BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY BULLETIN

Brigham Young University

STUDIES

Autumn 1959—Winter 1960

Brigham Young University

STUDIES

Volume I, Number 2 Volume II, Number 1

CONTENTS

The purpose of *Brigham Young University Studies* is to be a voice for the community of L.D.S. scholars.

Vol. 57 Provo, Utah April 15, 1960 No. 21

Brigham Young University Bulletin. Re-entered January 12, 1959, at Provo, Utah, as second-class matter under act of Congress of July 16, 1904. Accepted for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1703, Act of October 3, 1917; authorized July 30, 1918. Published six times during January, February, March and April, four times during May and September; and twice during June, October, November, and December. Second-class postage paid at Provo, Utah.

Brigham Young University Studies **is published by Brigham Young University.** Send manuscripts to Editor, *Brigham Young University Studies,* Box 12, McKay Building, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah. Enclose self-addressed, stamped envelope. Subscriptions, $2.00 for four issues; single copies, $.50 each. Please send subscriptions to Office of University Publications, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah.

Printed by Brigham Young University Press 1M 4-60 PRUP 10451

Folk Elements in the Formation of the Mormon Personality

AUSTIN E. FIFE

Sir Hilary and Tenzig felt a unique sense of achievement when they reached the 29,000 foot height of Mount Everest. Yet at the same time they must have sensed the smallness, the frailty of man in the face of the immensity of the earth and the cosmos spread out before them.

My own feelings were not dissimilar when as a student at Utah State University I climbed Mount Logan. As I arrived on the summit at daybreak I looked back upon the valley from which I had emerged to behold it shrouded in darkness. To the east the sun was rising beyond the ranges of Wyoming like a great beacon inviting me to pilot my course toward lands of the rising sun. I was not then aware that the darkness over Cache Valley came largely from the unilluminated recesses of my own soul, and that the beacon of that sun derived its inviting brightness from the humanistic tradition of Europe. Like a faithful pilot, for a quarter century since then I have plotted my course by this beacon, until at last I have circumnavigated the globe to make a landing once more in the valley whence I came. The flight has been filled with hazards and rewards and I am not sure if my presence here is to be compared with the welcome of a prophet in his own land or to the return of the Prodigal Son.

Typically an audience expects a folklorist to entertain it with quaint proverbs, to sing for it the songs that grandma used to sing, or to tell stories about Brer Rabbit and the fox. That he should speak about the structure of a culture or the formation of personality seems presumptuous. However, the realm of folklore is somewhat more vast than is ordinarily presumed, and, when pursued with diligence, it can throw light upon many areas of culture ignored by other disciplines.

Dr. Fife is vice-president of the American Folklore Society and chairman of the Modern Language Department of Parsons College in Iowa. He has served as a fellow of the *Musée National des Arts et Traditions Populaires* under the Fulbright program.

Folklore is a science which is too much neglected—the science of the commonplace. After all, it is what there is most of in our lives. It is taken so much for granted that we fail to see its deeper implications. The folklorist takes the view that what is most important is not truth itself so much as man's view of truth, not fact but myth. I hope that you will keep this definition of myth in your minds throughout this lecture. The word has been used in so many ways and to mean so many things that serious misunderstandings might arise if you fail to recall the particular meaning which we give to it: *myth is man's view of reality.*

Myth, then, and not fact, is the area that interests the folklorist: man's view of the cosmos, man's comprehension of the nature of life, of death, of life hereafter, and of life before birth. The folklorist insists that what is important is not so much the historic or scientific fact as the use that man makes of the historic or scientific fact in the here and now. Nor does the folklorist assume that fact and myth are perforce in conflict with each other. The word "lore" in *folklore* means both knowledge and belief, and these are not mutually exclusive.

As for the "folk" of *folklore,* a definition is somewhat harder. We would not, however, leave you with the traditional view that society is to be divided into two categories—the folk and the non-folk, the simple and the learned, the aristocrat and the plebeian. A folklorist must take the more democratic view that human beings are equal, not only before the law, but in intrinsic worth. Moreover, the folklorist recognizes that people are essentially "folk" in most of their behavior and "non-folk" in a little of their behavior. I myself try to behave in the realms of folklore and French literature as "non-folk." I am, or strive to be, a specialist who seeks to know the knowable and to expound it with the maximum possible correspondence between the fact and my view of the fact. In these fields I might be called a scientist. But just get me talking about sports or automobiles or glaciers or zoology, and I am as "folk" as they come. My pulse is quickened by the appearance of a snake, be it poisonous or not, because in the "folk" tradition I was trained to react that way. Had I been reared in the snake cult of the Cumberland Gap I might take the most deadly reptiles and

wrap them caressingly about my neck. The behavior of all of us is to a very large degree determined by the selection of myth that we have made via the channels of the folk.

This selectivity brings us to a definition of personality which is basic to the subject-matter of this lecture. Each of us is born as an organism whose genetic structure establishes certain characteristics, certain potentials, and certain limitations. But the essence of the *person* which this organism eventually becomes is formed gradually via experience. The terms "heredity" and "environment" have traditionally been used to express this dual source of the personality. However, the importance of "heredity" may well have been exaggerated, and the term "environment" is inadequate because it suggests a static set of conditions rather than a complex of living, changing experiences which spring from a common source but which form a particular unity for each individual. The common mass whence these experiences spring is the myth system of a particular culture—the views of reality that are held in common. Personality, in this context, is little more than one individual's selection of myth. This personality is not a rigid unchanging thing, but an evolving complex until the sad moment when the individual has so solidified his myths that nothing can be added to them or substracted from them: *rigor mortis* not yet, but *rigor personalitatis,* which is an even sadder state: from it Henri Bergeson, in his essay *Laughter* derives the essence of the comic.

Folklore is a science of the commonplace: the folklorist strives to assemble, classify, and understand man's commonplace views of reality, just as a botanist assembles, classifies, and understands plants. The songs learned and sung outside of school, the church, the concert hall, and commercialized mass-media; the rhymes, proverbs, sayings, comparisons, similies, and metaphors not learned from professors or school books; the gestures, signs, and symbols not taught by the dramatics coach or art teacher; the anecdotes, yarns, and stories that school anthologies and MIA manuals do not print; the houses, derricks, gates, fences, quilts, and rugs that are not designed and made by skilled craftsmen in drafting rooms and factories, or by specialists in the mechanical engineering and home economics

departments of state colleges; the rhymes, jingles and finger-play that we use to entertain children—from a selection of these each man forms to a very large extent his view of reality and works out his relationship with the cosmos. The folklorist finds them quite as important as the subject matter of any traditional scientific or humanistic discipline.

The folklorist, of course, recognizes the importance of the work being done by other scientists. Theirs is the task of ever seeking to make man's myths correspond to reality as nearly as possible, for when our myth systems get out of step with reality there is confusion in the ranks—chaos in the culture and frustration in the personality. There is similar chaos when scientists wish to impose views of reality which seem to destroy cherished myths. All of folklore is not error, nor is all myth falsehood. Man is a believing animal. He must form a view of reality for himself. The scientists cannot form it for him, although they must keep trying to communicate to man their findings. In our daily lives we must each face situations and solve problems nearly all of which are too complex or require too immediate a solution for the scientific method to be of much use. This being true, there is only one recourse: to make an act of faith, depend upon an intuitive decision, follow the impulse that springs from the totality of one's accumulated myths.

We have reached a point where we might venture to make some basic distinctions between the cultural roles played by the folklorist, the scientist, and the humanist. Please note, however, that if we segregate them it is only for the sake of definition. If a scholar is worth his salt there is a bit of all three within him, whichever he prefers to be called. The scientist should not be a destroyer of myth but one who purifies it by trying to make it correspond to reality as nearly as he can. He must let man believe, but he must give man knowledge by which he may construct beliefs that are dependable.

The humanist is a myth maker. His job is to take the commonplace on the one hand and the scientific on the other and join the two in holy wedlock. The humanist must be sensitive to the flexible elements of myth so that he can find ways of accommodating the new to the old, not the old to the new. Remember, myth has seniority over science: seniority via age

and seniority via plurality of acceptance. We cannot hope to build man in the image of the scientist, but we may build scientists in the image of man.

The folklorist assembles, classifies, and interprets myth. And since myth is an evolving, changing thing, just as is personality, his job is never finished. He must keep offering the scientist the data of myth for his rites of purification. For the humanist he must keep redefining the essence of contemporary myth systems so that *he* may lead chastened bride and groom into a new union. Thus has man ever sought to establish his *rapport* with the cosmos, and in this manner alone can he hope to maintain it.

I come to folklore via the Mormon myth system and the humanistic tradition of France. For twenty years I have been re-examining the components of my Mormon culture so that I might thereby gain a better view of myself. And for nearly thirty years I have steeped myself in the language, literature, and culture of France because I felt that it was central to the stream of Western Civilization of which both American and Mormon culture are a part. I wrote a doctoral dissertation on mediaeval Christian folklore, and have taught French language and literature for nearly twenty years. During that time I have spent many long and short vacations with Mrs. Fife in many Mormon and western towns, talking with the folk about the commonplace elements of their culture. In hundreds of interviews we have gathered their songs and stories, listened to their pioneer reminiscenses, and recorded their sayings, beliefs, proverbs, and jokes. We have photographed their houses, barns, gates, fences, and hay derricks. We have made kodachrome slides of their lovely quilts and rugs, and gathered their homespun medical and cosmetic recipes. We have trod the ditchbanks to interview farmers about the planting of crops, the killing of hogs, or fights over water. We have visited new mothers in hospitals to ask them about their views on courtship, marriage, pregnancy, and the rearing of children. Each little tidbit has been like a crumb from the table of some other discipline, yet of the crumbs we think that we have made a loaf.

In Franklin, Idaho, my informant looked me over inquiringly and said: "You know, you look just like a man I almost married." "Who?" I asked. "Hendricks Stocks," she said. And I replied: "Well, that's understandable. Hendricks is my first cousin!" In Ogden I went to interview Zeke Johnson, longtime superintendent of the Bridges and Arches National Monuments. "I am Doctor Fife, representing the Library of Congress, and I am here to . . ." Zeke interrupted: "Fife, eh! Any relation to Jeanette Fife?" "Why, yes," said I. "Jeanette Fife was my grandfather's sister." Zeke put his arm around my shoulder: "Well, son," said he, "Jeanette Fife was my father's third plural wife!" Thus the bonds of kinsmen were established between us, and I gained entree into another storehouse filled with treasures of Mormon lore. The pleasures derived from the interviews themselves have been so great that our time would have been well spent even if we had taken no notes nor published any of the results of our findings.

I have given a rather extensive background about the materials and methods of folklore, and our particular commitment to it; the logical next question should concern the application we have made thereof in the study of the folklore of our own culture. What have we found to be the components of the Mormon myth system as we have observed them, not in Mormon theology or in the organized activities of the church, but among the Mormon people? At the very outset we should remind you that the Mormon folk tradition is part and parcel of Anglo-American folk tradition, despite the peculiarities which it has inherited from Mormon theology and from the unique Mormon sociological experience. I have at times felt that not only is the Mormon folk culture uniquely American but excessively so, that in some areas we actually exaggerate American qualities. With nearly all Americans we share a common European heritage and voluntary migration into a wilderness by individuals and family groups who were searching for an improved way of life in a new and hostile land.

> The lands that boast of so much light
> We know they're all as dark as night
> Where poor men toil and want for bread
> And rich men's dogs are better fed.

The lands that boast of liberty
You ne'er again would wish to see
When you from England make a start
To cross the plains in your handcart.

These lines from a ballad of the Handcart Pioneers express an almost universal view of immigrants to the New World which is basic to the formation of the American personality: a clean break with the fatherland, a mystical faith in the discovery of the land of promise. The same things recur in hundreds of songs, tales, and anecdotes of almost every linguistic and racial group that colonized our land. Together they constitute an almost militant and idealized ethnocentrism which sets our culture apart from the rest of mankind: tragically apart in this tiny world of the era of fission! Little wonder that isolationist feelings have made us shun European entanglements, exalt our materialistic achievements as if God spoke no language except Yankee American. High tariffs, resistance to foreign aid, and a whole schema of isolationist political behavior are but a few of the manifestations of this "chip on the shoulder" attitude toward the lands that gave us our birth.

Activism is another element of the American myth system that is maximized among the Mormons. Lower middle class Europeans have seldom had the feeling that they could do much about their humble lot in Europe. That is why many of them immigrated here. And, by jove, when they got here they were going to change their lot! Futility is simply not American. If you don't like what you have, what you are, and where you are, you can do something about it and you should. "God helps those who help themselves." "Never say die." "Where there's a will there's a way." "Put your shoulder to the wheel." These ideas expressed in many of the forms of folk tradition are universal in America. The group that set out to colonize Blanding, Bluff, and Monticello beyond the ominous chasms of the Colorado had to build a kind of ramp down the side of a steep incline. The job detained them for several weeks but they did it and amazed the local Indians who knew that the Colorado simply couldn't be crossed at that point. And while they were

building their ramp they rallied their confidence by singing:

> Did you ever hear tell of the spider
> Who tried up the wall for to climb?
> If not just take this as a guider,
> It may come in handy in time.
>
> Nine times he tried hard to ascend it,
> And every time took a fall,
> But he kept right on climbing, light-hearted,
> And at last reached the top of the wall.
>
> Do you think it's by sitting and sighing
> You'll ever obtain all you want?
> It's cowards who stand around crying
> And foolishly saying, "I can't."
>
> It's only by plodding and working
> And laboring up the steep hill
> With faith in your heart never shrinking
> And saying, "I can and I will."

If you want to see how far the myth system of a culture can differ from this maximization of the principle of activism, you should re-read "The Thousand and One Nights." Here all is fate: fame and fortune, pleasures and sorrows, are made by a whim of Allah, and human beings are moved by him like so many pawns on the chess-board of the earth.

I suppose that all pioneering groups have been preoccupied first of all with the solution of immediate economic problems. The sustenance of life certainly has a high priority among the cultural values of any people whatsoever. It becomes almost overpowering when hunger, poverty, and the hostility of an unknown land conspire to threaten life itself. Hence it would be surprising indeed if a practical materialism had not dominated the growing years of our American culture. The Mormon pioneering experience intensified this hazard, although rather well organized group techniques for alleviating the material needs of the people gave them somewhat more security than was felt by other pioneers of the great American desert.

All western pioneers knew hardship, hunger, want. Such an imprint was made on the pioneer imagination concerning the value of material things that we, the second and third generations, in our easy luxury, still project the obsessions of our ancestors, nourish the illusion that the more wealth we accumulate the better off we are, even when our possessions have actually become a burden. There are correctives for this rampant materialism in other-worldly aspects of the theology of Mormonism and in delicacies of the folk imagination, but these correctives have not gone far enough as yet in bringing us around to a frame of mind where we can use our material wealth in the best interests of the good life.

One has but to examine the amazing mass of Mormon tales and anecdotes about the rewards that are in store for those who keep the faith to note that in almost every instance the rewards involved are of a material rather than of a spiritual or aesthetic nature. We cite the following story as an example.

> A large group of Mormon Boy Scouts was seated Indian fashion around a camp fire. The light of the flames gave occasional glimpses of faces that were expectant and eager. The famous San Juan guide and storyteller, Zeke Johnson, was telling them a faith-promoting story. Zeke's tall figure, unbent after seventy years of wrangling and prospecting, cast its shadow across the boys to the outer edge of the circle.
>
> "Once upon a time, back in '49, there was two young fellers from Missouri name of Black and Temple that come through Salt Lake on their way to Californie gild diggin's. They'd made an agreement that if either one of them left the other while on the way to the gold fields, the other would take possession of the whole outfit for his journey.
>
> "When they'd stopped at Salt Lake to replenish their supplies, they saw the church folks gathering at the old Bowery. And the one name of Black decides to go over and listen to the Mormon meeting. He was so impressed by the sermon delivered by Orson Pratt that he decides right there and then to join up with the Mormons. So next morning he goes and takes his personal things off the wagon and tells his buddy he's going to stay in Salt Lake. Of course his friend protested but Black wouldn't give in and so he had to go on to Californie alone.

"Well, you know when I was down there at Blanding, I was both the mayor and the bishop. And I conducted two funerals down there that I want to tell you about. The first was a funeral for Brother Black—the very same one that come out to Salt Lake and stayed back in '49. He had over a hundred descendants, and never in my life have I been to such a beautiful funeral where there was more love and veneration showed to the deceased.

"It wasn't more than a week before an old man, a beggar, come to town with a horse and a pack mule. And he died there and 'cause there wasn't no folks that cared about him, being the mayor I had to take care of him. Well, I finds out his name is Temple—the very same Temple that come through God's counrty back in '49 and kept right on going till he got to Californie. He didn't have a cent, or a friend, or a relative. A bunch of us chipped in and got him some burying clothes and I conducted his funeral and it wasn't attended by a single person that had ever known him before."

A concomitant to the American and Mormon preoccupation with material wealth is what one fine scholar has called the "health, education, and recreation complex," which makes its indelible mark on all of the forms of community activity in our Mormon culture. Mormon commitments to health, education, recreation, and welfare programs of substantial proportions and of amazing complexity are so ever present that the young Mormon may make commitments to leadership in scores of these activities and enjoy opportunities to develop skills in group dynamics which exceed those of any other cultural group in America. This activity may have one negative result, since they may thus be deprived of opportunities for the contemplative life. They read less, think less, and feel less than might be possible if their social commitments were not so great. The French philosopher Pascal once said that the misfortunes of man derive from his inability to remain alone in a room. The prestige of books is not as high among us as it ought to be, nor are we as aggressive as we should be about seeking out and incorporating among us great ideas that emerge in cultures not our own. We are activists, but as yet to a large extent in social and materialistic ways. The time may well have come when we should seek ways of channeling our activism into realms of intellectuality

and aesthetics which could be rewarding beyond our hopes.

Somewhat more is to be said about the commitment of our culture to education. Via official pronouncement of the leaders of the church almost since its inception it has been inculcated that man cannot be saved in ignorance. Both at Kirtland and at Nauvoo truly startling experiments were made in education by the church, especially when they are viewed in the frontier environment that presents so few examples of worthy educational programs. Moreover, today it appears that a startlingly large percentage of young Mormons pursue educational programs beyond high school. There is a reason for this beyond the emphasis of the theology upon knowledge: Mormons believe in large families, and a predominantly agricultural economy cannot provide employment for a population that has increased at the rate at which the Mormon population has increased. Hence Utah's chief export has been young Mormons. They fill the crafts and professions of America. Let me use a personal example which I think may be typical. My grandparents on either side reared more than a dozen children each. When men of my father's generation came to maturity there was still farm land to be wrested from the wilderness so that most of the first generation of Utah-born Mormons was reabsorbed by the land. But the 160 acres which my father tilled would have had to be carved into sixteen-acre parcels in order to hold his ten offspring on the soil. One stuck to farming in the same region; two remained in farming but had to seek land on the confines of Mormondom, and the other seven entered professions or skilled employment at far-flung points in America. To them, education was an economic necessity: thank heaven there was a commitment to it in the theology of the church!

It is to be noted, however, that the Mormon commitment to education takes two rather well defined directions: one toward an understanding of the Mormon cosmology which is developed in such great detail that little room is left for varying points of view; the other, towards professional competence, with a rather specific goal of permitting a young Mormon to earn a living. Neither of these goals constitutes a concept of liberal education as it has existed for a long time in the institu-

tions of higher learning of Western Europe and the United States. What is called a liberal education is directed neither towards a specific professional competence nor toward the understanding of the cosmology of a single cultural group. Rather, its goal has been to liberate the mind of man by exposing it to all of the great lines of thought and aspiration which have played a guiding role in the civilizations of man at all times and in all places.

Now it is a near universal experience of young people when they are in the pursuit of higher learning, particularly in graduate school, to feel a degree of intellectual restlessness. The myths which their parents and their communities have used to instill respect for family, civic, and religious disciplines seem for a time to be at loggerheads with the realities encountered by young adults in their intellectual, social, and economic life. Great spiritual and intellectual crises are bound to occur, with varying degrees of neurotic reaction. Insofar as I can see, this crisis is particularly severe among young Mormons. Some examine the new systems of thought which confront them in an adult intellectual world and end by rejecting them wholly in favor of the totality of elements which forms their traditional way of life. A second group becomes resentful of the rigid and demanding idealisms which have been inculcated in their youth, and go through life like men without a country, since all too often a stable new system of values does not come to replace that which has been cast aside. There is still another group which liberalizes their traditional Mormon views of reality to encompass therein some of the great systems of thought and belief which have been common in the current of Western civilization since the dawn of the Hebraic and Helenic eras. This group is not nearly large enough. If there has been vitality in the Mormon views of reality, it certainly has been in the capacity it has had for accommodating itself to ever-changing realities. This process is best continued where there is a group among the young leadership eager to see human values in the far-flung corners of the earth and to bring them into the spiritual and intellectual spheres of our own inheritance.

All of this may well have been complicated by the fact

that rarely have clear distinctions been made among us between intuitive knowledge and knowledge acquired via sensory perceptions, or between abstract and concrete terms. It should be apparent that when one says on the one hand: "There is water in the upper ditch," and on the other: "Jesus Christ is our Savior," there is a difference in the nature of the evidence and hence in the kind of knowledge possessed. In the first case, one knows because one's eyes have seen, one's hand has felt, one's tongue has tasted, and one's ear has heard: the senses have perceived and the mind has recorded and interpreted their perception. In the second instance, intuitional forces have been at work, be they conceived simply as a subconscious synthesis of experience or as a flow of energy from God to man via the intermediary of the Holy Spirit. Moreover, in the second statement, "Jesus Christ is our Savior," an abstract term has crept in, since, although there is little quibbling to be done about the nature of water, or of the upper ditch, it is somewhat more complex to decide what is meant when one has used the term "Savior." All of us here might acecpt the statement, yet even within the frame of reference of our common Mormon heritage I am sure we would not agree on what the assertion means. Whenever abstract terms are treated as realities there is danger of embarassing pitfalls for the mind.

Now, when the young Mormon scientist gets involved in graduate studies he must learn that, when behaving as a scientist, he must reject all knowledge which does not come to him via sensory perception. He must behave *as if* there were no other ways of acquiring scientific truth. If he is insistent upon carrying this scientific method into the realm of religion, then he may be in great danger of losing his faith. It is, however, an absurd error on his part to attempt to apply the scientific method in all of the realms of life. Even in the simple matter of buying a new car or in choosing its color this scientific method is of relatively little value. It is at most a critical device to apply to a problem which must ultimately be solved by man's oldest intellectual technique, an intuitive decision.

Having made this cavalier pronouncement upon the fallacies which some young scientists commit, I feel constrained to come to a more sensitive point, namely that an equally dangerous

step may well be taken by the young Mormon who decides in his maturity to live uniquely via the intuitions which he feels come to him from the promptings of the Spirit. Nowhere in Mormon theology is there evidence that the Saints should settle all of their problems, make all of their decisions, via this intuitive process. Emphasis upon knowledge, which presupposes to a large degree the scientific frame of mind, is constant in our tradition, so that it sometimes almost seems that the intuitive process was intended for sacred and complex realms alone, and that rationality should always serve as a watchdog over the lambs of intuition. Not a few young Mormons use intuition as a device to retreat from knowledge.

We could dwell upon accounts of excessive dependence upon intuition at tedious length, citing cases of promptings of the Spirit, answer to prayer, healings, rewards and punishments, which in their totality would seem embarrassing even to the most faithful among us. I feel constrained to dwell upon one example for a moment. Repeated accounts appear of the missionary who has suddenly found himself eloquent in a foreign tongue, and thus capable of expounding the gospel with remarkable persuasiveness, or of confounding civil authorities of other governments, or the learned spokesmen of other sects. This belief, I am afraid, has all too often had the effect of making missionaries actually lazy about the very difficult but rewarding task of learning the languages which they so urgently need, and not a few of them return to Zion somewhat less than eloquent, and with very superficial views about the culture of the people who have been their hosts. This causes me to ponder what I think is a serious problem in Utah's educational program. With our missionary system, our commitment to genealogical research, and the large proportion of our young people that enters graduate schools, we have a greater need for foreign language skills than any other cultural group in our land. Yet the programs to meet this need, either public or otherwise, are among the most inadequate. We wonder if here a misapplication of the concept of intuitive knowledge has not deprived us of another worthy Christian virtue: application to hard intellectual labor.

Another lively American and Mormon trait is the cult of

the family. Among us it takes on unique characteristics in that the family is believed to be an eternal and indestructible unity based upon a patriarchal system encompassing one's ancestors and one's posterity. A great percentage of the total productive energy of our culture is committed to the work of constructing these patriarchal pyramids. The commitment of our elders to this task, I feel sure, furnishes a sense of usefulness in the culture which old people do not find anywhere else in America. It is alarming, nevertheless, that in a country where the family cult has been pushed the farthest, divorce and family instability are increasing at an alarming rate.

The possibility suggests itself that to solve our complex and growing problems of broken families and juvenile delinquency we need to direct our energies somewhat more than we have toward the self-fulfillment of the individuals who must inevitably constitute the groups. No matter how devoted we are to family solidarity, there is an equally high ideal in devotion to the self-fulfillment of each human being as an independent intellectual identity. If the individual gains a notion of his integrity as an individual in a culture, then he is most apt to fulfill his family, his religious, and his civic obligations.

I am more hopeful than I once was about the plight of the young intellectual in our culture and about the ultimate success of liberal movements among us. The effect of my folklore studies has been to increase my respect for our folk heritage. The lore of Mormonia forms as satisfactory a base for flights into humanism and science as have the folk cultures of most peoples. The roosts on which Aristotle or Pascal or St. Thomas spread their wings were no more sturdy: we need not feel that our feet have been glued.

A couple of weeks ago I climbed Mount Logan again. It was early evening and slanting rays of sunlight filled Cache Valley with light and warmth. I saw the west fields where I had spent many hours fishing. Later the piping of the red-wing blackbirds, the scent of marsh gas, and the sloshing of muddy water in my shoes would be like good companions to accompany me on my journeys in Darwin's *Voyage of the Beagle,* Buffon's *Natural History,* Bergson's *Creative Evolution*, and Thoreau's *Walden*—Cache Valley had given me tools to under-

stand man in his relationship to the biological world. I saw the Fourth Ward meeting house where the grave responsibilities of manhood were inculcated via ritual, preachment, and precept. If at times they seemed almost too heavy for me to bear, I have, I think, learned to take my social role seriously. In that meeting house I was heralded away to France where a whole new culture would be unfolded to me—a culture so rich and human that I would come to feel like Thomas Jefferson who had said a century and a quarter earlier: *"Tout le monde a deux pays; le sien et puis la France."* "Everyone has two fatherlands, his own and after that France."

And finally I saw Utah State University, where I went through my first rites of myth purification. The process was as painful as a surgical operation but I survived and recovered. Nor was the essence of my Mormon view of reality destroyed in the process. I remain an activist, have faith in the rewards that are in store for those who strive. I am materialist enough to be grateful for the modest wealth my culture has bestowed upon me. There have also been rewards of a less tangible and more enduring nature in the realms of intellectuality and aesthetics which my particular kind of activism has caused me to uncover. I may still be ethnocentric in the way in which I treasure my heritage, but I have strived to develop loyalties which transcend it, encompassing my country and the world in which I live. In the narrow realm of folklore and French civilization I may even have become a scientist, seeking to make my views about these subjects correspond with reality as much as possible and accepting evidence which comes from the senses that I have. But I still solve most of my problems by an act of faith and with spontaneous conformity to my myths. I keep my muscles busy as well as my mind, believing that the health of the two is inseparable: the mind, however, comes first. I am committed to the cult of the family, but I keep some realms of my being which are preeminently personal.

I have likened the purification of my myths at Utah State University to a surgical operation. It was a complicated case and the patient was hardy but stubborn. It lasted three years. Beloved professors took turns wielding the knife, and I am

grateful to have had opportunity this summer to thank them for the expertness of their surgery.

In my young manhood I looked down upon Cache Valley to see it shrouded in darkness. A few weeks ago I looked down upon it to perceive light. The old proverb says that gold is where you find it. This also seems to be true of darkness and of light.

PICTORIAL

GENEVIEVE ST. CYR

Lives of the saints with persecution remind us
we have promises to keep, for the lie whether fresh
on the lips or from long convenience makes conscience
hoe-down beneath our step the word of that first
equinox, the grass dry and no spring rain nor thunder
in July. The heart is said and the foetus once
formed, there is murder to prevent the inevitable
kick and cry. Heavy with forgetting the red cunning
of petals bruises and lets loose in pools a sickly
blood, we have tied our ankles with cords thin and cautious
as willow leaves and walked among the peonies where
laughter dried in the sun and no wall to weep against.

We have promises to keep. Baking in the sun, the forever
cake dissembles a flower we plucked from profusion
of grasses while we meditated hunger. Now the flower
is hungry too, and Rita the wound burning a crimson bud
in her forehead reminds us of the time for planting.
Agnes the flames could not devour nor man's eye
nor beast, succumbs her white fragility headless,
and the Holy Innocents in the grieving arms where the
blasphemous sacring flung them wear their ghosts like
vows we made. O clement and terrible, burning, drowning,
the earth in their mouth, and all singing and festival,
procession, profusion, persecution, reminding us.

The Mormon Gold Mining Mission of 1849

EUGENE EDWARD CAMPBELL

The story of the Mormon gold mining missions forms an interesting and unique chapter in the annals of the California Gold Rush. Two companies of young Mormons came to California in 1849 at the call of their Church leaders, rather than to satisfy a desire for personal wealth.[1] Their journals give added information on the "Death Valley" tragedy; on life in the California gold fields in 1850; and on contemporary Mormon attitudes and practices. They also tell of the founding of the Latter-day Saints' Hawaiian Mission by some of these mining missionaries.

It is important to note that when gold was discovered in California in 1848, the Mormons were in a position to acquire a giant's share of the precious metal. Six members of the Church were working with James Marshall when the discovery was made,[2] and they, with some of their companions, discovered other rich deposits, including the fabulous Mormon Island. In addition to the men working with Marshall, over sixty of their Mormon Battalion comrades were employed by John A. Sutter in the immediate vicinity. Nearly one hundred discharged members of the Battalion were working in the San Francisco Bay region and were among the first to reach the gold fields. Sam Brannan, who announced the discovery in San Francisco, advised his Mormon colony, who had come to California on the ship *Brooklyn* in 1846, to go to the gold areas. More than three hundred Latter-day Saints were at work on Mormon Island by

---

Dr. Campbell is professor of history at Brigham Young University.

1 In addition to these missions, one hundred men answered the call of their Church leaders to go to the gold mines in 1855 in a vain attempt to liquidate the debt owed for their San Bernardino property. (See Eugene E. Campbell, *A History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in California 1846-1946,* pp. 170-171, unpublished dissertation, University of Southern California, 1952.)

2 These men were Henry W. Bigler, Azariah Smith, James S. Brown, William W. Berger, Alexander Stephens and William Johnson. All had been members of the Mormon Battalion.

July, 1848, according to William Tecumseh Sherman, who accompanied the governor of California on a tour of the gold fields.[3]

In addition to these advantages, Sam Brannan, who was the official leader of the Latter-day Saints in California, was in possession of a store at Sutter's Fort, a river launch, a large stock of supplies brought around the Horn on the *Brooklyn,* a considerable sum of Church money (tithing) with which he could obtain more supplies, and a large fenced-in farm of fertile land at the junction of the San Joaquin and Stanislaus rivers. Moreover, Brannan possessed an entrepreneur's spirit and considerable business ability. If Brigham Young had chosen to send a messenger from Winter Quarters requesting Elder Brannan to prepare to receive the body of the Church in California, it might have been an easier task to lead his people there than to have them join the advance company in the desolate valley of the Great Salt Lake. The Salt Lake colony, consisting of approximately two thousand people, had survived the first winter, but was facing serious trouble because their crops had been attacked by the crickets. Undoubtedly, it would have taken only a word from their Church leaders to start the Saints on their way to California.

With a strong nucleus of Church members already in California, and with upwards of twenty thousand more on their way westward, equipped with the necessary things to make the trip to California, the Saints could have been in the gold regions a full year before the great Gold Rush of 1849. With their close knit organization, their willingness to sacrifice for the Church, and their talent for working together as a community, they might have "skimmed the cream" off the entire gold area. But history has recorded a different ending. Brigham Young and his aides rejected the opportunity and fought against the idea of the Church members mining gold in California. They were, in great measure, successful in their effort.

"The Lord will bless you and prosper you," President Young told the Saints, "if you will get cured of your California fevers as quick as you can."[4] He went on to show that the Sacra-

3 William T. Sherman, *Memoirs* (New York, 1875), I, 52-53.

4 Brigham Young to Parley P. Pratt and John Taylor, *Journal History of the Church* (hereafter referred to as *JH*), July 17, 1848.

mento Valley was an unhealthy place in which to live; that the acquisition of gold would not be as valuable as food and drink; and that to become wealthy in precious metals was to court degradation and ruin. He reminded the Saints that the Spaniards had looked for gold, and had not only lost their greatness, but had almost lost their God; moreover, the English colonists, who had paid attention to agriculture and industry, had waxed strong and become a powerful influence for good.[5] James Brown quoted Brigham Young as saying:

> Some have asked me about going [to California]. I have told them that God has appointed this place [the Great Basin] for the gathering of his Saints, and you will do better right here than you will by going to the gold mines. Some have thought they would go there and get fitted out and come back, but I told them to stop here and get fitted out. Those who stop here and are faithful to God and his people will make more money and get richer than you that run after the god of this world; and I promise you in the name of the Lord that many of you that go thinking you will get rich and come back, will wish you had never gone away from here, and will long to come back, but will not be able to do so. Some of you will come back, but your friends who remain here will have to help you; and the rest of you who are spared to return will not make as much money as your brethren do who stay here and help build up the Church and Kingdom of God; they will prosper and be able to buy you twice over. Here is the place God has appointed for his people . . . .[6]

In September, 1849, Young recorded the following note in his journal:

> Fourteen or fifteen of the brethren arrived from the gold country, some of whom were very comfortably supplied with the precious metal, and others, who had been sick, came back as destitute as they had been when they went on the ship *Brooklyn* in 1846. That there is plenty of gold in Western California is beyond doubt, but the valley of the Sacramento is an unhealthy place, and the Saints can be better employed in raising grain and building houses in this vicinity than in digging gold in Sacramento, unless they are counseled to do so.
>
> The true use of gold is for paving streets, covering houses, making culinary dishes; and when the Saints shall have preached the gospel, raised grain, and built up cities enough, the Lord will open up the way for a supply of gold to the per-

5 See "Second General Epistle of the Twelve," JH, October 12, 1848.

6 Taken from the Autobiography of James Brown (Salt Lake City, 1941), p. 122.

fect satisfaction of his people; until then, let them not be over-anxious for the treasures of the earth are in the Lord's storehouse, and he will open the door thereof when and where he pleases.[7]

Brigham Young was primarily concerned with the "gathering" of the Mormons to build up their "kingdom" in the Great Basin, but he also appeared to be convinced that gold mining was not a fit occupation for his members and that it would actually be to their economic advantage to remain in the Great Basin and till the soil. Supporting this thesis, he said:

> I will commence at the north and go to the south settlements and pick out twenty-five men of our inhabitants as they average, and another man may take fifty of the gold diggers, off hand, and they cannot buy out the twenty-five men who tarried at home. Before I had been one year in this place, the wealthiest man who came from the mines, Father Rhodes, with $17,000, could he buy the possessions I had made in one year? It will not begin to do it: and I will take twenty-five men in the United States, who have staid at home and paid attention to their own business, and they will weigh down fifty others from the same place, who went to the gold regions; and again, look at the widows that have been made, and see the bones that lie bleaching and scattered over the prairies.[8]

On another occasion, in a more vigorous way, he exclaimed:

> I hope that the gold mines will be no nearer than eight hundred miles. . . . There is more delusion, and the people are more perfectly crazy on this continent than ever before. . . . If you Elders of Israel want to go to the gold mines, go and be damned. If you go, I wouldn't give a picayune to keep you from damnation. . . . I advise the corrupt, and all who want to go to California to go and not come back, for I will not fellowship them. . . . Prosperity and riches blunt the feelings of man. If our people were united, I would send out some of our men to get gold who would care no more for it than the dust under their feet, and then we would gather millions into the Church. Some men don't want to go after gold, but they are the very ones to go.[9]

Despite the negative attitude of the Church leaders towards

7 History of Brigham Young, MS, 1849, p. 144.
8 JH, September 6, 1850.
9 Bancroft, *History of Utah,* p. 303.

the Church members going to the gold fields,[10] President Young permitted certain leaders to "call" young men of their choice on a "mission" to journey to California and mine gold for them. Prominent among those sent were Henry Bigler, whose diary was to set the accepted date of the original discovery of gold at Coloma, and George Q. Cannon, who later became a counselor in the Mormon Church First Presidency. If reluctance to go could be considered a qualification for being selected, as Brigham Young indicated, then Bigler and Cannon qualified without question. Bigler wrote in his journal:

> . . . It fills me with sorrow to think of leaving, for I am attached to this place and this people, for they are my brothers and sisters and my friends, and it was with considerable struggle with my feelings that I consented to go.[11]

However, he felt it was a call to aid an old man who had suffered greatly for the Church, and consented to go.

Cannon's feelings on the matter were expressed twenty years later in a series of reminiscent articles. He wrote:

> . . . it was in the fall of the year that we were selected. We formed a company and were joined by some few whose only motive was going to enrich themselves by digging gold.
>
> There was no place I would rather not have been at the time than in California. I heartily despised the work of digging gold. . . . There is no occupation I would not rather follow than hunting and digging for gold. My instructions were to go to California, and be guided by the counsels of Elders Amasa Lyman and Charles C. Rich, two of the Twelve Apostles.[12]

A third member to leave a written record, Albert K. Thurber, felt that the call was given as a test, and although he was

---

10 Evidence that this attitude was continued after the call of the miners may be seen in the following excerpts. The *Deseret News* of January 24, 1852, contained the following editorial: ". . . but may we not go to California and get some gold to pay off our debts, then we can buy what we want, and then we can be independent again and go ahead as usual? *No!* Saints, you cannot go to California, as you have done in years gone by and still retain your fellowship in the Church. It is getting too late in the day for the children of the kingdom to trifle." The Journal History of November 16, 1855, contains the following proposal from Heber C. Kimball: 'I move that Henry J. Jarvis, Thomas S. Williams, Lorin W. Babbitt, and those who went to California be cut off from the Church—for their wickedness, their slandering and their meanness."

11 Henry Bigler, Diary, Book B. MS, October 11, 1849.

12 G. Q. Cannon, "After Twenty Years," *Juvenile Instructor*, Vol. IV (1869), pp. 13-14. Hafen states that Cannon was outfitted by his uncle, John Taylor (later third President of the Mormon Church). See *Far West and Rockies Series*, Vol. II, Journals of Forty-Niners, p. 218.

not anxious to go, he did not seem so reluctant as the other two. He had come to Salt Lake Valley with a company of gold seekers in 1849, became converted to the Mormon Church, and decided to stay in Salt Lake. He obtained work with B. J. Johnson, one of the Church leaders, who called him to go to the mines. His account is as follows:

> The California gold mines were attracting great attention and as B. J. Johnson was of the Council of Seventy, the president, Brigham Young, authorized them to send a few men, as Johnson told me, *to prove them.* He proposed for [Jacob D.] Burnham and me to go. We worked one week without mentioning the subject and then decided to go in a short time. Johnson was to fit us out and get one third of what each made and we to receive one third of what he made at home.[13]

Dr. Leonard Arrington, in his *Great Basin Kingdom,* came to the conclusion that the Church leaders permitted the calls in order to get more gold dust to supply their mint, which had just been reopened.[14]

The most detailed and dramatic account of the call is found in Bigler's diary. He described it as follows (Bigler's spelling uncorrected):

> MONDAY 8TH Makeing preparations today to go on a mission to California to get Gold for Father John Smith, as he has been kicked & cuft about and finily drove out of the United States because he worshiped God according to the dictates of his own consience and has becum poor, he is Counciled to fit out some person and send them to the Gold mines and he has Called on me to go and is now fiting me out to go with Brother C. C. Rich and others who are sent. Bro. Rich leaves today. It fills me with Sorrow to think of leaveing for I am attached to this place and this people for they are my brethren and my friends, it was with Considerable strugle with my feelings that I Consented to go.
>
> TUESDAY OCT. 9TH This day I settled up all my ac-

---

13 Kate B. Carter, *Treasures of Pioneer History,* Vol. III, p. 274.

14 Leonard Arrington, *Great Basin Kingdoms,* p. 72, Harvard University Press, 1958. Arrington's theory seems to be only a scholarly guess, because his footnote at this point refers to an earlier unpublished study of the L.D.S. Gold Mining Missions made by the author and Professor Arrington, which does not contain any evidence to justify such a conclusion. The author is indebted to Professor Arrington for being made aware of Albert King Thurber's journal and to Dr. LeRoy Hafen for permission to examine his typescript copy of this journal.

counts, paid all my debts, Sold my wheat and a fiew bords [boards of lumber] to Bro. Stanes.

THURSDAY 11TH last evening Father Smith sent for me he wanted to bless me, he then laid his hands on my head and blest me and also Brother [James] Keeler in the name of the Lord. Brother Keeler is a going for Thomas Calister we will go in the same waggon together; about 2 p.m. we was ready. I told Brother Keeler to call by my house with the waggon and I would be ready. I wrote a note and stuck it on the side of my door for my brother-in-law [John Hess] to take charge of some clothing I had left in a sack; at this moment I experienced what I shall not here attempt to describe. I walked back and forth across my floor and my feelings was spent in a complete shower of tears, every thing I looked upon seamed to simpethise with me and say go in peace only be faithful and all will be right. I herd a rattling and looked up and saw the waggon a coming. I hastened to the Curtings of the window and wiped away every tear, and went out to the waggon. I was requested to get in. I refused. I told Brother Keeler I would walk as I wanted to call at the tin shop to buy a canteen, I paid 6 bits [75 cents] for one & 2 bits for a quart cup; I then got in the waggon and we drove to Brother Flakes on Cottonwood, about 10 miles. Got thare in the night, all was gone to bed, we mired in the big field. we had to get in the mud and water with our shoulders to the wheels; after a long time we got out all wet and mudy. We called at Brother Chipmans and got some Butter and 2 large fresh loves of good light wheat bread for which we paid $2 together with a little tin pail to carry our butter in.

FRIDAY 12TH This morning we ware detained a little in getting something made. We found that one of our horses was sick, supposed to have a tech of the Belly ache, and to carry out father Smith Blessings we bought a mare of Brother Flakes, paid $20 down and give our note for 100$ with interest at our Return. At 10 AM we was on the way, went 13 miles and encampt near the Banks of Jourdan.[15]

Bigler and Keeler joined a company of about twenty gold

15 Bigler, Book "B," October 8-12, 1849. "Father" John Smith was an uncle to Joseph Smith; Presiding Patriarch of the Church (1849-1854); and president of Salt Lake Stake (September, 1847, to October, 1848). He had participated in all the Mormon migrations, and had been "kicked and cuffed about" by anti-Mormon mobs. He was sixty-eight years old in October, 1849, and died five years later. Thomas Callister, his son-in-law, was only twenty-eight in 1849, but had been through the Nauvoo experiences and exodus. He subsequently became the first president of Millard Stake.

"missionaries"[16] with James M. Flake as their captain. They left Salt Lake on October 11, 1849, and arrived at Williams' Ranch on December 11, 1849, after a difficult journey in which they became part of the "Death Valley" group that attempted to take a short-cut to the California mines.[17] While at Williams' Ranch, Bigler recorded a communication from Apostles George A. Smith and Ezra T. Benson which reveals something of the Church leaders' attitudes concerning the availability of gold. He wrote:

> Brother Rich got a letter from Brothers Geo. Smith and E. T. Benson (both were apostles . . . . Brothers S. and B. want Brother Rich to raise them $5,000 from the brethren who are on a mission to get goald [gold] that their hands may be liberated and be able to return to their fields of labor (missions) and they will pray the Lord to lead the Brethren in some nook or corner where it lays, as for my part I shall be glad to help raise it for them and have their prayers and blessings on my head.[18]

They left Williams' Ranch on January 12, 1850, and finally made their way to "Slap Jack Bar" on the Middle Fork of the American River where they began their search for gold.

The company of which Albert Thurber was a member was organized in Provo, Utah, in mid-November "by appointing Simson D. Huffaker, captain."[18] There were thirty-one members in this group, although it is not certain that they were all "called" to mine gold.[19] After a three months' journey, they arrived in Los Angeles, where they were met by Amasa Lyman and Jared D. Hunter. They took the steamer from San Pedro to San Francisco and then continued on to Sacramento, arriving

---

16 President Cannon says twenty were in the original company. A careful reading of the Bigler journal and Cannon recollections yields the following names: George Bankhead, John W. Berry, Henry Bigler, John Bills, Joseph Cain, George Q. Cannon, Darwin Chase, Joseph Dixon, William Farrer, Peter Fife, James M. Flake, Henry Gibson, James Hawkins, Peter Hoagland, James Keeler, Thomas Morris, Joseph Peck, J. Henry Rollins, Boyd Stewart, Judson Sheldon Stoddard, and Thomas Whittle. Apparently some were not specially called gold miners for the profits were divided among only twelve workers, and only nine accepted mission calls to the Sandwich Isles, while one went to Oregon.

17 Part of the non-Mormon contingent of this company decided to continue this untried northern route and went on to perish in what has since been called Death Valley. See the account of a survivor in William Lewis Manly, *Death Valley in 1849* (San Jose, California, 1849).

18 Bigler, Book B, MS, January 6, 1850.

19 Carter, *Treasures of Pioneer History*, V. 3, p. 274.

April 1, 1850. Here they were fitted out for the mines and began looking for a claim. Thurber wrote:

> As we were traveling along a Green Woods in the Valley of Lewisville, we concluded to go up the creek and try our luck. Saw that the whole bottom had been prospected and concluded it was a dull show for us.
>
> Bought a washer of Jacob Gates for $64.00. Five of us worked with it. First day made some $2.50 each. At night I told them there were too many with the machine and we put it up at auction. I bought it, and with my partner Burnham, made $40.00 the next day. We mined in this place for about one month, but sent two men to find a claim for the summer. The gold was beautiful, mostly nuggets. We were very free to exhibit it to anyone supposing that we could do better anywhere else than there as it had been all prospected over by old miners. The first thing we knew the creek bed was nearly claimed and the place was alive with miners, leaving us small claims. It proved very rich all through that section of country.[20]

Later he described life in the mines in the following excerpt:

> The mess that I was in, seven of us, bought seven or eight mules. We concluded that miners were getting too thick and as soon as the water got down in the rivers we would start for our claim high up on the north fork of the middle of the American river, 30 of us men. We could not get animals within one mile of our claim on the river just below where a little stream enters in that has a beautiful cascade on it. We set to work at building a dam and making a race. The river was some 60 yards wide. We built two walls across it, about 6 feet apart and packed dirt in sacks and on our backs to fill in. After we got the water turned, we commenced to sink a hole 30 feet across but failed to reach bed rock. We worked here one month and got $1.50—five cents apiece.
>
> John W. Berry was very sick at this place. Concluded to leave for the Middle Fork previous to which the following

---

20 The Thurber Journal mentions the following as probably members of the company: H. Alexander, Erastus Bingham, Willard Bingham, William Bird, Kiser Brown, Isaac Brown, Jacob D. Burnham, David Cade, Washington N. Cook, Berrill Covington, Hyrum Curtis, Albert Dewey, Franklin Dewey, Bradford W. Elliott, Jacob Gates, William P. Goddard, John Gould, Simpson D. Huffaker, Barnum, Kinion, Samuel Miles, John Murray, James C. Sly, and Albert King Thurber. Some of these persons may not have been gold missionaries, but mayhave been traveling with them. Others are not mentioned. Many details of the Gold Mission will remain obscure until the journals of other participants are brought to light.

21 Carter, *Treasures of Pioneer History,* V. 3, p. 280.

notice was posted. "This is to certify that all persons are forbid to violate the right of a damned claim."[22]

Thurber's group finally went to "Slap Jack Bar" on the middle fork of the American River, where the other group had been working all summer. Here they were visited by Apostles Lyman and Rich who advised those men who did not have a good claim to go back to Salt Lake Valley.[23] Thurber concluded, along with fifty others, to return to Salt Lake in the company Amasa Lyman was organizing, but his partner, Burnham, decided to stay and prospect a little longer. When they separated, Thurber remarked, "I never saw a man look so lonesome. He took sick and died about two weeks later."[24] Thurber ended up with "two mules, an old pair of boots, hat, a pair of pants and a flannel shirt, $4.50 in gold dust."[25] He later reported to Brigham Young that "he never felt better than when he got over the mountains," which seemed to please the Church leader very much.[26]

Meanwhile, at "Slap Jack Bar," Bigler's group had been working all summer endeavoring to build a diversion dam across the river. They had been so busy that Bigler had failed to keep his daily diary account, but on September 23, he took time to write the following account:

> I have not written for many months. . . . I have exposed myself to both Indians and wether [weather] more than I ever want to do again, living out in the snow and storms and rain without shelter, some of my brethren have died . . . all of my brethren have been sick having been much exposed working in gold. . . . I am tired of mining and of the country and long to be home among the saints.[27]

Two days later he gave a more detailed report of the summer's experience when he wrote:

> I have been at work ever since my arrival at the mines which was last February exposing myself living out in the rains and snow, traveling and prospecting, building and repairing dams, working up to my neck in water and for weeks

22 Carter, *Treasures of Pioneer History*, V. 3, p. 281.
23 *Ibid.*, p. 289
24 *Ibid.*, p. 283.
25 *Ibid.*, p. 289.
26 *Ibid.*
27 Bigler, Book B, September 23, 1850.

> ter up to my waist and arms, having made but little; the expenses overrun the gain. In August I sent $100 to Father Smith by Brother A. Lyman and we expect to finish our claim in a fieue [few] days and then will leave for our fields of labor. Brother Clark and Blackwell are counciled to go. Brother Clark will preside. . . . The tithing I paid to Brother Rich and Amasa for myself and Brother Smith was $83.60. That shows how much I have taken from the earth $836, this would appear that I ought to have lots of money, by me, but I have none. I may say at present and it makes the hair fairly stand upright on my head when I think of it.[28]

Bigler then included in his account some of his expenditures such as a shovel and pick for ten dollars, four wash pans for eight dollars, one pair of boots for ten dollars, and he also mentions that he had to borrow the one hundred dollars that he sent to Father Smith with Amasa Lyman.[29]

On October 3, 1850, after finally completing their dam, the missionary miners began to reap the rewards of their labors. Bigler described it as follows:

> *Sunday, October 6th.* Last Thursday morning we commenced taking out the gold after laboring so long in building and repairing our dam so often, and today we divided the pile, there being twelve shares, $200.00 apiece.
>
> *Sunday, October 13th.* Washing gold all week and today divided 444 dollars each.
>
> *Tuesday, 15th* the gold has failed, o what a pity.
>
> *Wednesday, 16* divided 92 dollars apiece. We shall make preparations to leave for the Sandwich Islands forthwith.[30]

The decision to go to the Sandwich Islands came as the result of an event which took place at "Slap Jack Bar" which more than justified the entire venture, as far as the Church is concerned. Bigler's record of this event reads as follows:

> This morning the brethren was called together at our tent by Bro. Rich, he stated that he wanted some of us to go on a mission to the Sandwich Islands to preach the gospel, that his opinion was that it would cost no more to spend the winter there than it would here, that we could make nothing in the wintertime in consequence of so much water in the streams, and another thing provisions would be much higher in the

28 *Ibid.*, September 25, 1850.
29 *Ibid.*
30 Bigler, Book B, October 6-16, 1850.

> mines and it would cost us more money to stay here and make nothing than if we went to the islands and preach, in his opinion it would be the best thing we could do and the best council he could give. . . then he called upon ten of us 1 of which was to go to Oragon [Oregon] with Boyd Stewart, and the remaining 9 was set apart as follows, Thomas Whittle, Thomas Morras, John Dixon, myself, Geo. Cannon, Wm. Farrer, John Berry if he wished, James Keeler, James Hawkins. He then laid his hands on us and set us apart for the mission and blessed us in the name of the Lord, and told us to act as the spirit dictated when we got there.[31]

This led to the founding of the Latter-day Saint Hawaiian Mission and the subsequent growth of the Church in that region. It is interesting to note that Charles C. Rich did not assume the role of a prophet in calling the men on a mission, but simply gave them what he felt was the best advice that he could. His reasoning seemed to be practical rather than spiritual.

Another point of interest connected with this call was the fact that it seemed to be a fulfillment of a dream which Bigler recorded in his journal almost a year before. On October 16, 1849, shortly after the Church-called miners had left Salt Lake Valley, Bigler wrote, "Last night I dreamed I was not going for goal [gold] but was going to the islands to preach the gospel."[32] Again at Williams' Ranch, Bigler recorded that "Today Bro. Pratt asked me if I would go to the islands should Bros. Rich and Amasa Lyman call me to go. I told him that I should if that was their council."[33] It should be noted in connection with the dream that he did not specify what islands he was to be sent to, and that he was in company with some of his friends who were going to the Society Islands. This may have had some influence upon the nature of his dreams at the time.

The day after this call, George Q. Cannon recorded his feelings about the mining situation. This would probably indicate that Apostle Rich did not have to use too much persuasion to get the miners to accept the mission call. He wrote:

> The rising water caused a cessation of work in the mines, and there was little to do for the miners expect to gamble away what little they had, and those who had nothing, had nothing to do but steal, rob, play at cut-throat, and such like

31 *Ibid.*, September 25, 1850.
32 Bigler, Book B, October 16, 1849.
33 *Ibid.*, December 31, 1849.

> social games. . . . There were three, four, or five murders reported in the territory each day—and no government. Authorities had too much property and business themselves.[34]

As indicated before, the missionary miners remained at "Slap Jack Bar" until after their gold failed, and then they left for their mission. On their way to San Francisco, Bigler recorded that they stopped at Brother Crow's in Suttersville to get some Books of Mormon and Doctrine and Covenants; had dinner at Brother Leffingwell's for $1.25 apiece; slept under a tree at Brother Thatcher's; and paid Brother Green to carry them in a wagon to Brother Lathrop's Mormon Tavern. This cost them $2.00 apiece.[35] They seemed to make a practice of visiting Church members along the way, but did not attempt to secure hospitality without payment. They remained in San Francisco until November 15, 1850, when they sailed for their mission in the Hawaiian Islands.

In conclusion, it seems apparent that the gold-mining missions were failures as far as their primary purpose was concerned. The men involved had spent at least a year away from their homes with considerable risk of their lives and health and had failed to find the gold they were seeking. Several members had lost their lives in the effort. The most successful group had secured less than $20,000 in gold and their expenses had been such as to make their profits almost negligible.

It may be said, however, that the Church profited from the venture in two ways. First, the missionaries who went to Hawaii laid the foundations for a very important branch of the Church there; and second, the returning miners could be cited as living proof of the wisdom of the Church leaders in advising the saints to stay away from the California gold mines.

---

34 George Q. Cannon, journal entry recorded in the Journal History of the Church, MS, September 26, 1850.

35 Bigler, Book B, October 19 to October 29, 1850.

DAY'S END

CHRISTIE LUND COLES

The fiery eye of God on the west rim
of heaven and hill
gazes at me, still, yet not still;
And beginning to dim,
falls into the lime and yellow bowl
of aloneness, but not until
it has sand-stung my hope
and found it wanting. I tremble before
what I know I must. Lord, do not sleep,
do not close the door.

An Approach to Modernity in Art

GERRIT DE JONG, JR.

To Webster of dictionary-making fame is given the credit for saying that to become famous one need but espouse an extremely unpopular cause and work vigorously to promote it. The title of this paper indicates clearly that my fame is assured. "Modernity," in art, as in other fields of human endeavor, has always been unpopular, statistically at least. Even among those who call themselves artists, only a relatively small number will admit that modern art has any value in any respect. In fact, comparatively few artists go "modern." It is not my purpose to persuade any artist who has found the most personal way of expressing himself, to give up his established practices in order to turn modern. This paper was written in the hope that it might give a little help to the bewildered layman in the field of art. For it is my belief that the reason laymen do not appreciate art more than they do, especially modern art, is that they do not know what to look for in art works.

For the purpose of discussion, we shall make art mean all kinds of artistic expression, including music, painting, sculpture, literature, dramatics, dancing, architecture, interior decoration, and perhaps still other kinds that may come to mind. We shall designate as "modern art" the varied contemporary expressions of serious art only. In our discussion "modern music," for instance, is not to be confused with jazz, or so-called popular music; "modern painting" will not refer exclusively to abstract or non-objective productions; when we say "modern architecture" we do not mean all-glass houses only; and so on throughout the various categories of art. A fine piece of chamber music by Ravel, one of the better known paintings by Picasso, an exquisite terpsichorean production presented by the Ballet Russe, an architectural masterpiece by Wright, a powerful drama by O'Neill—such products we shall refer to as "modern."

We of this generation have heard about Stravinski, Proko-

Dr. de Jong is former dean of the College of Fine Arts at Brigham Young University.

fiev, de Falla, Debussy, Ravel, Picasso, Mattise, Grant Wood, Derain, Martha Graham, Diaghilev, Eugene O'Neill, and other moderns, and we can see the sneers on the faces of many of their "critics" when their works of art are mentioned. We have also heard how the masterpiece produced by a four-inch paint brush attached to the tail of an ass received a grand prize when exhibited in a Paris salon. This anecdote is usually told in order to insinuate that that sort of thing is typical of all modern art, and consequently, that all modern art is insincere. I have heard it said by some recognized artists even, that "people who paint like that are nuts—crazy as a bedbug." It is not infrequently suggested by otherwise discriminating people that excessive drinking and addiction to dope are often the motivating causes of modern artistic expression.

In almost any field of human endeavor reasonable people know that they have to have certain requisites to be able to judge the quality of any ideas or products of skill. Isn't it strange that in the field of art, in religion, and in literature numerous uninitiated laymen feel perfectly capable of judging quality without ever having had any technical training, instruction, or experience in these fields? Van Loon, in his excellent book *The Arts,* reminds us that "the layman is rarely asked to favor us with his opinions upon the work of an expert surgeon or engineer." Then he asks, "Why should we not extend the same courtesy toward the artist, who expresses himself in quite as individual a way as the man who removes our appendix or who builds our bridges and subways?"[1]

In view of the nature of his work and contribution to the community, the serious and sincere artist could well be compared to a "recording instrument." The "records" made by any artist are never like those made by any other artist, however, for each artist records in his own particular way. The "record" any artist makes becomes a reflection of his attitude to life as he sees and understands it, his individual philosophy, his personal credo. "Whether his 'record' means something to the rest of us or nothing at all," says Mr. Van Loon further, "is none of his concern. The nightingale and the raven too are not interested in our opinions. They do the best they can in the hope

1 Van Loon, Hendrick Willem, *The Arts* (New York, 1937), p. 16.

that they will gain the approval of some other nightingale or raven. This is very sad when the nightingale finds himself surrounded by ravens or *vice versa.* But nothing can be done about it."[2]

All pre-modern art movements and styles of recognized standing began as "modern" movements and styles. Every new form of artistic expression was the result of a strongly felt dissatisfaction with the more or less established and current art forms. The ancient Greeks did not know that the forms they were using were ancient. They did not even know that they themselves were ancients. In fact, they firmly believed that they were modern—and, what's more, they were. Digging among the ruins left by old civilizations, we have never yet unearthed a coin stamped 215 B.C. Naturally, the people who were living in the era we now designate B.C. did not think of their day in terms of what was to come; they know only what had gone before. In that sense of the word art works produced today are no more modern than those of any period preceding our own.

It is not surprising to find that today modern works of art are roundly denounced as inferior, as insincere, as unreal, and as lacking in art qualities generally. That is precisely the way in which most modern works of art have been received in any period of history. Rembrandt's "Nightwatch," now sometimes singled out as the world's greatest artistic achievement, at the time of its creation was considered extremely modern. The clair-obscure that characterized his paintings, by which he highlighted centers of interest and caused other parts practically to disappear, was entirely new among the artistic practices of his day. The members of the nightwatch who paid to have their picture painted by the great Leyden master felt that the photographic objectivity and fidelity they had hoped would characterize their painting were very uneven, and in spots, entirely lacking. Even though Rembrandt's technique was considered a radical departure from conventional methods when the "Nightwatch" was painted, today the most conservative art teachers recommend to all their students that they make a close study of Rembrandt's work.

The writings by Emile Zolá, like *The Saloon,* for instance,

2 *Ibid.,* p. 17.

were very modern in their day. It was generally felt that in them artistic form had been reduced to a minimum, while content had been raised to the maximum. For all practical purposes, Zolá's naturalism constituted a complete reversal of the sugar-sweet type of realism current in France before the turn of the century. Naturally, many patrons of literature found that Zolá had gone too far, that his art work (if indeed it could be called art) was too modern.

Again, none of us today would think of Beethoven's later symphonies as modern. But Beethoven's contemporaries found his method of expressing himself artistically entirely new, very erratic, and quite incomprehensible. The execution of Beethoven's compositions also demanded new technical skill and dexterity from the orchestral musicians of that day. In fact, it is said that one string bass player threw down his instrument and gave it as his opinion that Beethoven was completely insane. Today Beethoven's style is generally regarded as sane, even sedate, the very antithesis of modern.

Most of the artistic practices that originated in former periods were short-lived. Relatively few of them become well enough established to be regarded as conventional today. How many of the art forms now called modern will endure to strike root and gain general acceptance, no one can predict with assurance. It is to be expected, however, that most of the modern experiments now being tried will be given up sooner or later. It has always been thus and there is no reason to believe that the history of present modern art movements will not run true to form.

When the layman says that modernity in art is not justified or justifiable, he really means to say that he recognizes a rather pronounced difference between the modern and the more conventional and established pre-modern forms of expression. He notices that in one way or another a modern art work has left the beaten path. Being familiar with the established and accepted forms, and totally unaccustomed to the modern forms, in his perplexity he is immediately tempted to say that he does not understand a modern work of art.

In the case of modern interior decoration we are already adjusting to many new developments, such as new combinations

of color, new linear design, the use of new materials, etc., with greater ease than in other fields of art. The old school recommended complete harmonization; the new school suggests principally contrasts, at times violent contrasts. Off-shade rather than straight colors seem now to be preferred. Since we have not yet had sufficient time to become entirely accustomed to these new treatments, we still say now and then that we do not understand them. Particularly in the field of painting, when a modern work is seen for the first time, we often hear it said that the meaning is not clear. "What does it mean?" "What does it represent?" These are among the most popular questions we hear in such a situation. Then it is that we so often hear the comment, "I don't understand it!" As a matter of fact, there is nothing to understand, at least not in a logical sense of the word. For art addresses itself primarily to the emotions, not to the intellect. A good painting, a fine musical composition, an exciting redecoration of our living room is not expected to bring us knowledge or give us information. Art puts no premium on being understandable in the sense of being logical or even reasonable; it would rather stimulate intuition or awaken the imagination. That is its only mission. Art should be made to provide a feast for the senses but should not, and does not, try to furnish food for thought.

One popular objection to modern music, for instance, is that the harmony is "unnatural." Now, our scientific friends can easily show us that the unpleasurable reaction experienced when modern harmonic progressions are heard really has nothing to do with the naturalness or unnaturalness of the harmony used. It cannot be explained on the basis of closeness to nature, therefore. A much simpler and more tenable explanation is that the listener has not yet become accustomed to hearing the tonal combinations used in modern harmony, which always has a tendency to leave him a bit puzzled. The established and already accepted older types of harmony seem natural because the listener has had a sufficiently long time to become familiar with them. The traditional sub-dominant-dominant-tonic progression, which now seems so threadbare and uninteresting to a cultured ear, is composed of the lower overtones, those that lie nearest the fundamental. Modern harmony, on the other hand, results

largely from combining those overtones that occur much higher in the series. Both types of harmony are equally natural, since the component elements of both are taken from the same series of overtones which nature regularly produces. Hence, we cannot assume that the laws of nature indicate that one type of harmony is to be preferred over the other. In the last analysis, the reason conventional harmony is thought of as pleasant, and modern harmony as unpleasant, is that we have had adequate time to accustom our ears to the now called conventional forms, but not to the modern forms. Nevertheless, given time to hear the newer harmonic combinations over and over again, as we were for the old ones, we shall no doubt learn to appreciate many of the new harmonic effects introduced in modern music, and learn that they too can give us pleasurable reactions.

The physicist would explain that parallel fifths and octaves, seldom used in the musical compositions of our predecessors, but now rather freely employed, are always present among the overtones created when any one bass note moves to any other. Therefore, this phenomenon cannot be called unnatural either. It is not to be doubted that in time, not too far distant, we shall learn to listen to these progressions and be aesthetically lifted up. To sum up, then: in musical composition our ears accept as harmonious the cord formations and progressions we are used to hearing, while those chord formations or progressions which are in any way unusual or strange are said to be inharmonious. What our ear interprets as harmonious gives us pleasure; whatever we still think of as inharmonious does not. We could speak similarly of the new and unusual rhythmic patterns that characterize contemporary compositions: the established and much used rhythms give us a feeling of satisfaction, the new ones do not.

Now let us raise the age-old question, whether music is a heteronomous or autonomous art. An explanation of these two terms is in order here. Those who think of music as heteronomous believe that the content of music is essentially non-musical; that is, music communicates a reality that exists independently of its embodiment in music. They say, for instance, that "music expresses the will and passions of human beings, feelings and emotions being its burden in a variety and precision not

possible in words."[3] On the other hand, those who hold music to be an autonomous art believe that it is *sui generis;* i.e., its content or meaning is purely musical. The autonomists believe that the musician concerns himself only with tonal-rhythmic structure as he elaborates purely musical thematic material into compositional patterns.

Obviously persons who adhere to the heteronomous theory, that is, those who think that all music represents something other than music, have much greater difficulty in their attempt to get aesthetic satisfaction through modern music than do those who hold to the autonomous explanation. Renato Almeida, South America's foremost living musicologist, has the following to say about the new tendencies in music:

> Music does not have to tell a story, nor make a design, nor model anything. It may be descriptive or plastic, but it must always be a suggestion and permits an atmosphere or interpretation in which the human soul, freed and exalted, experiences life through intense aesthetic enjoyment. The essence of music is music, hovering above all things, dominating them and elevating itself by the eminence of sound, incomprehensible and mysterious. Wagner is right—when the other arts say *this means,* music says *this is,* for it penetrates reality and through emotion creates a sensible world which is higher and integral. The other arts, Nietzsche insists, are arts of appearance, arts of phenomena, arts of dreams. Music transcends and translates the *noumenon.* Therefore, being the only absolute art, at least for the contemporary spirit, it must be the freest, in order better to realize the desire of our sensibilities. We must not, therefore, disturb music essentially by ascribing to it functions which, if it were to fulfill them, would deform it. The more music frees itself from the other arts, the more it becomes music. Parallelism with reality should result in musical creation which does not copy nature, but, on the contrary, originates in it, as if it were a part of its incommensurable totality.[4]

In this quotation the word *noumenon,* a philosophic expression first used by Kant, indicates here the extra-sensible and imponderable reality, in opposition to *phenomenon.* This would make *noumenon* the universal essence, the ultimate reality, the

3 David W. Prall, *Aesthetic Judgment,* New York, 1929, p. 216.
4 Renato Almeida, *Historia da Musica Brasileira* (Rio de Janeiro, 1942), p. 449.

thing itself, *das Ding für sich* as Kant called it, inaccessible to human comprehension. The excerpt quoted above from *The History of Brazilian Music* shows plainly that Renato Almeida, like most contemporary students of aesthetics, sees modern music definitely going more and more in the direction of autonomy rather than heteronomy.

Purely from the aesthetic point of view it may be well to remark here that the beauty we try to see in art lies principally in the form, the shape, the appearance of the work of art. The great German philosopher Kant argued that content and subject matter of an art work have very little to do with its beauty. For instance, to ask what a picture represents, or what a piece of music describes, or what a story is about is really beside the point. Although Croce does not go quite so far in this direction as Kant and his followers, even he says that beauty consists simply in successful expression. This explanation still leaves beauty purely a matter of form. Hence, no logical significance, no practical or ethical consideration, not even sensuous enjoyment adds to, or detracts from, the beauty of an aesthetic object. Santayana likewise finds the formal aspects of beauty of great importance, but thinks that the sensuous pleasure caused by art should also be considered fundamental. The pragmatic philosophy of John Dewey and his followers reduces beauty, the cause of our aesthetic experiences, to skillful adaptation of means and ends. Taken to its logical conclusion this point of view erases entirely the distinction between fine art and applied art, which may be just as well for the layman. Lipps made it clear long ago that we "feel ourselves into" objects that we contemplate aesthetically. As a result we call natural phenomena and man-made art works beautiful if we like the way it feels to identify ourselves imaginatively with them.

In general it may be said, therefore, that art, including modern art, tries to make a sensuous appeal, not a rational appeal. To the creative artist the form he gives his productions is of far greater importance than their content. Hence, it follows that, in our attempts to appreciate art, we should look mainly for the manner, not the matter. We are less concerned with *what* an artist paints, and more concerned with *how* he paints. A book review should be more than a reduced version of the story that

can be told in forty-five minutes. Far more important aesthetically is the philosophic and linguistic treatment the author has given his fundamental ideas. At a recent chamber music concert a friend of mine began to enjoy the extremely modern Fourth String Quartet by Béla Bartók immensely, as soon as I got him to quit guessing what extra-musical human experiences the composer had tried to describe, and to pay attention to the novel manner in which the thematic musical material had been worked into a fascinating compositional pattern.

When we become aware of the great importance of the formal aspect of beauty, and we see that the principal difference between conventional and modern artistic endeavor is explained on the basis of form, we begin to see why it is so difficult for so many persons to appreciate modern art in any of its manifestations. By being more interested in the content itself than in the treatment the subject matter received at the hands of the creative artist, they miss the very message the artist tries to convey. Modern artists today deal with essentially the same material as that used by preceding generations. But their personal reactions to this material have always changed from generation to generation, and from individual to individual. These reactions will continue to be personal and individual. The products of our modern artists can give us significant help in developing aesthetic values, mainly because they constantly see life in a new light, using new forms of expression to communicate to us their new impressions. We must not forget that trying to grasp the meaning of new forms of expression is always difficult for a time. But patience will be rewarded here also. Unfortunately, as soon as we grow accustomed to modern art forms they cease to be modern, for then they will already have become like their predecessors, conventional.

The sun jewels
The sand.
I lie
In a blue and white
Montage
Of foaming sky:
Illusion of
Bird and wind
Out of the moment's
Destiny;
Lights from somewhere
Snapping and weaving
Wet beads;
Surf churning black
Specks; and
Sand crabs
Nicking
The air . . .

—Douglas Hill

Charles Darwin After One Hundred Years

VASCO M. TANNER

For the past three centuries man's physical and intellectual environment has been undergoing changes. Great masses of the population of the western world have failed to grasp the basic meaning of these changes and, as a result, are living under the dictates of a culture of the past.

Today as never before, man, due to his use of the scientific method in learning the secrets of the operation of the inanimate and animate world, has opened up a vastness of the universe which leaves us with a feeling of awe and reverence of the ultimate power back of it all.

Thinking men and women see changes occurring in the world today. They are agreed that the world about us is undergoing orderly change. They see mountains changed into valleys and seas filled by the erosive power of mighty rivers; how radio-active elements disintegrate to form new elements and how man is shrinking his universe at a frightening rate. All this change is, to the scientist, evolution. It is opposed to a belief in an unchangeable, fixed universe.

The fear of evolution in the minds of many people involves a fear of science in general. Unfortunately, those who have a fear of science hold that people should be kept in ignorance of the physical and organic world, since learning the ways of nature may be contrary to the beliefs which have come down through the ages. These views do not frequently make allowances for the changing times in which we live. We either find ourselves in a changing world or an unchanging one. If through the dictates of our own cogitation we are led to accept the view that the world is changing, we accept all that evolution implies;

Dr. Tanner is professor of zoology and entomology at Brigham Young University. He read this paper before the staff members and students of the College of Biological and Agricultural Sciences of Brigham Young University, and the Weber College Faculty Association on November 23 and 24, 1959.

that is, that throughout nature there is an orderly change.

At this point I wish to emphasize the orderliness that is found in nature. Through the laborious research of great human minds we are now able to deduce that all changes are part of a great process that has no beginning and no end that are within our powers of comprehension. This concept was not easy to come by. It is the result of a painstaking struggle with nature. Charles Darwin was not thoroughly convinced of it when he began delving into nature's secrets. Just as evolution in the universe is a slow process, so its meaning and significance will be slowly grasped by man. Nevertheless, it is with few exceptions, the accepted view of scientists of the world. If there is an acceptance of universal and continuous change in all living and non-living matter, we are well on our way to looking at the contribution of some of the exponents of this line of thinking.

Today we pause to commemorate the contributions of one of these famous men—Charles Robert Darwin—an Englishman born on February 12, 1809, one hundred fifty years ago. It was also on February 12, 1809, on the same day, month and year, that another great world figure was born, Abraham Lincoln, an American; both emancipators, one of man's intellectual outlook, the other of man's body from the lash of a task master. Radical adjustments in the intellectual, spiritual, social, and biological philosophies and planning of man are the consequential results of the impact of the contributions of these liberators.

It was also just one hundred years ago today, November 24, 1859, that Darwin's epoch-making book, *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life,* was published in London, England. The whole edition of 1250 copies was exhausted on the day of issue.

Charles Darwin was the son of Robert Darwin and the grandson of Erasmus Darwin. At the age of 16, Charles was sent by his father to Edinburgh to study medicine. He was not interested in medicine, so spent much of his time during the next three years attending lectures on Natural History and Geology under the direction of Professors Henslow and Sedgwick.

In 1828, at the request of his father, he entered Christ College at Cambridge, from which he took a degree in 1831.

Darwin's interests were now as much in biology and geology as in divinity. He was thus eligible to become the naturalist of the famous British Expedition which was preparing to go around the world.

Young Darwin, age 22, received the appointment as naturalist due to the helpful influence of Professors Henslow and Lyell, and sailed from Devonport on December 27, 1831, in the *Beagle,* a ten-gun brig under the command of Captain Fitz Roy. He returned to England in October, 1836, at the end of the voyage which took him around the world. He had studied in South America, Galapagos Islands, Tahiti, New Zealand, Australia, Tasmania, St. Helena, and other Atlantic Ocean Islands. From 1838 to 1841 he was secretary of the Geological Society of England, during which time he spent many hours with Sir Charles Lyell, the great geologist of his time. In January, 1839, Charles Darwin married Emma Wedgwood, his cousin. They lived in London until 1842, when they moved to Down, Kent, 20 miles from London. They were the parents of 10 children; two daughters and five sons survived him. Four of their sons became distinguished scientists and members of the Royal Society of London. His wife was a good companion to him, helping him in his short working periods of two to three hours each day. His lack of stamina was owing to an illness he acquired during the five-year voyage of the *Beagle.* He died on April 19, 1882, and was buried in Westminister Abbey.

Charles Darwin grew up in a conservative intellectual climate. The theory of descent or transmutation was, however, being widely discussed by such men as Lamarck, Charles Lyell, Henslow, Hooker, and Sedgwick. Erasmus Darwin, Charles' grandfather, who died seven years before Charles was born, was an advocate of transmutation. Lyell, owing to his finding of rock strata and fossils, was advocating that the earth was much older than was generally maintained. As Darwin glimpsed the forest jungles of Brazil, he became fascinated by the splendor of the forests, birds, and insects. He learned how perfectly some species escaped destruction by camouflage or mimicry and how for ages the struggle for life had been going on. Great collec-

tions of plants, insects, birds, and fossils were collected and dispatched to England for future study. It was during his pensive moments that he began to realize that time and change were the essence of transmutation. The data he was gathering would be of value to him in the future. He was gathering the facts out of which he would be able to make his far reaching and lasting deduction.

After more than three years spent in South America, the *Beagle* arrived at the Galapagos Archipelago on September 15, 1835. Darwin had been looking forward to a study of the flora and fauna of these islands. It was here that he began to realize that isolation, competition, and time were some of the creative factors in the organic world.

The Galapagos Islands, situated on the Equator 500 miles west of Ecuador (which administers them) consists of 10 major and several small volcanic islands. These islands were discovered in 1535, and have been visited only by buccaneers, whalers, and some scientific collectors until recently, when the Ecuadorians established a penal colony on St. Charles Island. Since Darwin's visit in 1835, much disturbance of the fauna and flora has resulted from introduction of animals on some islands and the ruthless killing of the tortoises.

On these oceanic islands Darwin found a unique plant and animal world—a little cosmos—nothing like it any other place on earth. After spending five weeks surveying several of the islands, he made a most interesting report on his findings.[1] He believed the Archipelago was the result of volcanic action, which led him to classify it as oceanic islands. Information now available throws some doubt upon this conclusion, since Pliocene fossils have been unearthed on some of the islands. Disregarding the origin of the islands, Darwin found only one indigenous land mammal—a mouse—no amphibians, three most unique reptiles—the great land tortoises and two iguanas (one aquatic in habit, the other living entirely on the land)—and thirteen species of finches, as well as many other animals and plants.

The large tortoises are found on all the major islands and some of them grow to immense size. Darwin reports that some

1 *Journal of Researches, 1901* (New York: C. F. Collier and Son), chap. 17.

specimens require six to eight men to lift them from the ground, and that they afford as much as two hundred pounds of meat. The males are larger than the females. The tortoises which live on the lower arid parts of the islands feed chiefly on cactus. Those which are found higher up on the mountains, where it is damp, eat leaves and berries found on various trees.

The tortoise is fond of water, drinking large quantities. Since springs are found only on the larger islands, situated well away from the shore in the central part, the tortoises from the low lands and shore areas have made well-beaten trails to the springs. The traders and buccaneers followed the trails to the watering places when collecting tortoises for a meat supply on their ships. Tortoises coming in from the low areas of the islands for water remain for several days at the springs. When one reaches the spring, Darwin reports, ". . . the head is buried in the water above the eyes and [it] greedily swallows great mouthfuls, at the rate of about ten in a minute."[2] For many days after a visit to the spirng the urinary bladder is said to be distended with fluid. Many traders seeking water to quench their thirst drink the contents of the bladder if full.

The tortoises begin laying eggs in the fall, October. The eggs are white and a little larger than a hen's egg. They are usually laid together in the sand and covered over by the female. The eggs and meat of the tortoises are widely used by the inhabitants of the islands and by the whalers and the buccaneers in the past. Darwin reports that a single vessel has taken away as many as seven hundred, and that one ship company brought down to the beach two hundred tortoises in one day. A careful study of these interesting creatures has revealed that there were fourteen species or subspecies living in the archipelago. Some of them are now extinct owing to the slaughter of the adults and the killing of the young by introduced animals. Darwin did not appreciate at first the fact that there were fourteen species on islands. His attention was called to it by the vice-governor, Mr. Lawson, who declared "that the tortoises differ from the different islands and that he could with certainty tell from which island any one was brought."[3]

---

2 *Ibid.*, p. 433.
3 *Ibid.*, p. 445.

Before leaving the islands Darwin concluded that "there can be little doubt that this tortoise is an aboriginal inhabitant of the Galapagos; for it is found on all, or nearly all the islands, even on some of the smaller ones where there is no water; had it been an imported species, this would hardly have been the case in a group which has been so little frequented."[4]

The iguanas along with the tortoises are the most conspicuous animals on the islands. They are found no other place in the world. One species, *Amblyrhynchus cristatus,* when mature is three to four feet long and weighs 15 to 20 pounds. It feeds on sea-weeds and, when not swimming in the sea for food, basks in the sun on the lava rocks along the beach. The other species, *A. demarlii,* lives entirely upon the land, feeds only upon land plants, is smaller than the marine species, and spends much of its time in burrows which it digs in the volcanic sand of the desert lowlands of the islands.

Darwin observes that "the aquatic species is by far the most remarkable, because it is the only existing lizard which lives on marine vegetable productions."[5]

He also remarked, "We must admit that there is no other quarter of the world where this order (reptiles) replaces the herbivorous mammalia in so extraordinary a manner."[6]

Since the thirteen species of Darwin's finches on the Galapagos, plus one on the Cocos Island to the northwest, are such a self-contained group with no obvious relations elsewhere, I have chosen to report rather fully on their habits and evolution. Not only do they vary from island to island, but up to ten different species of them can be found on a single island. It is reasonably certain that all of the Darwin's finches evolved from an original colonizing form. The close resemblance among the species in plumage, calls, nests, and eggs suggests that they have not yet had time to diverge far from one another. It seems clear that the beak differences among the several forms of finches are adaptive. Some of the differences are greater in some forms than in others. These finches furnish circumstantial evidence for the origins of new species by reason of geographic isolation.

---

4 *Ibid.,* p. 435.
5 *Ibid.,* p. 441.
6 *Ibid.*

David Lack has recently studied the Galapagos finches.[7] The following notes are from his study:

> If differentiated forms, such as the Darwin's finches, are to persist along side each other as separate species, two conditions must be met. First they must avoid interbreeding, and second they must not compete for the same food. In the Galapagos Islands differentiation was possible because the original species could scatter and establish separate homes on the various islands. A similar group of birds which have evolved as the finches are the sicklebills of Hawaii, which are likewise on an Archipelago.
>
> The 14 species of Darwin's finches fall into four main genera. *First* there are the ground finches, embracing six species, nearly all of which feed on seeds on the ground and live in the arid coastal regions. *Secondly,* there are the tree finches, likewise including six species, nearly all of which feed on insects in trees and live in the moist forests. *Thirdly,* there is the warbler-like finch (only one species) which feeds on small insects in bushes in both arid and humid regions. *Finally,* there is an isolated Cocos Island species which lives on insects in a tropical forest.
>
> Among the ground finches, four species live together on most of the islands: three of them eat seeds and differ from each other mainly in the size of their beaks, adapted to different sizes of seeds; the fourth species feeds largely on prickly pear and has a much longer and more pointed beak. The two remaining species of ground finches, one large and one small, live chiefly on the outlying islands, where some supplement their seed diet with cactus, their beaks being appropriately modified.
>
> Of the tree finches, one species is vegetarian, with a parrot-like beak seemingly fitted to its diet of buds and fruits. The next three species are closely alike, differing primarily in body size and in the size of their beaks. A fifth species eats insects in mangrove swamps. The sixth species of tree-finch is one of the most remarkable birds in the world. Like a woodpecker, it climbs tree trunks in search of insects, which it excavates from the bark with its chisel-shaped beak. While its beak approaches a woodpecker's in shape it has not evolved the long tongue with which a woodpecker probes insects from crannies. Instead the tree-finch solves the problem in another way: it carries about a cactus spine or small twig which it pokes into cracks, dropping the stick to seize any insect that emerges. This astonishing practice is one of the few recorded

7 David Lack, "Darwin's Finches," *Scientific American,* April, 1953.

> cases of the use of tools by any animal other than man or the ape.[8]

Time will not permit a discussion of other elements of the fauna and flora. Suffice it to report that of the more than 400 species of plants reported on the islands more than 50 per cent of them are indigenous, and that there are 35 families of Coleoptera represented by 205 species of which far more than a majority are endemic.

Confronted by this array of new animals and plants, Darwin began to search for an explanation as to their origin. These islands as noted above are removed from the main land of South America; they are in the direct course of the Humboldt Current which, coming from the Antarctic region, makes the surface waters of the islands 15 to 20 degrees cooler than the nearby tropical sea; storms and strong winds rarely occur, and winter rains are light. The mountains of some of the islands rising to several thousand feet are usually covered by a mist, which makes possible the growth of trees and ferns. The lowlands and the shores are desert-like, with no continuous streams and very few springs, some of which are dry during most of the year. Let us see what Darwin was thinking about this problem. The following quotation is from his *Journal of Researches*:

> The natural history of these islands is eminently curious and well deserves attention. Most of the organic productions are aboriginal creations, found nowhere else; there is even a difference between the inhabitants of the different islands; yet all show a marked relationship with those of America, though separated from that continent by an open space of ocean between 500 and 600 miles in width. The Archipelago is a little world within itself, or rather a satellite attached to America, whence it has derived a few stray colonists and has received the general character of its indigenous productions. Considering the small size of these islands, we feel the more astonished at the number of their aboriginal beings, and at their confined range. Seeing every height crowned with its crater, and the boundaries of most of the lava-streams still distinct, we are led to believe that within a period geologically recent the unbroken ocean was here spread out. Hence, both in space and time, we seem to be brought somewhat near to

8 *Ibid.*

> that great fact—that mystery of mysteries—the first appearance of new beings on this earth.[9]
>
> Reviewing the facts here given, one is astonished at the amount of creative force, if such an expression may be used, displayed on these small, barren and rocky islands; and still more so at its diverse yet analogous action on points so near each other. I have said that the Galapagos Archipelago might be called a satellite attached to America, but it should rather be called a group of satellites, physically similar, organically distinct, yet intimately related to each other, and all related in a marked, though much lesser degree, to the great American continent.[10]

Darwin returned to England in a questioning attitude. He began at once to organize his voluminous notes and study the fossils and biological specimens collected during the voyage. In 1839 he set forth in an interesting and challenging way some of the results and experiences of the five years spent on the Beagle. The book, *A Naturalist's Voyage Around the World,* brought fame to Darwin as a naturalist and developed in him a determination to spend his life in zoological research. He determined to study the transmutation of living organisms and if possible arrive at some satisfactory explanation. In 1838, while he was reading Malthus on "Population," the idea of natural selection flashed upon him, thus providing a theory with which to work. Even with his decision to use natural selection as a major factor in explaining the fact of evolution he made slow progress. In 1842 he wrote a thirty-five page statement on the theory of the descent of animals, but put it aside until he could get more supporting data. Again, in 1844, he added materially to his first statement in a 230-page abstract of his thinking on evolution.

A letter from Alfred Russel Wallace in early 1858 came as a shock to Darwin and ended his procrastination in the publishing of his *Origin of Species.* Wallace, a careful field worker and well-trained biologist, had arrived at a similar conclusion as had Darwin as to the role played by natural selection in evolution. After a discussion on this matter with Lyell and Hooker it was agreed that a joint communication of the views of Dar-

9 *Ibid.*, pp. 427-428.
10 *Ibid.*, p. 450.

win and Wallace should be published in the July number of the Journal of the Linnean Society. This done, it was then important that Darwin should finish his study and publish the *Origin of Species.* After 13 months of painstaking writing and editing he published his greatest contribution, the *Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection.*

There was a mixed reaction to it. Some notables as Sir John Herschel, Adam Sedgwick, and Bishop Wilberforce were outspoken in their opposition to it. It was supported by such leaders as Hooker, Lyell, Wallace, Alfred Newton, Huxley, and Spencer.

After one hundred years Darwinism is widely accepted by scientists of the world. Through his careful efforts Charles Darwin established evolution as a fact; and subsequent workers have pointed out that natural selection, isolation, variation, and heredity operating over long periods of time provide the methods or factors for evolution. The plants and animals we see today are the results of changes that have been wrought in pre-existing forms by the above-mentioned factors. Thus we conclude that Darwin made two major contributions: first, he established evolution as a fact; second, he advanced natural selection as an important factor in the process. He had the following to say about natural selection: "This preservation of favorable individual differences and variations, and the destruction of those which are injurious, I have called Natural Selection, or the Survival of the Fittest."[11] Darwin contended throughout his writings that evolution in the biological world has been slow and orderly and the results of long periods of time. This contention has been supported by additional evidence from the several disciplines such as comparative anatomy, embryology, classification, paleontology, geographical distribution of animals, genetics, geology, physiology and psychology. Evidence to support an orderly change from older species to more recent ones has especially come from the fields of classification, paleontology, and geographical distribution. Natural selection and isolation as extrinsic factors in the method of evolution are clearly evident in the life on the Galapagos Islands.

---

11 Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species,* Vol. I, p. 98. International Science Library, A. L. Fowle, New York.

Charles Darwin's contributions have done more to unify the biological sciences than those of any other man. Likewise, the impact of Darwinism has been felt in almost all fields of science and learning. Such subjects as psychology, history, sociology, astronomy, and anthropology have been benefited and given new direction. With new facts and forces and instruments of precision at our disposal we have within our grasp the means of more thoroughly controlling our universe.

In this discussion we have not commented on man's relationship to the higher animal species. In conclusion it may not be out of place to make the following comments. From a biological and philosophical point of view, there can be no question but that man is related in a physical way to the animals. His structure, physiology, embryology, and heredity make him one of them. But he is much more than an animal: he has psychic and spiritual characteristics which need to be explained as much as the evolution of his body. If we accept the deduction presented at the beginning of this paper that all changes are part of a great process that has no beginning and no end, and that there is an orderly change which runs through the universe, there is reason to believe that there are possibilities of our some time growing or evolving to a place at which we more clearly understand the God of this universe and the divinity that is within us.

MANTI TEMPLE

KARL KELLER

A faceless stone stands above my valley,
pushing the broad seasons before it into
millennia of green light. And the sky
surrounds the stone confession of courage in
an intercourse of blue voices unscarred
by preposterous sky-foam of star-crossed man.
The stone is a stark sail for our eyes,
set upon a sea of its own, leading
our washed feet and naked souls upon
the bread-strewn waters of our faith,
where are carved cherrystones into stars.

God and Immortality in Dostoevsky's Thought

LOUIS C. MIDGLEY

Ivan Karamazov, Dostoevsky's "nihilist," fully recognized the consequences of the denial of God and immortality. Ivan gave us two different formulations of his position. First, "there is no virtue if there is no immortality" (BK, 66).[1] Secondly, Ivan

> solemnly declared in argument that there was nothing in the whole world to make man love their neighbours. That there was no law of nature that man should love mankind, and that, if there had been any love on earth hitherto, it was not owing to a natural law but simply because men have believed in immortality. . . [I]f you were to destroy in mankind the belief in immortality, not only love but every living force maintaining life of the world would at once be dried up. Moreover, nothing then would be immoral, everything would be lawful, even cannibalism (BK, 65).

The final pay-off of Ivan's nihilistic doctrine is that

> for every individual . . . who does not believe in God or immortality, the moral law of nature must immediately be changed into the exact contrary of the former religious law, and that egoism, even crime, must become, not only lawful but even recognized as the inevitable, the most rational, even honourable outcome of his position (BK, 65f.).

Ivan's bold doctrine, from one point of view, is high minded

---

1 References to Dostoevsky's writings are not separated by the use of superscript and notation at the end of the paper. They will appear as abbreviations in parenthetical references in the body of the essay. The abbreviations used for Dostoevsky's writings will include: (BK), *The Brothers Karamazov,* trans. Constance Garnett (New York: Macmillan, 1948); (NU), *Notes from the Underground,* in *The Best Short Stories of Dostoevsky,* trans. David Magarshack (New York: Modern Library, n.d.), pp. 107-240; (DW), *The Diary of a Writer,* trans. Boris Brazol, 2 Vol. (New York: Scribner's 1949), in the citations in this essay the volume number will not be indicated, however volume one ends with page 558; (P), *The Possessed,* trans. Constance Garnett (New York: Modern Library, 1936); (L), *Letters of Fyodor Michailovitch Dostoevsky to his Family and Friends,* trans. Ethel Colburn Mayne (New York: Macmillan, 1917); (I), *The Idiot,* trans. David Magarshack (London: Penguin, 1955).

and lofty. Ivan had considerable difficulty believing that his theory was just "an attractive theory for scoundrels . . ." On the contrary, "humanity will find in itself the power to live for virtue," Ivan argued, "even without believing in immortality. It will find it in love for freedom, for equality, for fraternity" (BK, 79).

The Moral Argument

In his novels Dostoevsky attempted to develop arguments for the existence of God and for human immortality. These arguments, in some respects, are strikingly similar to arguments proposed by Immanuel Kant, who felt that God was beyond the reach of both the senses and of analytical reason, but not beyond "moral proof." Kant based his belief in the existence of God on man's moral nature. The conscience of man assumes that the moral ideals of man are somehow realizable. But moral ideals apparently cannot be realized on earth. They can only be realized if there actually is a supreme moral will—God. Morality for Kant leads inevitably to religion. God becomes the postulate of practical reason.[2] In order for the world to make sense—that is, make moral sense—it is necessary that God exist. God exists in order to recompense evil for evil and good for good. Also, man must be immortal if he is to receive judgment. Kant also treated freedom of the will as a postulate of the practical reason.

Now it cannot be maintained that Dostoevsky follows Kant across the board. In fact there are significant differences as well as similarities between the two men on these matters, and some are profound differences at that. The chief difference between Kant and Dostoevsky is on the question of freedom. Not that Kant opposes freedom of will. For Kant freedom is not factually evident in the world of appearances—the phenomenal world. By observing the phenomenal world we discover rigid, deterministic uniformity. Freedom exists only in the noumenal world, and Kant was emphatic in declaring that man cannot know anything about the reality that stands behind this phenomenal world.

---

2 The use of the term "postulate" by Kant was not intended to suggest that the belief was merely tentative or hypothetical, but, on the contrary, it was used to indicate that reflection on the facts of morality would produce necessarily a belief in what could only be realized by implication from morality.

But freedom, for Dostoevsky, is an empirically verifiable phenomenon. It is clear in the *Notes from the Underground* that radical freedom, the real fundamental of human nature, was not just a kind of postulate to make things work out all right morally in the end, but, on the contrary, freedom was the real stuff of life, something each individual realizes, something that can be seen functioning in the history of individuals and nations. Real freedom makes evil possible; freedom being the capacity to choose the evil as well as the good.

Dostoevsky felt that man could observe that he was not an "insect" (NU, 111), or the "keys on the piano" (NU, 136), or a "stop on an organ pipe" (NU, 132). Dostoevsky reasoned that "you can say anything you like about world history, anything that might enter the head of a man with the most disordered imagination. One thing, though, you cannot possibly say about it: you cannot say that it is sensible. If you did, you would choke at the first word" (NU, 75). Dostoevsky used the word "sensible" in the sense of determined; that is clear from the context. The real enemy of humanity in the *Notes* was a rationalist, a shallow fellow who feels that man can be comprehended and ordered in a way analogous to the deterministic harmony and order inherent in a mathematical proposition such as "twice-two-makes four" (NU, 132, 139f.). The deterministic quality can be seen in this example. You see, it follows necessarily, that starting with two and two, you will get four if you add.[3] Dostoevsky saw clearly the frequent alliance between philosophical rationalism and determinism. He distinguishes himself by rejecting both rationalism and determinism. In this respect the *Notes* represent a rather important contribution to the literature on the subject.

No Morality Without Immortality

We have noted a distinct difference between Kant's argument for freedom and Dostoevsky's position with respect to freedom. It is, however, more difficult to distinguish Kant and Dostoevsky on the question of the existence of God, and, per-

3 Ivan confessed that: "With my pitiful, earthly Euclidian understanding, all I know is that there is suffering and that there are none guilty; that cause follows effect, simply and directly; that everything flows and finds its level—but that's only Euclidian nonsense" (BK, 250).

haps, even more difficult when the question of immortality is considered. Kant argued that immortality was a necessary postulate of practical reason and that it was necessary simply because human values appear meaningless without it. Immortality was necessary in order to round out Kant's ethical system.

It would not be too far from the truth to suggest that Ivan Karamazov's emphatic declaration that "there is no virtue if there is no immortality" (BK, 66) has a certain kind of fundamental compatibility with the Kantian moral postulate. But with Dostoevsky more than with Kant the argument appears to be a two-edge sword—meant to cut both ways. Dostoevsky argues it both ways. Without immortality there is no virtue, but it works the other way also, so that without virtue, there is no immortality.

In an editorial in *The Diary of a Writer* entitled "Arbitrary Assertions," Dostoevsky related his views on what he referred to as "the basic and loftiest idea of human existence—the necessity and inevitability of a belief in the immortality of the human soul" (DW, 538). It is clear right from the start that Dostoevsky's insistence on immortality was meant to have a direct relationship to his axiology. Dostoevsky's intense and abiding interest in crime and suicide is important at this point. Dostoevsky felt that he had discovered the formula of a "logical suicide." "Suicide, " Dostoevsky argued, "is the necessity of the immediate inference that without faith in one's soul and its immortality, man's existence is unnatural, unthinkable, impossible" (DW, 538). He added that little by little

> the thought of his aimlessness and his hatred of the muteness of the surrounding inertia lead him to the inevitable conviction of the utter absurdity of man's existence on earth. It becomes clear as daylight to him [the suicide] that only those men consent to live who resemble the lower animals and who come nearest to the latter by reason of the limited development of their minds and their purely carnal wants. They agree to live superficially as animals, i.e., in order "to eat, drink, sleep, build their nests and raise children." Indeed, eating, sleeping, polluting and setting on soft cushions will long attract men to earth, but not the higher types (DW, 538f.).

Kirillov, a revolutionary "nihilist" of *The Possessed,* had a penchant for suicide. Krillov dreamed of suicide as a result of

his failure to believe in the existence of God. What Kirillov lacked, according to Dostoevsky, was the "true" religion. Shatov exclaimed: "Kirillov, if . . . if you could get rid of your dreadful fancies and give up your atheistic ravings . . . Oh, what a man you'd be, Kirillov!" (P. 581). Dostoevsky resented indifference even more than disbelief.[4] The rapid spread of "complete disbelief in one's soul and its immortality" was considered by the author of the *Diary* to be "the most dreaded apprehension" of the Russian future (DW, 539). But Dostoevsky also feared indifference or scoffing at the "loftiest ideas of human existence" (DW, 539). The man who has considered the "eternal questions" and ends up rejecting God and immortality may be lost, but he is really only one step from salvation.[5]

Stephen Trofimovitch's conversion was the result, at least in part, of his having realized that

> The one essential condition of human existence is that man should always be able to bow down before something infinitely great. If men are deprived of the infinitely great they will not go on living and will die of despair. The infinite and the Eternal are as essential for man as the little planet on which he dwells. My friends, all, all hail to the Great Idea! The Eternal, Infinite Idea! It is as essential to every man, whoever he may be, to bow down before what is the Great Idea. Even the stupidest man needs something great (P, 675).

In *The Diary of a Writer* Dostoevsky wrote:

> Neither man nor nation can exist without a sublime idea. And on earth there is *but one* sublime idea—namely, the idea of the immortality of man's soul—since all other "sublime" ideas of life, which give life to man, *are merely derived from this one idea* (DW, 540).

---

4 Tihon announced to Stavrogin that "outright atheism is more to be respected than worldly indifference. . . . Say what you may, but the complete atheist stands on the penultimate step to most perfect faith (he may or may not take a further step), but the indifferent person has no faith whatever. . . ." *The Possessed,* p. 698.

5 Perhaps it is not true that Dostoevsky treats religion as if it were just the condition of being concerned. However, he comes close to this formulation which has recently been popularized by Paul Tillich. The definition of religion as "ultimate concern" lies at the very heart, in one way or another, of the entire theology of Tillich. An atheist, in Tillich's view, is concerned about the important questions and is therefore both religious and one step from salvation. For both Tillich and Dostoevsky the worst condition is not unbelief. In Tillich's view being concerned with something less than the ultimate is the worst condition. Dostoevsky looked upon indifference as the highest sin. There is only a slight difference in these two formulations.

What was Stephen Trofimovitch's Great Idea?[6] It turns out to be God, and the corollary of the *idea* of God is the doctrine of immortality. The old man exclaimed:

> My immortality is necessary if only because God will not be guilty of injustice and extinguish altogether the flame of love for Him once kindled in my heart. . . . If I have once loved Him and rejoiced in my love, is it possible that He should extinguish me and my joy and bring me to nothingness again. If there is a God, then I am immortal (P, 673f.).

The two keys to Dostoevsky's ethical system, God and immortality, are treated in his novels as postulates necessary to provide genuine meaning to life.[7] Kirillov, for example, recognizes that "God is necessary and so must exist" (P. 626). "But I know," says Kirillov, that "He doesn't and can't" (P, 626). Stavrogin suggests that God's non-existence is "more likely." Kirillov, however, draws the ultimate conclusion: "Surely you must understand that a man with two such ideas can't go on living?" (P,626).[8]

The "eternal questions" that the "Russian boys" are endlessly engaged in discussing, torment Dostoevsky's "heroes."[9] Ivan Karamazov says: "It's God that's worrying me. That's the only thing that's worrying me. What if he doesn't exist? What if Rakitin's right—that it's an idea made up by men? Then, if He doesn't exist, man is the chief of earth, of the universe. Mag-

---

6 Dostoevsky wrote that he was "firmly convinced that the majority of suicides, *in toto,* directly or indirectly, were committed as a result of one and the same spiritual illness—the absence in the souls of these men of the sublime idea of existence." *Diary of a Writer,* Vol. I, p. 542.

7 Dostoevsky wrote a letter to N. L. Osmidov that presented a reasoned argument for the existence of God. "Now suppose that there is no God, and no personal immortality (personal immortality and God are one and the same—an identical idea). Tell me then: Why am I to live decently and do good, if I die irrevocably here below? If there is no immortality, I need but live out my appointed day, and let the rest go hang. And if that's really so (and if I am clever enough not to let myself be caught by the standing laws), why should I not kill, rob, steal, or at any rate live at the expense of others? For I shall die, and all the rest will die and utterly vanish! By this road, one would reach the conclusion that the human organism alone is not subject to the universal law ['every single organism exists on earth but to live—not to annihilate itself], that it lives but to destroy itself—not to keep itself alive. . . . Is that no indication of personal immortality?" Dostoevsky, *Letters,* p. 234.

8 In 1870 Dostoevsky admitted to A. M. Maikov that one fundamental idea had tormented him all his life and that was "the question of the existence of God." *Ibid.,* p. 190. Dostoevsky knew about a man "with two such ideas" because he was that man.

9 Dostoevsky wrote in 1854 that there are moments of deep and genuine religion for man, and "in such moments, one does, 'like dry grass,' thirst after

nificent! Only how is he going to be good without God? That's the question. I always come back to that" (BK, 676f.). Ivan asked, in another place: "But what will become of men then, . . . without God and immortal life?" (BK, 623). Rakitin, an atheist, replied, "Didn't you know? . . a clever man can do what he likes . . . " (BK, 623). There is an old captain in *The Possessed* who, after having participated in a discussion in which "short work" was made of God, exclaimed: "If there's no God, how can I be captain?" (P, 229). Dostoevsky produced an amusing dialogue in *The Brothers Karamazov* between Alyosha and Ivan in which the question of the existence of God and immortality was tossed back nad forth (BK, 134f.). It is significant to note that the ironic statement by Ivan combined some of Dostoevsky's favorite ideas, but they are stated in reverse. Ivan said: "If there is a God, if he exists, then, of course, I'm to blame and I shall have to answer for it. But if there isn't a God at all, what do they deserve, your fathers? It's not enough to cut their heads off, for they keep back progress" (BK, 134). Atheism cuts the props out from under values and leads to terrible crimes.

In the early part of *The Brothers Karamazov* one of Dostoevsky's characters asks the saintly Zossima how he can regain faith:

> But I only believed when I was a little child, mechanically, without thinking of anything. How, how is one to prove it? . . . How can I prove it? How can I convince myself? (BK 51).

Zossima's answer was simply that proof is impossible, "though you can be convinced of it" (BK, 51). The way to gain conviction is by "the experience of active love," whatever that is. Love is a product of the "practical reason" and not a matter of knowledge.

---

faith, and that one finds it in the end solely and simply because one sees the truth more clearly when one is unhappy." For Dostoevsky, the impact of raw experience on man produced suffering, torment and eventually terrible unhappiness. "I want to say to you, about myself, that I am a child of this age [the age of wanderers], a child of unfaith and skepticism, and probable (indeed I know it) shall remain so to the end of my life. How dreadful has it tormented me . . this longing for faith, which is all the stronger for the proofs I have against it. . . . If anyone could prove to me that Christ is outside the truth, and if the truth really did exclude Christ, I should prefer to stay with Christ and not with truth." *Ibid.*, pp. 70f.

The long review of parallel passages is intended to indicate the seriousness with which Dostoevsky took the problem of the existence of God and immortality, as well as to indicate the direction of his thought. It should be clear that Dostoevsky rested his ethics on religious considerations. That God gives meaning and value to life was a central theme in Dostoevsky's religious thought.

But God and immortality also rest on the value system. Kolya said in *The Brothers Karamazov*: "Oh, I've nothing against God. Of course, God is only a hypothesis, but . . . I admit that He is needed . . . for the order of the universe and all that . . . and if there were no God he would have to be invented . . . " (BK,584). It certainly is not unreasonable to speak of inventing a hypothesis: Kant, of course, would have called it a postulate. Dostoevsky not only makes abundant use of a kind of Kantian argument but he also recognizes the major theoretical flaw in the argument. The postulate may represent only a kind of wish and not a concrete reality.[10] Dostoevsky never seems to have solved this very important problem. He never solved it, that is, to his own satisfaction. The difficulties inherent in the moral argument for God and immortality are not as important for Kant as they are for Dostoevsky. Kant was a philosopher of religion only after he had arranged his "rational" and "scientific" worlds.[11] Dostoevsky, if he was a philosopher at all, was a philosopher of life and of religion. Dostoevsky not only fails to have made use of the Kantian epistemological superstructure and the metaphysical assumptions upon which the moral argument is based, assuming of course, that Dostoevsky borrowed it in the first place from Kant; but he also fails to provide an epistemology for himself.[12]

---

10 Ivan said: "there was an old sinner in the eighteenth century who declared that, if there were no God, he would have to be invented. . . . And man has actually invented God. And what's strange, what would be marvelous, is not that God should really exist; the marvel is that such an idea, the idea of the necessity of God, could enter the head of such a savage, vicious beast as man." *The Brothers Karamazov,* p. 240.

11 Kant, however, wanted to stress the primacy of the practical reason over the pure or theoretical reason. The primacy is sometimes called the *"moral a priori."* Kant's moral argument has had an enormous impact on religious thinking. Many have taken up the argument and have refined and sophisticated it. See especially the Anglican writer C. S. Lewis, *The Case for Christianity* (New York: Macmillan, 1947).

12 I know of no literature on the subject of the possible relationship of

"Logical Suicide"

We began by attempting to treat the question of immortality, but have been forced to shift slightly and consider its favorite running mate, the existence of God. In Dostoevsky the two are intimately related.[13] The questions of God and immortality have been dealt with more or less separately for two reasons: (1) the existence of God, for Dostoevsky, raises special problems; (2) the question of immortality leads more directly to Dostoevsky's axiological assumptions.

Dostoevsky wrote two essays on immortality and suicide in *The Diary of a Writer* (see DW, 470 ff.; 538 ff.). The man who is not indifferent to the "eternal questions," "not a cast-iron man," will, according to Dostoevsky, suffer and be intensely tormented by religious doubts. "Irresistibly, there stand before him the loftiest, the most pressing questions," and he added:

> What is the use of living if man has already conceived the idea that for man to live like an animal is disgusting, abnormal and insufficient? And what, in this case, can retain him on earth? He cannot solve these questions and he knows it, since even though he realizes that there is what he calls a "harmony of the whole," still he says: "I do not understand it, I shall never be able to understand it, and of necessity I am not going to partake of it: this comes of its own accord." Now, it is this lucidity that finished him. Well, where is the trouble? In what was he mistaken?—The trouble is solely in the loss of faith in immortality (DW, 540).

Dostoevsky asked the question: "Who is happy in this world and what kind of people *consent* to life?" (DW, 471). Both are radically difficult questions. Well, it's the animal types who *consent* to live. Materialists enjoy life because they only think of eating, sleeping, drinking, and building a nest. Dostoevsky was sure that "to build one's nest pre-eminently signifies—to plunder" (DW, 471). Now we have reached the criti-

---

Kant and Dostoevsky. The only indication I have that Dostoevsky was at all familiar with Kant's works is the fact that while in Siberia Dostoevsky was apparently able to secure a copy of Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason*. See E. H. Carr, *Dostoevsky; A New Biography* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1931), p. 82; and Ernest J. Simmons, *Dostoevsky: The Making of a Novelist* (London: John Lehmann, 1950), p. 65.

13 In one of his letters he says that God and immortality are identical. See note 7.

cal question for Dostoevsky's ethics. "Perhaps," he wrote,

> I may be told that one may arrange one's life and build one's nest on a rational basis, on scientifically sound social principles, and not by means of plunder, as heretofore.—All right, but I ask: What for? What is the purpose of arranging one's existence and of exerting so much effort to organize life in society soundly, rationally and righteously in a moral sense? Certainly no one will be able to give me an answer to this question. All that could be said in answer would be: "To derive delight." Yes, were I a flower or a cow, I should derive delight (DW, 471).

Well, what is the validity of the "humanistic" ethic? In treating "humanism," Dostoevsky raised a question that had tormented him all his life. The issue is simply the problem of evil—how can suffering in life be justified?[14] "Yes, were I a flower or a cow, I should derive delight," retorts Dostoevsky.

> But, incessantly putting questions to myself [an old habit with Dosteovsky], as now, I cannot be happy even in the face of the most lofty and *immediate* happiness of love of neighbor and of mankind, since I know that tomorrow all this will perish: I and all the happiness, and all the love, and all mankind will be converted into naught, into former chaos (DW, 471f.).

At this point we may see an important element of Dostoevsky's view of human nature emerge in his demand for universal justice and meaningfulness.

> And on such condition, under no consideration can I accept any happiness—and not because of my refusal to accept it, not because I am stubbornly adhering to some principle, but for the simple reason that I will not and cannot be happy on the condition of being threatened with tomorrow's zero. This is a feeling, a direct and immediate feeling—and I cannot conquer it. All right: if I were to die but mankind, instead of me, were to persist forever, then perhaps, I might nevertheless be consoled. However, our planet is not eternal, while mankind's duration is just as brief a moment as mine. And no matter how rationally, happily, righteously and holily mankind might organize its life on earth—tomorrow all this will be made equal to the same zero (DW, 472).

---

14 Perhaps a better way to state the problem would be: how can the existence of evil, i.e. sin and suffering, be reconciled with the character of God? If you believe that God is both somehow all-powerful and at the same time good you are taxed in the extreme to make the reconciliation.

Dostoevsky had reached the point where he could attack one of his favorite enemies—the idea that by assuming some fundamental kind of unity or order in the universe you have justified God or the universe to man. This is not a useful theodicy. To be told of some "almighty, eternal and fixed law of nature . . ." does not console Dostoevsky for human suffering. The finding of a law of nature to explain how mankind and the earth shall ultimately be wiped away does not solve the problem. The whole idea appears to be "profoundly insulting," and completely disrespectful to mankind, "and all the more unbearable as here there is no one who is guilty" (DW, 472).

We have had occasion to note the "Underground Man"—the man with the sneer—the one who defends human nature from the onslaughts of those who would deny the ultimate, radical freedom of man in the name of some deterministic theory of "science," and also against the encroachments of materialistic self-interest. Dostoevsky never got over the feeling of disgust for the ant-heap or the "Crystal Palace." Concerning the "Palace of Crystal" of the materialists, Dostoevsky's "sneering man" said:

> You see, if it were not a palace but a hencoop, and if it should rain, I might crawl into it to avoid getting wet, but I would never pretend that the hencoop was a palace out of gratitude to it for sheltering me from the rain. You laugh and you tell me that in such circumstances even a hencoop is as good as a palace. Yes, I reply, it certainly is if the only purpose in life is not to get wet (NU, 141).

Dostoevsky was not satisfied with the gay and optimistic European conception of the inevitable progress of man based on the laws of nature. This optimistic tale appeared to him to be empty and meaningless. To have everything that man has struggled for and built with endless suffering washed away by some blind movement of nature appeared to be the greatest possible injustice—an injustice against which the "thinking man" would ultimately rebel. Dostoevsky had his "logical suicide" proclaim his own sentence: "I sentence this nature, which has so unceremoniously and impudently brought me into existence for suffering, to annihilation, together with myself . . . And because I am unable to destroy nature, I am destroying only myself, weary of enduring a tyranny in which there is no one guilty" (DW, 473).

A Sublime Idea

To Dostoevsky the thought that all life would ultimately be reduced to a "zero" (one of Dostoevsky's favorite expressions) was highly intolerable. He argued that it so completely stirs the spirit of the "logical suicide" that "it even kills in him love itself of mankind."

> Similarly it has been observed many a time that in a family dying from starvation, father and mother—when at length the suffering of their children grew intolerable—began to hate them, those hitherto beloved ones, precisely because of the intolerableness of their suffering. Moreover, I assert that the realization of one's utter impotence to help, to render some service, or to bring alleviation to suffering mankind—and at the same time when there is a firm conviction of the existence of that suffering,—*may convert in one's heart love for mankind into a hatred of it* (DW, 540f.).

Dostoevsky felt that in the area of private morality, murder, and suicide were the inevitable results of being deprived of a lofty idea: revolution and the nihilistic blood bath rest on the same kind of moral failure—the lack of living faith.

Dostoevsky had a plan for a novel that he never fully completed. It was to feature a man who suddenly lost his belief in God. "The loss of faith has a colossal effect on him . . ." Dostoevsky planned to have his hero attach himself to various atheist movements and he "finds at last salvation in the Russian soil, the Russian Saviour, and the Russian God" (L, 158; for an early plan for the novel about "the atheist"). The atheist was to finally gain a living faith. But faith in what? What is all this talk about the soil and the people? In the same editorial in the *Diary* where Dostoevsky proclaimed that suicide is the logical answer for one who is infected with the nihilistic spiritual illness, that is, one who lacks the "sublime idea of existence," we are told that the "ugly segregation from everything essential and real . . ." is "detachment from the soil and from the people's truth . . ." (DW,544).[15] But this "segregation" or On the other hand, and this is the helpful side of Dostoevsky's insight, the youth may also "as soon as he has reflected serious-

15 Dostoevsky once wrote an article on the suicide of a young girl who had killed herself because of indignation. Why would anyone want to kill himself because he felt indignant? According to Dostoevsky: "Against the simplicity

"detachment," (both terms are frequently used) from the Russian people is not entirely the same thing as failure to believe in immortality. Did Dostoevsky have two formulas? The moral postulate that we first discovered went something like this: "For if there is no everlasting God, there's no such thing as virtue, and there's no need for it" (BK, 669).[16]

What is Dostoevsky's God? Dostoevsky felt that socialists of the European variety necessarily had to be atheists (DW, 6f, P, 253). The close relationship of atheism and socialism is illustrated by a passage from *The Brothers Karamazov.* After Dostoevsky had remarked that the young men of Russia "fail to understand that the sacrifice of life is, in many cases, the easiest of all sacrifices," but that long, hard, determined effort for an ideal is the most difficult thing in the world, he noted that one of these young men:

> if he had decided that God and immortality did not exist, he would have at once become an atheist and a socialist. For socialism is not merely the labour question, it is before all things the atheistic question, the question of the form taken by atheism to-day, the question of the tower of Babel built without God, not to mount to heaven from earth but to set up Heaven on earth (BK, 22f.).

ly . . ." be "convinced of the existence of God and immortality . . ." (BK, 21). In this case he will say: "I want to live for immortality, and I will accept no compromise" (BK, 21). Both belief in God and immortality, and, on the other hand, belief in socialism and atheism, are, for Dostoevsky, what would today be styled "ultimate commitments."

Dostoevsky was always concerned with what the "Russian boys" (one of his favorite expressions) were doing. What do the "Russian boys" talk about when they chance to meet in some tavern? Russian "green youth [he might have said 'raw-youth'] have to settle the eternal questions first of all" (BK, 238). What are the eternal questions? For many, the eternal

---

of the visible, against the meaninglessness of life! Was she one of those well-known judges and deniers of life who are indignant against the 'absurdity' of man's appearance on earth, the nonsensical casualness of this appearance, the tyranny of the neat cause with which one cannot reconcile himself?" *Diary,* Vol. I, pp. 469f.

16 "But what will become of men then?" I asked him, "without God and immortal life? All things will be lawful then, they can do what they like?" *The Brothers Karamazov,* p. 623.

questions are "the existence of God and immortality." But there are others.

> And those who do not believe in God talk of socialism or anarchism, of the transformation of all humanity on a new pattern, so that it comes out the same, they're the same questions turned inside out. And masses, masses of most original Russian boys do nothing but talk of the eternal questions (BK, 239).

To ask those "eternal questions" is to really live. Dostoevsky was furious with indifference. Stavrogin is a listless type. He did not even care if he died in the duel. But in the end he cared enough to kill himself. At least he got off dead zero. The events that nudged Stavrogin into "real" action also brought about profound changes in other "Russian boys" in *The Possessed.* Stephen Trofimovitch was another "type" who failed, except at the very conclusion of his life, to take the real questions of life seriously. All he could say was "I am weary of life and nothing matters to me" (P, 77). The "free thinking" Shatov also found God. Dostoevsky reported that "Shatov had radically changed some of his former socialistic convictions . . . and had rushed to the opposite extreme" (P, 27). To Kirillov, Shatov said: "Kirillov if . . . if you could get rid of your dreadful fancies and give up your atheistic ravings . . . Oh, what a man you'd be, Kirillov!" (P, 581).

The Russian God

Dostoevsky was essentially a pessimist, but he does offer hope and this hope is in Russia's God. He states the idea in *The Possessed* :"To cook your hare you must first catch it, to believe in God you must first have a God" (P, 256).

Dostoevsky's novels are full of strange passages that relate in some way God and the "people." Shatov, for example, proclaimed that "he who has no people has no God" (P, 36). Shatov simply asserted that a loss of faith in the Russian people would result in either atheism or possibly indifference.[17] The

17 Dostoevsky felt "all evil to be grounded upon disbelief, and maintain[ed] that he who abjures nationalism, abjures faith also. That applies especially to Russia, for with us national consciousness is based on Christianity. 'A Christian peasant-people'; 'believing Russia'; these are fundamental conceptions. A Russian who abjures nationalism (and there are many such) is either an atheist or indifferent to religious questions." *Letters,* pp. 257f. " Russians do

indictment of "youths" who separate themselves from the people may or may not be significant, but what has it really got to do with atheism?

Shatov attempted an answer. Dostoevsky had Shatov argue that nations are not built on science or reason but are actually grounded on another principle. This principle is "the seeking for God." Well enough, but this is then followed by a most remarkable passage. Shatov continued:

> The object of every national movement, in every people and at every period of its existence is only the seeking for its god, who must be its own god, and the faith in him as the only true one. God is the synthetic personality of the whole people, taken from its begining to its end. It has never happened that all, or even many, peoples have had one common god, but each has always had its own. It's a sign of the decay of nations when they have gods in common (P, 254).

It would be hard to deny that Shatov was speaking for Dostoevsky when he said: "Only one nation is 'god-bearing,' that's the Russian people . . ." (P, 255).[18] Stavrogin interreupted Shatov with the observation that Shatov had actually reduced "God to a simple attribute of nationality . . . " (P, 254). But Shatov soon replied: "On the contrary, I raise the people to God. And has it ever been otherwise? The people is the body of God" (P, 255). This position is fully consistent with other statements made in *The Possessed.* For example: "the mother of God is the great mother—the damp earth" (P, 144). Was Dostoevsky's "hare" the Russian people? After having taken into consideraton the fact that Dostoevsky frequently went out of his way to identify atheism with a separation from the people, it seems difficult to avoid drawing the rather gloomy conclusion that his Russian God was the Russian people.

---

not simply become atheists, but actually *believe* in atheism, as though it were a new religion, without noticing that they believe in negation." *The Idiot,* p. 587. It may seem strange to treat atheism as a religious phenomenon, but that was Dostoevsky's intention.

18 The "ultimate destiny, of the Russian nation," according to Dostoevsky, was to "reveal to the world her own Russian Christ, whom as yet the peoples know not, and who is rooted in our native Orthodox faith. *There* lies, as I believe, the inmost essence of our vast impending contribution to civilization, whereby we shall awaken the European peoples; there lies the inmost core of our exuberant and intense existence that is to be." *Letters,* p. 175.

DIANA

Elouise Bell

I ride on the back of the earth
To catch elusive stars.
A centaur with spurs of desire
And a whip of vision's reach.

Ride the earth, ride the earth,
Let the clay be pounded away;
The dust whirls up at my back,
Sharp pebbles cut in a spray.

COMPANY FOR GERTIE'S PIGEONS

Elouise Bell

Lions in the barn,
Darn!
Caterpillars on the neck,
Heck!
Elephants on the roof,
Oof!

The Second American Revolution: Era of Preparation

HYRUM L. ANDRUS

I. *General Preparations*

An analysis of the origin of Mormonism in its historical setting reveals several interesting relationships between its principles and objectives and the trends of the society of the day. Although these relationships do not warrant the conclusion that Joseph Smith borrowed his major ideas from his historical setting, they do show that the claims he made and the principles he set forth were compatible with the spirit and aspirations of the age, and were accepted by many as the means of attaining the goals they urgently sought.

Because the period during Joseph Smith's activity in history was intensely revolutionary, it has been termed the *Second American Revolution.* But unlike the political revolution of the preceding century, that which occurred between 1820 and about 1845[1] was social, religious, and economic as well as political. Orestes A. Brownson said of the nature of that turbulent era:

> No tolerable observer of the signs of the time can have failed to perceive that we are, in this vicinity [New England] at least, in the midst of a very important revolution; a revolution which extends to every department of thought, and threatens to change ultimately the whole moral aspect of our society. Everything is loosened from its old fastenings, and is floating no one can tell exactly whither.[2]

As described by Emerson, the era was one of schism and conflict in which "ancient manners were giving way." It was an age of "severance, of dissociation, of freedom, of analysis, of detachment. . . of universal resistance to ties and ligaments

---

Dr. Andrus is assistant professor of religion and social science at Brigham Young University.

1 Emerson dated this revolutionary era from 1820 to about the twenty years following. See his "Historic Notes of Life and Letters in New England."

2 Orestes A. Brownson, "Two Articles from the Princeton Review," *The Boston Quarterly Review,* III (July, 1840), 265-323.

once supposed essential to civil society." Young men in the new generation "were born with knives in their brain, [with] a tendency to introversion, self-dissection, anatomizing of motives." Under the onslaught old forms of authority—in church, college, courts of law, etc.—fell, as experiment became credible and antiquity grew ridiculous.[3] Seldom have such great transformations occurred in so short a period of time. The forces of revolution were manifested in many forms. To again quote Emerson, as he noted "the progress of a revolution" in New England:

> Those who share in it have no external organization, no badge, no creed, no name. They do not vote, or print, or even meet together. They do not know each other's faces or names. They are united only in a common love of truth and love of its work. They are of all conditions and constitutions.[4]

Continuing, Emerson declared:

> This spirit of the time is felt by every individual with some differences—to each one casting its light upon the objects nearest to his temper and habits of thought; to one, coming in the shape of special reforms in the state; to another, in modification of the various callings of men, and the customs of business; to a third, opening a new scope for literature and art; to a fourth, in philosophical insight; to a fifth, in the vast solitudes of prayer. In all its movements, it is peaceable, and in the very lowest marked with a triumphant success.[5].

Socially and economically, egalitarian movements sought to close the gap between the high and the low, the rich and the poor, the privileged and the underprivileged, as reform movements gained strength. The cause of women's rights was championed by ardent zealots who adopted the language of Jefferson in their "Declaration of Sentiments" which emphasized the grievances the fairer sex had suffered under male tyranny, while proclaiming that henceforth women should be free. Religiously, the awakening spirit split every church into Old and New, Papel and Protestant. The rise of Jacksonian Democracy was attended with essentially the same effects in the realm of the political. "It was a proud day for the people," Amos Kendall declared at the inauguration of Jackson; but Justice Story, John

3 Emerson, *op. cit.*
4 Emerson, *The Dial,* I (July, 1840), 1-4.
5 *Ibid.*

Marshall's close friend and disciple on the Supreme Court, reported another mood in accents of bitterness: "The reign of King 'Mob' seemed triumphant."[6]

An important factor that gave rise to conflict in society was an awakening quest for truth and a deeper insight into the meaning of life. As observed by Emerson, men grew "reflective and intellectual." "There was a new consciousness." When these enlightened insights came into contact with the existing order, the position of tradition was challenged, resulting in "a war between intellect and affection."[7] Another observer said of the enlightening spirit of the age: "The world is deriving vigor, not from that which is gone, but from that which is coming; not from the unhealthy moisture of the evening, but from the nameless influences of the morning."[8]

With the awakening that occurred, "there grew a certain tenderness on the people, not before remarked."[9] Men realized more keenly their responsibility to their fellow men, to God and even to God's other creatures. While some philanthropic individuals attacked the tyranny of man over brute nature and sought to take the ox from the plough and the horse from the cart, others went even farther. As reported by Emerson, "Even the insect world was to be defended—that had been too long neglected, and a society for the protection of groundworms, slugs and mosquitos was to be incorporated without delay."[10] The spirit of millennial peace was endeavoring to manifest itself in the world.

Many factors combined to make the decades immediately following 1820 an opportune time to reorganize society. This was true particularly in America where men displayed "an astonishing fertility of resource and willingness to change."[11] Indeed, rapid change was the "dominant condition of life" at

---

6 *Argus of Western America,* Frankfort, Kentucky; March 18, 1829; Story to Sarah Waldo Story, March 7, 1829, W. W. Story, *Life and Letters of Joseph Story,* I, 563.

7 Emerson, "Historic Notes," etc.

8 Sampson Reed, "Observations on the Growth of the Mind," 1826.

9 Emerson, *op. cit.*

10 Emerson, "New England Reformers."

11 Carl Russell Fish, *The Rise of the Common Man* (New York, 1929), p. 105.

the time.[12] Several early revelations to Joseph Smith indicate that he was fully aware of the nature of these ideal conditions and evidenced a keener insight into their significance than he could have had by his own limited observation. Repeatedly the admonition was given: "Behold, the field is white already to harvest; therefore, whoso desireth to reap, let him thrust in his sickle with his might, and reap while the day lasts."[13]

America's relative adolescence was important in facilitating change. The mold of her social and economic institutions had not as yet been set. The industrial revolution, with its problems and adjustments, was only then reaching the new world. Jefferson could pass peacefully from the scene hardly moved from his ideals of an agrarian society, but Jackson came to the presidency two years later supported to an important degree by the laboring classes, who were then seeking answers to the problems of industrialization. Could something be done to alleviate the distressing conditions in an industrialized society? Must that which had happened in England and other countries through industrialization be repeated in America? These questions loomed larger and larger, and adequate answers were nowhere in sight. In his brilliant essay, "The Laboring Classes," Orestes A. Brownson sought such answers. The fact that he produced such a work is symptomatic of the times; men were keenly aware of their unsolved problems.

In other ways America was coming of age. By 1820 literary developments commenced to keep pace with America's physical progress. In that and the following year were published Irving's masterpiece, *The Sketch Book,* Bryant's first volume of *Poems,* and Cooper's novel, *The Spy.* America was coming of age. With such growth Americans developed an attitude of self-centered confidence that detached them from European influence and centered attention upon their own social arrangements. The spirit of the Monroe Doctrine was widespread in the United States so that diplomatic relations with Europe were reduced to a minimum. Fewer young men went abroad to study than before or since. Thus, during this period of intense reform the

12 Oscar Handlin, "The American Scene," *The Forty-Eighters: Political Refugees of the German Revolution of 1848,* ed. by A. E. Zucker (New York, 1950), p. 28.

13 See *Doctrine and Covenants,* 4:4; 6:3; 11:3; 12:3; 14:3; 33:3,7.

attention of the American people was not diverted from the task of introspection and self-analysis to any great degree by outside influences from abroad.

Other factors were also operating to bring American institutions and experiments in social organization to the public attention at home and abroad, as they never could have been before. Prominent people in Europe were beginning to pay more than passing attention to the new republic and the principles upon which it was founded. Heretofore, many foreign observers had viewed America's republican institutions with reserve bordering on disdain, but now they looked with favor and anticipation toward America. Harriet Martineau aptly indicated this change of attitude in the following words:

> It is common to say "Wait; these are early days. The experiment [of American government] will yet fail." The experiment of the particular constitution of the United States may fail; but the great principle, which, whether successful or not, it strives to embody, the capacity of mankind for self-government—is established forever.[14]

The spirit of reform was widespread in Europe as well as in America, and reformers in western Europe were thinking along lines and striving toward similar goals as their American contemporaries. In Great Britain the Reform Bill of 1832, the Factory Act of 1833, and the repeal of the Corn laws in 1846 were major victories won in the name of reform. On the continent of Europe reform was a grim business, made so by the fact that Liberals there were faced with an organized program of repression—the so-called "Metternich system"—that sought through police control, censorship, and espionage to suppress liberal movements. For this reason, reformers in Europe looked hopefully to America where their counterparts were allowed free rein in developing their ideas. Here was added reason why European attention was centered upon America.[15]

The stage was set for people in America and in Europe to take cognizance of any new society that might develop here and

---

14 Martineau, *Society in America* (London, 1837), I, 2-3.

15 Whenever influences from Europe did find expression in America, they merely aided the progressing revolution without distracting America's attention from herself. Utopian schemes patterned after Owenism and Fourierism are examples. The same was true in the case of New England's Transcendentalist school. When they appealed to European thought, they did so to "find confirma-

command a hearing; it was a time when foreign travelers and local reporters sought to record and explain the wonderful phenomenon of American society with its many experimental projects. There was what *The Evening and Morning Star,* published by the Saints in Missouri, described as an "unquenchable thirst for news."[16] The attention that was centered upon American society was intense, as was indicated by a more recent writer:

> The generation was exposed to a continual "close-up" without having learned how to appear before the camera. Never before was the surface of life so exposed to the gaze of the public and the future. . . . Never before were there so many travelers to observe them, with so easy a market for their observations when put into print. Never had the busy reporters of the newspapers been so numerous and so alert to catch the mass or the individual in some unusual pose, some amusing gesture.[17]

It requires but a moment of candid reflection to see how this insatiable quest for news made it easy to spread the message of Mormonism abroad. The alleged appearance of an angel and the unearthing of a "Golden Bible" were topics of immediate interest. It was not long before the work was spoken of by people near and far, either for good or for evil. And amid the din of discussion those who were conscientious sought out the truth of the matter for themselves.

The general upheaval in society was accompanied by a large-scale migration of people in America. From 1830 to at least 1850 the impulse to migrate grew stronger as the facilities

---

tion" for their faith, not to lay the foundations for their thought. See Parrington, *Main Currents In American Thought* (New York, 1930), II, 381-82. The reflective and intellectual mood, the new consciousness—these were the incipient factors in developing the movement. Transcendentalism was an American school, confirmed, aided and abetted by European scholarship.

16 July, 1832.

17 Fish, *op. cit.,* p. 137. Alexis de Tocqueville visited and wrote of the Shaker community, near Albany, New York; Mrs. (Frances) Trollope, from England, underwent considerable hardships to visit Fanny Wright's community at Nashoba, Tennessee; Fredrika Bremer, a Swedish writer, visited the North American Phalanx, a Fourierist community in New Jersey, on more than one occasion, and went also to see the Shakers; Friedrick List, a prominent economist, spoke favorably of George Rapp's community at Economy; the German Duke of Saxe—Weimar—Eisenach went to observe, first, Robert Owen's New Harmony experiment in Indiana, and then the Rappite society at Economy; and Charles Dickens made an American tour in which he visited the Shakers at Mount Lebanon in New York. To these international figures could be added several other observers, foreign and American, who looked hopefully toward Brook Farm, the Shaker colonies and other similar experiments.

for transportation improved. Alexis de Tocqueville, foremost European critic of American democracy, gave the following description of population movements in the early thirties: "An American takes up, leaves, goes back to ten occupations, in his life; he is constantly changing his domicile and is continually forming new enterprises." Again: "In the United States a man builds a house in which to spend his old age, and he sells it before the roof is on; he plants a garden, and lets it just as the trees are coming into bearing; he brings a field into tillage, and leaves other men to gather the crops."[18]

The prevailing tendency to move and relocate made it easy for new movements to establish themselves by facilitating the gathering together of those of like sympathies. In the Mormon movement, the "spirit of the gathering" was also very important; yet the barriers were greatly reduced by the migratory conditions of the time. For these two reasons, converts to Mormonism readily left their homes for the centers of gathering; and thereafter moved westward from New York state to the Great Basin in the West.

In summary, during the Second American Revolution, many possessed an intense spirit of reform. There was a deeper insight into the nature of life and its meaning. Men repudiated the past and sought for something more compatible with the spirit of the age. Finally, there was an unquenchable thirst for news and a high degree of mobility on the part of the people. All these factors combined to make the period from 1820 to 1845 an ideal time to introduce the Mormon movement. It was an era when old forms and customs were being done away and when the mold of new socio-religious and economic systems could easily be set.

II. *Religious Preparations*

The fervor of the Second American Revolution was distinctly and increasingly religious. Almost every topic of discussion was invested with the religious qualities of certainty and enthusiasm. It was an era in which John Humphrey Noyes could seriously nominate Jesus Christ for the Presidency of the United States of America and of the whole world, and have

---

18 G. W. Pierson, *Tocqueville and Beaumont in America* (New York, 1938), p. 130; Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1863), II, 164.

such a nomination bear fruit in the form of a Peace Convention held in 1838.

From 1820 onward the efforts of religious enthusiasts grew apace, and several practical measures were taken to promote the development of religious feeling. The American Tract Society was organized in 1825, and by 1831 it had 20 vice-presidents and and 36 directors. In the year prior to its sixth annual meeting it distributed approximately 65,000,000 tracts. The American Home Missionary Society was effected in 1826 with the objective of converting the world, commencing with the unregenerated souls in America. The Society employed 201 missionaries who labored in eighteen different states; but as New York was the place of greatest religious interest, 113 of these were assigned to work in that state. There, people were "dead-ripe" for conversion.[19] Finally, the American Sunday School Union was organized with the objective of establishing Sunday Schools everywhere. By 1827 it had over 400,000 children under instruction, with 60,000 teachers.

By 1831 the developing religious sentiment reached a climax. "The year 1831 is known in religious annals of America as the year of the 'great awakening,'" one writer explained. "There had been religious revivals before, but none so great as the one that shook the country in the years 1831 to 1834."[20] These years correspond with the period in which the message of Mormonism was introduced to the world. With the consuming interest in religious matters, the proponents of the new revelation made it a prominent topic of discussion.

Religiously, as well as socially, the existing state of expectancy expressed itself in the hope of the millennium. Never in the history of Western society had the millennium seemed so imminent; never before had people looked so longingly and

---

19 As reported by Theodore Weld to Charles G. Finney. See *Weld Papers,* I, 45. New York very probably produced more converts to the Church than any other state in the Union. It was here that the missionaries found their most receptive adherents. See Whitney Cross, *The Burned-over District* (Ithaca, 1950), p. 149. Early missionary journals support Cross's conclusions.

20 *Religious Experiences of John Humphrey Noyes, Founder of the Oneida Community,* ed. George Wallingford Noyes (New York, 1923), p. 32. While the thoughtful and virtuous placed a deeper reliance upon spiritual fact, after 1831 there was in all the practical affairs of society a gradual withdrawal of genuine religious feeling. From that time on much of the existing fervor was founded in emotionalism and radicalism. See, for example, Emerson's "Divinity School Address," where this fact is pointed out.

hopefully for its advent. It was expected that twenty years or less would see the dawn of that peaceful era.[21] Men turned their thoughts inward and upward. Spiritual realms were explored and "theories of the Christian miracles" were readily expounded.[22] Many were persuaded to accept the reality of spiritual fact, including the millennium and its attendant miracles.

Contrary to the popular feeling of the day, Joseph Smith did not look for the immediate advent of Christ: Zion had first to be built and her law established in the earth; the Jews must gather to Palestine to build their temple and become sanctified; the American Indians had to be rehabilitated until their lands would "blossom as a rose"; and, finally, if the world failed to repent, the judgments of the last days would first be poured out.[23] Christ would come, said a revelation to the Prophet, in a day when the "whole earth shall be in commotion, and men's hearts fail them, and they shall say that Christ delayeth his coming until the end of the earth."[24] Nevertheless, the existing millennialism gave impetus to the work at hand. "We all look for the appearing of the great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ," declared a church writer, "but we shall look in vain, until Zion is built; for Zion is to be the dwelling place of our God when he comes."[25]

The religious awakening was accompanied by a widespread urge among the people to get back to the purity of Christ's gospel, a desire that was particularly important in preparing the minds of men for the message of Mormonism. The movement which adopted the name "Disciples of Christ"—headed by such men as Thomas and Alexander Campbell, Sidney Rigdon, Barton W. Stone, and Walter Scott—developed as a result of this awakening urge. The name they adopted aptly expresses the guiding sentiment that brought about their organization. In 1800 there was no religious denomination of any significance calling itself after the name of Christ; but the individual and

---

21 See Cross, op. cit., pp. 25-6; *Religious Experiences of John Humphrey Noyes*, pp. 33-4; Fish, *op. cit.*, p. 3.

22 Emerson, "New England Reformers."

23 *History of the Church*, V, 324, 336-7; *Doctrine and Covenants*, 49:24; 87.

24 *Doctrine and Covenants*, 45:26.

25 *Messenger and Advocate*, III (September, 1837), 563.

concerted efforts of many, including the Campbells and their associates to get back to the fundamentals of Christ's gospel, brought the "Disciples of Christ" into being as an organization.[26]

Alexander Campbell became one of the leading religious figures in the America of his day. His views were in harmony with the existing trends, leading simultaneously to a repudiation of traditional dogma and to the quest for the pure Christian doctrine and faith. "We are convinced, fully convinced," he declared, "that the whole head is sick, and the whole heart faint of modern fashionable Christianity."[27] On the other hand he expressed the hopes and aspirations of many when he inquired:

> . . . do not the experiences of all the religions—the observations of the intelligent—the practical result of all creeds, reformations, and improvements—*and the expectations and longings of society*—warrant the conclusion that either some new revelation, or some new development of the revelation of God must be made, before the hopes and expectations of all true Christians can be realized, or Christianity save and reform the nations of the world? We want the old gospel back, and sustained by the ancient order of things: and this alone, by the blessing of the Divine Spirit, is all that we want, or can expect, to reform and save the world.[28]

A recommissioned body of Priesthood was also sought by Campbell. "A divine warrant has always been essential to any acceptable worship," he declared. "The question, 'Who has required this at your hands'? must always be answered by a 'Thus saith the Lord,' before an offering of mortal man can be acknowledged by the Lawgiver of the universe." A "regular and constant ministry," he asserted, must be commissioned with "divine authority."[29]

The state of expectancy in the religious world was such that "many thousands of people were yearning for the 'primitive gospel'; the words 'Reformation,' 'Restoration,' and 'the Ancient Order of Things' were in the air."[30] This was particularly true in the Campbellite movement where "hundreds began

---

26 See Winfred Ernest Garrison and Alfred T. DeGroot, *The Disciples of Christ* (St. Louis, 1948), pp. 80-2.

27 *The Christian Baptist,* I, 33.

28 *The Christian System,* p. 10. (Italics by the writer.)

29 *The Christian System,* p. 250.

30 Daryl Chase, "Sidney Rigdon—Early Mormon," Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Chicago, June, 1931, pp. 2-3.

to declare themselves for the 'Restoration.' "[31] One historian described the work of Campbell's associate, Walter Scott, as follows:

> He contended ably for the restoration of the true, original apostolic order which would restore to the church the ancient gospel as preached by the apostles. The interest became an excitement; . . . The air was thick with rumors of a "new Religion," a "new Bible."[32]

In 1830, Campbell discontinued publication of the *Christian Baptist* and began a new periodical, the *Millennial Harbinger.* The name of the new organ was indicative of the growing sentiment of religious expectancy. To epitomize his objective in setting forth the need for a restoration of the Ancient Order of Things, etc., Campbell headed the Prospectus with the passage of scripture most often quoted by Latter-day Saints as fulfilled in the coming of the angel Moroni to reveal the everlasting Gospel, contained in the *Book of Mormon*:

> I saw another messenger flying through the midst of heaven, having everlasting good news to proclaim to the inhabitants of the earth, even to every nation and tribe, and tongue and people—saying with a loud voice, Fear God and give glory to Him, for the hour of His judgment is come; and worship Him who made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of water.[33]

Campbell could not better have prepared the people for the message of Mormonism had he planned his work toward that end from the beginning. Even a preparation of the minds of men for the story of the angel Moroni and the revelation of the everlasting Gospel was not excluded. It is little wonder that Sidney Rigdon and other important figures among the Disciples gave serious consideration to the claims set forth by Joseph Smith. A Disciple historian caustically reported that prior to his conversion to Mormonism Rigdon, "with pompous pretense," was anticipating "some great event soon to be revealed to the surprise and astonishment of mankind." The modern Elias "was prepared and preparing others for the voice of some mysterious

---

31 *Ibid.*, p. 35.

32 A. S. Hayden, *Early History of the Disciples' Church in the Western Reserve* (1876).

33 *The Millennial Harbinger,* I (January 4, 1830), 1. The translation is evidently Campbell's.

event soon to come."[34] Following Rigdon's conversion a revelation through Joseph Smith said:

> Behold, verily, verily, I say unto my servant Sidney, I have looked upon thee and thy works. I have heard thy prayers and prepared thee for a greater work. Thou are blessed for thou shalt do great things. Behold thou was sent forth, even as John, to prepare the way before me, and before Elijah which should come, and thou knewest it not.[35]

In an effort to curb a mass conversion to the Mormon movement from among his followers, Campbell bitterly attacked the *Book of Mormon;* and the *Millennial Harbinger* carried articles with such titles as, "Mormonism—the Means by Which It Stole the True Gospel." When Hayden later sought to explain the Disciple's dilemma, he lamented that "the misfortune governing the case was that many people, victims of excitement and credulity, and taught in nearly all pulpits to pray for faith, now found themselves met on their own grounds." The Mormon Elders likewise exhorted them to pray in faith and to believe the scriptures; and God would reveal to them that the claims Joseph Smith made were true. "And so, finding an emotion or impulse answerable to an expected response from heaven, [they] dared not dispute the answer to their own prayers, and were hurried into the vortex."[36] God was answering the humble prayer of faith in behalf of the "imposters."

On a more sophisticated and intellectual plane, but nevertheless in harmony with the current trends of the time, such men as Emerson, Thoreau and Parker turned their thoughts to the realm of transcendent meditation; and from this vantage point they expressed hopes similar to those set forth by Campbell and his associates, with a like effect in preparing the minds of men for the message of Mormonism. In his famous "Divinity School Address" of 1838, Emerson exhorted the graduating class of the Cambridge Divinity College to "cast behind you all conformity and acquaint men at first hand with Deity." "It is

---

34 Hayden, *op. cit.*, pp. 209-18.

35 *Book of Commandments,* ch. XXXVII, Verses 3-6. In later years, when a Cambellite congregation near Manchester, England sought information on the Mormon claim to a Restoration at the hands of L.D.S. authorities in that area, Parley P. Pratt wrote to Sidney Rigdon, in America: "Tell friend Campbell to go ahead and prepare the way, the Saints will follow him up and gather the fruits." *Times and Seasons,* II (April 1, 1841), 365.

36 See Hayden, *op. cit.*, pp. 174, 197, 209-18.

my duty," he emphasized, "to say to you that the need was never greater of new revelation than now." On another occasion Emerson lamented that, while "foregoing generations beheld God and nature face to face," modern man only beheld God through the eyes of the Ancients. "Why should we not also enjoy an original relation to the universe?" he cried. "Why should we not have a poetry and philosophy of insight and not of tradition, and a religion by revelation to us and not the history of theirs?"[37]

Theodore Parker, who "prefered the Jesus of historic fact to the Christ of theologic fancy,"[38] claimed that there was but one true religion, and that all others were merely based upon men's opinions of the permanent word of Christ. These views he set forth in an address significantly entitled "Transient and Permanent." Therein he expressed his desire that the transient forms devised by men might pass away and that there might be a renewal of the permanent gospel of Christ. Said he:

> Let then the transient [man-made dogma] pass, fleet as it will, and may God send us some new manifestation of the Christian faith, that shall stir men's hearts as they were never stirred; some new word, which shall teach us what we are, and renew us in the image of God; some better life, that shall fulfill the Hebrew prophecy, and pour out the spirit of God on young men and maidens, and old men and children; which shall realize the word of Christ and give us the Comforter, who shall reveal all needed things![39]

George Ripley and Orestes A. Brownson shared similar views. They felt the time had arrived "to clothe the religious sentiment with a new form, and to fix upon some religious institution, which will at once supply our craving for something positive in religion, and not offend the spirituality which Christianity loves."[40] Brownson pointed to the widespread nature of this awakening quest. Said he: "It comes to us on every wind from all quarters,—from France, from Germany, from England even."[41] Likewise Ripley wrote: "We respond, with living

---

37 Emerson, "Nature."

38 Theodore Parker, *Theodore Parker's Experiences as a Minister* (Boston, 1859).

39 Parker, "Transient and Permanent."

40 *The Christian Examiner*, XVII (September, 1834), 63-77; XXI (1836), 225-54.

41 Brownson, "The Everlasting Yes."

sympathy, to the earnest voice that comes to us from beyond the sea, calling for a new organ of theology."[42] On the European scene Harriet Martineau in England and Carl Schurz in Germany registered the fact that this spiritual awakening was widespread in those areas.[43] The religious awakening supplemented the general trends of the day to make this era a favorable time to introduce Mormonism into the world.

III. *The Mormon Scene*

Prior to the time most of the early converts cast their lot with Joseph Smith they, first, became dissatisfied with existing creeds and forms of religious organizations. Second, they were seeking to get at the truth of the Bible's teachings pertaining to salvation. And third, often they were seeking for a new revelation of the pure Christian faith—a revelation coming directly from God.

Such sentiments occupied the mind of Joseph Smith when first he went into the woods to pray in the spring of 1820. But Joseph Smith was not the only one to retire to a secluded place to pray about this matter; and he was not unique in thereafter concluding that existing religious faiths "were all wrong."[44] Thousands were engaged in such soul-searching experiences. Said George Q. Cannon of the early Mormon converts:

> . . . it may be said that hundreds and thousands had a yearning, anxious desire for something higher, something nobler, something more certain, something that was from God. This feeling animated thousands of hearts in various lands, and the Elders were guided to them, and when they saw their faces, when they heard their teachings and humbled themselves in obedience to the commandments of God, they became profoundly convinced by the testimony of Jesus Christ, that the Gospel they taught was indeed the ancient Gospel restored.[45]

On another occasion, President Cannon said of the early experiences of Wilford Woodruff and others:

> I have heard him [Wilford Woodruff] relate that in his early days he has gone out in secret and besought God to restore the ancient Gospel, to restore the ancient gifts, to restore the ancient power, and he received a promise from God be-

42 *The Christian Examiner*, XXI, 225-54.

43 *Harriet Martineau's Autobiography* (London, 1877), pp. 112-3; Carl Schurz, *The Reminiscences of Carl Schurz* (New York, 1907), I, 69-71.

44 Joseph Smith's "First Vision," *History of the Church*, I, 6.

45 J. D., XXII, 240-1.

> fore he ever heard of the Latter-day Saints, or ever heard of the organization of this Church, that the time would come when the true Gospel would be restored, and that he should have the privilege of being identified with it. And the thousands that compose this Church today, who joined it when they were adults, were, the most of them, in a similar condition, a similar state of mind. Dissatisfied with existing creeds, . . . conscious that there was an absence of that divine power and of those heavenly gifts which characterized the Church in ancient days; dissatisfied with this condition of things, they besought God earnestly, fervently, and anxiously, to restore His Gospel to the earth, or to send some message of life and salvation unto them. They were thus prepared, and it is those few who have been gathered from the nations of the earth. . . . Joseph Smith said that this would be the character of this work.[46]

As early as 1823 Joseph Smith was made aware of the effect the work he was to inaugurate would have upon men. Said Moroni to him at that time: "Wherever the sound [of the new dispensation] shall go, it shall cause the ears of men to tingle, and wherever it shall be proclaimed, the pure in heart shall rejoice, while those who draw near to God with their mouths, and honor Him with their lips while their hearts are far from Him, will seek its overthrow, and the destruction of those by whose hands it is carried."[47] No truer forecast could have been made of the effect the message of Mormonism would have upon the world.

A study of the early converts reveals to what extent they were prepared for the Restoration. At an early age George A. Smith inquired "after the original principles of the Gospel," and soon concluded that prevailing "religious motions were mere matter of opinion."[48] When Joseph Smith wrote in 1828, giving an account of the spiritual manifestations he had received, the letter made a powerful impression upon the family of John Smith.[49]

So intent was Orson Pratt in seeking for spiritual light, as a lad of eighteen, that he did not give himself the necessary time for rest. Said he: "I took the privilege, while others had retired

---

46 J.D., XXV, 171-2.
47 *Messenger and Advocate,* February, 1835.
48 *Millennial Star.* XXVII, 406.
49 "George A. Smith's Journal," under 1828. No other date given. Church Historian's office, Salt Lake City, Utah.

to rest, to go out in the fields and wilderness and there plead with the Lord, hour after hour, that he would show me what to do—that he would teach me the way of life and inform and instruct my understanding." Many times he was solicited to join the churches in the area, "but something whispered not to do so." When he heard the message of Mormonism, he said: "As soon as the sound penetrated my ears, I knew that if the *Bible* was true, their doctrine was true."[50]

Wilford Woodruff had a similar experience, and was baptised after the first sermon he heard.[51] When he was informed that two Elders had scheduled a meeting near his residence, Woodruff started for the meeting place without waiting for supper, praying "most sincerely" that he might discern the truthfulness of the message. During the meeting the "Spirit bore witness" that the *Book of Mormon* had been revealed by God; and when liberty was given that any in the congregation might express themselves concerning the message they had heard, Woodruff was "almost instantly" upon his feet. He exhorted his neighbors and friends not to oppose the missionaries, as they had preached the "pure gospel of Jesus Christ." When he concluded others, including his brother Azmon, "arose and bore a similar testimony."[52]

Before Brigham Young heard of Mormonism he "had searched everything pertaining to the Churches," but was unable to find "a Bible church upon the earth."[53] Consequently, he became "sick, tired, and disgusted with the world" and its "vain, foolish, wicked, and unsatisfying customs and practices." This attitude he retained until he read the *Book of Mormon*.[54] His brother, Joseph Young, was of the same disposition and once said: "Brother Brigham, there are no Bible Christians upon the face of the earth, and I do not see any possible escape for the human family." So deeply concerned was he that he did not have a "smile on his countenance for years."[55] In like manner, William W. Phelps "had long been searching for the 'old

50 *Deseret News,* IX, 153-5.
51 See J. D., IV, 99; *Millennial Star,* XXVII, 182.
52 Matthias F. Cowley, *Wilford Woodruff* (Salt Lake City, 1909), pp. 32-3.
53 J. D., X, 311; XXI, 46.
54 J. D., V, 39; VIII, 129.
55 J. D., VIII, 129.

paths' " but never believed that any of the sects of the day "possessed the truth." Upon hearing of the *Book of Mormon,* he later wrote, "I rejoiced that there was something coming to point the right way to heaven."[56]

Many who were awakened expressed confidence that God would restore His true Gospel to men. Dr. Willard Richards repudiated the sects and declared boldly that God "would soon have a church whose creed would be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth."[57] After endeavoring to reconcile the doctrine of his church with the *Bible* and failing to "make it correspond," Thomas B. Marsh withdrew from all sects. To his old class leader in Boston, Massachusetts, he declared that he "expected a new church would arise, which would have the truth in its purity."[58] David W. Patten was also searching for a new revelation from God. Said he: "By dreams and visions, many things were made known unto me, which were to come; and from the teachings I received of the Holy Spirit, I was looking for the Church of Christ to arise in its purity, according to the promise of Christ, and that I should live to see it." When Patten heard of the "restoration of the Gospel," by letter from his brother, he arose in church and informed his friends and neighbors that he "had at last got word of the Church of Christ." Next day he started on a journey of three hundred miles to join the new church.[59]

Others with like anticipations included Jesse W. Crosby, William Huntington, Lorin Farr, and Samuel Holister Rogers. Through the "visions" of his mind Crosby had been assured of these things to such extent that "none of the excitements of the day" thereafter affected him. Huntington was so convinced that for some two or three years he proclaimed publicly that such a church would rise in his day. Farr received his assurance largely from his grandfather, who passed away about two years before the family heard of Mormonism. When the Elders proclaimed the doctrine of the Restoration, Farr exclaimed: "Why, that is what my grandfather said." The Rogers family claimed

---

56 *Messenger and Advocate,* I (February, 1835), 65; I (May, 1835), 115

57 *History of the Church,* II, 470.

58 *Millennial Star,* XXVI, 360.

59 *Millenial Star,* XXVL, 406; Lycurgus A. Wilson, *Life of David W. Patten, The First Apostolic Martyr* (Salt Lake City, 1900), pp. 2-4.

to have received their hope concerning the new church from a stranger who visited the vicinity in which they lived several years before, and promised them "that they would all live to see it and would join it."[60]

When the message of the restored Church spread beyond the confines of the United States, missionaries of the Church found that a similar preparation had occurred in other lands. In the spring of 1836, Parley P. Pratt was sent to Toronto, Canada, to "find a people prepared for the fulness of the gospel."[61] After being refused the opportunity of preaching in the churches and civic halls of the place, Pratt visited a group who "had been wont to assemble and search the scriptures." This group, he wrote at the time, "had discovered the corruptions of Christendom, and were diligently searching for truth." The result of their discussion was that "they felt the need of prophets and apostles to organize them, and minister the ordinances and spirit to them." Some suggested, "Let us be agreed and ask for God to commission us by revelation." Said others: "It might be that the Lord has already commissioned apostles in some parts of the world; and if he has, it must come from them."[62]

"During this time," Pratt wrote,

> I had listened in silence: sometimes crying and sometimes smiling—my heart burning within me. Someone at length observed that a stranger was in the room, who might wish to speak. I said that I should be glad to speak on the subject in the evening: liberty was granted, and an appointment made: after which they kneeled down and in tears confessed their naked, destitute situation; praying God to pity and relieve them.[63]

Thereafter, multitudes flocked to hear the Mormon Elder from the United States. Said Pratt: "I preach, read and con-

---

60 "The History and Journal of Jesse W. Crosby, 1820-1869," Typewritten copy in Brigham Young University Library, pp. 1-3; "Diaries of William Huntington," Typewritten copy in Brigham Young University Library, in "Mormon Diaries," XVI, 1-2; Edward W. Tullidge, *Northern Utah and Southern Utah* (*Biographies of the Founders and Representative Men*) (Salt Lake City, 1889), p. 176; "Journal of Samuel Holister Rogers," Typewritten copy in Brigham Young University Library, pp. 2-3.

61 *Autobiography of Parley P. Pratt,* pp. 130-31.

62 Letter of Parley P. Pratt, to John Whitmer, *Messenger and Advocate,* II (May, 1836), 317-8.

63 *Ibid.*

verse to people all day and all night: sometimes the morning sun is dawning upon us before we have thought of rest; and generally the clock strikes twelve before we retire."[64]

As Elder Pratt left for Toronto, it was prophesied by Heber C. Kimball that "from things growing out of this mission, shall the fulness of the gospel spread into England, and cause a great work to be done in that land."[65] After investigating the situation in England, through the writings and reports coming to people in Canada from friends and former associates in the Old World, Pratt wrote: "Tens of thousands are awakened in that land to these subjects, and are sending swift messengers to the nations around them, to teach these things [the need for a restoration of gospel truth], insomuch that the excitement seems to have become general among kings and nobles, priests and people." Pratt wrote an eleven-page letter to England, giving the people there an account of "the work of the Lord among us."[66]

Information on the rise of Mormonism had already reached parts of England, however, more than a year before Pratt wrote to that land; and a council of the pastors of the Irvingite movement, held March 28, 1835, decided to send a representative to America to investigate the matter. The following month they wrote to certain Mormon Elders, stating:

> The Lord hath seen our joy and gladness to hear that He was raising up a people for himself in that part of the New World, as well as here—O may our faith increase that he may have evangelists, apostles and prophets filled with the power of the Spirit, and performing his will in destroying the works of darkness.
>
> The Rev. Mr. John Hewitt [their representative] was professor of Mathematics in Rother'm Independent Seminary, and four years pastor of Barnesly Independent Church. He commenced preaching the doctrines we taught about two years since, and was excommunicated—many of his flock followed him, so that eventually he was installed in the same church, and the Lord's work prospered. As he is a living epistle you will have, if all is well, a full explanation. Many will follow

64 *Ibid.*
65 Autobiography of Parley P. Pratt, *op. cit.*
66 *Messenger and Advocate,* II (May, 1836), 318.

> should he approve of the country, i.e. who will help the cause, because the Lord hath favored them with this world's goods.[67]

This letter not only reveals the nature of the religious awakening in the British Isles, it also reflects the tendency on the part of many there to look expectantly toward America. But upon his arrival, the Rev. Hewitt became prejudiced toward certain claims of Mormonism, possibly from the perverse reports against the Church, and no real benefit came from his visit.

When Heber C. Kimball and Orson Hyde of the Quorum of the Twelve, with others, went to England in 1837, they found a fruitful field. Several ministers were preaching on the evils of contemporary Christianity and the need for a restoration. It was from among such groups, in particular, that the Mormon missionaries found the most ready converts.[68] During the first eight months of proselyting, the missionaries converted some two thousand people.[69] There came a time when church membership in the British Isles was greater than that in America. Wilford Woodruff became one of the greatest champions of Mormonism in the British Isles. His work at Herefordshire was of particular significance. There he found a group of over six hundred people who had broken off from the Wesleyan Methodists and "were continually calling upon the Lord to open the way before them and send them light and knowledge that they might know the way to be saved." In six months Elder Woodruff saw this group, with the exception of one person, come into the Church; and in addition, twelve hundred others were converted in that area.[70]

Later, in the 1840's, John Taylor and others introduced the work among the French people. Before leaving that field of labor, a conference was held at which some four hundred members were represented.[71] Again, it was principally among those previously awakened to a quest for a faith more consistent with the spirit and teachings of original Christianity that Mormonism

---

67 *Ibid.*, p. 316.

68 See Orson F. Whitney, *Life of Heber C. Kimball* (Salt Lake City, 1888), pp. 161-4.

69 *Ibid.*, p. 204.

70 Wilford Woodruff, *Leaves from My Journel* (Salt Lake City, 1882), pp. 77-9: J. D. XVIII, 122-5; XXI, 315.

71 J. D., I, 19-24.

found its converts. It was with real meaning that George Q. Cannon said of the majority of early converts from America and Europe: "They have been convinced of the truth very frequently before they scarcely heard it."[72]

IV. *Socio-Economic Preparations*

Few years so clearly mark the commencement of a new era as does the year 1829[73] when the foundations of the new Dispensation, laid April 6, 1830, were being prepared. America in that day was a "country of beginnings, of projects, of designs, of expectations," aimed at the "reform of domestic, civil, literary, and ecclesiastical institutions."[74] It was simultaneously an age of iconoclasts and utopians.

In the opinion of many the whole of society was to be made over, not merely some of its parts reformed; fundamental causes, not effects, had to be altered. "The evil we speak of is inherent in all our social arrangements," Brownson declared, "and cannot be cured without a radical change of those arrangements."[75] Robert Owen agreed, contending not merely for an "extensive" but for a "universal" renovation of society—"an immediate and almost instantaneous revolution in the minds and manners of the society."[76] Fourier, the French reformer whose ideas had a powerful effect upon America in the 1840's, held similar views. His American proponent, Albert Brisbane, emphasized the need for doing "away with civilization itself" and organizing all things anew.[77] The prevailing attitude led Emerson to exclaim: "What is a man born for but to be a Reformer, a Remaker of what man has made; a renouncer of lies; a restorer of truth and good, imitating that great Nature which embosoms us all, and

---

72 J. D., XXII, 322:23.

73 See Albert Bushnell Hart, *The American Nations: A History* (New York, 1906), XV,xi.

74 Emerson, "The Young American;" "Lectures on the Times."

75 Orestes A. Brownson, "The Laboring Classes," a review of Thomas Carlyle's *Chartism,* originally published in the *Boston Quarterly Review,* 1840.

76 See Robert Owen, *Report to the County of Lanark* (Glasgow, 1821), reprinted among the appendices to *The Life of Robert Owen,* by himself (2 vols. [Number I and I.A.] London, 1857-58), I.A., 287; "Discourse in Washington," February 25, 1825, reprinted in *New Harmony Gazette,* II (May 2, 1827), 241; Robert Owen, *Book of the New Moral World* (London, 1836), part I, iv; *Lectures on the Rational System of Society* (London, 1841), pp. 19-21.

77 Charles Fourier, *Le Nouveau Monde Industriel et Societaire* (Paris, 1829), p. xv, translated and used by Albert Brisbane as a motto in his periodical *The Phalanx* (New York, 1843), p. 2; Albert Brisbane, *Social Destiny of Man* (Philadelphia, 1840), p. 286.

which sleeps no moment on an old past, but every hour repairs herself, yielding us every morning a new day, and with every pulsation a new life?"[78]

With the above desires was an effort by some to develop a complete society integrated within the highest ideals of Christian faith and ethics. Such reformers faced the problem of combining dynamic faith in human dignity with vitalizing institutions through which that faith would be stimulated toward full expression. Brownson pointed to the need for a "general doctrine which enables us to recognize and accept all the elements of Humanity." Said he:

> If we leave out any one element of our nature, we shall have antagonism. Our system will be incomplete and the element excluded will be forever rising up in rebellion against it and collecting forces to destroy its authority.[79]

Channing emphasized that the true spirit of brotherhood and peace can only be achieved by men understanding their relationship to God and the purpose of existence. Such knowledge would "revolutionize society," creating relationships not then dreamed of by men.[80]

The Second American Revolution was thus marked by an all-consuming quest for a perfect society. Nothing less would do. As Ralph Volney Harlow explained, reformers of the day would not relinquish their major premise of perfectibility, but expended their energies searching for the true pattern of society. Consequently, numerous and varied schemes for making over the world were proposed and explored.[81]

The significance of this unquenchable desire for a perfect society, in preparing the stage for the introduction of Mormonism is apparent when it is noted that, in the Dispensation of the Fulness of Times, *all things* were to be gathered together in Christ and sanctified by His Spirit. Mormonism was not merely a religion, but a society. It was an all-inclusive plan of life, sufficiently comprehensive to care for every legitimate human need —the perfect way of life, patterned after the celestial society of

---

78 Emerson, "Man the Reformer," *The Dial,* I (April, 1841), 523-126.
79 Orestes A. Brownson, *New Views,* November 8, 1836.
80 See Parrington, *op. cit.,* II, 333.
81 See Ralph Volney Harlow, Gerrit Smith: *Philantropist and Reformer* (New York, 1939), p. 100.

heaven. In its scope was the plan of the City of Zion, a model after which cities throughout the world were to be patterned. There was a system of economics founded in the maintenance of man's free agency and aspiring to the ideals of social union and equality, which would elevate man spiritually, culturally, and intellectually, while enriching him economically. Uplifting social principles were added to stimulate and enhance man's educational, recreational, and family life.

Significantly, the quest for a perfect society expressed itself in a communitarian movement where many sought either to find or to develop a model society that could be used as a pattern in reorganizing the world. This feature of the nineteenth-century reform movement made the prevailing idea of a total reconstruction of society unique when compared with the efforts of most former revolutionaries. Confident that once a true society was either found or developed men everywhere would imitate it, reformers devoted themselves to the development of model communities. Though often referred to as "utopian socialism," this movment is more appropriately called "communitarianism," because it emphasized the use of the model community as a precedent for the reform of society in all its parts.[82]

Zion was considered to be such a model system—an ensign or standard to the nations. Kings and noblemen were to come to Zion and learn of her ways, that they might walk in her paths. A revelation indicates: "I have sent mine everlasting covenant into the world, to be a light to the world, and to be a standard for my people, and for the Gentiles to seek it."[83] The Saints were commanded to, "Arise and shine forth, that thy light may be a standard for the nations."[84] Before Zion could fulfill her destined role in the earth, the Saints were expected to develop her law, that "the kingdoms of this world may be constrained to acknowledge that the kingdom of Zion is in very deed the kingdom of our God and his Christ."[85]

Paradoxically, the quest for a perfect society was associated

82 See Arthur E. Bestor, Jr., "The Ferment of Freedom," *Problems in American History,* ed. by Richard W. Leopold and Arthur S. Link (New York, 1952), pp. 321-22.

83 *Doctrine and Covenants,* 45:9.

84 *Doctrine and Covenants,* 115:5.

85 *Doctrine and Covenants,* 105:31-2.

with an ardent spirit of individualism and a burning zeal for social union—two incompatible ideals, except as united in Zion's covenant society. The existence of these two ideals simultaneously in the hearts of men presents a difficult situation for historians to explain. It was a day when the individual was the world. The perception of this ideal, said Emerson, was "a sword such as was never drawn before."[86] With it as a criterion old forms of society were weighed in the balance, and those found wanting were cast aside. Should the institution resent such treatment and threaten excommunication, the individual often acted first, and "in public and formal process" excommunicated the institution.[87] Presidents, legislators, judges, and people of prominence listened eagerly while new theories for reorganizing society in the individual's interest were expounded.[88] President Jackson considered it a divine call to work in the interest of the common man.

But while it was an age of individualists epitomized by the lives of Emerson and Thoreau, the world, in the words of the former, was "awakening to the idea of union."[89] Or, as Brownson declared, "Progress is our law, and our first step is UNION."[90] Channing said:

> In truth, one of the most remarkable circumstances or features of our age is the energy with which the principle of combination, or of action by joint forces, by associated numbers, is manifesting itself. It may be said, without much exaggeration, that everything is done now by Societies. Men have learned what wonders can be accomplished in certain cases by union, and seem to think that union is competent to everything. You can scarcely name an object for which some institution has not been formed.[91]

Brotherly association was the guiding ideal of the communitarians. Reformers in Europe and America were convinced that the demands of an advancing civilization would be co-

86 Emerson, "Historic Notes," etc.

87 Emerson, "New England Reformers."

88 See Fred E. Haynes, *Social Politics in the United States* (Boston and New York, 1924), pp. 25-28.

89 Emerson, "New England Reformers."

90 Brownson, *op. cit.*

91 Channing, *Christian Examiner,* VII (September, 1829), 105-6. There was a similar trend in Europe. By 1831 there were some 300 co-operative stores in England. See Carl Wittke, *The Utopian Communist: A Biography of Wilhelm Weitling, Nineteenth Century Reformer* (Baton Rouge, 1950), p. 15.

operative in nature. "They were founded in love and in labor," said Emerson of the new associations. "They proposed. . . to amend the conditions of men by substituting harmonious for hostile industry."[92] In the words of Brisbane, it would not be "through hatred, collision, and depressing competition; not through war, whether of nation against nation, class against class, or capital against labor; but through union, harmony, and the reconciling of all interests" that the world would be renovated and the "suffering masses of mankind" elevated.[93]

Emphasis upon union was not considered a retreat but a step forward in social arrangements. Communitarians, as Bestor notes, seriously considered societies founded upon social union as the means of reforming the world.[94] Martineau, for one, declared that the possible application of the principles of cooperation to large classes of society was "the most important dispute, perhaps, that is agitating society."[95] Nevertheless, the value of these many communitarian schemes, as Emerson noted, was not to be found in "what they have done, but [in] the revolution which they indicate as on the way."[96] Men have largely forgotten the many community experiments that arose out of the prevailing urge for perfectionism and social union. But though Owen at New Harmony, Ripley at Brook Farm, and a hundred other reformers with like desires contributed little of lasting value for the historian to record, their efforts stand as a barometer registering the ideals that caught the attention of men and molded their thinking in that day. In this sense communitarianism prepared the way for Mormonism.

Social union, within the context of individual freedom, was a cardinal principle upon which the society of Zion was founded. There are no more lofty concepts of free agency and the dignity of the individual than those revealed through Joseph Smith. Yet a revelation emphatically declared: "If ye are not one ye are not mine."[97] Every man in the new economic system

---

92 Emerson, "The Young American."

93 Printed as a motto in Albert Brisbane's, *A Concisce Expostion of the Doctrine of Association* (2nd ed.; New York, 1843), cover and title page.

94 Bestor, *Backwoods Utopias,* p. 3.

95 Martineau, *Society in America,* II, 57-8. See also I, x-xiv, xvii-xviii; II, 54-65.

96 Emerson, "The Young American."

97 *Doctrine and Covenants,* 38:27.

was to "deal honestly, and be alike among this people, and receive alike, that ye may be one."[98] Consider the words of John Taylor:

> We are seeking to establish a oneness, and that oneness under the guidance and direction of the Almighty. . . . We consider that union is the great principle that we ought to cultivate, union in religion, morals, politics, and everything else. . . . then we shall grow, and prosper like a green bay tree. . . . This is what we are after, and when we have attained to this ourselves, we want to teach the nations of the earth the same pure principles that have emanated from the Great Eloheim.[99]

A specific example of how the communitarian trend led men to accept the program revealed through Joseph Smith can be seen in the case of Sidney Rigdon and his associates. Before their conversion to Mormonism they organized a community known as the "Family," where all things were to be held in common. Isaac Morley was the dominant figure in the community; and his farm was headquarters for group activities.[100] Sidney Rigdon, however, placed the support of his pulpit behind the move and soon became "a champion for the restoration of Christian communism."[101] In a "passage at arms with Mr. Campbell," some two months before he heard of Mormonism, a Campbellite source reported that Rigdon "introduced an argument to show that our pretension to follow the apostles in all their New Testament teachings, required a community of goods."[102] Rigdon's effort to establish "the ancient communism as practiced in the Church at Jerusalem," said another source, resulted from "an earnest effort to restore the primitive faith and practice."[103] Said Lyman Wight, who had recently been converted to Rigdon's religious views:

> I now began to look at the doctrine of the Apostles pretty closely, especially that part contained in the second chapter of

98 *Doctrine and Covenants,* 51:9.

99 J. D., XI, 346.

100 *History of the Church,* I, 146. Said George A. Smith of the name of this group; "It has sometimes been denominated the Morley family, as there was a number of them located on a farm owned by Captain Issac Morley."—J. D. XI, 3-4.

101 Chase, *op. cit.,* p. 37.

102 Cited in *ibid.*

103 Errett Gates and E. B. Hurlbert, *The Early Relation and Separation of Baptists and Disciples,* p. 75.

the Acts of the Apostles, where they had all things common. In consideration of this doctrine I went to Kirtland, almost 20 miles, to see Br. Isaac Morley and Br. [Titus?] Billings. After some conversation on the subject we entered into covenant to make our interests one as anciently. I in conformity to this covenant, moved the next February [1830] to Kirtland, into the house with Br. Morley. We commenced our labors together in great peace and union; we were soon joined by eight other families. Our labors were united both in farming and mechanism, all of which was prosecuted with great vigor. We truly began to feel as if the Millennium was close at hand; everything moved smoothly on till about the first of November [1830]. About this time five families concluded to join us in the town of Mayfield, about seven miles up the [Chagrin] river. They each owning a good farm and mills, it was concluded best to establish a branch there. Accordingly, I was appointed to go and take charge of this branch.[104]

It was while Wight was moving to Mayfield that Parley P. Pratt, Rigdon's former associate, with Oliver Cowdery and others, arrived in the area bearing news of the new revelation to Joseph Smith. Wight reported that when the missionaries "brought the *Book of Mormon* to bear" upon the people, "the whole of the common stock family was baptised."[105]

The effort of those in the Family to practice original Christianity, economically as well as religiously, had much to do with their conversion to Mormonism. Hayden noted that their acceptance of Mormonism "was paved by the common stock principle."[106] First they sought for a restoration of the ancient order of things. This led them to imitate the New Testament society in its economic practices. Finally, they accepted Mormonism as a literal restoration of the pure faith and practice. Having come that far, they were prepared to accept a revelation through Joseph Smith clarifying true Christian economic

---

104 Personal sketch of his life, by Lyman Wight, written to Wilford Woodruff enclosed with a letter dated at Mountain Valley, Texas, August 24, 1857. Wight kept a daily journal throughout his life, and from comments made in this account he obviously consulted it at the time of this writing. Original documents on file at the Church Historian's Office, Salt Lake City, Utah.

105 *Ibid.*

106 See Hayden, *op. cit.*, 174, 197, 209-218, 298. Those in this group "were daily looking for some wonderful event to take place in the world," said another writer caustically. "Their minds had become fully prepared to embrace Mormonism or any other mysterious 'ism' that should present itself."—Eva L. Pancoast, "Mormons at Kirtland," Unpublished Master's Thesis, Western Reserve University, May 1, 1929, p. 20.

principles. When the revelation on the Law of Consecration and Stewardship was given the Prophet reported: "The plan of common stock which had existed in what was called 'The Family,' whose members generally had embraced the everlasting Gospel, was readily abandoned for the more perfect law of the Lord."[107]

The Law of Consecration and Stewardship was significantly different in principle from that arrangement previously espoused by Rigdon. The plan revealed through Joseph Smith reveals a natural affinity with the theology and philosophy of the *Book of Mormon,* while Rigdon's system was a common-stock program much like many other communitarian schemes of the day. The *Book of Mormon* contains a record of two groups organized in the same manner as the New Testament society, and indicates that they were founded upon mature individualism, where all members imparted "of their substance of their own free will and good desires" to the poor.[108] There was no common-stock principle there. Instead, each individual had control over his own property, but freely imparted of his substance that those in need might also enjoy the good things of the earth and become self-sustaining, independent persons, united in love by the spirit of the Gospel and by their mutual covenants with God. The Prophet stated specifically that he "did not believe the doctrine" upon which the Family was founded.[109] John Whitmer gave the following picture of the Ohio community, which also indicates that Rigdon's plan had little in common with the principles of Mormonism:

> The disciples had all things in common and were going to destruction very fast as to temporal things, for they considered from reading the Scriptures that what belonged to one brother, belonged to any of the brethren. Therefore they would take each other's clothes and other property and use it without leave, which brought confusion and disappointment.[110]

---

107 *Times and Seasons,* IV, 368. The revelation mentioned above concerned other matters, as the law of the Church, besides the Law of Consecration and Stewardship.

108 Mosiah 18:28; Alma 1:26-31; IV Nephi; Mosiah 4.

109 *History of the Church,* VI, 32-3.

110 "Book of John Whitmer," *Journal of History,* January, 1908, p. 50. Whitmer was appointed Church Historian in November, 1831. Before Joseph Smith removed to Ohio, Whitmer was sent to preside over the early converts in Ohio and was therefore personally acquainted with them.

Whitmer's statement is substantiated by Levi Hancock's report on his first contact with the Family. Hancock had joined the Church immediately after the Mormon missionaries arrived in Ohio, and shortly thereafter went to Kirtland. Though he knew nothing of Rigdon's community at the time, his conversion to Mormonism was evidently taken by a member of the Family to signify that he had been accepted into their program. While visiting Isaac Morley's farm, he was approached by the said communitarian, who took his watch "and walked off as though it was his." Said Hancock:

> I did not like such family doings and I would not bear it.[111] I thought he would bring it back soon but was disappointed as he sold it. I asked him what he meant by selling my watch. "Oh," said he, "I thought it was all in the family." I told him

The minutes of a conference held at Winchester, Randolph County, Indiana, November 29, 1831, also reveal that distinctions existed between the principles set forth by Joseph Smith and the common-stock systems of the day. Two recent converts had come into some difficulty because they supposed, by reading the Acts of the Apostles, that early Christian "disciples had ought to or were privileged to live 'in common stock.'" They were corrected in their views, confessed their error before the Church, and were forgiven.[112]

The relationship of the Family to the Law of Consecration and Stewardship was strictly preparatory. The development of Morley's community reveals the existence of a powerful urge to reorganize society. Instead of having to stimulate such desire, Joseph Smith had only to direct it into appropriate patterns. Again the scene had been amply prepared for the principles revealed through him. Meanwhile, the converts had the responsibility of discriminating between those principles set forth by the Prophet and others espoused in the many systems of the day. And as may be expected some failed in this duty. Of these John Witmer said: "There were some of the disciples who were flattered into this church, because they thought that all things were to be common; therefore they thought to glut

---

111 "Autobiography of Levi W. Hancock." Typewritten copy from the original, Brigham Young Library, p. 44.

112 *Journay History*, November 29, 1831.

themselves upon the labors of others."[113] But though men in some measure failed to understand, God fulfilled His responsibility by preparing all things for the Restoration and its message, to the extent that the injunction could be repeated: "Say nothing but repentance of this generation."[114] Failure to repent and discriminate was a principle factor that kept men from embracing the program of the new Dispensation; in all other ways they were prepared for its law. The field was indeed white and ready for harvest.

113 Whitmer, *op. cit.*
114 *Doctrine and Covenants*, 6:9; 11:9.

Book Reviews

McMurrin, Sterling M. *The Philosophical Foundations of Mormon Theology.* Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1959.

In the brief compass of a monograph, Professor McMurrin has given us a survey statement of basic metaphysical implications of Mormon theology (this is the meaning of "Philosophical Foundations") which is penetrating and, in many ways, helpful.

Primarily he raises six classic questions of ontology, outlines major historical alternatives, and then identifies and relates Mormonism. To do justice to the Mormon position, he is forced to qualify each of his characterizing terms with another term, often of traditionally opposite meaning. Thus, for example, he describes Mormonism as pluralistic and non-absolutistic in its quantitative conception of the universe (p. 8), yet qualitatively as monistic (all things are matter) and at the same time dualistic (spirit is more refined than matter) (p. 17). It is dynamistic (the universe is in process), yet committed to unchanging entities: intelligences, eternal elements, space and time, and "principles" (pp. 12, 23, 24). It is supernaturalistic (God, angels, spirits are not "ordinary objects of sense perception"), yet naturalistic (they are subject to the spatial, temporal, causal order) (p. 19). Its value theory is absolutistic and platonic, yet at the same time instrumental and pragmatic (pp. 24, 25). It is realistic in its conception of universals (p. 26), yet at the same time nominalistic, especially as regards the Trinity (pp. 8, 28). If affirms the necessity or self-derivation of all existent things, yet teaches genuine human freedom and novelty (p. 29). In addition to these matters of exposition, the author offers a sketch, under each heading, of important inter-relationships and implications of these ideas for other Mormon teaching and practice.

Now it is, of course, possible to question the adequacy, in principle and in fact, of this selection of issues and of the de-

scriptive pigeon-holes resulting from it. Mormonism, it might be said, is unamenable to such analysis because (1) it is avowedly open-ended and incomplete in structure; (2) its actual development historically has been unsystematic; (3) its inmost meaning and vitality are more clearly available to the participating prophet than the detached philosopher; and, hence, (4) to distill philosophical theses out of Mormon theology is to superimpose and speculate. These objections no doubt have relevance to this project, but they do not completely invalidate it or destroy its worth. The approach has a place and, for this writer, a very important one.

The monograph shows clearly that it is precarious to move from similarity of word-usage to assumptions of common belief. The very fact that on several counts the author couples his terms with those of opposite connotation should give warning to scholars who "discover" this or that "ism" in Mormon literature and then presume to ride that philosophical steed to its usual destination. The paper shows that at its very center Mormonism houses other steeds with other destinations. Often these are not only of a different color but of a different breed.

On this score, Professor McMurrin's writing is not always flawless. Cases of mistaken identity sometimes compound into omissions and unjustified derivations. An illustration:

1. The discussion of universals (a problem rarely, if ever, treated with much seriousness by Mormon writers) concludes that with respect to "Church" and "Priesthood," Mormonism tends to be realistic; viz., its writers use language suggesting that these have status over and above their individual instances (pp. 26, 27).

But this, surely, is at most a surface resemblance. Priesthood in Mormon literature is much more clearly a particular than a universal, and is certainly not a platonic non-temporal, non-spatial, entity or form of which earthly instances are copies. As distinguished from a name for authoritative commission, or as a collective name for those who bear it, it is frequently described as a power, close in significance to such (uniquely defined) Mormon terms as "Spirit" or "powers of godliness." Despite terminological likness (e.g "eternal" and "unchanging"), Mormonism derives from this doctrine of Priesthood consequences

quite other than those of Greek or Scholastic realism. One does not, for example, need to conceive Priesthood as a universal in Plato's or St. Thomas's sense to believe, as Mormons do, that certain official acts may be binding and efficacious though the person performing them is not fully "magnifying" his Priesthood (Cf. p. 26). Nor is the Mormon teaching about the source, proper exercise, and conditions of loss of the Priesthood compatible with the traditional Catholic doctrines of inerrancy, transmission, and divine right. Other differences, not merely verbal, suggest that to identify the Mormon view with "the Catholic theory" obscures rather than clarifies.

Similar comments might well be urged against his use of platonism to describe Mormon value-theory. The Mormon view that values are in some sense objective is closer to certain forms of realism, intuitionism, or naturalism than to platonism. There is, again, his summary statement that Mormonism is "a kind of naturalistic humanism within a general theistic context" (p. 20). Either these three core-terms, or Mormonism itself, must be revised before they belong together. Such comments simply underline a point on which Professor McMurrin is himself insistent: that Mormonism has its own idiom and is frequently falsified when couched in other terms.

2. Another example, this time leading to omission, is his description of the classical vs. Mormon conception of Divine knowledge. With respect to the "Omniscience" of God, we are told that Mormonism denies the non-temporal "eternal now" of classic theology, yet that "his divine knowledge anticipates the future even though the future is yet unexperienced, unique, and undetermined" (p. 14).

Now both for theology and religion, tremendous consequences hang on the resolution of the issue whether Divine foreknowledge is compatible with human freedom or self-determination. Mormonism has distinctive teachings which operate in the definition and resolution of this issue. Professor McMurrin chooses to emphasize the practical implications (e.g., "an utter seriousness of life and moral endeavor" p. 22) which follow from the Mormon conception of freedom and purpose. But if he is correct in ascribing a doctrine of Divine anticipatory knowledge to Mormonism, he should give comparable mention to consequences of this doctrine. Historically

these (e.g., calling, covenant, and prophecy) are of at least equal importance.

3. Perhaps this omission is related to another issue on which, again, he is misleading. This is the problem of necessity vs. contingency. Emphasizing the radical thesis of the *aseity* or self-existence of man, Professor McMurrin points out how inimical this position is to Christian orthodox conceptions of creation, fall, and human finitude. He summarizes by saying that this view diverges abruptly from neo-orthodox accounts of man. So far so good.

But he pushes this view of autonomous intelligences to consequences which, for typical Mormon theology and practice, it does not have. Even among the orthodox and neo-orthodox there are two primal sorts of human contingency. One is the contingency of actuality—that man may, in every sense of being, cease to be. The other is the contingency of potentiality—that man may fail to become what he may become: his potential self, his "authentic self," a completed person, or "saved." For most classical and contemporary theologians man is absolutely contingent in *both* senses. For Mormonism man is necessary or independent in the first sense, as an intelligence. But he is contingent or dependent in the second sense. Indeed, for Mormonism, the question of man's status must be raised at each of several successive stages or "estates" of his development.

Professor McMurrin tends to argue that Mormonism is required to affirm the second sort of independence as an implication of the first. His final paragraph then ascribes to Mormonism "pelagian and arminian tendencies" which lead to the rejection of certain conceptions of fall, original sin, grace, election, perseverance and (though unmentioned) atonement.

But the Mormon doctrine of intelligences, free agency, and merit are side by side in its theology with increased and inviolate sets of conditions without which man remains unfulfilled. No less radical than the conception of man's ultimate *origin* ("co-equal with God") is the thesis (not even mentioned by Professor McMurrin) of the potential *destiny* of man. In harmony with this teaching (which shatters several traditional presuppositions), Mormonism has its own doctrines of fall, sin, grace, and atonement or redemption, all of which emphasize man's dependence. Professor McMurrin's neglect of these may be due

to the summary character of his monograph or to his intention to write a second paper with a theological rather than a philosophical focus.

Aside from these and related problems of content, three things, for this reviewer, emerge from the study:

First, the really radical character of Mormonism is seen. Rejecting or replacing, as it does, many of the axioms of Western tradition, it becomes decisively clear that Mormonism unites, dissembles, and contributes doctrines of a truly revolutionary character. Differences that are delineated are not merely peripheral, but basic—at the very core of its ontology—and nothing is more basic.

Second, other aspects of the latent philosophy of Mormonism are hinted at. If one can more or less accurately discern an ontology in the Mormon literature, what then of other matters: a distinctive theory of knowledge, an ethic, a philosophy of language, of history, of education, of aesthetics, of science? Much clarification, comparison, and integration (which is to say, much understanding and appreciation) might well result from such topical analyses of Mormonism—topics which underly and overly the theology and religion.

Third, the approach itself is established as fruitful. Attempting neither to defend nor to disparage, but simply to describe, McMurrin has, granting limitations of scope and perspective, served as an accurate reporter. Dealing with the assumedly familiar, he yet provides most readers a venture of discovery, of seeing meanings and implications often missed. This is one, perhaps the best, type of philosophical analysis. Both friends and critics of Mormonism may profit from it.

There are, then, distortions and hanging threads. But in the aggregate this is as significant a portrait of the metaphysical implications of Mormonism as has yet been presented. If it is not the first chapter, it is yet the prospectus of many chapters in the yet-to-be-written volume: *The Philosophy of Mormonism.* An important question, one asked with increasing frequency, is whether such a task should be undertaken. This monograph, and the generally favorable response it has received, should be used in the case for the affirmative.

Truman G. Madsen

Larson, Gustive O. *Outline of History of Utah and the Mormons.* Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Co., 1958.

Professor Larson's first chapter sets the style and tone of his entire book. This short introduction to the history of the Great Basin before the coming of the Mormons does not attempt to give the reader a detailed report of all that occurred but rather a brief insight into the fact that the basin area was well known to a few hundred white men before the Mormons set foot on it. The material given is remarkably complete for such brevity, and although it does not concern the Mormon people, it is of good general interest.

The next two chapters are background history of the Mormon people before they came to Utah. As a history of the state, these chapters would be superfluous if the history of Utah was not so interwoven with the religion of the Latter-day Saints that an understanding of one cannot be had without an understanding of the other.

The body of the book is written in chapters under topic headings such as "Exploration and Colonizing," "Early Government," "Indian Relations," "Entering Statehood," "Twentieth Century Mormonism." This method has necessitated slight repetition of some materials, but the surprising aspect is that there is such a small amount of it. The topics are handled in a skillful manner, giving the reader the feeling that the content of the book is far more orderly than would have been the case had the author tried to deal with each event in its exact chronological order.

The insertion of Chapter XII on the Colorado River Basin is a particularly commendable and worthwhile addition, because it deals with an integral part of both Utah and Mormon history that has been sadly neglected by many other historians.

A chief weakness of the book might be said to be in the oversight of the printer or of the proofreader. A few errors are so obvious that one is certain they are not due to lack of knowledge on the part of the author. The word *temporarily* on page 116 should have been printed as *temporally*. The word *Bibliography* should be at the top of the page (on page 277) instead of below the title of the first chapter. The Indian agent and subagents (page 143) could not have been appointed under the

Intercourse Act of 1854; just below this statement the author tells of the actions of the men in these appointed positions as early as 1851 (Mr. H. R. Day deserted his post as sub-agent on September 28, 1851). Samuel H. Woodson was not awarded a four-year contract to carry the mail in 1859 (page 172) but much earlier (1850) as is obvious from the remainder of the paragraph. Also Brigham Young did not die in 1887 (page 226) but in 1877 (page 260). On page 233 it is stated that the 1890 census showed that out of a total population of 207,905 there were 118,000 Mormons and 10,000 Gentiles; this leaves approximately 79,000 people unaccounted for. The map of the Colorado River Basin is on page 236 at the end of Chapter XIII, "Entering Statehood," when it should have been placed somewhere near the beginning of Chapter XII, "The Colorado River Basin."

In a few places references are left out that should have been cited. In a few other places where secondary sources have been cited (to the authors of which Professor Larson gives deserved credit in his preface) the original sources might also have been cited with increased value to the book.

The few maps and charts that have been used are a great aid to the reader. One could only wish that the author had used more of them in places where they would have proven helpful.

In a few cases the topics discussed are so brief that they are not covered adequately. The topic Gentile Merchants (page 170) appears to be incomplete. The short paragraph on the Colorado River Project might have been told more completely by the inclusion of two or three more sentences.

Still the strongest point of the book seems to lie in Professor Larson's ability to say so much so clearly and yet so briefly. Every sentence contains important matter. He cannot be accused of being verbose or of discussing irrelevant matter. The few paragraphs used to describe the Missouri troubles of the Saints might be cited as examples of extreme brevity with clarity and completeness of expression.

Summing up: A book well written in which the author has expressed himself with clarity of language, completeness of thought, and accuracy of information, having accomplished his purpose with consideration for the reader's time and enjoyment.

Russell R. Rich