complete abhorance. He condemned it as a "satanic force" that struck at all the principles which freedom-loving people held dear. The principle that was foremost in jeopardy of being destroyed was freedom of religion—the right to worship what, where and how the individual desired.

In order to appreciate Clark's attitude towards Communism, it is necessary to understand the Communistic view concerning religion. In examining the situation of religious freedom in Russia, one finds that there are laws, regulations and political policies relating to religion. The Soviet Constitution made this statement: "In order to ensure to citizens freedom of conscience, the church in the USSR is separated from the state and the school from the church. Freedom of religious worship and freedom of anti-religious propaganda is recognized for all citizens."¹

To any lay observer, this seemed to be an equal treatment

of religion and anti-religion. The following official explanation made it clear that there was actually no equality of these freedoms. "It is known that on the basis of Article 124 of the USSR Constitution, all citizens of our country are free to perform religious ceremonies and to conduct anti-religious propaganda. But the law does not give anyone the right to conduct religious propaganda." As could be seen, the freedom extended to believers in religion by the Soviet Constitution was that of worship; the freedom extended to atheists was that of propaganda. There was no equality.

The Soviet Law of April 7, 1929, deprived the churches of the right of owning property, teaching religion, exercising charity, and assuming their former place in public life. Section 17 of this law, which was still in force as late as 1961, provided that churches could not organize for children, young people and women, special prayer or other meetings, or for the teaching of religion. A decree of 1921 prohibited the teaching of religious doctrine to persons under 18 years of age and a decree of 1923 prohibited any private religious instruction of children in groups comprising over three.

These Soviet laws and regulations were severe but the spirit of the law was even more sinister. The Great Soviet Encyclopedia.

---


after observing that the church existed legally in the USSR, pointed out that the Communist Party considered religion as an "ideology having nothing in common with science and, therefore, it could not remain neutral. The Party considered it necessary to conduct profound, systematic scientific-atheistic propaganda."\(^4\) The program and Constitution of the Communist International, Moscow, 1936, stated, "among the tasks of cultural revolution . . . a special place is occupied by the struggle against the opiate of the people, religion--a struggle which must be carried on systematically and relentlessly."\(^5\)

Karl Marx, one of the early founders of communistic theory, felt that religion should be given no quarter. It was the first enemy to be destroyed. Marx, in his examination of Hegel's *Philosophy of Right*, called religion the "opium of the people" and he explained what he meant. "The people in past ages lived in a world of oppression and unhappiness. Therefore, they created for themselves an illusory world of happiness to which they could retreat. Insofar as religion gave some crumbs of comfort it did good, but now when the people can achieve real happiness, such illusion is not only a distraction but a fatal narcotic."\(^6\)

\(^4\)Great Soviet Encyclopedia, L, 642-643, as quoted in Estoniya, op. cit., p. 64.


Ezra T. Benson, Secretary of Agriculture in 1958, conducted a trip to the Soviet Union to foster a better relationship between Russian and American agriculture. He was accompanied by several prominent persons. One of them, Tom Anderson, editor of a well-known farm magazine, made this comment about religion in Russia:

These people have what has been described as 'freedom of religion'! It is freedom to live out their last few years without being shot in the back of the neck; freedom to go on existing in a living hell under a forced choice between God and their own families. These old souls live by faith alone... The Communist plan is that when these 'last believers' die off, religion will die with them.  

The impression that was conveyed here was one of mere toleration toward religion, with the feeling that in due time the old would perish and then all religion would become nonexistent within the Soviet Union. This was quite possible because of the suppression of religious ideas among the youth of Russia.

Young people in Russia were governed by law regarding the study of religion. Not only were they forbidden to study any type of theology, but they were continually indoctrinated as to its evils. The indoctrination process began at an early age, the state having its greatest opportunity when the youth were commencing their education. In Russia there was compulsory education from the age 7 to 16. It was during this period of time that most young people developed their atheistic attitudes.

---

These attitudes were based on the Soviet conviction that science was the only phase of learning worthy of man's rational explorations. Religion being "a crutch upon which old men and women lean, a superstition with no fragment of proof attached."\(^8\)

Martin C. D'Arcy, writing on the conflict between Communism and Church observed that, "From the point of view of Communist ethics, only what aids the destruction of the hated features of the bourgeoisie, of the old capitalist world of exploitation and poverty, only that which goes to build the new Soviet, Socialist order is moral and ethical."\(^9\)

It would be difficult for a Christian to understand such a moral philosophy. To the believer in God, truth was consistently stating fact under any circumstance. The Lord declared, "Thou shalt not kill," and the Communist says, "kill if it benefits the Party." This is clearly seen in the many Communist purges which showed a complete disregard for human life. The believer in Christ's teachings would be unable to espouse such a philosophy. D'Arcy offered this thought: "What Christianity and Communism have to offer are then as different as heaven and earth, and it would appear that they must meet in a head-on collision. . . The choice is between God and man, and the Communist has chosen man. The two cannot live in the same world. The Communist recognizes this,


and as a consequence he makes it his first object to destroy religion wherever he encounters it. The persecution of religion is not an accident but a deliberate policy."

This situation was also apparent to Mr. Clark. He said, "No true Christian can support that which casts out God, makes Christ a myth, condemns Christianity to death, perverts, corrupts, and destroys the sacred relationship of family for a system of free love or some equivalent, wipes out our free agency, crushes out liberty, and makes us nothing but obedient slaves to a soulless, Godless State."  

Certain members of the Mormon Church had been espousing Communism because of a belief that Communism and the United Order, a communal system practiced by early Latter-day Saints, were virtually the same thing. Clark condemned such a belief and in a speech to the Priesthood of the Church, he explained the basic difference in this way. Under the United Order every man was called to consecrate to the Church all of the possessions which he had; thus the man's property became absolutely the property of the Church. Then the Bishop returned to the donor by legal deed that amount of real and personal property which would be required by the individual for the support of himself and his

---

10Ibid., pp. 233-234.

family "according to his family, according to his circumstances and his wants and needs."\(^\text{12}\) This the man held as his own property.

Clark continued by explaining that basic to the United Order was the private ownership of property, every man had his own property from which he might secure that which was necessary for the support of himself and his family. Clark said, "It was not contemplated that the Church should own everything or that we should become in the Church, with reference to our property and otherwise, the same kind of automaton, manikin, that Communism makes out of the individual, with the State standing at the head in place of the Church."\(^\text{14}\) Thus to Mr. Clark the great difference between the two systems was that under the United Order man still retained the right to private ownership of property, whereas under Communism all property belonged to the State and it was used only as directed by the State. In analyzing the two systems, Clark commented: "The United Order and Communism are not synonymous. Communism is Satan's counterfeit for the United Order."\(^\text{15}\)

Communism's great threat then was the destruction of the spiritual rights of man: "The Marxist principles and policy wherever found look to the temporal, not to the spiritual," said Clark, "they exalt

\(^{12}\) Doctrine and Covenants 83:17.


\(^{14}\) Ibid.

\(^{15}\) Semi-Annual Conference Report (October, 1943), p. 11.
The fight against religion which the Communists carried on was the foremost reason for Clark's hatred for Marxism; however, he rejected the Soviet philosophy for many other reasons. Clark felt that all the basic freedoms enumerated in the Constitution of the United States were in jeopardy and he manifest his great concern in this statement:

"I have been preaching against Communism for twenty years. . . . I tell you that when Communism comes, the ownership of the things which are necessary to feed your families is going to be taken away from us. I tell you freedom of speech will go, freedom of the press will go. . . ."  

Clark referred to the Communists as "revolutionaries" and outlined their intentions toward America in this way:

The end the revolutionists seek is fairly clear; it is the overturning of the whole existing order, political, financial, economic, social, religious, the complete destruction of our Constitution and the government established under it, and then the setting up of some sort of despotism that shall destroy, in all these fields, the free agency which the Lord gave to man.  

Thus the Marxian ideology which struck at the very heart of all that Americans hold most dear, was not to be accepted nor tolerated, but was to be stamped out by God-fearing, freedom-loving men everywhere.

16Ibid., (October, 1959), p. 86.  
17Ibid., (October, 1941), p. 16.  
18Ibid., (April, 1941), p. 19.
CHAPTER IV

THE WELFARE STATE

The second great force, in addition to Communism, which threatened the United States was the rapid growth of the welfare state.

In 1932, three years after the crash on Wall Street, the American public sensed that a great change was necessary to relieve them from the woes of the great depression. They could no longer accept what they regarded as President Herbert Hoover's defense of individual enterprise and advocacy of noninterference of government in business. Instead the American populace turned a sympathetic ear to the Democratic Party's movement headed by the governor of New York, Franklin D. Roosevelt. When the 1932 national election figures were compiled, Roosevelt had received 22,809,638 votes; Hoover 15,758,901.¹ The people had rejected individualism as an approach to basic economic, social and political problems presented by the depression and had accepted the New Deal with its emphasis on federal relief programs.

The New Deal employed a variety of methods in an effort to reinstate the depression-bound unemployed. The primary device used

was the creation of various relief agencies. The Federal Emergency Relief Administration, a temporary organization, established in May, 1933, gave about $3 billion to the states for dole payments or for work-project wages. This was followed by the Civil Works Administration in October, 1933, which provided work relief under local supervision during the winter months of 1933-34. In July 1935, the Works Progress Administration was established under which widespread public improvements such as bridges, highways, and public buildings were constructed.

The new administration employed many efforts to revive American economy. The Public Works Administration, authorized by the National Industrial Recovery Act of June, 1933, gave business a tremendous shot in the arm. The administration undertook some 34,000 projects involving a great range of public works and costing over $4 billion.

Repeal of the Prohibition Amendment by the passage of the twenty-first amendment in December, 1933, promoted recovery, at least of the breweries, distilleries, and wineries, not to mention the growers of hops, grain, and grapes.

As a cap to its recovery program the New Deal sponsored the National Industrial Recovery Act authorizing the National Recovery Administration. The objectives of this group included increased purchasing power, improved standards of labor, and rehabilitation of industry.

The problem of agriculture in the United States had been acute since the close of World War I. The depression tended to make the
situation more severe, with low prices, heavy mortgage debt, high fixed charges all harassing the farmers.

First, Congress passed the Frazier-Lemke Farm Bankruptcy Act in June, 1934, which provided federal credit to forestall mortgage foreclosures. In April, 1935, Roosevelt created the Resettlement Administration which helped families on marginal lands to move to more fertile farms.

Second, the principle attack against the primary problem of overproduction came in the crop-control provision of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of May, 1933. What the New Dealers tried to do was cut production of agricultural produce to the needs of domestic consumption. Thus, by creating a scarcity, they could establish parity prices for farm commodities. They would eliminate price-depressing surpluses by paying the farmers to reduce their crop acreage. To finance these payments the government would collect a tax from processors of farm produce who in turn would shift the tax to consumers.

No piece of legislature more clearly revealed the break with the past then the Social Security Act of August, 1935. The law enacted a federal-state program of insurance. Each state, "under virtual federal compulsion but with a minimum of federal supervision," established its own system of social security. The federal government taxed all employers three per cent of their annual payrolls collected by

\[\text{Ibid.}, \text{ pp. 399-410.}\]
the states. The act contained three major provisions: old age and survivors' insurance, unemployment compensation, and public assistance grants available to states for a program of social welfare including help to the blind, the aged, the crippled and minor children.  

In summation, the principle objectives of the New Deal were relief, recovery and reform. The federal government under the New Deal assumed the responsibility of overseeing relief for those thrown out of work as a result of derangements in the economy. The New Dealers in their recovery program followed a "pump priming" policy--spending money in large amounts in an effort to get the economic machine operating to the point where it could carry on under its own momentum. Under the reform program, the New Dealers hoped to bring the nation up to date with the rest of the world by reshaping existing institutions.

Clark criticized practically every phase of the New Deal. He was specifically concerned with relief to the unemployed in the form of the "dole". The New Dealers initiated the "dole" which was money paid to the unemployed with no strings attached. To Clark any person who received something for nothing from the government was unfaithful to the heritage of the Founding Fathers.

Clark expressed his feelings on the matter of relief in this way:

Those who had so suffered and starved and frozen and bled, who had watched their dearest comrades die, all not for money nor material well being, but for an abstract cause—human liberty and self-government—would have been shocked to know that a few generations thence some, not many may we hope, of those to whom they bequeathed the richest civic heritage of all time, would be clamoring for an idler’s dole. Stunned would they have been to learn that even some of those who have been placed in positions of high civic honor and trust were ministering to this debauching political heresy.

According to Clark, any relief program which was designed to give, with no prospect of any return, was instituted by Satan, the rebellious son of God who rejected the Father’s plan of free agency in the pre-existence. Clark expressed his views in this manner:

Repeated reference has been made to the Great Council in heaven and to what it meant. One element of it I should like to refer to, namely,—what Satan then proposed to do was to give salvation without labor, that is, to get something for nothing. This is the spirit which is abroad today. It is the spirit which we must fight, or it will destroy us.

The destruction which could have come about through the “dole”, according to Clark, was a curse of idleness. He said, "There is no curse equal to the curse of idleness. It destroys the man, the group, the people, or the nation, who suffer under it. Now, in saying that, I am not wishing to reflect upon those who are involuntarily idle, who cannot

---


5 Pearl of Great Price, Moses 4:1-4.

find anything to do. Idleness, I repeat, is a curse which destroys whoever is subject to it. 7

Another great objection which Clark raised against the "dole" was that government funds had to be acquired from the public in the form of taxes. He stated that, "the state nor the federal government has any funds except only such funds as it obtains from the people. Neither of them has anywhere a great pile of gold to which it can go for its money." 8 Because of this situation, certain individuals with money had to contribute to all those unemployed. Clark rejected such a system in this manner: "Now as to the other point--the living of one large group without work on the industry, thrift, and sacrifice of the rest of the world. I say again, this is virtual slavery for those who furnish the livelihood for the idlers." 9

To those Latter-day Saints who had refused to accept relief in the form of the "dole", Clark paid this tribute: "The true heroes of the depression are those L.D.S., who under this terrible depression, deprived of their jobs and livelihood, have lived on, struggling, using up the accumulation of the years that they might keep off the 'dole' . . . ." 10


9 Ibid.

However, many members of the Mormon Church had accepted relief. They had begun to enjoy the free help given by the government. Clark, along with other Church authorities, became very much concerned with the problem. They realized that something had to be done to alleviate the suffering of the Church members caused by the depression. In April, 1936, at a General Conference of the Church, a plan was presented by the Church leaders, known as the Church Security Program, which was designed to administer aid to Church members. The program had two basic objectives: (1) To create a surplus of foodstuffs and other commodities during the summer months and to provide work for all employable persons who were receiving assistance from the Church; (2) To set up within the Church an organization to make it possible for the Church eventually to take care of all of its people inclusive of government relief and to assist them in placing themselves on a financially independent basis. The first objective was to be accomplished by the employment of various make-work projects. Some of these projects were: drying preserving vegetables and fruits; making clothing and bedding; rehabilitating ranches, farms, or gardens; working on Church properties; operating wood yards and coal mines; and assisting when possible the sick and aged. The second objective was to be reached by the collection of surplus

---

11 Ibid., p. 334.

commodities through private donations, or from community projects. These goods were to be stored in a centrally located storehouse and distributed to the members of the Church as their needs demanded.

The success of the Security Program or the Welfare Plan, as it was later known, was remarkable. During the winter of 1936-37, the Church had available, through the voluntary contributions of loyal members of the Church, sufficient money, food, fuel, clothing and bedding to take care of the needs of all worthy members through the winter.

In August 1938, Time magazine published an article dealing with the plan of relief as instituted by the Mormon Church. It praised the success of the program and attributed its inauguration to the "arch-republican" J. Reuben Clark, Jr. "The program could be made to sound," it stated, "like an anti-New Dealer's sweetest dream."\(^{13}\) Whether or not Clark inaugurated the plan is not certain, but surely he was a great contributor to its success. Certainly many of the basic proposals were anti-New Deal and Clark was definitely opposed to the Democratic Party's plan of governmental control.

Some of Clark's most violent criticisms were directed against the initiation of the Social Security Act of 1935. The living of one large group without work on the industry, thrift, and sacrifice of the

\(^{13}\)Time, XXXII (August, 1938), 26.
rest of the people, was, according to Clark, "virtual slavery for those who furnish the livelihood for the idlers." Clark felt that the aged, the sick and the maimed should receive assistance, but that the federal government should have no part in such activity. Clark said, "the prime responsibility for supporting an aged parent rests upon his family, not upon society." He defends this position by utilizing the scriptures found in the Bible and in the Doctrine and Covenants. The fifth commandment as recorded by Moses in the Book of Exodus stated: "Honor thy father and thy mother: that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee." In order to honor his parents a child must be willing to care for them in sickness or old age. Clark stated, "the family which refuses to keep its own is not meeting its duties." According to Clark, if the family, due to a lack of funds, was unable to support the aged or the sick, then the responsibility shifted to the Church. The Doctrine and Covenants stated who should be cared for by the Church: "And widows and orphans shall be provided for, as also the poor." Clark was aware, however, that many of the aged and sick did not belong to any Church and did not have any family to care for them. In such a

15 Ibid.
16 Exodus 20:12.
18 Doctrine and Covenants 83:6.
situation, the responsibility for their care rested upon the local state

government. Clark said:

I am convinced that the problem of relief for the unemployed
and the care of the maimed, decrepit and old, will equally yield to
solution by constitutional methods. Over-reaching of Constitutional
functions and Constitutional powers are not necessary. As a prin-
ciple, and as a practice, the Federal Government should not under-
take the solution of these problems and the meeting of the needs
incident thereto. These burdens should be left where they now
legally rest—with the local State government.  

Although the state should handle these cases, Clark felt extreme caution
should be observed, in order that only those who were definitely without
family or Church assistance might receive aid. Otherwise many would
decievfully sponge off society. Mr. Clark made this comment with regard
to the "idler": "Society owes to no man a life of idleness, no matter what
his age. I have never seen one line in Holy Writ that calls for, or even
sanctions this. In the past no free society has been able to support great
groups in idleness and live free."  

Thus in view of the governmental controls exercised by the
Democratic Party under the New Deal, Clark raised great protest. He
said:

They are leading us down the road to a Communistic state
by subjecting us to regimentation, increasing step by step in rigor,
complexity, and scope, thus destroying our morale; they have
sought to lower our standards of life and of living, day by day,
down near to the level of the shiftless and improvident, by rulers
and regulations wholly unnecessary and deeply harmful, ... By


preventing a man from enjoying the fruits of his own labor they are throttling thrift and industry, invention and initiative.

He continued his barrage in this manner:

By their multiplicity of useless and even harmful laws, rules and regulations, touching the activities of the private lives of the people, they have encouraged the people in lying, deceit, idleness, greed, avarice, until they threaten the destruction of the warp and woof of the character of the people.  

To this list of grievances, Clark added still more in his attack upon the Welfare State:

Many begin to think they may rightfully lay their hands upon other men's goods, that they may reap where they have not sowed, that they may righteously get something for nothing.

They have engendered and promoted class and race hatreds, those fatal poisons to free institutions and a free people.

They have laid their withering and corrupting hand upon all governmental agencies and activities they could reach.

In summary, Clark's opinions concerning the nature of the state stemmed from his dedication to traditional American beliefs and to his acceptance of those theological concepts relative to the state as taught by the Mormon Church. Clark expressed great concern for the welfare of the government of the United States. He felt that two forces were

---
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attempting to destroy the American system of government--Communism and the replacement of the democratic free-enterprise system in this nation with a welfare state. Clark urged all men to combat these two forces and to stand fast to traditional Americanism.
CHAPTER V

THE ROLE OF VIOLENCE

Undoubtedly the greatest influence on Clark's attitude concerning war and violence came from the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. This organization and its religious concepts dealing with violence seemed to permeate and to dictate his whole philosophy on the subject. Therefore, to better understand Clark's views on war and violence, it becomes necessary to deal briefly with those scriptures employed by Clark which relate to violence.

To Moses from Sinai came the decree, "Thou shalt not kill," thus establishing the will of God concerning violence among men. Jesus Christ, the Son of God, repeated the command then made even anger against a man's brother a sin: "Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgement: But I say unto you, That whosoever

1Exodus 20:13.

2J. Reuben Clark, Jr., "Slipping From Our Old Moorings," p. 7. Address delivered at the Annual Meeting of the Utah Poultry Producers Cooperative Association, Salt Lake City, Utah, March 5, 1947. Found in File M1387, Special Collections, Brigham Young University Library.
is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgement." 3

Later Clark referred to the Savior who gave several classical statements concerning violence and how a person should react to it: 4

"But whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also." 5 He continued by saying, "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you." 6 The epitome of love was to love one's neighbor as himself; the term "neighbor" included all men, as Christ illustrated in his parable of the Good Samaritan. 7

However, Clark noted that on certain occasions the Lord made exceptions to His rule of non-violence and these should be noted. 8

Concerning the crime of murder, God ordained a law by which the offender was to pay for his crime with his own life. "He that smiteth a man so that he die, shall be surely put to death." 9

At times it became necessary for an individual to exert

---

3 Matt. 5:21-22.
4 Clark, "Slipping From Our . . .," pp. 7-8.
5 Matt. 5:39.
6 Matt. 5:44.
8 J. Reuben Clark, Jr., "America, A Chosen Land of the Lord," p. 4. Address presented at the 45th Annual Conference of the Young Men's and Young Women's Mutual Improvement Associations, Salt Lake City, Utah, June 9, 1940. Found in File M230, Special Collections, Brigham Young University Library.
9 Exodus 21:12.
force in the defense of his family. According to the Book of Mormon, man was justified even to the extent of killing. "And again, the Lord has said that: Ye shall defend your families even unto bloodshed." Further allowance was granted in defense of personal property, country, individual rights and religion.

According to the **Doctrine and Covenants**, war in some instances was acceptable to God who gave the following formula for all people to follow:

And again, this is the law that I gave unto mine ancients, that they should not go out unto battle against any nation, kindred, tongue, or people, save I, the Lord, command them. And if any nation, tongue, or people should proclaim war against them, they should first lift a standard of peace unto that people, nation or tongue; And if that people did not accept the offering of peace, neither the second nor the third time, they should bring these testimonies before the Lord; Then I, the Lord, would give unto them a commandment, and justify them in going out to battle against that nation, tongue, or people. And I, the Lord, would fight their battles, and their children's battles, and their children's children's, until they had avenged themselves on all their enemies, to the third and fourth generation.

In reference to the above quotation, Mr. Clark said: "He gave us a great law of war telling us that we his people, should not go to war unless commanded by him and then telling what those who were attacked should do." It was apparent then that war should only be

---

10 *Book of Mormon*, Alma 43:47.


fought on those terms issued by God. Also, that nation most favored of him which complied with his formula need not fear because God would fight the battle and victory was assured.

In the Book of Mormon, Helaman described to Moroni how he and two thousand young Ammonites went to battle against the Lamanites. Thousands of the Lamanites were destroyed, but not one of the Ammonites suffered death. Helaman attributed this great miracle to the power of God:
"And thus were we favored of the Lord; for had they come upon us in this our weakness they might have perhaps destroyed our little army, but thus were we preserved."

War then could be either morally right or wrong depending on the purposes of those who initiate the conflict. In the past, probably the most common incentive for nations to go to war has been the desire to acquire additional territory. According to Clark, if conquest could give a good title to territory, then it logically followed that conquest should be a legitimate means of obtaining property. This was the unholy rule of force, the unholy rule that "might makes right".

This is the rule that has lain behind every great empire that has ever been built during the whole history of the world; it lies behind every great empire that exists today. There is nothing new in the doctrine, neither in the practice.

Under such a rule, war is and must always be the instrument of the growth of empire. Under such a rule, nations rise and fall, as might advances or wanes.

13 Book of Mormon, Alma 56:19.
Under such a rule, safety in empire comes only to the power which is dominant in arms and resources. This rule of force became a terrifying thing. Those empires which had something to lose were continually afraid of the "have-nots" who were constantly in search of more territory and were willing to fight for it. But such a rule of force was "satanic". It was not of God. To Mr. Clark, nothing was more unrighteous, more unholy, more un-Godly than man-declared mass slaughter of his fellowmen for an unrighteous cause: "We can look with no degree of allowance upon the sin of unholy war and a war to make conquest or to keep conquest already made in such a war."15

It seemed apparent to Mr. Clark that war among empires was brought about by a few aspiring individuals determined to heap honor and riches upon themselves by using the mass of society as a tool to accomplish their designs. These leaders employed the ignorance of their followers to deceive them and distorted facts in an effort to breed hate against an unknown enemy. In reference to World War II, Mr. Clark said: "One of the greatest tragedies of the war now starting is that every people now engaged in it have been led into it without their fully knowing just where they were bound. The people themselves are largely innocent
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14 J. Reuben Clark, Jr., "In Time of War," Improvement Era, XLII (October, 1939), 657.

15 Ibid., p. 656.
of this slaughter. God will not forgive betrayal of His children by those who rule over them."

The innocent, those spurred on by unholy rulers, need not fear the judgement of God; but the leaders, men who have implanted hate, greed, and a spirit of conquest in their hearts should tremble and fear for proclaims the Lord, "All they that take the sword shall perish with the sword."

It became apparent to Clark that war and killing were both necessary on occasion and that at times they were sanctioned by God. This did not, however, diminish the evil involved in both when dealing with the unholy use of violence. One of the greatest evils involved was the cankering of man's soul with hate, the creation of a lust for killing:

You cannot fill the hearts of men with murder and then have a normal world. When you get hate into the hearts of men, anything can happen—lying, cheating, stealing, immorality, and the thousand of other things that follow. For when we lose our regard and respect for human life, we have very little left. . . . I tell you that to make an army, you must teach to kill and that must be the thing that you get into the hearts of these young people. And, I repeat, plant that once in their hearts and everything else is possible.

In order to combat these evil thoughts implanted in the hearts of man, Clark felt it necessary to preach love, forgiveness and peace. At a General Priesthood Meeting of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day
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16 Ibid., p. 698.
17 Matt. 26:52.
Saints, Clark referred to an anticipated nuclear war with the Soviet Bloc:

Brethren, I beseech you, put hate out of your hearts, fill them with the love of your fellowmen and bring into your consciousness the enormity of the crime that is contemplated and pray God that some way may be found to avoid it. If the nations will seek for peace in the spirit of the peace of Christ, it will be found. I fear they will not do it.  

It is not the intent of this thesis to do a study on international law and its affect on war. However, it is necessary to trace briefly the development of humanitarian concepts of war in order to understand Mr. Clark’s ideas regarding the subject.

In the early history of the world, wars of extermination or enslavement were more or less the rule. However, when the Roman Empire became all powerful, it adopted more temperate measures. While Roman leaders recognized the need for some war, their feelings were more humane so they were willing to grant certain rights to their enemies. After the decline of the Roman Empire, the world entered the "Middle Ages". Even though the codes of chivalry placed some restrictions on the use of violence, still Clark felt that apparently every excess that could be invented by man was practiced as nations went to war. Things became so bad, he believed, that finally at about the period of Reformation, men's consciences became shocked at "man's inhumanity to man", and they began to see if something could not be done to bring more humanity into the conduct of war.  

19 Ibid., p. 177.  
20 Ibid., (October, 1946), p. 86.
In 1583 Hugo Grotius, an early writer on International Law, was born. In the course of his life he prepared the first great work on international law, *De Jure Belli et Pacis*. In his preface Grotius stated the reasons why he wrote this treatise:

I saw prevailing throughout the Christian world a license in making war of which even barbarous nations would have been ashamed; recourse being had to arms for slight reasons or no reasons, and when arms were once taken up, all reverence for divine and human law was thrown away, just as if men were thenceforth authorized to commit all crimes without restraint.  

It was Grotius' work which prompted the bringing into war something of humanity (if humanity may be properly spoken of in connection with war).

For centuries nations studied Grotius treatment, but it was not until 1861 that they implemented his ideas. During that year the United States erupted into Civil War. Until this time civil war was a war by traitors; those who were taken as prisoners of war were treated as such. In 1863, at the request of Lincoln, Francis Lieber, a political refugee from Germany, drew up what became known as "General Orders 100", which went out to the Federal armies in the field, and thereafter governed the conduct of our armies in the Civil War. These rules went further than any practice of nations up until that time in international war. These rules forbade the bombardment, without notice, of places where there were civilian people. It provided for the protection of museums, of libraries, of...  

---  

scientific institutions. These were to be saved from the ravages and destruction of war. Undefended towns were not to be attacked. Civilians were to be spared. Old men, women and children, the wounded, all were to receive the maximum possible protection. 22

The Hague Conference of 1899 to 1907 provided for certain humanitarian inhibitions on the waging of war. They adopted a declaration prohibiting the dropping of projectiles from ballons; they provided that poison gases should not be used. They repeated the prohibitions that undefended towns should not be bombarded. Family honor was to be respected; pillage and rape and arson and the whole train of like crimes was to be forbidden. 23

Then came World War I; the world began to sink back into barbarism. According to Clark, Germany employed poison gases; towns and villages were seized in a most brutal manner; the life of man became of no value and thousands of innocents were slaughtered. 24

Humanitarianism seemed to be losing ground fast. In 1935 the beating of war drums was heard again in Germany. J. Reuben Clark, sensing the tragedy that was soon to befall the world pleaded for humane

22Clark, "In Time of War," op. cit., p. 657.


methods of warfare:

namely, that the civilian population the women and children, the sick, the aged, and the infirm of the warring nations shall, so far as possible, be protected; that indiscriminate bombing and the bombing of unfortified places shall not be engaged in; that actual hostilities shall be waged only against and between the armed forces of the belligerents. 25

His pleadings to society went unheard, for such destruction as had never been seen in history took place in many nations of the world.

Clark, being an authority on the subject of international law; having seen the progress made in history toward a more humane method of warfare and then observing what he believed to be a great retrogression of mankind during World War I and World War II, spoke out with vehemence against such brutality. Especially were his criticisms raised against America's use of the atomic bomb.

We have lost all that we gained during the years from Grotius (1625) to 1912. And the worst of this atomic bomb tragedy is not that not only did the people of the United States not rise up in protest against this savagery, not only did it not shock us to read of this wholesale destruction of men, women, and children, and cripples, but that it actually drew from the nation at large a general approval of this fiendish butchery. 26

Mr. Clark further commented: "Today, we sit quietly, with our consciences scarcely stricken when we contemplate Nagasaki and Hiroshima where we introduced the use of the Atom Bomb." 27


27 Ibid., (April, 1948), p. 175.
On another occasion, Clark observed: "Military men are now saying that the atom bomb was a mistake. It was more than that; it was a world tragedy."

In 1945, at a community service of all faiths, Mr. Clark said:

We end the war with the use of the most destructive weapon the mind of man has yet conceived. It can literally destroy nations, apparently with a degree of horror and misery and suffering heretofore unknown. Humankind, the beasts of the fields, the fowls of the air, the fish in the sea, --all can be wiped out and it may be the earth itself made lifeless. We have learned how to unleash an elemental force of the universe.

Clark was not concerned about the power of atomic energy as such, but about the manner in which men had used it and might use it in the future. He realized that the force released could be of tremendous importance to the well-being or to the destruction of mankind. Clark noted: "We of America appear to have loosed upon the earth that which can be the greatest curse that ever afflicted men, or the greatest temporal blessing that ever can to humanity."

To Clark, man was God's greatest creation, in fact man was a spiritual child of the Almighty. This alone made human destruction or well-being of significant importance. Clark felt America should have been an example to the world in the curtailment of inhumane tactics during war, but that in many cases the nation led the "pack": "Our love

---
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for peace, our actual record for peace, our boasted concern for humanity, should have led us to seek some arrangement with our enemies to curtail barbarous methods, rather than to try to outdo them. Clark compared the United States to "beasts" in a jungle which think only of the most vicious ways to destroy life.

Mr. Clark was greatly concerned about possible future wars. He said:

So far as one can judge, the next war is now planning under a system that will call for the use of weapons which will wipe out cities and, if necessary nations. I have had it reported—I do not know how accurately—that our military men are saying that if we had a forty-eight hour lead, the war would be over. How many of us brethren are really horrified by the thought of the indiscriminate, wholesale slaughter of men, women, and children—the old, the decrepit, the diseased; or are we sitting back and saying, 'Let's get at it first'. How far away is the spirit of murder from the hearts of those of us who take no thought in it?

To all faithful Latter-day Saints, this land of America was destined by God to be a beacon of light to other nations suffering under oppression. Peace and freedom was to be its standard, prompted by a love of Jesus Christ. According to a Book of Mormon prophet: "this is a choice land, and whatsoever nation shall possess it shall be free from bondage, and from captivity, and from all other nations under heaven, if
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31 J. Reuben Clark, Jr., "Some Factors in the Proposed Post-War International Pattern," Address delivered before the Los Angeles County Bar Association, Los Angeles, California, February 24, 1944, p. 21. Found in File Mor. 082, Special Collections, Brigham Young University Library.

32 Ibid.

33 Semi-Annual Conference Report (April, 1948), pp. 174-175.
they will but serve the God of the land, who is Jesus Christ, who hath been manifested by the things which we have written. "34 Thus the promise that America should be a land free from bondage was given upon the condition that this nation should serve God. As America spent billions of dollars in a search to find more effective methods of warfare, Mr. Clark feared that God was being eliminated from the picture entirely and thus opening America to destruction.

In reference to tests conducted on the use of biological or "germ" warfare and the continual efforts of the United States to develop larger and more powerful nuclear weapons, Clark made this statement:

Thus we in America are now deliberately searching out and developing the most savage, murderous means of exterminating peoples that Satan can plant in our minds. We do it not only shamelessly, but with a boast. God will not forgive us for this.

If we are to avoid extermination, if the world is not to be wiped out, we must find some way to curb the fiendish ingenuity of man who has apparently no fear of God, man or the devil, and who is willing to plot, plan, and invent instrumentalities that will wipe out all the flesh of the earth. 35

In desperation Clark protested against the search for new weapons of war and methods of killing:

And, as one American citizen to one hundred thirty millions, as one in one billion population of the world, I protest with all of the energy I possess against this fiendish activity, and as an American citizen, I call upon our government and its agencies to see that these unholy experimentations are stopped, and that somehow we get into the minds of our war-minded general staff and its satellites, and into the general staffs of all the world, a proper respect for life. 36

34Book of Mormon, Ether 2:12.
36Ibid.
Thus Clark voiced his opinions against the use of inhumane methods of warfare. He was convinced that this nation, though destined to be a free land and protected by God, would not achieve its destiny if such "unholy" methods of violence were used in the slaughter of mankind.
CHAPTER VI

ISOLATIONISM

The role of violence was not the only political issue which the twentieth century raised for Clark. As an American conservative, he was concerned about the breakdown of traditional American isolationism. Clark declared:

I am a confirmed isolationist, a political isolationist, first I am sure, by political instinct, next, from experience, observation, and patriotism, and lastly, because, while isolated, we built the most powerful nation in the world. ¹

This attitude was characteristic of Joshua Reuben Clark, Jr. throughout his entire adult life. With an almost fanatical spirit, he condemned the involvement of the United States in any of the European embroilments. One of his greatest desires was to see the United States rise to a position of importance second to no other nation because of its position on neutrality and isolation. Mr. Clark believed that any alliance made with a foreign nation which would have the affect of destroying this position was a curse brought upon the United States by unpatriotic men.

¹J. Reuben Clark, Jr., "Our Dwindling Sovereignty," Address delivered as the Fourth Annual Pi Sigma Alpha Lecture, sponsored by the Institute of Government, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah, February 13, 1952, p. 3. Found in File M1255, Special Collections, Brigham Young University Library.
Clark's role as an isolationist seemed to stem from two different sources. First, according to Mr. Clark, from a knowledge of past history dealing with diplomatic affairs, and second, from a good deal of experience involving relations with other nations.

Dealing with the first source, Mr. Clark divided history into three periods: first, the period from 1600 to 1800; second, from 1800 until World War I; and third, the period from World War I until the present. During the first period, the policy of neutrality and isolationism was begun and developed by such great Americans as George Washington, John Adams and Thomas Jefferson. Previous to the Revolutionary War, four wars had been fought on American soil; the outcome of which had little effect on the colonies: King William's War, 1689-97, Queen Anne's War, 1702-13, King George's War, 1744-48, and the French and Indian War, 1754-63. During these wars many lives were lost and a great deal of money expended with nothing gained. The French Revolution erupted in 1789. It soon became necessary for Washington to take a stand on the position of the United States due to two treaties made with France during the American Revolution. After careful consideration, Washington and his Cabinet decided that the treaties did not require the United States to join France and a policy of neutrality was pursued. Although France exerted great pressure against this policy, Washington remained firm in his stand on neutrality. In 1800 Napoleon admitted that the two treaties involving the United States and France had no legitimate hold on America.
to force a participation in European wars. America was now free from entangling alliances with Europe.

Following the position of Washington, Jefferson, while advising Congress of the purchase of Louisiana, commented as follows:

Separated by a wide ocean from the nations of Europe and from the political interests which entangle them together, with productions and wants which render our commerce and friendship useful to them and theirs to us, it cannot be the interest of any to assail us, nor ours to disturb them.²

The second period from 1800 until World War I was a time of strengthening our position of aloofness. This was the time of the Monroe Doctrine, which rounded out United States' foreign policy, so far as exchange of territories on this hemisphere was concerned. It was a time, according to Clark, "that we were a young, weak nation, relatively, and yet we were speaking to the great European powers on terms of equality, telling what we would do and what we would not do, we were speaking to them as equals and we were maintaining our complete independence of them."³ During this period of time the United States was only involved in three foreign wars: the War of 1812, the war with Mexico, and the war with Spain. Every other dispute she had been able to settle by peaceful means. During this period, America escaped all the wars in Europe. Mr. Clark said: "America, up to World War I, had nothing essential in

²Annals of the Congress of the United States, 8th Cong., 1st Sess., October 17, 1903, p. 15.

³Clark, "Our Dwindling Sovereignty," p. 20.
her history, that was not a step forward in her march of progress. And all of this was possible because our interests and our destiny were not entangled with those of any other country. 4

During those periods of time when America was not hampered with entangling alliances, the United States made the greatest growth that had ever been made by any nation during the whole history of the world.

From World War I until his death, Mr. Clark was appalled at the abandonment of traditional policy and at America's entering into alliances with Europe. He seemed quite confident that had the proclamation of neutrality issued by President Wilson in August 1914 been observed by America, the war with Germany could have been avoided. Nevertheless, the United States did enter the conflict. By the time the war ended on November 11, 1918, America found the cost of victory to be staggering. 5 Nearly as distressing to Mr. Clark as the loss of life and property was the role which the United States had cast for herself. No longer the great emblem of neutrality and peace; now a nation to be feared for her vigorous activities in the caldron of world affairs.

By the middle of the 1930's it became apparent to America that Europe was once again to be a victim of war. On September 1, 1939,
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4Ibid., p. 22.

5Knowles, op. cit., pp. 201-202. "48,900 battle deaths; 2,900 missing in action; 4,400 prisoners; 56,900 dead from disease and 6,500 dead from other causes."
Hitler's legions fell upon Poland and destroyed her in twenty-seven days. President Franklin D. Roosevelt promptly proclaimed American neutrality but soon abandoned this policy by having Congress pass the Lend-Lease Act which cost America $50 billion by 1945. The closure of American ports and the seizure of sixty-five Axis ships in American ports was a firm indication that United States' neutrality no longer existed. All of these measures were in one way or another war measures and they virtually brought the United States into the war. The shipment of goods on lend-lease carrying vessels which were armed for protection courted the attack of such vessels by Axis submarines. President Roosevelt appealed for public sympathy and the nation was aroused as never before against such apparent brutality. Mr. Clark, however, aligning himself with such isolationists as ex-president Herbert Hoover and John L. Lewis, insisted that this was not America's war and that this nation should not be concerned with it. To Americans duped by sentimentality concerning the sinking of armed vessels, Mr. Clark had this comment:

One thing more, an armed vessel, whether it be a merchantman or a battleship, is considered to be a vessel of war and subject to all the hazards of war. Neutrals using such vessels either for travel or for cargo purposes use them subject to all the dangers incident to the navigation of vessels of war on the high seas, and neither they nor their government can legitimately complain of the eventualities which may overtake them.6

6 Clark, "In Time of War," p. 694.
To Americans the sinking of their merchant ships was terrible, but no less influencing was the obvious brutality of Germany in the murder of the Jews, the starving of the Russians, and the total disrespect for life displayed by Hitler. Sympathy arose to a high pitch and the allied nations used every means available to drag the United States into the holocaust. In reference to the propaganda distributed by the allies to involve America in the war, Mr. Clark commented:

We may expect that every means, both fair and foul, which can be devised by hating, desperate men, fighting for their lives, will be used to drag us into this war. We must not accept anything at its face value; we must question every statement, carefully examine every incident. Such is war. 7

To Clark neutrality was of the utmost importance. America had a destiny to fulfill, one of peace, a standard to all nations oppressed by greedy war-mongers. Rarely indeed were mere violations of neutrality legitimate cause for war. According to Clark, there is always a conflict between neutrals and belligerents, the neutrals trying to preserve their trade and commerce and each belligerent trying to prevent all intercourse with the other. Seizure and confiscation of cargoes are normal incidents of war. After the war is over, the belligerent is called upon to pay for infractions of neutral rights, but even if payment is refused, war should be avoided. Instead of war, said Clark, the United States should:

demonstrate our love for humanity, our justice, our fairmindedness, our determination to do works of righteousness as God shall make them known to us, we shall then be where at a fitting and promising

7Ibid.
time we can offer mediation between the two belligerents and bringing our moral power and influence into action we shall have a fair chance to bring an end to the criminal slaughter of our fellowmen and to give birth to a peace that shall be lasting...

Much to Clark's dismay, the nation was soon involved in a life or death struggle with Germany, Italy, and Japan.

Thus in a period of less than thirty years, America had been involved in two of the most terrible wars known to man. To Clark, the United States had gone from a once isolated neutral to a power involved in the affairs of practically every nation in the world. A condition which was completely out of harmony with the ideals of the Founding Fathers and one which would ultimately have a disastrous affect on the freedoms they had fought for in the American Revolution.

Any treaties of alliance which would further involve the United States in the affairs of foreign nations were undesirable to Mr. Clark. He divided these treaties into three classes: (1) Alliance arrangements made during a war and relating to its conduct, often called coalitions. Normally they cease with the end of hostilities. In this class would be grouped such arrangements as the Atlantic Charter (1941), the Moscow Conference (1943), the Conference at Yalta (1945), and the Potsdam Conference (1945).

---


9 On May 8, 1945, the Reich surrendered unconditionally to the United States, Great Britain and the Soviet Union. On September 2, 1945, less than a month after the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the representatives of Japan and the allied powers met on the decks of the USS Missouri in Tokyo Bay and signed the terms of surrender.
(2) Permanent military alliance providing for mutual aid in case of future international conflicts. In this class were found the alliance with France in 1778 and the North Atlantic Pact. (3) Permanent alliances, always with a strong and sometimes with a predominant military flavoring. In this class he placed the proposed League of Nations and the United Nations Charter.

With regard to the first class of alliance treaties, Mr. Clark was not overly concerned because in general the provisions as stated therein are dissolved at the end of the conflict. However, in dealing with the second group, he expressed alarm. The North Atlantic Pact was, according to Clark, defensive alliance against Russia. No matter what the cause might be, if Russia should strike one of the allies under the treaty, America must go to war in order to meet her treaty obligations. Such an alliance can only be a disaster to the United States, a tool used to employ America's might and power in defense of any trivial disagreement between Russia and an ally under the treaty, said Clark.

With respect to the third class of alliances, Clark voiced his strongest objections. During the great debates in Congress over the proposed League of Nations, Clark was a firm supporter of isolationist senators Henry Cabot Lodge from Massachusetts and William E. Borah from Idaho. It was Clark, in fact, who prepared and submitted much of the
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10 Clark, "Our Dwindling Sovereignty," p. 23.
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material used by Senator Lodge to defeat the treaty proposed by President Wilson. It was Clark's desire to sever all ties with other nations which would restrict America's sovereignty: "The Family of Nations cannot exist on any other principle than their freedom in all matters of domestic policy, nor can individual states . . . . Every state, member of the Family of Nations, must be its own master as to its own nationals." 12

On July 28, 1945, on the other hand, the United Nations Charter was ratified by the United States Senate. Clark was appalled at what had happened. Never before had America given up so much through permanent alliance with other nations. Basic nation sovereignty had been impaired in three important ways: first, America had lost the right to conform to the provisions of the United Nations Charter; second, America lost the power to adjust her own international difficulties by giving to the Security Council the right to use force in a dispute involving charter members if the Security Council deemed it necessary in order to preserve peace; third, America lost the right to declare war, the power to decide against whom we should make war, the power to conduct war, and the power to make peace and to determine its terms. Clark said:

Thus we raise and equip our forces, sea, land and air, but the Security Council, with the Military Staff Committee, determines when and where the forces shall go, who commands them, how many go, for how long, in what cause and against whom. So, subject to temporary measures of self-defense, pending Security Council action,

12 Clark, "In Time of War," p. 698.
our boys shall fight and die, and the Security Council, not ourselves, will send them into that fight.\textsuperscript{13}

In reference to these treaty alliances, Mr. Clark exclaimed:

Our adventure into world politics, contrary to the principles that were framed by the good sense and I think inspiration of our Founding Fathers have levied upon us a tribute leading almost to the brink of disaster, and so far as ordinary human foresight can determine, we are by no means yet to the end of the road.\textsuperscript{14}

Though sovereignty was impaired and though a seemingly pessimistic attitude was reflected by Clark concerning America's fate in foreign affairs, still a partial solution was given to the problem. First, only the most patriotic men and women should be chosen to hold positions of responsibility. Thus, according to Clark's philosophy, eliminating the chance for further embroilment in international affairs. Second, since the charter members of the United Nations have the power of amendment, the United States should attempt to amend the Charter in order to make it a useful device for furthering world peace and seek to restore sovereignty to each individual nation.

\textsuperscript{13}Clark, "Our Dwindling Sovereignty," p. 30-31.

\textsuperscript{14}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 34.
CHAPTER VII

CONSTITUTIONAL CONSERVATISM

It would be very difficult to find a man who was more dedicated to his concept of the basic principles of Americanism than J. Reuben Clark, Jr. His entire political philosophy seemed to be dedication to the retention and protection of the political concepts found in the Constitution of the United States. When speaking of the Constitution he spoke with reverence and expressed a sincere devotion for the document. These feelings which are so easily discerned may be attributed in large measures to the religious concepts espoused by Mr. Clark. He felt certain that the Constitution of the United States was framed by men who were inspired of God. He based this belief on several passages of scripture found in the Doctrine and Covenants:

And for this purpose have I established the Constitution of this land, by the hands of wise men whom I raised up unto this very purpose and redeemed the land by the shedding of blood.  

While the foregoing justified Clark's belief that the framers of the Constitution were inspired of God, the following passage justified his loyal support of the document:

And now verily I say unto you concerning the laws of the land, It is my will that my people should observe to do all things I command.

1Doctrine and Covenants 101:80,
And that law of the land which is constitutional, supporting that principle of freedom in maintaining rights and privileges belongs to all mankind, and is justifiable before me. Therefore, I the Lord, justify you, and your brethren of my church in befriending that law which is the constitutional law of the land; And as pertaining to law of man whatsoever is more or less than this cometh of evil.  

The personal testimony of Joseph Smith, the Mormon prophet also served as a basis for Clark's strong devotion to the Constitution. While commenting on Smith's political beliefs, Clark expressed the following: He told us that the Constitution, under which we live, was an inspired document, that its principles were elemental to free human government and declared we should adhere to the Constitution and to the principles thereof.  

In an address delivered before the General Priesthood of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Clark further expressed his feelings toward the prophet, as a source of his own devotion to the Constitution: "I believe the Constitution was inspired. The Lord said so. The Prophet said so; and the prophets since Joseph have said so; and I am not prepared to consider the Constitution in any other light."  

Accepting the Constitution as a divinely inspired safeguard, preserving the rights and privileges of men in the land of America, Mr. Clark rejected any and every move to change the document with its basic

---

2Ibid., 98:4-7.
concepts of government other than by the means outlined in the Constitution itself.

To those would be "defamers" of the Constitution who felt the document outmoded; not responsive to present-day conditions of life and living; not sufficient to meet and solve present-day problems; those who felt America needed a modern, up-to-date system of government, Clark stood firmly opposed. He expressed his confidence in the present-day value of the document as follows:

The Constitution, as approved by the Lord, is still the same great vanguard of liberty and freedom in human government that it was the day it was written. No other human system of government, affording equal protection for human life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, has yet been devised or vouchsafed to man. Its great principles are as applicable, efficient, and sufficient to bring today the greatest good to the greatest number, as they were the day the Constitution was signed.  

This conservative view of the Constitution and the government which it established was characteristic of Mr. Clark's political philosophy during his entire life. In fact, he seemed to make it his duty, as an American, to speak out with vehemence against any practice which he considered to be unconstitutional or which in any way opposed those principles of government laid down by the Founding Fathers.

Clark was concerned about the destruction of constitutional rights and privileges due to "conspiring men" who were attempting to destroy America by introducing undemocratic principles of government. He believed that these principles originated in the "Civil Law" which ran

---

counter to the "Common Law" traditions of American democracy. According to Clark, in Civil Law the source of all power was the personal ruler; whether prince, king, or emperor. This concept seemed to originate, Clark believed, from two codes of law: the Theodosian (A.D. 438) and the Justinian (A.D. 534). Neither of these codes were developed by the legislative branch of government, nor on the initiative of the people, but both originated with the ruler of the nation. Their provisions were dictated by him for his advantage. This is often referred to as the lex regia concept of law. Clark reflected his feelings toward the lex regia concept as follows: "The sovereign power rested in the head of the state, who granted to the people, his subjects, the rights he decided they should have, reserving all other rights in himself, as likewise the right to extend, alter, add to, or withdraw the rights already granted."

And on another occasion while speaking on the same subject, Clark stated:

The people under this system have those rights, powers, and privileges, and those only which the sovereign considers are for their good and for his advantage. He adds or takes away as suits his royal pleasure. All the residuum of power is in the Emperor. Under this system, the people look into the law to see what they may do. They may only do what the Emperor has declared they may do.

This civil law or lex regia concept of law was very distasteful to Clark. In contrast, he praised the Common Law— that law begun in


7J. Reuben Clark, Jr., "Let Us Not Sell Our Children Into Slavery," An Address delivered before the Utah State Farm Bureau
England and further developed in America. Under the Common Law, true sovereignty rests not with the emperor but with the people. This great principle was embodied in the Preamble to the Constitution of the United States:

We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

Under this system, the people set up the government. They bestowed the power. They gave to the government the powers they wished to give. The residuum of power was in the people. There was no emperor, no lex regia. Clark pointed out that in a democracy the people through their chosen representatives—not the emperor or a small group—make the laws. To make sure these representatives do not get out of hand, they are elected for short terms of office. In this way the people can, at intervals, displace unsatisfactory representatives and elect others to take their places. Furthermore, the people specified in the Constitution the matters about which their representatives in Congress could and could not make laws. The sovereign power was in the people and the legislative branch could go only as far as the electorate authorized. 8

It became apparent to Clark that certain foreign influences were attempting to introduce many lex regia concepts into the American Federation, Hotel Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah, November 21, 1952, p. 13. Found in File M1255, Special Collections, Brigham Young University Library.

Common Law system. These were completely out of harmony with the principles embodied in the Constitution. Foremost among these innovations, according to Clark, were the attempts to give legislative power to the executive branch of the government and to change the constitutional amendment process.

There is a growing tendency for our Congress to turn over to administrative commissions the power to make laws. This plan carries the innocent description of making regulations for enforcing the laws. But lawyers know that under the guise of issuing regulations, these administrative bodies really legislate, not only in procedural matters, but also in substantive matters.9

On another occasion he made reference to these directives:

Behind them are no popular urges—indeed, they not infrequently fly in the face of the people's desire; they are made without public notice or discussion, in violation of established law-making procedure; they are not made by the representatives of the people, on the contrary, they are made by young, frequently alien, bureaucrats, with boyish outlooks and frequently with no practical experience . . . .10

Clark then proceeded to illustrate certain directives that had been established by those "aliens":

They have prescribed what a manufacturer may make and how much of it, and have set up price ceilings on the sale of the articles . . . .

They have prescribed what working men shall be paid, the number of hours they shall work, the conditions under which they shall work, how many shall work, and their rates of compensation.

They have compelled or induced the farmer to destroy his crops and kill his cattle and hogs in such numbers and proportions as they determined . . . .

They have fixed the prices for which the products of the soil and of the herds could be sold . . . .

They have created conditions which forced American womanhood into the fields, the workshops, the factories to become laborers; they are luring mothers away from their children into industry, leaving their children to run the streets idle, uncared for, untaught, undisciplined, the easy victims of disease and plagues, immorality, wickedness and crime.\(^{11}\)

These "directives", according to Clark, violated at least three different phases of constitutional law: (1) They permitted the encroachment of the executive branch upon the powers of the legislative and judicial branches, completely denying that constitutional principles defined as the separation of powers. (2) These "directives" also took certain powers and rights from the states and from the local governments and lodged them in the federal government which, according to Clark, violated the principle of States Rights. (3) He also felt that they removed sovereignty from the people and placed it in the hands of the executive branch of the federal government.\(^{12}\)

Regarding the threat to the separation of powers existing between the three branches--the executive, the legislative, and the judicial--Mr. Clark emphatically exclaimed:

No greater concern was shown on any point than that there should be no encroachment by one department of government on any other; that there should be no invasion by one department into the field of the other; that there should be no delegation of authority by one department to another. To forestall this, the Framers set up a series of so-called "checks and balances". And among these

\(^{11}\)Ibid., pp. 10-12.  
\(^{12}\)Ibid.
matters of gravest concern, none was more poignantly felt and considered than that of putting the executive power under rigid control.\textsuperscript{13}

Clark felt strongly that the President of the United States was usurping from the legislative branch the power to pass laws through the use of the above-mentioned "directives". Clark believed that through the use of other political means, such as "denying patronage, or by social ostracism, or by active opposition at the polls against recalcitrant lawmakers," the President was able to not only recommend legislation, but actually to draft it, and submit it to his favorites in Congress who would secure its passage.\textsuperscript{14}

The President was also taking from the Congress the right to approve the appointment of diplomatic representatives of the government by commissioning personal, quasi-diplomatic representatives, so-called "ambassadors at large" to conduct relations abroad. Clark pointed out that Col. Edward M. House, an appointee of President Woodrow Wilson, was not an approved representative and yet had sufficient power to commit America to enter World War I on the side of the allies more than a year before Congress declared war.\textsuperscript{15}

The removal of certain rights and powers from the state and local governments and the placing of those rights in the hands of the federal

\textsuperscript{13}Clark, "Some Fundamental Principles . . . .", p. 22.

\textsuperscript{14}Clark, "Let Us Not Sell Our Children . . . .", p. 20.

\textsuperscript{15}Ibid.
government was another source of concern to Mr. Clark. He considered the enactments or "directives" by the federal executive as a means of destroying the power of local government.

The largest possible measure of local self-government, in our State, in the county, in the city, and in the village, is not alone our safety, but our salvation. The people must live and have a right to live under laws which they wish and which they help to frame; these laws must be drawn through a sympathy with and an understanding of the needs of the people whose welfare they are framed to meet; they must be enforced by local citizens having that same sympathy and understanding of both needs and welfare.\(^{16}\)

Those enactments which destroyed this local self-government were in the strictest sense, according to Clark, undemocratic and unconstitutional.

Mr. Clark expressed himself very emphatically as to the source of sovereignty in the United States. The Framers of the Constitution left sovereignty with the populace which was to delegate only certain powers to state and federal governments. However, through the use of "directives", various "treaty alliances" and through so-called "treaty-law",\(^{17}\) sovereignty was, according to Clark, being removed from its place in America. Speaking on the subject of sovereignty, Clark said:

Now, really, whereas the sovereign, the personal sovereign, told the people what they might do, we, in the Constitution, have told our officers what they might do, and if they act constitutionally, they may only do to and for us what we have authorized them to do. That is a very important distinction and one I should like to have you carry in your minds, because there are influences at work in this country, for one reason and another, that would take away from us

\(^{16}\)Clark, "Washington Birthday Address," p. 5.

\(^{17}\)Supra, Chapter V.
that element of sovereignty, and would lodge the sovereignty in the President of the United States and a two-thirds majority of the Senators present constituting a quorum and they propose to do this by what they call "treaty-law".\textsuperscript{18}

Any such attempts to remove this sovereignty from the populace and place it elsewhere, except as provided for in the Constitution, were to be stopped!

A great deal of the blame for these enactments must be placed on the legal profession since it had the power to put a stop to them by branding them as unconstitutional. Mr. Clark, commenting on this, said:

Then the enactments began in the midst of a great depression, and the lawyers were inclined to wink at usurpations in the hope that somehow they would pull us out of our troubles. This feeling was encouraged by the easing up in enforcement procedures or the writing of a new prescription, whenever popular outcry became too threatening. Then as time went on, and the plan developed, the lawyers became fearful of governmental retaliation if the enactments were contested. Finally, they seem to have given up the fight, and to take as constitutional every law, every "directive" or other enactment that appears . . . .

According to Clark, certain persons were attempting to change the amendment process as provided for by the Constitution. These individuals were composed of "aliens" attempting to promote lex regia concepts in America. Concerning any change advocated by such men, he said:

I should like to point out to you that in that inspired document, the Constitution, the Lord prescribed the way, the procedure

\textsuperscript{18}J. Reuben Clark, Jr., \textit{Some Political Blessings} (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1957), p. 37.

\textsuperscript{19}Clark, "Some Factors of a Now-Planned . . . .", p. 15.
by which the inspired framework of that Constitution could be changed. Whenever the Constitution is amended in that way, it will be an amendment that the Lord will approve; but whenever it is amended in any other way than He prescribed, we are not following the commandment of the Lord and must expect to lose our liberties and freedom.

Clark felt that the Constitution was written to protect minorities in America. For this reason, amendments were to be made only by large majorities—two-thirds for action in the Senate and three-fourths among the states. With regard to individuals or groups who attempted to change this prescribed order, he said:

If we are to have an amendment by the will of one man, or of a small group of men, if they can amend the Constitution, then we shall lose the Constitution; because each succeeding person or group who come into a position of place and power where they can "amend" the charter, will want to amend it again, and so on until no vestige of our liberties shall remain.

Thus to Clark, a deviation from traditional Americanism through the signing of treaties or by permitting lex regia concepts to enter established American governmental procedure was to place the nation in danger of losing its "liberties" bought with the blood of its forefathers.


\[21\] Ibid.
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In summarizing the political views of J. Reuben Clark, Jr., it was necessary to recognize him both as an individual involved directly with the civil governing process and as an ecclesiastical authority in the hierarchy of the Mormon Church. Practically all of Clark's political concepts were directly related to his interpretation of those scriptures used by the Church.

The nature of man's relationship to the state was, according to Clark, determined by a pre-earth existence. Clark believed man to be a spiritual child of God, inheriting certain divine attributes which could ultimately result in the individual becoming a god. Man's earthly experience was planned to eventually make this possible.

Clark felt that governments were instituted by God for the purpose of assuring to man "free agency" or the right to choose for himself. However, Clark believed that since men had "free agency" they were thus free to change the governmental process as they desired. In many instances this resulted in the formation of governments, which were corrupted by evil men, with the purpose of enslaving the populace and destroying "free agency" through the use of inhumane methods of warfare. Those governments which Clark feared the most were Communism and the Welfare State.
According to Clark, the most perfect form of government was that created by the United States Constitution. He felt that this document had been written by men who were inspired by God and that a stamp of approval had been placed upon it by the Almighty. Therefore, Clark believed that any changes made in the governing processes outlined in the Constitution, except as were therein allowed, were completely out of harmony with the wishes of God and would be disastrous to the American government.

To Clark, certain policies which seemed to fit into this "unconstitutional area" were: the breakdown of traditional American isolationism; the entering of America into entangling alliances with foreign nations; and the inauguration of excessive governmental controls in the United States.

In conclusion, it should be noted that although Clark's views regarding the foregoing were accepted by many individuals throughout the Mormon Church, still many people rejected them, primarily because of a feeling that Clark was not being realistic. They felt that America, being the great power that she was, had to assume more governmental controls and become more involved with other nations in the world.

This study proved to be rather difficult due to a lack of personal information about Mr. Clark. However, it is hoped by the author that those who read this thesis will be gratified by becoming acquainted with some political views of a most interesting figure--J. Reuben Clark, Jr.
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ABSTRACT

The political views of J. Reuben Clark, Jr. have been of interest to the membership of the Mormon Church since the year 1933, when Clark was appointed second counselor to Heber J. Grant, then President of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. This interest was generated in part by the various political positions of importance which Clark held since 1906, and by the numerous politically-oriented speeches which he gave from time to time throughout the Church and the nation.

According to Clark, the nature of man's relationship to the state was determined by a pre-earth existence. Clark believed man to be a spiritual child of God, inheriting certain divine attributes which could ultimately result in the individual becoming a god. Man's earthly experience was planned to eventually make this possible.

Clark felt that governments were instituted by God for the purpose of assuring to man "free agency" or the right to choose for himself. However, Clark believed that since men had "free agency" they were thus free to change the governmental process as they desired. In many instances this resulted in the formation of governments, which were corrupted by evil men, with the purpose of enslaving the populace and destroying "free agency" through the use of inhumane methods of warfare. Those governments which Clark feared the most were Communism and the Welfare State.
According to Clark, the most perfect form of government was that created by the United States Constitution. He felt that this document had been written by men who were inspired by God and that a stamp of approval had been placed upon it by the Almighty. Therefore, Clark believed that any changes made in the governing processes outlined in the Constitution, except as were therein allowed, were completely out of harmony with the wishes of God, and would be disastrous to the American government.

To Clark, certain policies which seemed to fit into this "unconstitutional area" were: the breakdown of traditional American isolationism; the entering of America into entangling alliances with foreign nations; and the inauguration of excessive governmental controls in the United States.

The sources of information used to write the thesis were limited to: general reference material; the Semi-Annual Conference Reports of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints 1933-1961; other addresses given by Clark before civic and religious groups; and articles by Clark in the Improvement Era and other periodicals.

It was not the intent of the writer to critically evaluate Clark's views relative to the above-mentioned areas, but rather to state Clark's political ideas in a logical and well-organized manner; thus providing a view of his opinions concerning the areas mentioned and leaving the reader to either agree or to disagree with Clark.
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