BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY BULLETIN

Brigham Young University

STUDIES

Autumn 1960

Brigham Young University

STUDIES

Volume III Number 1

CONTENTS

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.**

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

Vol. 57 Provo, Utah December 15, 1960 No. 39

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.

Printed by Brigham Young University Press 1M 12-60 PRUP 18451

Some Metaphysical Reflections on the Gospel of John

David H. Yarn, Jr.

Introduction

Those persons with even the barest acquaintance with the gospels know that each is an account of the earthly life and ministry of Jesus Christ. This fact being true, it is natural to expect that Jesus would be the central subject of the gospels. The preface to the Gospel of John is a superb example of the centrality of Jesus in those books.

Through the years I have been aware of these facts, but upon my most recent reading and studying the Gospel of John the extent of Jesus' centrality in that book was impressed upon me with far greater rational force than ever before. I am not speaking here of a testimony of Jesus as the Christ—that is another matter. I am speaking of the Gospel of John as a book and the place of Jesus in that book.

It is interesting that the force of my realization came during the process of a metaphysical inquiry rather than during what might be distinguished as theological or doctrinal study. Of course, I have devoted considerable time to the study of doctrine, and I acknowledge my indebtedness to God for the witness of the Spirit that Jesus is the Christ. However, the point that I want to make is that as one reads John's Gospel with metaphysical concepts in mind it is most revealing to see how completely everything is oriented in the Lord. For example, some of the categories one might consider are being, becoming, relation, potency, unity, duality, teleology, change, process, and causation. Let me offer three brief illustrations and some general observations.

Being

First, let us consider perhaps the most basic of all philosophic concepts, being. This word is the noun form of the verb

---

Dr. Yarn is dean of the College of Religious Instruction at B.Y.U.

"to be." "To be" ordinarily means "to exist." For something to exist or to be means that it is. In case the "it" happens to refer to a person one would more properly say he is. The comparable form in the first person singular is I am. This is the name Jesus used in an encounter with the Jews who claimed to identify themselves with Abraham. In maintaining His priority to Abraham, Jesus said, "Before Abraham was, I am" (John 8:58). Here Jesus referred to Himself in the same language used in the revelation to Moses at the burning bush: "I AM THAT I AM . . . Thus shalt thou say to the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you" (Exodus 3:14). Of course, this statement has the force of saying, I am he who is.

Jesus used the phrase "I am" in many statements to His disciples, in John's book. We all use the phrase "I am" extensively; however, the "I am" statements of Jesus are of great ontological significance. For example, He says to the Samaritan woman regarding the Messiah, "I that speak unto thee am he" (John 4:26). To others He said, "I am the true bread" (John 6:35), "I am the living bread" (John 6:51), "I am the light of the world" (John 8:12), "I am the door of the sheep" (John 10:7), "I am the resurrection and the life" (John 11:25), "Ye call me Master and Lord: and ye say well; for so I am" (John 13:13), "I am the way, the truth, and the life" (John 14:6), and "I am the vine, ye are the branches" (John 15:5).

Implicit in all of these statements is the idea that Jesus has a secure ontological status. He, in His own being, is living bread, light, the door, the resurrection, the life, the way, the truth, the vine, the Lord, the Master, the Messiah.

Of course, the preface to John's Gospel, already alluded to, relates importantly to what I am saying. It identifies Jesus as the Word, who was made flesh, and dwelled among men (John 1:14), and as Him who made all things (John 1:3). Also the preface says, "In him was life, and the life was the light of men" (John 1:4).

These statements are consistent with the others just cited which come from various parts of John's Gospel on the point that being is in some way inherent in Jesus. Of Jesus, to say He is, is not enough, for isness in Jesus implies so many things beyond mere existence. Jesus not merely is, He is God. To be is

one thing, to be God is quite another. As stated earlier, we all say, "I am," Jesus said, "I am he."

The priority of Jesus is asserted by John in the opening sentences of his book. He said: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God" (John 1:1-2). Therefore, from the outset John identifies Jesus as the Word, says that He was with God in the beginning, and that He was God. And then, as it were, to be sure that although Jesus is God He would not be confused with the Father, he repeated, "The same was in the beginning with God" (John 1:3).

Obviously, there are many implications regarding God, the universe, and man in the foregoing, but my concern here has been to explore very briefly being as it relates to Jesus. One of the very fascinating dimensions of the foregoing, being and Jesus, introduces another metaphysical category, that of relation. One of the most interesting aspects of this category is the relation of Jesus to the Father.

Relation

As is well-known, the substantial relation of Jesus and the Father was a matter of philosophical and theological controversy for centuries. I have no intentions of entering that controversy here. However, there are a few matters having to do with the functional relation between the Father and Son, which are also of an ontological character, I wish to mention.

In what I have already said I have indicated that in John's Gospel Jesus is the central subject, He is I am, *being* as it were; and yet, in addition to all of the "I am" statements of Jesus, He is represented as continuously paying filial homage to the One who sent Him—the Father. For example, He said: "For I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me" (John 6:38). Also, "My doctrine is not mine but his that sent me" (John 7:16). Finally, "My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to finish his work" (John 4:34; see also John 6:29; 6:44-45; 7:28-29; 10:36; 12:44; 13:20; 17:3).

Other passages illustrate dimensions of the filial homage in 14:28). In another place He had said, "My Father . . . is greater Jesus. He declared: "For my Father is greater than I" (John

than all" (John 10:29). "As my Father hath taught me, I speak these things" (John 8:28). "I speak that which I have seen with my Father: and ye do that which ye have seen with your Father" (John 8:38). But Jesus is not only represented as acknowledging His Father as Father, but also He acknowledges Him as His God. In giving instructions to Mary Magdalene, He said: "Go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God" (John 20:17).

These passages regarding the functional relation between the Father and the Son perhaps illumine what was said earlier about the I am statements. The essence of all those statements seems to be best expressed in the phrase, "I am the way, the truth, and the life" (John 14:6), and in the words, "I am the door of the sheep" (John 10:7). That is, as I am, Jesus is not only *being* as such, but He is the "door," the "way," etc., to God, His Father. He pays homage to God as His Father and as His God, yet at the same time He, Jesus, is I am, and central to John's Gospel as the sole means of man's ever returning to God. At this point obviously, the question of the relation of the Father and the Son to man arises, but this question will necessarily have to be ignored here as much as possible in the interest of space.

The I am statements are a few of the many assertions that Jesus is the only way to the Father. Illustrating both this point and that about filial homage is this widely quoted verse: "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life" (John 3:17). John quotes Jesus often regarding this matter. Jesus said: "This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent" (John 6:29). This clearly identifies the work of God as belief in Jesus. But Jesus being the "way" or "door" to God He said: "He that believeth on me, believeth not on me, but on him that sent me" (John 12:44). Similarly, "He that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me" (John 13:20). These statements seem to be sufficiently lucid that anyone should be able to grasp the point that one functional relation of Jesus to the Father is that He is the only means by which men can return to the Father. The statements

or verses quoted are formulated positively. There is another statement formulated negatively which John attributes to Jesus which is probably far more emphatic regarding the relation under discussion than any other. Jesus said: "He that hateth me hateth my Father also" (John 15:23). This strikes sharply at those persons who would profess belief in God and reject Jesus. Simply put, those who hate Jesus hate God also. Here is a rather summary verse on this relation of Jesus and the Father: "And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent" (John 17:3). In summary, it appears Jesus was God who was with God from the beginning. He was the Creator who saw what His Father did, was taught by Him, became His only begotten Son, obeyed His commandments (John 14:31; 15:10), identified Himself as the only way men could return to God, and declared that eternal life involved knowing both God the Father and Himself. The metaphysical question of relation in the Godhead involves a number of other questions, the most obvious of which, perhaps, being those of unity, duality, and trinity. These are rooted in such familiar verses as, "I and my Father are one" (John 10:30), "Believe me that I am in the Father, and the Father in me" (John 14:11), "When the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father . . . he shall testify of me" (John 15:26), etc. (See also, John 10:38; 14:11; 14:20; and 17:21.) Up to this point we have attempted to examine briefly certain aspects of two metaphysical issues; Jesus and being, and the functional relation between Jesus and the Father.

Duality

Now let us look even more briefly at another metaphysical category manifested in several aspects of John's Gospel. That is duality. There are three basic dualisms in what might be called the metaphysics of John's Gospel. These dualisms may be designated appropriately, condition or state, process, and end. These three categories are interrelated, for the first, condition or state, has to do with things as they are; the second, process, has to do with the becoming of things in one of the two conditions or states; and the third, ends, concerns the consequences of the processes which are operative on things in one of the two conditions or states.

As regards the first category, condition or state, we observe John representing Jesus as contrasting His mortal environment with His pre-mortal environment. He speaks of earthly things and heavenly things (John 3:12). Jesus said: "He that is of the earth is earthly, and speaketh of the earth: he that cometh from heaven is above all" (John 3:31). Speaking to the Pharisees, He charged: "Ye are from beneath; I am from above; ye are of this world; I am not of this world" (John 8:23). The entire context of this passage is an illustration of this dualism. One aspect of it may be an extension of the earthly contrasted with the heavenly, or only a more vigorous and graphic formulation of the same dualism. I am inclined toward the latter interpretation. In Jesus' verbal exchange with the Pharisees they claimed Abraham as their father. Jesus said: "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do," etc. (John 8:44). Then He said, "He that is of God heareth God's words: ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not of God" (John 8:47). Here Jesus' expression "earthly things" becomes sufficiently inclusive to include men. The earthly things and heavenly things dualism becomes a "Ye are of your father the devil" and "I am of my Father, God" dualism. (See John 8:38-47.) In this dualism, however, all men were not considered earthly, as were the Pharisees alluded to here. Of Jesus' disciples, in a prayer to His Father and God, He said: "And the world hath hated them, because they are not of the world, even as I am not of the world" (John 17:14). What we see then, fundamentally, is that, according to John's Gospel, of the things that are (speaking with a grammatical interest), or (speaking with a metaphysical interest) of the things that be, some are in a condition or state called earthly and others are in the condition or state called heavenly. As regards being *per se,* ontologically this is a dualism.

Process in John's Gospel is the second example of dualism. Process has to do with the becoming of those who are mortal. Jesus speaks of two potencies in process and these constitute the processive bifurcation. He said: "It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing" (John 6:63). Also He said, "Labour not for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life, which the Son of man

shall give unto you" (John 6:27). Therefore, as there is a fundamental dualism of conditions or states, earthly and heavenly, there is a fundamental dualism of process, spirit and flesh. But man does not remain mortal man. Process, whichever one is operative in the case of a given individual, gives rise to consequences. This statement brings us to the third dualism in the metaphysics of John's Gospel, ends.

Simply put, what we have here is this. First there is being; something exists; more specifically, man is. Second, not only is man; he is in a process—that is, he is active and being acted upon; or, putting it otherwise, not only is man, but he is going, or more technically, becoming. Third, not only is man, and is he going, or becoming, but he is going someplace or becoming something. The point is, the processes result in ends. Jesus speaks of two ends, a dualism of ends. For example, He said, "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth in him" (John 3:36). Perhaps the statement which is as clear as any in John on this point is where Jesus was reported speaking on the eventual judgment of all mankind by Himself, the Son, and He said: "For the hour is coming in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, And shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation" (John 5:28-29). The dualism of ends is clearly distinguished as everlasting life and the wrath of God, or even more clearly, as the resurrection of life and the resurrection of damnation. So, in the condition or state of being, in process, and also in ends, in John's Gospel, we find dualisms.

In this brief paper I have attempted to point out some of the metaphysical aspects of the fourth gospel. Summarily, we have examined three basic concepts, being, relation, and duality. We considered being as it applies to Jesus, relation as it applies functionally between the Father and the Son, and duality as it is found in terms of condition or state of being, process, and ends.

There are other fascinating metaphysical concepts in the light or perspective of which the Johannine Gospel might be examined, such as unity, telology, causation, change, and

especially potency, but my study of that book in those terms, as well as those discussed in this paper, sustains the basic thesis of the entire Christian enterprise, that as far as man is concerned all things are oriented in Jesus the Christ.

Mormon Persecutions in Missouri, 1833

RICHARD L. BUSHMAN

The Mormon war in Missouri began in 1833 when the residents of Jackson County drove out the Mormons at gun point. Peace officers, militia leaders, ministers, and merchants joined the mobs. They broke into homes, whipped men and threatened women, destroyed the Mormon press, and tarred and feathered Latter-day Saint leaders. The Saints fled in all directions, most of them crossing the Missouri River into Clay County.

The Missourians were voluble about the causes of their enmity. Declarations adopted by mass meetings in Jackson County and articles by individual apologists described the sources of resentment: interference with Negroes, collusion with Indians, threatened armed aggression, the offensive religion of the Mormons, and their growing political power.[1]

To explain the settlers' hatred of the Mormons, some historians have simply repeated this list, safe in the assumption that some or all contributed to the outburst of violence.[2] But this conservative procedure leaves the episode in partial obscurity. A bare summary of causes gives no clear idea of the

---

Mr. Bushman is an assistant professor of history at Brigham Young University.

[1]Four documents describe mob feelings: Two manifestoes published by the mob in July 1833 before the expulsion, "The Manifesto of the Mob," and "Mormonism," are found in Joseph Smith, *History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints,* Salt Lake City, 1902, I, 374-6 and 395-9. "Mormonism," was published in the *Western Monitor,* Fayette, Mo., August 2, 1833. Isaac McCoy, a Jackson County minister, published an apologetic narration following the expulsion entitled, "The Disturbances in Jackson County." It appeared in the *Missouri Republican,* St. Louis, December 20, 1833, reprinted from the *Western Monitor.* Dale Morgan copied the *Missouri Republican* article into his "Transcripts of Articles on Mormonism and the Far West," a typescript in the Utah State Historical Society, Salt Lake City. Samuel D. Lucas, Jackson County merchant and later a militia general active in expelling the Saints from the State, wrote an article on "Jackson County" for the *Gazeteer of the State of Missouri,* compiled by Alphonse Wetmore, St. Louis, 1837, 92ff. Most of the article was given to describing the fantastic doctrines and moral depravity of the Mormons.

[2]For example, John Henry Evans, *Joseph Smith, an American Prophet,* New York, 1946, 105.

temper of the people who so readily took to arms to achieve their ends, nor of the relative importance of the forces acting on the Missourians.

Other historians in an attempt to evaluate the elements of controversy have selected the Negro issue as most fundamental. From a post-Civil War perspective, it has appeared credible that southern settlers would rise against a group of northerners accused of interfering with slaves. "Missouri's anti-Mormon outrages," writes one expert, "were the counterpart of the anti-abolition violence breaking out all over the country."[3]

This analysis makes the Jackson County persecutions intelligible; but such a reading of the evidence is questionable. A re-examination of the documents in an effort to sort and weigh the issues dividing Saint and gentile leads to another conclusion about the sources of conflict. Negroes indeed played a part, but it was not central. The Jackson County hatred for the Mormons was not peculiarly southern; it was rather of a piece with the forces that pursued the Saints to the end of the century.

I

In their manifestoes, the Jackson County citizens laid stress on Mormon subversion of slaves and the attempt to import free Negroes. But in fact the Mormons did not tamper with slaves and forcefully denied any intention of introducing free Negroes. Only one supposed incident backed up the complaint about subverting slaves. A Presbyterian minister, it was rumored, had said a Mormon encouraged a Negro to rebel, but when the Mormons interviewed the pastor, he denied the alleged accusation.[4]

The Mormons' enemies also pointed to an article on Negroes printed in the Latter-day Saints' newspaper, the *Evening and Morning Star*. In the summer of 1833 the *Star* had published the state laws restricting the entry of free Negroes, obviously with the purpose of discouraging the importation of colored people. "Slaves are real estate in this and other states,"

---

[3]William Mulder and A. Russell Mortensen (eds.) *Among the Mormons, Historic Accounts by Contemporary Observers*, New York, 1958, 77; cf. Ray Benedict West, *Kingdom of the Saints; the Story of Brigham Young and the Mormons,* New York, 1957, 45-6.

[4]*Evening and Morning Star,* Kirtland, Ohio, January, 1834, 243.

the article said, "and wisdom would dictate great care among the branches of the Church of Christ on this subject. . . . Shun every appearance of evil."[5] But for all its plainness, the article was interpreted by non-Mormon readers as an invitation to bring in free Negroes.

When the editor learned in early July how the mob leaders distorted his meaning, he rushed an extra into print. His intention, he said, "was not only to stop free people of color from emigrating to this state, but to prevent them from being admitted as members of the Church."[6] Though the Church did not oppose admission of Negroes, the editor in his anxiety to allay resentment, made the policy on the spot to quiet the settlers' suspicions. Despite his protestations, however, the Jackson citizens repeated their charges and a few days later destroyed the press.

Rumor alone could not have produced the violence. In this very decade, German immigrants were pouring into Missouri fresh from struggles for political liberty in Europe. They explicitly opposed slavery and actively sought to sway public opinion in this direction. They were far more likely objects of suspicion than the Latter-day Saints and yet suffered no physical persecutions. Like the Germans, the Saints were never guilty of tampering with slaves or importing free Negroes. But unlike the Germans, the Mormons expressly repudiated all abolitionist sentiments. If mere suspicion of interference with Negroes aroused Missourians to violence, the Germans should have been driven from the state before the Mormons.[7]

Though not the basic source of hatred, the Negro issue was played up in the manifestoes as a means of persuading the rest of the state that illegal violence was justified. The settlers needed public approval, to prevent intervention. If public opinion turned against Jackson County, the government could order in troops to restore the Mormons to their lands.

The manifestoes were self-conscious attempts to convince outsiders that the Mormons deserved eviction.One of them pre-

---

[5]"Free People of Color," in Smith, *History of the Church,* I, 378.

[6]*Evening and Morning Star* "Extra," July 18, 1833, in Smith, *History of the Church,* I, 379.

[7]Albert Bernhardt Faust, *The German Element in the United States,* Boston, 1909, I, 439-49.

tentiously declared that the move to rid the county of the Mormons "is justified as well by the law of nature, as by the law of self-preservation."[8] Not satisfied with a single statement, the mob leaders prepared an even lengthier, more formal "address to the public." It was proper, the citizens thought, "to lay before the public an expose [sic]" of their situation.

Professing to act "not from the excitement of the moment," but in "cool deliberation," they tried to explain why the Mormons deserved to be evicted.[9] The report shrewdly struck a note which would be sure to arouse anger throughout the state. The Mormons, it said, interfered with slaves and urged the immigration of free Negroes. Buttressed by these indictments, war with the Saints was made reasonable to the rest of the state.

II

These accusations heated tempers and added to anti-Mormon sentiment; but a more fundamental conflict raised the settlers' wrath to the point where unfounded accusations were accepted as fact: Jackson County gentiles feared the Mormons would soon dominate their society and government. The settlers believed, the Rev. Isaac McCoy reported, that the Mormons were unscrupulous in their determination "of getting entire possession of the county."[10] Jackson County drove out the Saints, another apologist said, in "self-defense."[11] This theme runs through both of the citizens' declarations in 1833. The Mormons were resolved, one of the statements said, to evict the old settlers by any means possible.[12]

There was real substance in the settlers' fears of Mormon domination. The Latter-day Saints themselves believed Mormon and gentile societies were incompatible. The revelations to Joseph Smith identified Jackson as Zion, and Zion was to be the abode of the righteous only.[13] If the gentiles did not leave, the Saints believed, the Lord would destroy them. When a cholera

---

[8]"The Manifesto of the Mob," in Smith, *History of the Church,* I, 374.
[9]"Mormonism," in Smith, *History of the Church,* I, 395-6.
[10]"Disturbances in Jackson County," in *Missouri Republican,* December 20, 1833.
[11]Lucas, "Jackson County," in Wetmore, *Gazeteer of Missouri,* 92ff.
[12]"Mormonism," in Smith, *History of the Church,* I, 396.
[13]Joseph Smith, *The Doctrine and Covenants of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints,* Salt Lake City, 1951, 46:67; 52:42.

epidemic threatened the county, one Latter-day Saint told McCoy that "this plague was for the destruction of the wicked, whilst. . . the righteous would escape."[14]

Similar predictions were often heard among the Saints. McCoy estimated the Mormons had declared "perhaps hundreds of times, that this county was theirs, the Almighty had given it to them, and that they would surely have entire possession of it in a few years."[15] "We are daily told," the settlers complained, "that we, (the Gentiles), of this county are to be cut off, and our lands appropriated by them for inheritances."[16] The Mormons declare openly, the "Manifesto of the Mob" said, "that their God hath given them this county of land, and that sooner or later they must and will have possession of our lands for an inheritance."[17]

No one seriously believed the Saints intended to gain power by force. The revelations specifically forbade them to shed blood to obtain Zion. The use of violence, they were warned, would bring the Lord's curse upon them.[18] Moreover, if the Saints were to raise their guns against the gentiles, obviously the county militia and all the forces of the state would mobilize at once for Jackson's defense. The gentles could have lightly passed off Mormon threats and prophecies if armed aggression was the Saints' only means of evicting the old settlers.

The actual basis of the settlers' fears was neither Negroes nor Mormon violence but the Mormons' growing political influence. Since the arrival of the first small band of Saints, a steady influx had swelled Mormon numbers to 1200, one third of the county's population.[19] And the end was not in sight. Through reading the *Star,* the citizens knew that the Church was actively proselyting through the north and east, recruiting more and more migrants to Missouri.[20] In a few years they would control schools, government and the courts.

> The day is not far distant [complained one declara-

---

[14]McCoy, "Disturbances in Jackson County," in *Missouri Republican,* December 20, 1833.
[15]*Ibid.,* December 20, 1833.
[16]"Mormonism," in Smith, *History of the Church,* I, 396.
[17]"Manifesto of the Mob," in Smith, *History of the Church,* I, 376.
[18]Smith, *Doctrine and Covenants,* 63:29-31.
[19]*Evening and Morning Star,* July, 1833.
[20]"Mormonism," in Smith, *History of the Church,* I, 397.

> tion] when the civil government of the county will be in their hands; when the sheriff, the justices, and the county judges will be Mormons, or persons wishing to court their favor . . . .[21]

It was the prospect of Mormon political supremacy which promised eventual dominance to the Saints and frightened the citizens into believing every rumor about Mormon audacity.

III

Many historians have recognized the threat to the settlers of Mormon political power, but they have not pointed out the implication of this fear. Why should the prevalence of Latter-day Saints in Jackson County so repel the citizens that they should offer to sell all their property rather than live under Mormon dominance? The Presbyterians and Methodists did not object to the predominance of Baptists, nor shrink at the prospect of Baptists governing them. No one cared if Episcopalians or Congregationalists migrated to Missouri and took office. In a land of religious tolerance, the faith of public officials supposedly mattered not at all. If the citizens of Jackson County had accepted the Saints as other denominations were accepted, no expulsion would have occurred. But the Mormons were different. The extraordinary character of Latter-day Saint doctrine distinguished the Mormons as outsiders who could not be trusted with political office.

Many people in the state sensed at once that the Mormons were driven out of Jackson County on account of their religion.[22] But the county could not justify its violence on these grounds. Religious toleration was too closely identified with the American constitution to be contradicted directly. McCoy did his best to counteract the impression of religious persecution, but it is evident in all the Jackson County statements.

The first charge of the "Manifesto of the Mob" was aimed at the Saints' religion. Mormons were "fanatics, or knaves," claiming to converse with God, heal the sick, and perform apostolic miracles. They blaspheme God, the "Manifesto" said, "and cast contempt on His holy religion" by their pretense to

---

[21]*Ibid.,* I, 397.

[22]McCoy, "Disturbances in Jackson County," in *Missouri Republican,* December 20, 1833.

direct inspiration, tongues, and by "the utter subversion of human reason."[23]

The second declaration of the mob tried lamely to disguise their hatred for the Mormon religion.

> Of their pretended revelations from heaven—their personal intercourse with God and His angels—the maladies they pretend to heal by the laying on of hands—and the contemptible gibberish with which they habitually profane the Sabbath, and which they dignify with the appellation of unknown tongues, we have nothing to say . . . .[24]

One of the county's apologists could not resist relating a scornful history of Mormon frauds, though he declined to descend to minutiae, "which would be as fatiguing as the detailed events of a wolf-hunt (including a biography of all the dogs). . . ."[25]

The Mormon threat was all the greater because the Saints could not be assimilated. The religious practices of the Mormons made them socially impenetrable. The settlers soon realized that Mormon clannishness would not diminish and that the Saints would never compromise their eccentric religious beliefs.

> We believed them deluded fanatics [the Mob Manifesto said], or weak and designing knaves, and that they and their pretensions would soon pass away; but in this we were deceived. The arts of a few designing leaders amongst them have thus far succeeded in holding them together as a society.[26]

The settlers felt the presence of this people characterized by "the profoundest ignorance," and "the grossest superstition" was not only a bane to society but destructive of sane government. Non-Mormons believed that men who thought God spoke with them might disregard all the standards of human decency: "The operation of fanatic zeal upon the human mind," Lucas declared, "will account for the seeming improbability and the audacity of the outrages contemplated . . . by this people."[27]

---

[23]"Manifesto of the Mob," in Smith, *History of the Church,* I, 375-6.
[24]"Mormonism," in Smith, *History of the Church,* I, 397-8.
[25]Lucas, "Jackson County," in Wetmore, *Gazeteer of Missouri,* 92ff.
[26]"Manifesto of the Mob," in Smith, *History of the Church,* I, 375.
[27]Lucas, "Jackson County," in Wetmore, *Gazeteer of Missouri,* 92ff.

One of the mob declarations specified vividly the horrors a Mormon majority would impose.

> What would be the fate of our lives and property, in the hands of jurors and witnesses, who do not blush to declare, and would not upon occasion hesitate to swear, that they have wrought miracles, . . . have conversed with God and His angels, and possess and exercise the gifts of divination and unknown tongues . . . ."[28]

Ultimately, then, it was religious differences that drove the settlers to expel the Mormons. The Latter-day Saints' belief in revelation and miracles set them off from the gentiles and aroused their disgust. Even before the full proportions of Mormon political power were evident, settlers brick-batted Mormon houses. More cool-headed citizens prevented further outbreaks for a time, but when it appeared that these outrageous extremists would soon assume political control, the county united to expel them. "The vexation that would attend the civil rule of these fanatics" was beyond the limits of toleration of all the settlers.[29]

Once disliked because of their religion and feared for their impending capture of political institutions, the Mormons could be believed capable of any atrocity. Mob leaders successfully propagated unfounded charges of tampering with slaves and planned armed aggression. These accusations added fuel to the fire first lighted by the religious differences between Mormon and gentile.

IV

Through all the persecutions from Jackson County to Utah, the conflict of Mormons and gentiles rested on an important assumption: the Latter-day Saints were an alien society. The mob declarations spoke of "their society" and "our society."[30] The Mormons were not simply deviants within the social group. They were outsiders whose actions did not follow the expected patterns of human behavior and who consequently could not be trusted.

---

[28]"Mormonism," in Smith, *History of the Church,* I, 397-8.
[29]*Ibid.,* I, 397.
[30]"Manifesto of the Mob," in Smith, *History of the Church,* I, 375.

The religion of the Saints, above all, defined their differences and estranged them from the gentiles. Clay County citizens frankly told the Mormons that their beliefs set them apart.

> The religious tenents of this people are so different from the present churches of the age, that they always have, and always will, excite deep prejudices against them in any populous county where they may locate.[31]

Wherever they settled, the Saints formed an enclave of religious enthusiasts within an essentially conservative protestant society.

Accustomed as the twentieth century is to economic explanations of human motivation, it is difficult to conceive how religion could move men to violence. It is necessary to think of the anti-Catholic sentiments of the Ku Klux Klan and of the animosity toward a Roman Catholic presidential candidate to realize the power religion still exercises in American society, especially in the South.

In the nineteenth century religion was of far greater import in both north and south. Theological differences heated the tempers of common men, and religious non-conformists provoked violence. In 1834 in Charlestown, Massachusetts, rioters burnt a Catholic convent. Horror stories purportedly from former nuns circulated widely, evoking organized efforts to preserve the nation from Roman idolatry. In the Know-Nothing movement, the Catholic menace became a political slogan.[32]

Rather than being the counterpart of anti-abolitionist uprisings, the persecutions of the Mormons were comparable to these religious antagonisms bursting forth in the 1830's. Both Catholics and Mormons departed radically from the normal pattern of Protestant belief. Both were suspected of plotting to usurp control of society.

The possibility of religious eccentrics dominating local government terrified each of the communities in which the Mormons lived. The basis of contention in 1838 was the entry of

---

[31]"Minutes of a Public Meeting at Liberty, Missouri," June 29, 1836, in Smith, *History of the Church,* II, 450-1.

[32]Ray Allen Billington, *The Protestant Crusade, 1800-1860,* New York, 1938, 41-53; W. Darrell Overdyke, *The Know-Nothing Party in the South,* Louisiana State University Press, 1950, 211-39.

the Saints into politics. (By then the Indian and Negro issues, really peripheral considerations in the first place, were in the background and soon to disappear.) In Illinois, the Mormons in state politics and their domination of Nauvoo were the causes of persecution. Even when the Saints had moved beyond the Rockies, the nation dispatched an army to deprive them of political control.

The Saints' vision of an earthly kingdom compelled them to seek a measure of political power. After their expulsion from Jackson County, the Mormons knew they must find a sanctuary where they could build their holy city; and only the state could assure them asylum. But Americans could not tolerate social control in Mormon hands. From the beginning until the last decade of the century, the fear of religious aliens in power lay at the heart of gentile hatreds and fears.

Salt Water Sunday

EILEEN GIBBONS

It did not help when Andrew said that Great Salt Lake was famous for its sunsets. Lola had no objection to pretty things. She always kept a bunch of flowers on the piano (crepe paper ones in the winter) and she had an eye for calendar pictures nice enough to frame. Right now, back home, there was a beautiful picture of a sunset hanging above the bed. But real, live sunsets take time, and Lola could not remember when she had ever had the leisure to stand and watch the sun go down.

The reasons, open-mouthed with awe, stood nearby. Six blue-eyed children—thoroughbreds, she called them, because they descended on all sides from grandfathers with not less than three wives and two foreign missions apiece. And any one of them, from Joe, the oldest, who was already a third-year deacon, down to Wayne, barely visible behind the baby he clutched tightly in front of him, could give an impromptu talk in sacrament meeting, bear a vibrant testimony that the Mormon Church was true, and lead in family prayer for a full five minutes. Lola didn't think you risked these things for money. Yet here they were standing among their boxed belongings on a railroad trellis in the exact middle of Great Salt Lake.

Water as flat as an ironing board, as blue as the rim on her rinse tub, reached in all directions, and under her feet was a rough wooden platform. A handful of buildings that looked as if they had been washed in by a wave stood before her and around their edges the platform narrowed into a railway. Lola looked down the tracks to the right, then the left, and saw the orange streamliner which had brought them fade into the distance.

"Well, dear, we're railroad station operators. This is it! This is our," Andrew laughed jerkily, "our summer home!" There were four houses but Andrew did not point. Theirs was obviously the hollow one. It was right in front of them, a flaked

---

Miss Gibbons is special instructor in English at Brigham Young University.

yellow: a "frame house," the man had said, "is provided with the position."

A glass-enclosed room jutted from the front of a house alarmingly close on the right. Inside, a woman in a peach-colored sweater and bobbed hair bent over a desk. "A Miss Price works the other shift. Want to talk to her?"

Lola was barely conscious of Andrew's words, but she knew that behind the controlled and casual rumble of his voice a middle-aged heart was leaping with the delight of something new, another experiment. She had learned long ago that summers off were the best thing about school teaching.

"Want to talk to her?" Andrew said.

She shook her head. "Not right now. Please, not right now, Andrew."

He swept his hand again and again over sparse black hair, finally destroying the wide part, and sat restlessly on one of the boxes. "I know it isn't fancy, Lola, but after you've seen a sunset," he laughed again, softly, "a sunset and of course, a pay check, dear, you won't mind the house. We've lived in places this bad before. Remember when we took that teaching job in Joseph City?"

She tried not to remember Joseph City, and at the same time she tried to smile. A smile would be appropriate, with Andrew laughing about everything, but a smile would not come. Surely he understood by now that she did not mind physical discomforts. Hard work was life. It was expected. It went with having big families.

She did mind spiritual discomforts. "Andrew, we're so far away from everything! I never dreamed we would be so far."

"Far? Twenty minutes?" Andrew's arm leveled stiff and bobbing in the direction from which they had come, the arm bands pulling at his shirt sleeves. "Twenty minutes down that track is Ogden! I tell you, Lola, the lake was practically the first thing the pioneers saw when they came into the Valley." His voice got louder; the high temper Lola blamed on eighteen years of eighth graders was in control. "I told you we could go to church! I told you we were right in the middle of Zion. What more do you want? For heaven's sake, dear, it took us almost thirty minutes to get to meeting at home by the time we got

Grandma Anderson up those confounded stairs!" Lola wished she had smiled when it would have helped. "Doesn't anybody trust me?" Andrew said as he looked about him, trying to catch the attention of the children. "This is the best summer job we have ever had, Lola, you *know* that." He stood up, as straight as a post. Lola knew he wished he were taller, or bigger through the shoulders like the early Church leaders who somehow governed their families without too much difficulty. She must have told him a hundred times, indirectly of course, that size did not matter. It was the soul of a man.

"I'm going to talk to Miss Price," he said, smoothing his sleeves. Lola watched the narrow back stiffen, then relax, as he walked away, and the hands slip nonchalantly into his pockets as he stepped, suddenly smiling again, through the door of the office.

Lola wanted nothing more than to be an understanding wife. A man was the head of the house, entitled to inspiration to guide it, and when the inspiration had obviously come— But she did not understand. Right this minute, for instance, she did not understand how he could smile at Miss Price.

"Your father is right, you know," she said aloud. But the children were not listening. They were peering over the edge of the platform into the salt water below or moving excitedly in and out of their summer home. Maybe Andrew was right. Land was not so far. You could see the Rockies in one direction, and maybe on a clear day the faint outline of buildings. She spoke loudly. "Come on, Joe. Everybody. Let's move in."

Joe began lifting boxes into the house. Barbara juggled Ted, and Harry carried loose books, violins, and swimming suits. Nanette tugged at Lola's arm. "Mother, there's a bathroom in there just like at Uncle Clifton's. Only you can see right through it. You can see the lake! Come and see. It's terrific!" Then Barbara came out and said soothingly, "It isn't such a bad house, Mother. It is kind of old, but there are lots of windows."

Wayne, who must have asked Andrew a hundred times (that had made him mad, too) if their house was really, honestly going to be right on a lake, just stood and stared, his mouth flopped full open and his eyes settled toward the west.

"Look, Mother. Look at those kids."

In front of the two smaller houses bunches of Mexican children peered from beneath uncombed bangs, their faces dirty and inquisitive. They were probably not Mormons. Lola smiled at them, then up toward the windows dried cloudy with salt spray. The plump faces of equally dark mothers pressed against the glass. Nodding recognition and waving briskly at the children, Lola took Wayne by the hand. "Come on, let's get settled so we can watch the sun go down."

As she unpacked she breathed deep the lake air and sent off a silent prayer. Even if the train would come back and take them home, back to a place where the hallowed ground of Zion was at least visible, to the violin lessons and the first beau Barbara had ever had whose father did not smoke, Lola saw in six pairs of blue eyes that nothing but a miracle could restore the stability she and Andrew had spent eighteen years cultivating.

The only thing to do was to unpack and live as near the Lord as possible, from one Sunday to the next, and try to save lots of money. On Sunday she would realize that of course they were really not very far from church and neighbors, they would be able to mingle with the saints, and everything would be fine. She could hardly wait.

By the time morning had filled and warmed the kitchen, Lola was scrubbing it. A square at a time she worked, half expecting the dark color to change. It did not, but it gave her a boost to know things were clean and that the corners had been gotten into. Clean corners made a clean room.

It gave her a boost, too, to think about last night. It had been a nice sunset. Evening and then the sun actually sliding off the edge of the water seemed to fix everything. The four houses made fairly impressive silhouettes after dark, and their lighted windows looked like squares of gold. It was even impossible to tell in the night that the Rocky Mountains could not be seen in all directions.

Best of all, Andrew had gotten tears in his eyes and just let them lie glistening in the long wrinkles of his cheeks. He always got tears in his eyes when he saw something really beautiful, or heard something very good, but last night he had put his arm around her waist, too, and held her tight at his side. Then she had nearly cried herself. She wasn't one to confuse

nature with God, but she was willing to give Him credit for sunsets if they would make a beau out of her husband.

She moved a fast, round rhythm across the floor. Andrew called her self-winding because when she really got working she started to sing. This time she slid into "She'll Be Comin' 'Round the Mountain" with such vigor that her voice soared through the house and beyond. Suddenly a smiling Andrew stood in the doorway.

"Happy, dear?"

Lola frowned. Even if he was right, there had to remain a difference between putting up with things and singing about them. She did not answer.

"Well, there's nothing to the job," he said. "We're getting paid for doing practically nothing."

Lola looked up at her husband. "Andrew, I hope we have time to watch the sun go down again."

He laughed aloud then. "Have time? Lola, Miss Price says that's all there is to do! Except of course eat and sleep."

"There is work, too, Andrew. The house is a mess."

"Look, if I know you," Andrew said, "we're going to have the house work done by the time today is over. Besides, the place isn't worth fixing up. We're going to have so much time we won't know what to do with it." He sounded as if he knew.

"But what about the children? Children have to have jobs."

"Wayne said he's going fishing. Did you hear him say that?" Andrew laughed again. Lola could not remember when he had laughed so much. "The kids are wild about the place, aren't they?"

"Joe isn't. He read magazines during the sunset."

"Don't let that frown fool you. He loves it. He's just stubborn."

Lola wished she could just say, "Yes, Andrew," and let it go at that. "I will not have the children idle all day."

"Okay, okay. You can find something for them to do if anybody can."

"I wish we had known. We could have brought some jobs. I've got jobs—"

"Well, we didn't," Andrew interrupted. His voice had a little snap to it now, but immediately it softened. "Lola, if you

want to, we can have a meeting, a family meeting, and talk about it."

"Andrew!" Lola rose quickly to her feet, tossing her head so that the brown hair fell long as she pulled a heavy net away and stuffed it into her apron pocket. Her mind filled with pictures of all eight of them, seated and attentive, solemnly discussing idleness. Family meetings were a commandment few Latter-day Saints were able to keep.

"Andrew, that's a wonderful idea!" She wanted to throw her arms around him, kiss shut the eyes that told her he knew darn well it was a wonderful idea. She had known all along that he did not mean it when he said parliamentary procedure in the living room was nonsense.

"It ought to take a while, too," Andrew said. "Maybe we could kill an hour or two a day with meetings."

Lola wished he would not joke about spiritual things, but she could not worry about that now. "Think of the unity! Think of it, Andrew!" Lola whipped about the kitchen, humming freely now, finishing her song.

"Well, it's an idea anyway," Andrew chuckled as he left. "I'll gather up the family."

Lola sparkled inside. They were isolated, but they were together, and Andrew had been right after all. What could better tide them over from Sunday to Sunday than family meetings?

By the time all of them were on their knees for morning prayers, a sign had been posted on the wall:

FAMILY MEETING AT 7:30, OR
IMMEDIATELY AFTER SUNSET
AGENDA: LEISURE

And by meeting time that night, not only was everyone ready and waiting, but to the agenda had been added

WHAT SHALL WE DO WITH TED?

Lola was sure there was a scripture that said the power of Satan would be upon the waters, and her mind darted right to it when Harry suggested that they tie Ted to a post so he would not drown.

"No," Lola said. There was silence. "We won't have that,

will we, Andrew?"

Wayne, holding Ted as usual, leaned from behind him. "There's no saving anyone head first in salt water, Mom. You ought to go swimming and see. There'd be no saving him if he fell in."

"It's just that tying him up isn't right, that's all." She thought she said it simply enough, with conviction enough, that there could be no question.

Andrew looked thoughtfully at the floor. He always looked at the floor, or at the ceiling, when he was thinking. "He is going to tumble off the bridge one of these days if we don't do something, I'm afraid," he said, still looking up, then down.

"Why can't we just watch him? Between seven of us, we ought to be able to watch him," Lola said.

Andrew stood up. He always stood up when he had made up his mind. "Lola, family." He paused. "I think that since the back yard is a twenty-foot drop to the lake, and the front yard is a railroad track, and since Teddy doesn't know the train schedule," he stopped to laugh, "I'm afraid we are going to have to tie him to something."

"But Andrew! He is a child of God. A little human being. He isn't a dog!"

"Well, Lola, since he doesn't know that yet, and since it is just for the summer, I don't think it would hurt anybody to tie him up."

Lola looked at her oldest son. He didn't talk much, but when he did he was usually sensible.

"What do you think, Joe?"

"Faith or fences, eh," he said. Barbara giggled. She was Joe's greatest fan.

"That's right," nodded Lola. "Do we have faith or don't we?"

Joe tipped his chair back against the wall. "We could leash him."

"That's the same thing," Lola said. Andrew said it was not. "If we leash him, dear, at least we can assign shifts. It will give the family something to do." The family did not want something to do. Harry said he was not going to be any baby tender, and the girls nodded in support until Andrew reminded them

that Wayne was right; there would be no saving Ted in salt water.

Lola knew it was decided, and she did not want to doubt Andrew, but she felt she must give in reluctantly, and even while she was sure that come evening prayers she would say she was sorry, she had to comment, "Well, some Latter-day Saints might do it."

Then she assigned jobs. Barbara was the best swimmer and was therefore to retrieve whatever Ted threw overboard, especially his diapers. Nanette was to scrub a certain portion of the walls each day. Joe had said that whoever built the massive bridge without stringing one little electric light wire to Midlake was a stupid fool, so he was given charge of the lanterns. Wayne would empty the pan under the ice box, even though there were two cracks in the floor beside it, and Harry would shake the rugs and wind the clocks. Everybody would take a shift at Ted's leash, and would try, insofar as possible, to keep busy.

Not only was it one of the longest family meetings they had ever had, but nobody left. Andrew was jubilant.

"We got a lot done, didn't we?" Andrew said as he climbed into bed. "I wonder if Miss Price heard us singing. I wonder what she thought if she did."

"Harry said she has ash trays all over her house, and a parakeet." Lola had heard about women who would rather have parakeets than children.

"Maybe we can invite her over next time," Andrew said. "It wouldn't be so bad being away from everything if we could convert somebody."

"We mustn't forget though that there is no substitute for being with the saints. Even family meetings don't make up for good neighbors and going to church."

Andrew's voice came right back, annoyed and tired. "I wonder if you will live until Sunday, for heaven's sake."

"Thank goodness it's almost here," Lola mumbled. It seemed an eternity. Three days. Three days of idleness, scrubbing walls that had already been scrubbed while wool batts and quilt tops waited at home to be stitched—an eternity until they could worship with the saints, and meanwhile Ted leashed all

the time. Somehow it seemed dishonest to be so anxious for the Lord's day if you sinned in the week.

"Lola, did you notice nobody left family meeting? Not even Joe?"

Lola nodded. Of course she had noticed. There was no place to go. But it had been impressive just the same.

"If we keep having problems, we will probably get into the habit of meetings by the time we go home," Andrew said.

Lola nodded again. She closed her eyes and went to sleep hoping there would be problems.

Thursday morning Nanette got splinters during family prayer and asked if it would be all right to make kneeling pads for everybody. Lola went to the kitchen wall and posted an agenda:

ARE KNEELING PADS RITUAL?

And when Nanette came back later and said that Tony Martinez had told Barbara she was the prettiest girl he had ever seen, Lola wrote below it:

TONY

"Barbara said she likes him, too," Nanette added, and Lola added:

NON-MORMON INFLUENCES IN GENERAL

Friday it was Wayne. "Mom, Mrs. Martinez won't let us use any more clear water. She said we can only rinse off the salt once a day." Lola went to the agenda wall:

CLEAR WATER AND MRS. MARTINEZ

Saturday Wayne said, "Mother, when is it Sunday? Can we go home on Sunday?" And Lola decided it would be good to have a meeting about Sunday. She did not want to seem ungrateful. She was thankful for the compensations, that they had had four family meetings, time to read *The Improvement Era* from cover to cover, and even time for sunsets. But there was no substitute for a real, live Sabbath.

Sunday morning everybody except Andrew, who had to work and refused even to discuss it because it would not do any good, got ready for Sunday School. It was Joe's day to take a bath, and he was the last one ready. While he labored with wavy hair that would not lie flat, Lola went into the small office where Andrew was typing train messages and told him

not to forget to stop the 9:20 so they could go into Ogden to church.

Andrew looked at the train schedule for a long time, then stood up and moved about the office, apparently in deep thought. Finally he looked toward Lola, but his glance spun by her.

"Dear, I've been thinking. All morning I've been thinking."

Lola adjusted her hat and balanced the hat pin in her teeth. "Is my hat even, Andrew?"

He looked at her a full second this time, then away. "Dear, do you think it is wise?"

"What?"

"Well, stopping the 9:20."

Lola stared. How else were they to get to church?

"I said, do you think that is wise, Lola? I mean, our first week, dear. I didn't realize it, but that's a ninety-car train. You don't just flag a ninety-car train twenty minutes from its destination and say you want to go to Sunday School, do you?"

Lola thought you did. She thought you did anything for the true Church, and she stood silent and unbelieving. By now all six children, Wayne pulling Ted, had crowded into the small office and surrounded her. They looked smileless at their father. Lola did not want to argue in front of them, but if Andrew would not seek first the Kingdom, she would have to.

"Andrew! It is Sunday morning!"

Andrew sat down. His expression was kind but firm, and he said, "Look, family, I'm sorry. I'm very sorry, but I guess we won't be able to go to church today." He paused. Lola did not say anything. She just stood there and looked at him. It was the first time he had sat down when his mind was made up. "Maybe sometime during the summer we can get Miss Price to work Sunday morning," he said, "and then I'll stop the train and explain to the conductor, and we will all go to Sunday School. Okay?"

"Okay," Wayne said, and Barbara nodded. Joe walked out.

"That's all right," said Wayne, patting his father on the knee, and Nanette said, "Don't worry, Daddy, it's all right." One by one they disappeared in the direction of the house.

Andrew looked up at Lola and tried to say with his eyes that inspiration had come. "Dear, this is one of the sacrifices. We decided there would be sacrifices. Remember?" Lola looked toward the door and the disappearing children, her starched and curled thoroughbreds. "They'll get over it," Andrew said.

Lola backed toward the door. "Heaven help us if they do," she said weakly, prayerfully. Before she was back into the house the tears came, and the more the children said, "It's all right, Mother, we don't care," the harder she cried.

She tried to remember that it was the Sabbath. She gathered the children about her in the biggest of the two medium large rooms and led them in all four verses of "We Thank Thee, O God, for a Prophet." Nanette prayed and they read the story of Alma's conversion from *The Book of Mormon*. Then they sang the first verse of "We Thank Thee, O God, for a Prophet" again because that was the only church song Wayne knew. Eating took a certain amount of time, and Lola began to wonder what they would do when Fast Sunday came. Maybe that would be the best day to stop the streamliner.

"I can't think of any more spiritual things to do," she told Andrew when he got off work. He could. He told faith-promoting stories about everything from healings to Aunt Rachel's finally getting a husband. Then he read from a book of pioneer stories he had brought, "with great foresight," Lola interrupted, and ended up by telling all of the good things he could remember about his missionary experiences in New Mexico.

The sunset was the nicest yet, and Lola felt sure as she got into bed that if the Sabbath could be kept holy without any of it being spent in church, they had done it. She did not know when she had been more thankful to have a day end, though, and she told the Lord so unashamedly.

"Andrew," she said as she turned off the lantern. "Andrew, even if it was all right to miss church, the bishop would die. Bishop Perkins wouldn't understand at all if he knew that not one of us—"

"Listen, Lola, I knew Bishop Perkins when he didn't know who went to church because he wasn't there. I remember when he—"

"Andrew!"

"I'm sorry, dear."

Long after Lola thought Andrew had gone to sleep and left her to worry alone, he said, "Lola, can't you see his cheeks, red like they get?"

"Whose?"

"Bishop Perkins'," Andrew laughed softly. "Lola, I think I'll go see him when we get back and tell him we haven't been to church once all summer. Just to see how he looks. You know."

Lola didn't answer. There are times when a wife should not. But she buried her face in the pillow and tried to remember whether the sunset hanging on the wall at home was yellow or pink or both. She pretended that if she lit the lantern, she could look and see.

Theory and Practice of Church and State During the Brigham Young Era

J. Keith Melville

The doctrinal ideas of nineteenth-century Mormonism were unique in many respects. Fundamentally it was a religious movement, propounding distinctive tenets as to deity, revelation, priesthood, and so on, but it also contained significant economic, social, and political ideological overtones. Much attention has been drawn to certain religious, economic, and social facets of Mormonism, but comparatively little to its political concepts.

The ultimate political goal of the Latter-day Saints was to establish the Kingdom of God on earth in order that the "kingdom of heaven may come" and that the millennial reign of Jesus Christ begin.[1] Restricted Christian concepts of a spiritual kingdom were expanded to include an earthly kingdom with all of the political connotations of existing political systems. Suggestive of this was the interesting organization known as the Council of Fifty, which was considered as the legislature of the Kingdom of God.[2] This kingdom, a politico-religious organization of world-wide proportions as conceived by the Mormons, was ultimately to assume sovereignty over all of the kingdoms of the world. Illustrative of this view was

---

Dr. Melville is assistant professor of political science at Brigham Young University.

[1]*The Doctrine and Covenants of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints* (Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1947), Section 65.

[2]Initiatory explorations of the political significance of the Council of Fifty have been made by Hyrum Andrus, *Joseph Smith and World Government* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Company, 1958); James R. Clark, "The Kingdom of God, the Council of Fifty and the State of Deseret," *Utah Historical Quarterly, XXVI* (1958), 130-148; and Klaus J. Hansen, "The Theory and Practice of the Political Kingdom of God in Mormon History, 1829-1890" (Thesis, Brigham Young University, 1959); but speculative leaps result from the incomplete sources of information. A definitive study is yet to be written.

a letter of Parley P. Pratt to Queen Victoria of England in which he invited her and her nation to join this momentous revolution. "Know assuredly," he wrote, "that the world in which we live is on the eve of a REVOLUTION, more wonderful in its beginning—more rapid in its progress—more lasting in its influence—and more important in its consequences,—than any which man has yet witnessed upon the earth; a revolution in which all the inhabitants of the earth are vitally interested, both religiously and politically—temporally and spiritually; one on which the fate of all nations is suspended, and upon which the future destiny of all the affairs of earth is made to depend."[3] He warned the "Sovereign and people" of England to repent and turn to the Lord. As the elements of clay and iron will not mix, neither will there be unity of the independent kingdoms of the world. He concluded: "The kingdoms of *this world shall become the kingdoms of our God and his Christ.*"[4]

The leaders of the Church believed that the kingdom began with the establishment of the Church and that it would grow to its grandiose proportions at the advent of the Savior, when He would rule as king. In the interim converts of the Mormon proselyters not only joined a religious movement, but became citizens in the newly established kingdom.

How did this basic notion of the Kingdom of God equate with the American ideas of freedom of religious worship and separation of church and state?[5] A review of Mormon history down to the death of Joseph Smith points out the fact that much of the turbulence can be traced to political conflicts, especially to interpretations or misinterpretations of the political beliefs and ambitions of the Mormons as an attempt to unite church and state. What were the attitudes of the Mormon

---

[3]Parley P. Pratt, *To Her Gracious Majesty, Queen Victoria* (Manchester: P. P. Pratt, 1841), p. 1. See also *Times and Seasons,* III, 592.

[4]*Ibid.,* Italics in original.

[5]It should be noted that the First Amendment limitation on the federal government that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof . . ." interpreted historically suggests it was not a statement of separation of church and state, but a protection of the established state religions in the individual states. However, the ideas of freedom of religious worship and the merger of church and state were generally considered as contradictory.

leaders in general and Brigham Young in particular on this issue?

The first adherents to Mormonism were New Yorkers of New England origin who were deeply steeped in the American tradition. Not only was the Constitution of the United States revered as an excellent framework of government; the Church believed it was divinely inspired.[6] In addition, the philosophy of the Mormons was one of compliance with and obedience and subjection to the laws of the land. The perceptible exception was applied to governmental authorities who, according to the Mormons, acted illegally or unconstitutionally.

When the Mormons did not receive what they thought were their rights from the governmental authorities, they were not reluctant to enter the struggle of politics. They attempted to use their influence with the federal government when seeking redress of their Missouri grievances. They gained a charter for the city of Nauvoo with wide powers because they held the balance of power between the two existing political parties in Illinois. When this position of political strength ebbed from them during the last days in Nauvoo, the Mormons actively sought political support from the federal government once again. As the election of 1844 approached, a canvas of the probable candidates brought little hope of support for the Mormon interests from any of them. A plan to promote Joseph Smith as a candidate for President of the United States marshalled the proselyting energies of at least 244 and possibly as many as 340 of the Mormon Elders to spread the political program of Joseph Smith throughout the United States, as well as preach the gospel. Brigham Young, because of his position as President of the Twelve Apostles, became an active political campaign manager stumping the eastern states in behalf of his "prophet and politician."

Smith's candidacy raised the issue of church and state in the 1844 campaign and no doubt increased the fears of his opponents as to political intentions. He suggested his political desires in an address to a group of workmen on the Temple in Nauvoo in 1843:

---

[6]*Doctrine and Covenants,* Sections 98 and 101.

> There is one thing more I wish to speak about, and that is political economy. It is our duty to concentrate all our influence to make popular that which is sound and good and unpopular that which is unsound. 'Tis right, politically, for a man who has influence to use it, as well as for a man who has no influence to use his. From henceforth I will maintain all the influence I can get. In relation to politics, I will speak as a man; but in relation to religion I will speak in authority.[7]

Fears that Smith would unite church and state if made President of the United States were no doubt amplified by his statement:

> As the "*World is governed too much*" and as there is not a nation or dynasty, now occupying the earth, which acknowledges Almighty God as their law giver, and as "crowns won by blood, by blood must be maintained," I go emphatically, virtuously, and humanely, for a THEODEMOCRACY, where God and the people hold the power to conduct the affairs of men in righteousness.[8]

Did this mean the election of Joseph Smith would bring to the head of the United States a person who professed to commune with God, to report His will and desires, to direct affairs of state in a religious way, and ultimately merge *sacerdotium et imperium?* Many were fearful that it did. The Latter-day Saints would have welcomed it, but what they would have welcomed was far removed from what they detected as the despotism which resulted from the theocracies of the Old World, or nations where the "two swords" were wielded by one sovereign.

What the Latter-day Saints visualized was a balance. Religion was not to be aligned with the state in any dangerous or oppressive manner. They feared that the opposite was actually taking place. An editorial in the *Times and Seasons* in March of 1844, contained the following:

> No one can be more opposed to an unhallowed alliance of this kind than ourselves; but while we would deprecate

---

[7]Joseph Smith, *History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Period I,* ed. B. H. Roberts (2nd ed.; 6 vols.; Salt Lake City: Deseret News Press, 1946, ff.), V, 286. This history and a seventh volume covering the Apostolic Interregnum are commonly known as the *Documentary History of the Church* and hereafter will be cited as DHC.

[8]*Times and Seasons,* V, 510. Italics in original.

an alliance having a tendency to deprive the sons of liberty of their rights, we cannot but think that the course taken by many of our politicians is altogether culpable, that the division is extending too far, and that in our jealousy lest a union of this kind should take place, we have thrust out God from all of our political movements, and seem to regard the affairs of the nation as that over which his direction or interposition, never should be sought, and as a thing conducted and directed by human wisdom alone.[9]

As early as 1835 the Church in a general assembly held at Kirtland, Ohio, had adopted by unanimous vote a declaration of belief regarding governments and laws in general which stated: "We do not believe it just to mingle religious influence with civil government, whereby one religious society is fostered and another proscribed in its spiritual privileges, and the individual rights of its members, as citizens, denied."[10] In 1841 a city ordinance was passed in Nauvoo which allowed religious freedom to all faiths. In fact, what the Saints wanted was the same opportunity. But these positions did not seem inconsistent in any way to the Mormons that governments should be guided and directed by principles of righteousness as indicated in the following editorial: "Certainly if any person ought to interfere in political matters it should be those whose minds and judgments are influenced by correct principles—religious as well as political; otherwise those persons professing religion would have to be governed by those who make no professions; be sub-

---

[9]*Ibid.,* V. 470. Joseph Smith organized a "special council" on March 11, 1844, which was usually called the General Council or the Council of Fifty. DHC, VI, 260, 61. Its immediate purpose was to assist in locating the Saints in the West and determine the policy to pursue in maintaining the individual rights of the Mormons. Ultimately this council was to be the legislature of the Kingdom of God. DHC, VII, 379. Even though its primary responsibility appears to be political, the position of Andrus, *op. cit.,* that there was a separation of church and state during the theocratic period of 1844-49 cannot be supported convincingly. (Discussions with Dr. Andrus following the publication of his book have resulted in a modification of his earlier views on church and state.) A survey of the meetings of the Apostles, the High Council, and the General Council during this period makes it obvious that religious *and* political matters were considered in the sessions of all three councils. Even though the General Council might have non-Church members on it, Parley P. Pratt pointed out in an address in the Valley on October 10, 1847, that the General Council included the Twelve, without which the Council was powerless, it appears. See "Journal of C. C. Rich," *MS,* on file in the Church Historian's Office for an outline of Pratt's address.

[10]*Doctrine and Covenants,* 134:9.

ject to their rule; have the law and word of God trampled under foot. . . ."[11]

It was difficult to separate spiritual and temporal affairs in the "mind of Mormonism." In fact the theology of Mormonism of the formative period brought a closeness of God to man; it was an earthly philosophy of life as well as metaphysics; the "heavenly city" of Christianity was moved to earth and a utopian society was thought to be within the realm of time as well as eternity. If this was so ideologically, it was emphasized by certain practical developments forced upon the Latter-day Saints.

The death of Joseph Smith did not result in the extinction of Mormonism as the anti-Mormon forces may have expected, and shortly thereafter violence again became common to western Illinois. The Mormons drew within the shell of their city and sought measures of self-defense. Governor Ford charged both sides with subverting the law in the court trials which took place in Hancock county. He concluded:

> From henceforth no leading man on either side could be arrested without the aid of an army, as the men on one party could not safely surrender to the other for fear of being murdered. . . . No one would be convicted of any crime in Hancock; and this put an end to the administration of criminal law in that distracted county. Government was at an end there, and the whole community were delivered up to the dominion of a frightful anarchy.[12]

This county-wide anarchy reduced the effective processes of government having jurisdiction over the Saints to the city government of Nauvoo. Before the death of Joseph Smith there were indications of a theocratically controlled city. The city officials were predominantly the leaders of the Church. The situation following the death of the Mormon prophet increased the active participation of the Church in political affairs. Nevertheless the city council of Nauvoo continued to function and carry out its duties in a manner not much different from that in most communities.

---

[11]*Times and Seasons,* V, 471.

[12]Thomas Ford, *A History of Illinois from Its Commencement as a State in 1818 to 1847* (Chicago: S. C. Griggs and Company, 1854), p. 369.

A political vacuum was not created until the legislature of Illinois repealed the Nauvoo charters. Two propositions were before legislature: one for absolute repeal, the other for repeal of the supposedly mischievous features. Governor Ford in his special message on Hancock county affairs recommended the latter action. This position had support from others in the government, but the anti-Mormon faction in the legislature was in control. "On the 21st of January, 1845, the repeal act was passed by a vote of 76 to 36; and subsequently it passed the senate by a large majority."[13] At this point the city of Nauvoo was reduced to the necessity of setting up town governments with a justice of the peace being the most responsible officer under the general law. It would have required twelve towns to cover the entire city.[14] This inadequate situation resulted in a virtual political vacuum, which was promptly filled by the organizations of the Church.

Brigham Young, as the President of the Twelve Apostles, assumed the responsibility of at least maintaining the peace in Nauvoo. The interesting way in which this was handled is illustrated by the following entries in Brigham Young's history:

> Monday, March 24, 1845. In company with the Twelve Apostles I attended a meeting at the Concert Hall in the evening. We ordained bishops who were directed to set apart deacons in their wards to attend to all things needful and especially to watch; being without any city organization, we deemed it prudent to organize the priesthood more strictly that the peace and good order hitherto sustained by the city might still be preserved.[15]
>
> Monday, April 14, 1945. Elder Richards and I attended the deacon's meeting. The deacons have become very efficient looking after the welfare of the saints; every part of the city is watched with the strictest care, and whatever time of night the streets are traveled at the corner of every block a deacon is found attending to his duty.[16]
>
> As the repeal of our City Charter has deprived us of our military organization, the following was issued by the council:—

---

[13]Th. Gregg, *History of Hancock County* (Chicago: Chas. C. Chapman and Co., 1880), p. 336.

[14]DHC, VII, 400, records that a small portion of the city was incorporated as the town of Nauvoo, April 16, 1845.

[15]DHC, VII, 388.

[16]DHC, VII, 399.

To Charles C. Rich:

President of all the Organized Quorums of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in Hancock County.

Greeting: You are hereby instructed to hold the same [*i.e.,* the quorums of the priesthood] in readiness for all duties that shall be necessary in all emergencies.

Done at the 'City of Joseph' this 14th day of September, A. D. 1845.

[signed] BRIGHAM YOUNG, President.[17]

In October, a great anti-Mormon convention met in Carthage. Nine counties were present, with Hancock county excepted and excluded. The committee concluded that the Mormons must leave the state, and appealed to the surrounding counties to accept the Mormon proposal to remove from the state the next spring. Pressures mounted, however, resulting in an earlier and major exodus from Nauvoo in February, 1846.

In this situation of emergency proportions, the theocratic civil government approached a system of theocratic martial law. On February 17, 1846, Brigham Young counseled the group which was assembling in the territory of Iowa as to order in camp, deportment, and conduct: "We will have no laws we cannot keep, but we will have order in the camp. If any want to live in peace . . . they must toe the mark."[18] This semblance of a military organization was preferred *en marche,* Brigham Young being unanimously elected president over the whole "camp of Israel" on March 27. The camp marched to Council Bluffs, later crossing over to the west side of the Missouri river to make winter settlement on Indian lands. The organization for and the conduct of the great exodus from Winter Quarters, as this last settlement was called, to the Great Basin was accomplished in military fashion.[19]

The Saints in their temporary location at Winter Quarters were governed by the ecclesiastical authorities—generally by the Twelve Apostles and the Council of Fifty and locally by the High Council and bishops. Urging from the Indian agents forced the Saints to leave the Omaha Indian lands in the spring of 1848. Those who could not go to the Great Basin were to

---

[17]DHC, VII, 443, 44.
[18]DHC, VII, 586.
[19]*Doctrine and Covenants,* Section 136.

move to the east side of the river. On Saturday, December 25, 1848, a meeting was held in the Log Tabernacle. "The congregation voted that the High Council on the east side of the river have all municipal power given to them by this people, and that the bishops' courts have authority as civil magistrates among the people, until the laws of Iowa are extended over us."[20]

The Iowa legislature of 1847 had made provision for the organization of counties out of the Pottawattamie lands, but partisan politics between the Whigs and the Democrats held this up for some time, and even after the county was organized, the High Council acted politically as well as religiously. This practice was typical of other Mormon settlements across Iowa as well. In addition to the legislative function of determining policy, the High Council was administratively responsible. It selected the necessary administrative officals such as the marshals, recorders, and so on. Policy administration was buttressed by a fully developed court system which utilized the different echelons of church organization. The following judical commission is an interesting example:

> Bro. L. T. Coons: You are hereby authorized to choose you two counselors and act in the capacity of Bishop in all civil cases, cases of difference, debts, immoral conduct, etc., among the brethren. Do all things in righteousness and see that the law of God is honored, and the Lord bless you in so doing. Amen.
>
> Done by order of the High Council of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints on the Pottawattomie Lands, this 22 day of January, A. D. 1848.[21]

The bishops' courts during this theocratic period were aided in the execution of their decisions by marshals, duly appointed or elected, who meted out corporal punishment. This administrative task, although indispensable, was entirely foreign to the priestly structure. The Church rule provided for punishment only through excommunication or some degree of disfellowship: coercion is the tool of the state. The Saints were conscious

---

[20]DHC, VII, 623.

[21]"Pottawattomie High Council Record," p. 78, as found in Therald N. Jensen, "Mormon Theory of Church and State" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1938), p. 46.

of this blending of civil and ecclesiastical offices. The members spoke of their "city corporation," and referred to their high council as a "Municipal High Council."

The following ordinance enacted by the High Council in the "Log Tabernacle," January 1, 1848, points out the merger of church and state convincingly:

> Be it ordained by the High Council of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints: Residents upon the Pottawattomie lands. That any person belonging to said church (who) shall steal from the Brethren, he or she, shall pay four fold the amount, or in case they have not the amount of property they shall receive not exceeding thirty-nine lashes and if they shall steal from a person not belonging to the church but living among us they shall make satisfaction to the person from whom they have stolen and then receive not exceeding thirty-nine lashes, or if they shall go to Missouri, Iowa, or any other place where there is jurisdiction of civil laws and there steal and come up here upon their being demanded and satisfaction given to this Council by the person coming and identifying the property and the person they shall be given up to the laws where they have transgressed for trial.[22]

Therald Jensen felt the above quotation revealed that the Mormon Church in assuming theocratic jurisdiction was operating in default rather than in defiance of the civil government. As this may be, the need for governmental arrangements journeyed with the Saints to their mecca in the Great Salt Lake Valley. In this semi-isolated situation, were the Saints to realize their political ideal, the Kingdom of God? A theocratic government similar to that of the Iowa settlements was organized, but an overt attempt to establish the Kingdom did not immediately materialize.

When the pioneers arrived in the Valley, all activities were sponsored by the Church.[23] Brigham Young proclaimed the first "land law" of Utah on July 25, and subsequent proclamations "announced there would be no private ownership in the

---

[22]*Ibid.,* p. 49.

[23]More detailed accounts of this theocratic period in Utah can be found in Dale Morgan, "The State of Deseret," *Utah Historical Quarterly,* VIII, 67-83; and Andrew Love Neff, *History of Utah: 1847 to 1869,* edited and annotated by Leland Hargrave Creer (Salt Lake City: Deseret News Press, 1940), pp. 107-112.

water streams; that wood and timber would be regarded as community property."[24] The site for the temple as well as proposals of a city planning type were presented to the camp which "passed all of the above votes unanimously, as they are recorded."[25]

In August of 1847, Brigham Young and certain other pioneer leaders prepared to return to Winter Quarters. Before doing so, they organized the Salt Lake Stake of Zion. John Smith was selected to be the president, and other leading men were nominated to the presidency and High Council. The selection of this governing body, which was the repository of political as well as religious authority, was approved by a vote of the Saints in the October conference.[26] Administrative officers, when the need dictated their selection, served under the direction of the stake authorities. Political, social, and economic regulatory measures were imposed to promote the welfare of the whole community. Pragmatically, the needs of the community, spiritual or political, were met without conscious concern for the principle of separation of church and state.[27]

The consciousness of the need of a formal civil code to integrate the members of the community was early indicated in the meetings of the High Council. A law committee was appointed "to draft laws for the government of the people in the valley" in a meeting of October 9, 1847. This committee failed to report because of want of time, and another committee was created December 26, 1847, to "draft such laws as were needed immediately."[28] Positive action resulted from the work of this committee and a civil code for the inhabitants of the Valley was theodemocratically begun as indicated by the following:

---

[24]A summation of the initial activities of the Saints in the Salt Lake Valley can be read in B. H. Roberts, *A Comprehensive History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints: Century I.* (6 vols; Salt Lake City: Deseret News Press, 1930), III, 269.

[25]"Journal History of the Church," July 28, 1847, p. 2. Hereafter cited JH. See also the "Journal of Wilford Woodruff," July 28, 1847.

[26]JH, October 4, 1847.

[27]The records of the period indicate, however, that the democratic political process was not extinguished as a result of the blending of church and state as the people participated in elections and popularly approved many of the policies initiated by the High Council. The "voice of the Church" at this point was also the voice of the people politically.

[28]JH, October 9, 1847, p. 1; December 26, 1847, p. 1.

> We the High Council of the Great Salt Lake City, in the absence of an organized jurisdiction of any Territory, for the peace, welfare and good order of our community proceed to enact the following laws, for the government and regulation of the inhabitants of this city and valley for the time being, subject to the approval of the people.[29]

The ordinances enacted were concerned with (1) vagrants, (2) disorderly or dangerous persons and disturbers of the peace, (3) adultery and fornication, (4) stealing, robbing, housebreaking or maliciously causing the destruction by fire of any property, and (5) drunkenness. Penalties were established commensurate with each offense. Compulsory work, lashes not to exceed thirty-nine on the bare back, fines not to exceed $1,000, and restoration of stolen property four-fold were the teeth to back up the ordinances.[30] These devices of compulsion and force were antithetical to the principles of love, persuasion, and long suffering which characterized the operation of the priesthood. The Church organizatiion was clearly assuming the political role of the state.

Development of needed roads and irrigation canals and the fencing of fields both private and public were accomplished by community action. The resources of the Church, which in this early western period were by and large the labor of the members, were used for public and ecclesiastical purposes without distinction. Roads and bridges to be built by voluntary labor did not materialize as rapidly as desired, which resulted in the problem being handled in a political way as is indicated by this excerpt from a letter of John Smith to Brigham Young:

> We . . . had to abandon the idea, and try a direct labor tax on polls and property; the assessment has been made and the estimates will soon be made by the bridge committee and pathmaster. The people feel interested in the bridges and roads, and are satisfied that the labor tax will bear equal; we therefore expect that work will be speedily done.[31]

The judicial structure of the Church was applied to the enforcement of laws and also the settlement of disputes between

---

[29]JH, December 27, 1847, p. 4.

[30]Subsequent ordinances were numbered following number five, but few of them are extant. Morgan, *op. cit.,* VIII (1940), Appendix B, 234-239, contains the available printed and numbered ordinances.

[31]JH, March 6, 1848, pp. 2, 3.

individuals. "The High Council was the supreme authority in the Valley, as was instanced on November 7, 1847, when the High Council decided against John Taylor in a dispute with Peregrine Sessions over ownership of a horse, for Taylor had no recourse except to say that he should 'appeal to the Quorum of the Twelve.'"[32] The decisions of the bishops' courts, which were essentially courts of arbitration in this early period, could be appealed to the High Council in Great Salt Lake City. Any decisions of this body warranting appeal had to wait until the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles returned to the Valley.

The governmental activities of the High Council continued following the return of Brigham Young, who had been made President of the Church while at Winter Quarters, and the other general authorities in September, 1848. Now, however, Young and other leading men of the Church met in council with the High Council. This larger "council" may have been the Council of Fifty, but the available sources do not permit definitive conclusions on this point. It is also not clear who sat on this later council, but the records make it quite obvious that Brigham Young dominated it.[33]

Cooperation among the Saints was fundamental to survival, but this was not left entirely on a voluntary basis. Regulatory measures, many of which were economic in content, were passed by the Council, such as the one authorizing the regulation of currency and empowering President Young to issue bills. A shortage of food in the Valley prompted the Council to resolve:

> That no corn shall be made into whiskey, and that if any man was preparing to distil corn into whiskey or alcohol, the corn should be taken and given to the poor; that the Bishops would ascertain the true situation of the people in relation to bread-stuffs and what amount each family had per head, and report to the next council; also that the licensed butchers who has [sic] refused to sell meat for the paper currency, be

---

[32]Morgan, *op. cit.*, p. 72. High Council records and the Journal History of this period contain other examples of the judicial process of this theocratic era.

[33]Archival records continue the use of "Council" following the vote of January 6, 1849, to relieve the High Council of its municipal duties. One should not conclude, however, that the High Council ceased to function politically at this time, as the "Council" references are far from clear as to which council is intended.

> required by letter to do so, or give up the butchering business.[34]

Subsequent council meetings were actively engaged in the legislative process, especially those of March 2 through March 4. Judicial decisions were handed down, including the unique method of collecting fines by offering the fined men for public sale "that they be made to work until they have paid the fines now due from them."[35] Naturally administrative functions were not overlooked. One of the major considerations of these meetings could be classified politically as the constituent function. Preparations were made to establish a provisional government. The spontaneous theocratic government had handled the immediate needs of the settlers, but the realization that the Valley eventually would be brought under the jurisdiction of the United States suggested the wisdom of organizing immediately a constitutional government.[36]

On March 5, 1849, a committee was selected to draft a constitution and report to a constitutional convention to be held in Great Salt Lake City.[37] The convention held March 8-10 resulted in the Constitution of the Provisional State of Deseret.[38] The organization of Deseret brought an end to the purely theocratic government in Utah country. There is indication, however, that the Council was active as a ruling body as late as December 29, 1849.[39] And the solid structure of Church organization supported the skeleton of governmental authority during the existence of Deseret and Church influence continued long after the demise of Deseret.

Brigham Young was the Governor of the State of Deseret and the first Governor of the Territory of Utah after it was created by the Compromise of 1850. Representatives of the state territorial legislatures were by and large the leaders of the Church from the major centers of Mormon setttlement in the territory. There is little doubt that the interests of Church

---

[34]JH, February 3, 1849.
[35]Morgan, *op. cit.*, p. 70.
[36]Entries in the JH of the dates mentioned dictate this conclusion.
[37]J. D. Lee, *A Mormon Chronicle: The Diaries of John D. Lee, 1848-1876*, ed. Robert Glass Cleland and Juanita Brooks (San Marino: Huntington Library, 1955), I, 90-92, discusses these events, but gives the date of March 4.
[38]JH, March 5-10, 1849.
[39]Morgan, *op. cit.*, p. 76.

leaders, supported by the majority of the residents of Utah, were translated into public policy during this period; but not without the cost of a half-century of friction with the federal government.

Local autonomy within the United States was desired by the Latter-day Saints, and many, including Thomas L. Kane, maintained that statehood was a *sine qua non* of peaceful political progress. As early as April 3, 1849, a memorial was drafted asking for a "territorial government of the most liberal construction authorized by our excellent Federal Constitution with the least possible delay, to be known by the name of Deseret. . . ."[40] In July of the same year, a memorial was drafted citing the need for a state government. Subsequently a temporary amalgamation with California was considered by the Saints as an indirect route to statehood, but it was defeated by the California legislature. Dr. John M. Bernhisel was an active Mormon lobbyist in Washington for Deseret statehood, but his noble efforts came to naught with the creation of the Territory.

The friction began with the first federally appointed officers for Utah who were not members of the Church. At a special conference of the Church, held early in September, 1851, the federal officials, Mormon and Gentile, were all assigned a place on the stand with President and Governor Young. When Judge Perry C. Brocchus was invited to speak he took the occasion to harangue the people for two hours relative to their disloyalty, and ultimately he discussed the subject of polygamy. He concluded by insulting the ladies by reference to their lack of chastity, expressing a hope that they would "become virtuous." The congregation was exasperated; Brigham Young was righteously indignant and arose and rebuked the judge. He said: "I love the government and the Constitution of the United States, but I do not love the damned rascals who administer the government. I know Zachary Taylor, he is dead and is damned,

---

[40]"Early Records of Utah," *MS* (located in Bancroft Library, Berkeley, California), entry for April 30, 1849. This is the first of three volumes, titled and catalogued in Bancroft Library, which comprises the excerpts from the "Manuscript History of Brigham Young" used in Bancroft's *History of Utah.* The other two volumes are entitled "Incidents in Utah History" and "Utah Historical Incidents."

and I cannot help it. I am indignant at such corrupt fellows as Judge Brocchus coming here to lecture us on morality and virtue."[41]

A series of letters was exchanged between Young and Brocchus, but the differences could not be reconciled and a complete rupture came when Judges Brocchus and Brandebury and Secretary Harris left their posts, accusing the Governor and the people of Utah of lawlessness and sedition. Daniel Webster, who was then Secretary of State, ordered the officials back to their deserted posts, but they chose to resign. The damage was accomplished, however, as the papers circulated the charges of sedition, and soon the "Mormon issue" found its way into national politics—polygamy was soon to become one of the "twin relics of barbarism." This first phase of friction ended with the debacle known as the "Utah War," when federal troops were sent to Utah to remove Governor Young from his federally appointed position. Governor Alfred Cumming, his successor, made a report to Washington refuting the charges of rebellion, but this proved to be only a short-lived truce in the long Mormon-federal conflict.

Brigham Young recognized the influence he had with the Mormons who settled the Great Basin. A case can be made that he never relinquished his position as the *de facto* Governor of Utah, and theocratic theories and practice continued. In 1867, he historically reviewed the conditions of the Saints and said: "I believe that Governor Cumming came to the conclusion that he was Governor of the Territory as domain; but that Brigham Young was Governor of the people."[42] This "ghost governorship" of Brigham Young began formally in 1862 with the third major effort of the Mormons to establish the State of Deseret. The territorial legislature on December 19, 1861, passed an act calling for a general election, to be held on January 6, 1862, for sixty-five delegates to a constitutional convention. Even though this act was vetoed by Governor Dawson, the several counties elected delegates to the convention which con-

---

[41]JH, September 8, 1851, p. 4. See also Brigham Young, *et al., Journal of Discourses* (26 vols.; Liverpool: F. D. Richards, *et al.,* 1854-1884), I (June 19, 1853), 186. Hereafter cited JD. Date in parentheses indicates the date when the discourse was delivered.

[42]JD, XI (February 10, 1867), 324.

vened on January 20. A committee of five, headed by George A. Smith, drafted the constitution which was essentially a reproduction of the constitutions of 1849 and 1856. The constitution was accepted by the convention on January 22, following which Brigham Young was nominated Governor. In the election held March 3, he was unanimously elected.

Brigham Young held great hopes for the new "State of Deseret." He was confident that it would be admitted into the Union. During March and April of 1862, he explained in discourses that the action of establishing a state government was within the scope of the Constitution, and that the people in so doing would not infringe on any laws of the government.[43] [44] In turn Deseret would guarantee to all the enumerated rights of the Constitution of the United States. Transcending this ideal even, Deseret was represented as a sovereign state in embryo. At a session of the "legislature" held in January of 1863, Young said:

> This body of men will give laws to the nations of the earth. We meet here in our second Annual Legislature, and I do not care whether you pass any laws this Session or not, but I do not wish you to lose one inch of ground you have gained in your organization, but hold fast to it, for this is the Kingdom of God, and we are the friends of God and you will find that much will grow out of this organization. . . . We are called the State Legislature, but when the time comes, we shall be called the Kingdom of God. Our government is going to pieces, and it will be like water that is spilt upon the ground that cannot be gathered. . . . For the time will come when we will give laws to the nations of the earth. Joseph Smith organized this government before, in Nauvoo, and he said if we do our duty we should prevail over all our enemies. We should get all things ready, and when the time comes, we shall let the water on to the wheel and start the machine in motion.[45]

---

[43]It is interesting to note that the disunion forces of the Civil War did not prompt the Mormons to establish their ideal, the Kingdom of God, as a separate political entity. Brigham Young spoke about the imminent destruction of the United States at the beginning of the Civil War, but the Saints looked to the Constitution of the United States as the proper source of their own political authority. Brigham Young's discourses on the Kingdom of God make it quite clear that he felt that it would be a transition of minor consequence from the governmental system under the Constitution to the Kingdom of God.

[44]JD, X (March 9, 1862), 39 ff; (April 8, 1862), 32 ff.

[45]JH, January 19, 1863.

From 1862 until 1870 the Legislature of the State of Deseret met annually. The session usually only lasted for a few days, at which time the members would engage in the formalities of installing Brigham Young as Governor as well as the other officers of the government, which did not as yet govern; the laws of the territorial legislature were re-enacted (both legislatures were made up of the same men); adjournment until the next year then followed.

The "ghost government" of the State of Deseret disappeared following the session of the General Assembly held in 1870. It is far from clear why Brigham Young allowed Deseret to expire. The change from annual to biennial sessions of the territorial legislature and the constitutional convention held in 1872, which had statehood as a prime objective, were undoubtedly contributing causes. The constitutional convention was unique in that both Mormons and non-Mormons participated, and the constitution represented a united reaction against the excesses of federal officers. Unity was lacking, however, on the issue of Deseret; the convention moved away from the name, the traditional constitution, and even the ideal which was connected with this unique organization.

The ideal of the Kingdom of God, however, remained with the Mormon leader. As though disillusioned with the numerous failures to gain statehood and the vexatious conflicts with the federal appointees in Utah, he seemed to turn in his final years more exclusively to religious interests. This change was not a turn to a spiritual, cloistered retreat from the mundane activities; this was not the temperament of Brigham Young. Indeed, it was during this period that his economic teachings incorporated a new element. Discourses as early as 1871 began to probe the possibility of bringing about a greater unity through the institution of the "Order of Enoch," which in its application was commonly called the "United Order." This was essentially a communitarian economic and social program patterned closely after the "Law of Consecration and Stewardship" which had been given to the Saints in Missouri. Total unity, economic and social as well as spiritual, was conceived by Brigham Young as a prerequisite to the realization of the Kingdom of God.

A communal and cooperative spirit had characterized the Church throughout the Brigham Young era. Through it the material as well as the spiritual objectives of the Saints could be realized most effectively. As a result, it became totalitarian in the sense of its all-inclusive interests. Its centralized organization, with the priesthood as its core, lent itself to effective leadership and popular support. Brigham Young's theories and practices in Church government added to the centralization of the organization and his admonitions encouraged the members of the Church to identify themselves totally with the "Church and Kingdom."

Many Church policies resembled state functions. The Church handled many disputes without taking them into the courts of the Territory. The Church was probably the most effective source of control of the natural resources in the early territorial period, and this control continued little diminished throughout the presidency of Brigham Young. Construction of roads, bridges, walls and numerous other projects of a public-works nature were initiated by the Church. Some projects were allocated to private individuals but controlled by the Church in a public-utility franchise fashion; others were planned and constructed from the funds collected by tithing or through donated labor *in lieu* of cash payments. Welfare projects, many of a make-work nature, were fostered by Brigham Young privately or as President of the Church, financed by the tithes of the members.

These functions, however, are not necessarily those of the state, even though they resemble functions which the state frequently undertakes. Consistent with their communal spirit and their unity in all other matters, the Saints approached the problems in the development of the Great Basin cooperatively. The community spirit was effective as suggested by Bancroft:

> As a cooperative association, Mormonism has not its equal in the history of the world. In every conceivable relation, position, interest, and idea; in every sentiment of hope and fear, of joy and sorrow—there is mutual assistance and sympathy. It enters into all affairs, whether for time or eternity; there is an absolute unity in religion, government, and society, and to the fullest extent short of communism, mutual assist-

ance in agriculture, commerce, and manufacture.[46]

This totality of Church interests was due in part to the fact that Brigham Young took no cognizance of needs beyond those which the Church could satisfy. But this also placed the Church in mortal competition with all other institutions for the allegiance of man—the state not excepted. Yet the volitional, noncoercive nature of the Church placed it on a different plane from the state. Brigham Young's notions on the "indomitable will of man," the inability of tyranny to control man, salvation as an individual responsibility, and the proposition that God himself is bound by law required a volitional view of the Church. As the head of the Church, he maintained that he was in precisely the same position as God: "He cannot force his children to do this, that or the other against their will—the eternal laws by which He and all others exist in the eternities of the Gods, decree that the consent of the creature must be obtained before the Creator can rule perfectly."[47]

The volitional nature of the Church is best expressed in its disclaimer of power over the minds and bodies of those who do not choose to accept its direction. Brigham Young had autocratic ways about him. He used strong language in directing his people, at times even suggesting violence. But his love for law and order forbade the individual to take violent measures into his own hands; violence was antithetical to the priesthood. "Our religion is founded upon the Priesthood of the Son of God. . . . It . . . is a pure and holy system of government. It is the law that governs and controls all things, and will eventually govern and control the earth and the inhabitants that dwell upon it. . . ."[48] Disfellowship and excommunication were the strongest measures available to the leaders of the Church—as a church.

Yet it is obvious that the theocratic periods of the Church were characterized by the practical necessity of the Church's assuming the functions of the state. "The history of Utah is the

---

[46]Hubert Howe Bancroft, *History of Utah* (San Francisco: The History Company, 1890), p. 369.

[47]JD, XV (August 18, 1872), 134.

[48]JD, X (July 31, 1864), 320.

history of the Mormon priesthood in its attempt to subordinate the state to the church, and make the authority of the priesthood superior to that of the United States government."[49] This, according to Bancroft, is civilization's accusation against Mormonism. Unquestionably the politico-religious attitudes of Brigham Young, such as "there is no true government on earth but the government of God or the holy Priesthood,"[50] as well as early Mormon history, afforded a basis for the accusation. To the Mormon leader, God was, and should be, the source of law. This position could be summarized best in the succinct statement on government by King Mosiah in the *Book of Mormon*:

> Let us appoint judges, to judge this people according to our law; and we will newly arrange the affairs of this people, for we will appoint wise men to be judges, that will judge this people according to the *commandments of God.*
>
> Now it is better that a man should be judged of God than of man, for the judgments of man are not always just.[51]

Brigham Young's concept of ideal government brought the omniscience of God into the political processes on earth. He said: "My Governorship and every other ship under my control are aided and derive direct advantages from my position in the Priesthood."[52] "If I was now sitting in the chair of State at the White House in Washington, everything in my office would be subject to my religion."[53] He explained that this would result in justice and mercy to all as a man holding the priesthood would be "qualified to wisely and righteously administer in any civil office, and in this manner the channel of true intelligence would be opened, and light and truth flow freely into every avenue of social life."[54] He added further: "When we see a religion, and one which is claimed to be the religion of Christ, and it will not govern men in their politics, it is a very poor religion, it is very feeble, very faint in its effects, hardly perceptible in the life of a person."[55] The gospel should unite the

---

[49]Bancroft, *op. cit.*, p. 375.
[50]JD, VII (May 22, 1859), 142.
[51]Mosiah, 29: 11, 12. Italics supplied.
[52]JD, II (June 17, 1855), 322, 23.
[53]JD, IV (August 31, 1856), 41.
[54]JD, II (June 17, 1855), 323.
[55]JD, XIV (June 4, 1871), 159.

people, and the ideal state would be directed along a course of the "greatest good for the greatest number" by the laws of God.

Although his notions might have resembled those of John Cotton and John Winthrop of New England's theocratic days, the demands of Roger Williams of individual freedom were within him also. This seeming ambivalence presented no apparent mental conflict for Brigham Young, as he was not conscious of any conflict between the blending of church and state and individual freedom. Church and state were inseparable in the mind of Brigham Young; they had overlapping jurisdictions. Separation would not only be undesirable but a fiction.[56]

Contrary to the position of many writers on the history of Utah, there was a lack of religious bigotry on the part of Brigham Young. His people were encouraged to learn whatever they could from ministers of other faiths. The Tabernacle was available to itinerant preachers. He said to the people of Ogden in 1871: "Accord to every reputable person who may visit you, and who may wish to occupy the stands of your meeting houses to preach to you, the privilege of doing so, no matter whether he be a Catholic, Presbyterian, Congregationalist, Baptist. . . ."[57] The tabernacle in St. George was offered to Father Scanlan for Catholic services and "Peter's Mass" was sung in Latin by a Mormon choir.[58]

The Kingdom of God would be a theocratic state, but it would recognize the right of liberty of conscience for all. The despotism which resulted from the theocracies of the Old World, or states where the "two swords" were wielded by one sovereign was antithetical to this utopia. "We would not make everybody bow down to our religion, if we had the power; for this would not be Godlike. . . ."[59] "I am perfectly willing you should serve the kind of a god you choose, or no god at all; and

---

[56]Henry P. Van Dusen, *et al., Church and State in the Modern World* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1937), p. 162, states that the separation of church and state notions rest on the false assumption that "Church and State have wholly independent and mutually exclusive jurisdictions. It implies—wrongly—that religion and politics are separate spheres of interest and activity."

[57]JD, XIV (June 3, 1871), 195.

[58]W. R. Harris, *The Catholic Church in Utah* (Salt Lake City: Intermountain Catholic Press, 1909), pp. 331, 332.

[59]JD, XIV (April 8, 1871), 94.

that you should enjoy all that is for you to enjoy,"[60] were representative attitudes of Brigham Young. During his second term as Governor of the Territory of Utah, while at the same time president of the Church, he said that the "law of God . . . the government of God, as administered here . . . will sustain all religions, sects, and parties on the earth in their religious rights, just as much as it will sustain the Latter-day Saints in theirs. Not that the diverse creeds are right, but the agency of the believers therein demands protection for them, as well as for us."[61]

Inconsistent attitudes toward the role of the church and the state appear in Brigham Young's thought possibly because he was not concerned with definitions. He did not trouble himself with the incompatibility of a church which by his own statements is volitional in nature; and a state which by definition and also by his own attitudes has a monopoly of legalized violence, or sovereignty; and the Kingdom of God, which appears to contain within it the volitional qualities of the church, but the governing powers of the state. Political developments in the Mormon domain resulted not from theory, but pragmatically from need. Practical requirements were accomplished in the most effective and expeditious manner possible. If the Church was best suited to act in a political capacity, then well and good, Brigham Young favored it.

The Kingdom of God, on the other hand, was a utopia to be fully realized in the future. It was considered quite carefully and to a greater extent theoretically. It was to be the most perfect form of government on earth, a pure theocracy. Brigham Young's notions on the Kingdom suggests that it was to be quite different than a church or state alone. It was to be a blend of church and state, but the coercive characteristics of the state were to give way to the nonviolent features of the gospel. And as Paul distinguished between the law and the spirit in his letter to the Galatians, the Kingdom was to be an entirely new society to replace the decadent nation-states.

---

[60]JD, I (August 1, 1852), 363.
[61]JD, III (March 16, 1856), 256.

They Say Caesar . . .

M. Krysl

They say Caesar spurred his horse to a gallop,
riding with his hands behind his back.
Undoubtedly countless Roman eyes
watched Gallic dust swirl into his Roman dawn
and as I stand now watching
a fumbling hand
grasp at some bit of silver
in the rusty can
and finally, clutching something,
place it unsteadily
for the hammer's false and trembling blow,
I ponder how age comes to every man,
reclaims the sureness that he has from life,
takes it along with teeth and hair
as casually but surely as a suntan goes
and Man becomes unbeautiful
so that instead of watching
a mighty Caesar rule his men,
I turn averted eyes uncomfortably away
from nails, chipping paint, and quivering blows,
the panting, almost frantic breath,
until caught, trapped, chained, held
by late light through a cracked window
I must take Thor's hammer
and pound my passion into rotting wood.

Mormon Folk Song and the Fife Collection

THOMAS E. CHENEY

A collector of folk song must first of all know what he is looking for. He must have some conception of what a folk song is.

A universally accepted generalization is that folk song must be the property of the folk. But to determine who are the folk and what constitutes possession is a problem which has led to disagreement among scholars. Is the term *folk* all inclusive? Is any member of society one of the folk, or does one cease to be of the folk when he attains the polish of education? Are the folk to be defined as the unlettered group? And are folk songs, as some people think, only those songs which are the product of nasal singers who adopt some spurious, pseudo-colloquial, sub-standard language? There are people who believe one must be either over eighty, illiterate, or a child of the hill country to be called a member of the folk. George Lyman Kittredge said: "*Folk* is a large word. It suggests a whole nation, or at all events a huge concourse of people."[1]

The folk, I think, includes all the people, without regard to sophistication or illiteracy, and, therefore, folk song is the property of the group, not that of one individual. The song must strike the universal chord of the great concourse of people. Early scholars—Francis Barton Gummere, Francis James Child, George Lyman Kittredge, Cecil Sharp, Reed Smith, Robert Gordon and others—maintain that the term "folk song" cannot be accurately used in identifying a song unless the song has had a period of traditional, oral transmission.

A conflate definition of folk song to which most authorities would subscribe would contain as essentials the follow-

---

Professor Cheney is associate professor of English at Brigham Young University.

[1]Helen Child Sargent and George Lyman Kittredge, *English and Scottish Popular Ballads* (Houghton Mifflin, Boston), 1932, p. XIX.

> ing qualifications: that the song have lost its identity as a consciously composed piece; that it have undergone verbal changes during oral transmission; and that it have been sung for an appreciable period of time, let us say two generations.[2]

There are many songs in Mormon tradition which can hardly be placed in this mold. For example, a temple is being built in St. George. A celebration is being held to memorialize completion of a certain part, and to stir the people to a devotion which will bring donated labor and funds to complete the structure, a man known to be "original" is asked to compose a song. He is not a literary or musical artist, rather a member of the folk who has already been identified as one who can put in words the feelings and thoughts of the unified people. He writes a song for the occasion which reflects so perfectly the group feeling and interest that it soon becomes a treasured memory to be sung long after completion of the temple. The song has not "undergone verbal changes during oral transmission." It has had little if any oral transmission.

Greenway, quoted above, says further:

> . . . the requirements of transmissional changes is valid only as a proof that the folk have taken possession of the song; it should not be considered as a criterion in itself. . . . It must be a definition of greater flexibility than traditional interpretation of "folk," yet rigid enough to distinguish folk song from material on the lowest level of conscious art, like popular song. It must be built on the solid base that folk songs are songs of the folk; its qualifications should be seen as nothing more than tests by which full folk possession can be determined.[3]

Such songs as that referred to above are property of the folk, though possession is not determined by oral transmission. Evidence of folk possession is obvious. First, the song is created by a folk artist who writes words (which often apply as a "parody" to a well known tune). The folk like the song; they immediately accept it, not as an expression of the author but as their own expression. The author is so right with the homogenic, unified group that his expression is kin to what

---

[2]John Greenway, *American Folksongs of Protest* (University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia), 1953, p. 5.

[3]*Ibid.,* pp. 7-8.

scholars have determined "communal authorship." They feel that the song is not what Charley says, it is what they themselves say.

To determine to what extent a song becomes the possession of the folk is the folklorist's problem. This can be no exact science. The white society of the south may decide that a person with one thirty-second part negro blood is a negro, but no reliable folklorist is foolish enough to deal with folk songs in terms of fractions. *Possession of the folk* being the key phrase in determining what is folk song, the scholar uses every means of finding the folk history of the song.

Many people have collected songs from the Mormon society. Among them are John Lomax, Austin Fife, Levitt J. Davidson, Lester Hubbard, and Olive Burt. Of these, Austin Fife's work has been the most complete. He plowed new ground. Unlike Lomax, Fife set out with a grant from the Utah Humanities Research Foundation to collect Mormon folklore exclusive of folklore of other areas. His work has great merit in that it is comprehensive enough to reveal ethnological traits of the society from which it came. His own comment regarding the extent of Mormon folksong is:

> So abundant are the songs that the Mormon folk have composed and sung at all the critical moments in their history that, were every other document destroyed, it would still be possible, from folk songs alone, to reconstruct in some detail the story of their theology, their migrations, their conflict with the Gentiles, and the founding and development of most of their settlements from New York to San Bernardino.[4]

Certainly in the past Mormons did compose songs and sing about everything as Dr. Fife says. Yet to say that Mormon history could be reconstructed in some detail from folk songs alone is a romantic conception. Certainly the Fife collection, as it comes from the Library of Congress, does not show the possibility.

The collection is not the finished product I had been led to believe, but is absurdly disorganized. Long ago ditto copies

---

[4]Austin and Alta Fife, *Saints of Sage and Saddle* (Indiana University Press, Bloomington), 1956, p. 316.

of titles in the Fife collection were circulated showing well organized materials under specific, logical headings as follows:

A. Prose Accounts of Mormon Folk Song and Folk Singing.
B. Germanic Folk Song Collected in Utah.
C. Songs of Specific Mormon Regional Setting and Inspiration.
D. Prose Accounts of Mormon Folklore.

These types and more are all in the collection sent out on tapes by the Library of Congress but they are a mulligan stew. To determine exactly wherein the fault lies is difficult, but I suspect it is largely the careless work of the Library of Congress.

The tapes sold to Brigham Young University reveal many faults, the most flagrant of which are as follows: Names of songs are rarely announced, though talk of less importance is inserted, and no indexing is provided with the tapes. The singer's name is not regularly announced; yet at times, often with a song and singer of little importance, name, home town, age, and how the singer came by the song are given.

As an example of the disorganization of this copy, the following is recorded on reel 9, side 2:

Blue Mountain ..... Sung, it appears, by Karl Gifford
(This is sung by the same singer on side 1 and repeated here. A discussion of the Blue Mountain legend is on reel 11.)
Clementine ..... Sung by boys' quartette
Don't Fence Me In ..... Sung by boys' quartette
The Utah Trail ..... Sung by boys' quartette
Navaho Indian Song ..... Sung by an Indian
Jesus Loves Me ..... Sung by Indian Children
(The Indian children sing this song again on reel 12 in English and then in Navaho language.)
Sioux City Sue ..... Sung by boys' quartette
That Silver Haired Daddy of Mine .... Sung by boys' quartette
(This same quartette sings "In the Garden" and "The Missouri Waltz" on reel 12.)
Haunted Falls ..... *Read* by Austin Fife
(This song is sung on reel 14 with the same words.)
Give My Love to Nell ..... *Read* by Austin Fife

The collection is not all folk song, as it is called. About one-eighth is folk tale—good folk tale—but not song: Nephite stories (reels 6, 8, 18), folk poems (reels 6, 7, 11), J. Golden

Kimball stories (reel 7), interview on the Kirkam Band (reel 8), Danish immigrant prayer (reel 8). These and other comparable folk tales should be in a separate collection of folklore.

About another one-eighth of the tapes is consumed by Dr. Fife's reading names of songs in various collections and in quoting songs. This practice is of questionable value. Undoubtedly he has copies of the songs available in his collection. To read for conveying the words to the listener (Dr. Fife certainly did not read them for the oral expression) is wasteful of tape when they can so easily be duplicated in print.

Another fault which could so easily be corrected on these tapes is false starts and repetitions of songs. I know Dr. Fife's problems in recording from the oral tradition of the folk. The microphone-shy singer gets frightened, forgets, tangles words, and often calls to the collector, "Stop it, I get tied up on these old songs." We have a good deal of this bumbling on these tapes which could be removed without loss.

Some songs are repeated in their lengthy entirety for such reasons as to supply a verse missed in the first singing or for no apparent reason. Some examples of this repetition are "The Double Tragedy" (reel 11), "Belle Brandon" (reel 12), "Come, Come, Ye Saints (reel 12). Another undesirable error is repetition of the same song, sung without variation as to music or words by different singers. This phenomenon occurs frequently in the Fife collection. "The Mistletoe Bough" (reels 2, 11), "Belle Brandon" (reel 12, 13), are examples.

Many songs included are not folk songs. Even a loose interpretation of the term *folk song* would not permit use of some songs in this collection.

Austin Fife and his wife, Alta, obviously collected these songs from oral circulation. Their use of many songs which are not true folk songs is not a serious breach. But Dr. Fife or the Library of Congress should have at least checked and edited out of the collection all songs which can positively be identified as not folk.

The following songs found in the collection cannot be called folk songs: "Don't Fence Me In," "The Utah Trail," "Sioux City Sue," "In the Garden," "Missouri Waltz," "I'll Take You

Home Again, Kathleen," "The Big Rock Candy Mountains," "Oh, Ye Mountains High," and "Come, Come, Ye Saints." Many others can be questioned. Folk song characteristics may be discerned in these songs as they may be discerned in the compositions of Stephen Foster, but that fact does not make them folk song. They are widely circulated, published songs. With the exception of the two hymns named last, they have not, in the form Dr. Fife published them, varied from the published version either in words or music. The folk have not expanded nor shrunk them, improved nor corrupted either words or music. They are not the property of the folk in origin, nor have they been confiscated by the folk to become their own tradition. The hymns, "Oh, Ye Mountains High" and "Come, Come, Ye Saints" may have had origin in folk tradition and may have had some traditional inheritance, but when Dr. Fife recorded them they had long since been part of the Mormon hymnology to be found in all Mormon hymn books. They have established themselves in the literary and musical tradition—have been promoted, as it were, out of folk tradition.

The final tape in the Fife collection contains all songs in Spanish, sung, it appears, by Mexican children. At any rate, the children say they learned the songs in Mexico. The Spanish songs are not translated or interpreted, and no explanation is given to relate the songs to any folk song pattern or group. One obvious thing is that they are not in the Mormon tradition.

Another group not in Mormon tradition are Indian songs in Indian language. The fact that some of the Indians who sing them are Mormon converts hardly makes the songs a part of the Mormon heritage.

Another small part of the collection came from girls at Occidental College who sang songs they "learned in camp," or from their associates, or in a chorus of which they were members. Most of these songs show little relation to traditional folk song.

One singer, Effie Cormack, furnished the Fifes with many significant folk songs. Mrs. Cormack, a resident of California and a Mormon convert, came from the South. The songs she has in her memory all came out of her own South, and, as one would expect, many of them reflect the traditions of that area

with its racial, geographical, and local heritage. Mrs. Cormack's songs have not been sung in Mormon society enough to become Mormon thought or expression. To consider them Mormon folk song would be as ridiculous as calling "Yankee Doodle" a Russian song because it was sung by a former American who became a Communist.

If the Fife tapes were properly edited, the area called Mormon folk song could be put on half the tape it now covers. This muddled work on these tapes reflects carelessness in the work of the Library of Congress and, whether it should or not, casts doubt on the work of Austin and Alta Fife. More than that, it sheds a cloudy light upon folklore and folklorists.

Even so, the Fife collection is extremely valuable. It contains masses of true Mormon folk song, bright tones in folk music, and literary touches in lyrics.

The Nightingale

GENEVIEVE ST. CYR

The mechanical bird covered with diamonds, sings only
waltzes until the insides give way, and the sound
of his craft is crowing. Whether or not
(my Ladies and Gentlemen, and the Emperor above all)
the mood is coquetry, gurgling as if their mouths held
sweet water, cheesemongers, chambermaids and courtiers,
lackeys and the Duchess, all try for a nightingale,
and the Chief Imperial Singer of The Bed Chamber.

The bird, wound-up, wags its tail and sounds the same
tune (decided beforehand) times over, and the moment
of a thousand gold lamps, where the walls and the floor
are made of china is recompense for the title of "Cook."
Even the Emperor's heart is on the left side.

The writers of books insist the Black Art untrue,
but the kitchen maid waiting in the outside world
where the garden ends, finds the cow's bellow gracious,
and frogs croaking in the marsh are church bells.

She dallies for tickets to the Court Festival to see
the Emperor dining, and the ZI-ZI-BI of the Music Master
charms the evil away though he fix on her the great
hollows of his eyes, and jewels glare.

In the woods blue by the bay, a small gray bird among
branches believes all that is written, watching
maids and their men grow merry on tea, their forefingers
in the air as they dance.

"Though I live alone,
My song is not stone,
Neither rubies, diamonds, nor pearls,
And the world is a place.
There the actual grace
Will tolerate waltzes and whirls.
Where the loud drums sound,
Both upstairs and down,
The sword strikes, the gold banner flies,
But porcelain takes care,
I sing as I dare,
And tears are in the Emperor's eyes."

Book Review

LEONARD J. ARRINGTON. *Great Basin Kingdom: An Economic History of the Latter-day Saints, 1830-1900.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958. 534 pp. $9.00.

No more significant and informative book on Mormon and Utah history has been produced in the last decade than *Great Basin Kingdom.* As a storehouse of facts and insights in which layman and scholar alike find fascinating shopping, it has already established its right to a place on the bookshelf of every serious devotee of the historical subject matter with which it deals.

Professor Arrington, a member of the Department of Economics at the Utah State University, has obviously lived with his research for most of his adult life. The annotated bibliography and chapter notes which occupy almost twenty per cent of the volume (pp. 415-515) will prompt generations of seminar students to rise up and call the author blessed because of of the clues for further investigation which abound in it. Despite the bulk and inconvenient location of the notes, no reader is well advised to ignore them, for they contain important supplementary information and many intriguing quotations from contemporary sermons and documents. Example, from the recollections of Robert Gardner, Jr., on the early days of the Dixie Cotton Mission:

> . . . we had a good time for we was united in everything we went at in these days we had no rich nor poor our tents and wagons and what was in them was about all we had, and we had all things common in those days and very common too especially in the eating line for we did not even have sargom [sorghum molasses] . . . . (p. 476, note 95).

Great Basin Kingdom is the story of the effort of the Latter-day Saints to build a self-sufficient, Church-directed economy in the West and of the ultimate abandonment of that effort. It is an economic history, not of a region or a political unit, but of a religious community, and except for a brief intro-

duction it is confined to the period between the arrival of the Mormon pioneers in the Salt Lake Valley and the end of the nineteenth century.

A short first section, "Design for the Kingdom (1830-1846)," concerns economic aspects of the Latter-day Saint experience prior to the move westward. Arrington's insistence that the basic ideas which Brigham Young sought to apply in the Great Basin were developed during the period of Joseph Smith's leadership is adequately supported, and the list of these basic principles is a good one (pp. 24-28).

The larger second section, "Building the Kingdom (1847-1868)," introduces a thesis to which Arrington recurs from time to time:

> It may yet be conceded that the well-publicized conflicts and differences between the Mormons and other Westerners and Americans were not so much a matter of plural marriage and other reprehensible peculiarities and superstitions as of the conflicting economic patterns of two generations of Americans, one of which was fashioned after the communitarian concepts of the age of Jackson, and the other of which was shaped by the dream of bonanza and the individualistic sentiments of the age of laissez-faire. (p. 63; also pp. 130, 410-411.)

This reviewer, who confesses a political and social bias in the matter, does not find the thesis convincingly demonstrated. For one thing, the Mormon-Gentile conflict began in the middle of the Jacksonian era and had only a brief lull after 1847. Further, there is too much of *laissez-faire* in Brigham Young himself to make him fit the role of protagonist of a consistently collectivist ideology; indeed, some of his utterances on public education and programs for the poor read like Social Darwinism and the Gospel of Wealth. There is also lack of evidence that the American business community took a directing part in the anti-Mormon campaign of the late nineteenth century. Why should it? The L.D.S. communitarian program sought only to conserve and produce resources for Kingdom-building; even in its most successful period it did not exclude capitalism from the Great Basin in the form of transportation, communication, finance, commerce and mining. Economic friction was often present, but hardly decisive.

Even so, this section is a tremendous revelation of the variety of economic ideas, techniques, and undertakings by which the Mormons sought to build a self-contained society in the pre-railroad era. Many readers will encounter here for the first time the public works program of the 1850's and 1860's, which employed as many as 2,000 men on Church projects like the Salt Lake Temple, the Social Hall, the Endowment House, and a wall around Salt Lake City. Tithing—mostly in labor and in kind—is shown to be a major source of capital for necessary projects. The versatility of the ecclesiastical "call" is attested by George Goddard's "rag mission" to collect materials for the Church paper mill (p. 115) and by this letter, written after the completion of the Salt Lake Theater: "Dear Brother and Sister Colebrook: Would you allow your daughter Nellie to act upon the stage. It would very much please me. Your Brother, Brigham Young." (p. 213.)

Part three, "The Kingdom Threatened (1869-1884)," deals with the rather desperate efforts to maintain the ideal of self-sufficiency after the coming of the railroad. Z.C.M.I., the School of the Prophets, the Church-sponsored railroads, and the United Order revival of the early 1870's are parts of the story. One marvels at the capacity of the Utah pioneers to produce the wherewithal for iron foundries, cotton mills, sugar factories, telegraph lines, immigrant-aid companies and diverse other enterprises, few of which became capital producers in their own right. The reader of Arrington's account is likely to be more impressed by the effort that went into these projects than by their successful outcome. Their most important long-range legacy was probably a brotherhood made stronger by shared exertions.

A final section, "Kingdom in Retreat (1885-1900)," describes briefly but persuasively the transformation in L.D.S. economic policy which followed the disastrous impact of the Edmunds and Edmunds-Tucker Acts. Some Mormon readers may find Arrington's phrase "the great capitulation" a bit harsh (p. 409), but there is no escaping the fact that by 1900 the effort to maintain a material Kingdom of economically independent, agriculturally-oriented communities to which all converts were admonished to gather, had been abandoned. The

Church had made peace with the world, and to some extent at least on the world's terms. This is a neglected period in Mormon history, and Arrington provides some challenging leads for future research.

The book is attractively printed. Alas, it is also expensive. The collection of pictures which follow page 412 is a valuable as well as interesting feature. Errors of detail are rare. The map on page 85 shows all the northeast corner of the original Utah Territory being detached in 1868; actually the portion east of 110° was transferred to Nebraska Territory in 1861.

In the judgment of this reviewer, Professor Arrington's most valuable contribution to the field of Mormon history, in *Great Basin Kingdom* and many articles based on the same investigations, is the demonstration that this subject can be handled according to sound criteria of objective scholarship. Other writers of the present generation have shown the same capacity, but none to a greater degree. Future seminar students who turn to Arrington's notes for research clues will be well advised also to read these lines from his preface:

> Finally, a word to Mormon readers who will be troubled about my naturalistic treatment of certain historic themes sacred to the memories of the Latter-day Saints. The church holds, of course, that it is based on divine revelation. The body of revealed knowledge, however, at least to the Latter-day Saint, is not static, but constantly changing and expanding. Revelation is continuous and expedient—"suited to the people and the times." Moreover, it is impossible to separate revelation from the conditions under which it is received: "We have this treasure in earthen vessels." Or, as Brigham Young expressed it, "the revelations which I receive are all upon natural principles." The true essence of God's revealed will, if such it be, cannot be apprehended without an understanding of the conditions surrounding the prophetic vision, and the symbolism and verbiage in which it is couched. Surely God does not reveal His will except to those prepared, by intellectual and social experience and by spiritual insight and imagination, to grasp and convey it. A naturalistic discussion of "the people and the times" and of the mind and experience of Latter-day prophets is therefore a perfectly valid aspect of religious history, and, indeed, makes more plausible the truths they attempted to convey. While the discussion of naturalistic causes of revelations does not preclude its claim to be revealed or inspired of God, in prac-

> tice it is difficult, if not impossible, to distinguish what is objectively "revealed" from what is subjectively "contributed" by those receiving the revelation. (p. ix)

Without assigning to Providence any specific responsibilities in connection with what transpired, and with full allowance for the projects which failed and the abandonment of the self-sufficiency goal, Arrington finds in the story told in *Great Basin Kingdom* a substantial and impressive Mormon contribution to the development of the American West. For bringing to light many time-obscured facets of that story, he deserves much thanks.

Richard D. Poll