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

CONAN E. MATHEWS

Through the various epochs of western cultural growth or change, art has served society in a variety of ways. It has been commemorative in Egypt and idealistic in Greece. For the Romans, it was propagandistic and practical; for the early Christians, it was awe inspiring and mystifying. In Europe it has bolstered pride and provoked rebellions. Families, nations, and churches have used art to entertain, to confound and deceive, to teach, inspire, and to build morale.

The various purposes for which the arts have been used are well known to artists and historians. The artist in the Mormon culture constantly faces the question of how or if his art relates to his faith, religious service, and scripture. Any member of the L.D.S. faith is particularly and peculiarly involved with this question because Mormonism is more than confession of belief. It is a way of life and affects everything the member thinks, feels, and does. It is hoped that, at least in part, some light may be shed on this question by the Fine Arts Festival being held this spring by the College of Fine Arts at Brigham Young University. This series of programs, discussions, and exhibits, under the title “Religion and the Fine Arts,” is being presented for enjoyment, edification, and evaluation. Throughout the Festival several questions or concerns will be foremost. What should we be doing to make our artistic contributions and creations more significant and meaningful to the Church, to the membership, and to the world? What direction shall the form and style of our art take? To what extent should we rely upon the historical heritage or current movements of the Western world?

The historical continuity can be traced back through the past 2,400 years to the Greeks of the Golden Age. Here we find some linkage with Asiatic and Egyptian cultures, but in a more restricted history of the Christian Church it ends a hun-

Professor Mathews is dean of the College of Fine Arts at Brigham Young University.
dread years or so after Christ. The early Christians sought a visual art, but they had nothing to turn to except the Greco-Roman tradition. Christ and the Church of His day got along without the visual arts as did the Jews, in the main, before Him. No heritage of architecture, painting, or sculpture of artistic or esthetic significance was made part of Judaism, and we Mormons rely heavily on the Old Testament.

The altar, the tabernacle, and the synagogue were simple and functional. Solomon seems to have attempted a departure in his temple, for we are told in I Kings that the cedar wood of the temple was carved with knots and open flowers and that certain appointments were overlaid in pure gold. This information reminds us of styles, motives and techniques prevalent in both the Asiatic and Egyptian cultures which were obviously known to Hiram, King of Tyre, who with his craftsmen came to the assistance of Solomon in designing and decorating the temple. Only recently has there come to light the fact that Hebrews did utilize, at least to some extent, pictorial illustration to accompany their written record.

Presumably, the early Christians were not aware of this heritage or, despite it, the early Christian Church borrowed from pagan Greece and Oriental and Asiatic cultures for visual symbol, pictorial concept, and decorative style. The greatest influence was Greek classical idealism. Although exotic and sensuous, Oriental decoration certainly has played a major role also. The full use of these art forms has been used without reservation by the Catholic, both Roman and Greek Orthodox, and most of the Protestant churches. The great murals by such painters as DaVinci, Michelangelo, Raphael, and Rubens are works of Catholics. Dürr and Rembrandt are among the Protestant artists who painted religious pictures. The Protestant painters were ordinarily not subsidized by the Church as were the Catholic painters.

The Protestant reformation dampened and discouraged, to some extent, the use of murals and particularly sculpture. The uses for which the visual arts were employed became didactic and documentary rather than inspirational or emotional.

Joseph Smith announced that these churches had only a form of godliness, lacking the authority and the fullness of the
truth. He added that truth and authority had been lost shortly after Christ's death and that a restoration had to come from those of Christ's time. He denied, at least to some degree, the heritage of everything that had happened between the time of Christ and the restoration of the true authority. Here, in spite of the fact that we seek after all things that are beautiful and of good report, we, as Latter-day Saints, are in something of a dilemma. We can and do accept the fact that the spirit of truth, the spirit of Christ, the desire to do good and to promote and strengthen virtuous attributes motivate men everywhere and at all times. We also believe that all men are the children of God and that regardless of race, creed, or nationality, great and good deeds or creations come from their minds and hands. These we accept, use, and enjoy.

Nevertheless, we are a peculiar people in possession of the fullness of the Gospel and the keys of the Last Dispensation. As such, what is our responsibility as artists, musicians, and writers? As scholars and students or teachers, how far shall we go in the use of the creations of Catholic and Protestant churches? Or shall we deny the heritage of their standards and criteria, past as well as present, and create our own works without regard for the so-called Christian tradition? If we could or did disregard this religious art, to what would we turn? To whom do we look for the new or the original purpose and meaning of the fine arts? What is the relationship of the arts to our religion or our worship? Is art to teach only or to inspire also? Should it represent or symbolize? Are the universal characteristics and responses to esthetic form related in any way to the religious response and experience? Are these two areas of human experience more meaningful independent of each other, or does one enrich the other? Should it be primarily pragmatic and materialistic? This, actually, is the emphasis we tend to give art at present. It would seem right and consistent with our faith that we can study and learn from the past, that we recognize the fact that in any culture or religion there may be usable and applicable music, literature, and painting. But what shall guide our selections?

We have been eclectic in our architecture to the point that we have churches in every conceivable style and combination
thereof. Is there an architectural style somewhere in the past that belongs more completely to our theology, philosophy, religious orientation and practice? What significance and meaning does the art of Mayan and Aztec culture of Central America hold for us? We have included these motives and styles, to some extent, in our architecture.

It seems to me that we have floundered artistically and creatively, utilizing and encouraging the creation or re-creation of much mediocre, realistic, and even naturalistic art, that we have set the criteria too much in terms of expedition and practicality, making our art primarily didactic, informative, or commemorative and not enough inspirational, esthetic, or idealistic. Despite this, I personally feel that some of our writers, composers, and artists are emerging with peculiarities, originality, and vitality consistent with the innermost purposes and values of Mormonism.

We are charged as Latter-day Saints to study and search. We are motivated to educational and scholastic achievement. But should we not have found the unique, original, or peculiar inspiration of artistic creation? Our religion is not Catholic in the Greek or Roman sense. It is not Protestant in the Lutheran, Episcopal, or Presbyterian sense. Should our architecture, music, painting, and writing be mainly a continuity of the traditional standards and styles from these cultures?

It is important to note that artists, writers, or composers are plagued with a sense of responsibility no less than is the Prophet. There may be false artists as there are false prophets, but, in my humble judgment, artists sense most keenly and conscientiously the fact that what they do has far-reaching implications for the society or culture of their time. They know that the true image of a people sooner or later will be primarily determined by their works of art. The artist knows, even though the majority of any culture is not aware of this fact, that art is the reflection and record of the true and the inner spirit. Art is shallow and superficial if it emerges from a spiritual climate which is shallow and superficial. Three thousand years of history bears this out. Studies on the rise and fall of nations and institutions confirm the fact that the art, like the religion and philosophy, is close to the soul. John Milton
said, "A work of genius is a work not to be obtained by the Invocation of Memory and her Syren Daughters, but by devout prayer to that Eternal Spirit who can enrich will all utterance and knowledge and send out his seraphim with the hallowed fire of his altar to touch and purify the lips of whom he pleases."

It is my observation that the L.D.S. artist has an especially keen sense of dedication and responsibility, but with his deep-seated concern for service to his brethren and obedience to authority he is felt to be without esthetic or artistic direction or confirmation from the most meaningful and spiritual sources. His services and talents are used, but his genius and creativity are not sufficiently challenged. He is asked to illustrate, decorate, perform (not necessarily well), accompany, recite, and explain but not to create.

I do not believe the L.D.S. artist is asking for subsidization or professional status in the Church—although such is the tradition in Christianity, generally. From the days of the early Italian Renaissance and almost universally since, the musician and artist have been employed by the church. Professionalism is contrary to our concept of the sanctity of talent and creative gifts. The L.D.S. artist wants the opportunity to bear his testimony voluntarily and freely through the media in which he can best speak.
Miss Helen
Max Golightly

She moves about her tasks of world and science,
With polished eyes upon the brilliant stone.
She gestures with her hands and calmly stereotypes
The grimace and the glance. Her voice is monotone.
Her sphere of life is Pleiades or Cipangu,
Where Numian natives dance the Archipelago.
(Impassioned symbols in the marble of her mind!)
In Ushuaia she studies diamonds from Peru.
Her world, forlorn through golden summers is maligned
With proud perplexities; in apathy her heart defined,
Makes tense all Time. She scorns the miracle of hope;
Her ears are acid touched, her tongue tastes bitter clay.
Sometimes she feels the sharp and probing root that grows
Deep down in self where white light suddenly brings pain;
And with its surge, eclipsing all minutiae,
She seeks at last, in shadow of the cross, a sign;
The clean green shines however briefly, and she knows
That knowledge has acquired its eager misanthrope.
Then is the axis on which turns her world no more
She shudders in her rooms, shrouds all her windowpanes
Mourning the silk, the chintz she did not hang,
She hides her grief and her obdurate remains.
JB: Successful Theatre Versus “Godless” Theology

PRESTON R. GLEDHILL

What's this, a serious verse play drawn from the most difficult and perplexing book of the Bible, a smashing box office success? Incredible! Can it be that this "beat," "atomic," sophisticated generation is suddenly so out of character that it has succumbed to the moral platitudes and preachy dogma of a typically sentimental religious drama and is standing to cheer?

Only the cheers are real. The universally acclaimed and prize-laden JB has brought its author, poet Archibald MacLeish, almost unknown in the theatre prior to this play, a reputation which at least in Europe ranks him as one of the top half dozen playwrights America has produced. JB was selected for presentation as representative of the art and culture of the United States during the 1958 International Exposition at Brussels before it was shown on Broadway.*

Brigham Young University theatre had the good fortune to receive the first amateur production rights following the professional run and tour. JB will be presented April 19-22, 1961, as a feature of Brigham Young University's first Fine Arts Festival. It will be directed by Dr. Harold I. Hansen.

*The Western Speech Association was granted special permission by Mr. MacLeish to perform a dramatized reading of JB at its 1958 convention just one month before its spectacular opening in New York. It was directed by Dr. Gledhill with a cast from Brigham Young University.

The critics were as unanimous as they were lavish in their praise of MacLeish's drama. (The single qualification was the occasional unevenness of his verse.) These are typical accolades:

"[JB] . . . may well become one of the lasting achievements of art and mind in our time."—Saturday Review

"In form as well as content, Archibald MacLeish's JB ranks with the finest work in American drama. . . . In form, it is theatre. In content, it is truth on a scale far above the usual dimension of our stage."—Atkinson (New York Times)

Dr. Gledhill is professor of speech at Brigham Young University.
JB has been translated widely and already is considered abroad as America's best play of the decade. With its amateur release its position may be extended to eclipse the current world-wide favorite American play, Thornton Wilder's Our Town. Although the latter is universal in its appeal and inner beauty, its atmosphere, manners, and setting are typically American. JB, on the other hand, is the personification of "everyman." A German critic from Düsseldorf makes the common observation: "The play evoked the feeling that Job is in every one of us. . . . tomorrow it may be us." Because of the quick and general acceptance of this play in Europe, it could be that in addition to being the giant among modern verse dramas its greatest contribution may lie in its helping to dispel the current hostility that is felt for all things American in many parts of the world.

The cold war uncertainty, frustration, violence, and malaise all contribute to the self identification of the entire atomic age with Job's sufferings and plaintive cries as to "why. . . why?" His tragedies—loss of loved ones, social status, war, devastation, financial failure, paranoia, physical and mental anguish—are our great tragedies. And like Job we are much more willing to confess our guilt than to admit our folly.

Another reason for the success of this contemporary version of the Book of Job is the slickness with which it avoids sentimentality (except perhaps at the end); nor does it conform to the usual stereotypes found in most religious plays. In fact, JB is not a religious or faith-promoting play. In the use of two broken-down but sympathetic actors in a modern sideshow setting MacLeish discovered a device by means of which he could portray the religious narrative of the Bible and at the same time be sufficiently detached to speak in the modern idiom. He relieves the dramatic tension through humor and colorful, bellicose verse and successfully eschews the maudlin and sanctimonious. Yet there is some hauntingly beautiful poetry as MacLeish attempts to answer man's eternal complaint, where is justice? Job's wife answers that there is no justice, only love. The justification of the injustice of the universe is our love, our love of life in spite of life.
You wanted justice, didn’t you?
There isn’t any. There’s the world...
Cry for justice and the stars
Will stare until your eyes sting. Weep,
Enormous winds will thrash the water.
Cry in sleep for your lost children,
Snow will fall...
snow will fall...

Then the author’s final affirmative answer as to how we must pick up our lives again after terrible disasters:

Blow on the coal of the heart.
The candles in churches are out.
The lights have gone out in the sky.
Blow on the coal of the heart
And we’ll see by and by...
We’ll see where we are.
We’ll know. We’ll know.

While this language is evocative and moving, is its message an oversimplification? This simple and somewhat bleak solution to the problems of the universe has received the bulk of the criticism leveled against the play. In an article which appeared in the New York Times and which is now a forward to French’s acting edition of the play, MacLeish defends his thesis:

“... love becomes the ultimate human answer to the ultimate human question. Love in reason’s terms, answers nothing. We say that Amor vincit omni but in truth love conquers nothing—certainly not death—certainly not chance. What love does is to affirm. It affirms life in spite of life.”

Christ’s answer was also love but of a much more elevating and all-encompassing variety (including the conquering of death), with love of God the key factor: through a genuine love of God and one’s fellow men man may return to the presence of an all-loving Father-in-Heaven. According to MacLeish, Job’s God is completely indifferent to his sufferings and is interested only in cowering Job into submission in order to display His “own power and Job’s impotence.”

Elia Kazan, director of the New York Production, finally prevailed upon MacLeish, six months after the Broadway opening, to alter slightly this final scene to make it stronger dra-
matically and to be more consistent with the remainder of the play.

The new ending and a few other changes added since the play’s run began, but which are not found in the reading edition nor the translations, do perhaps make it a better integrated play, but they magnify MacLeish’s negativistic and unchristian philosophy. He makes a moralistic, modern-day fable out of what he considers an age-old myth. MacLeish not only does not believe in a personal God but apparently is not a theist of any sort (although he does remain faithful to the Job original in his play by having God speak with a whirlwind). MacLeish does say in his article: “To me, a man committed to no creed, and more uncertain that I should be of certain ultimate beliefs, the God of Job seems closer to this generation than he has to any other in centuries.” A solicitous, kind, wise, and loving Father in Heaven does not exist in this play. It is man on his own. Church and God are closed issues:

The candles in the churches are out.
The lights have gone out in the sky.

In the final, poignant scene MacLeish’s protagonist repudiates God and faith in the future. Man’s only resemblance to faith and hope for the future lies in the fact that he is a feeling, suffering, and therefore a loving organism. But man is independent of any supernatural force. He is here in ignorance and after this life there is nothing but blackness: “With the dark before, the dark behind....” However, because man is a loving animal he will continue to survive, continue to suffer, and continue to make the same stupid blunders.

Many of those who admire MacLeish as a writer regret that since he used religious material he didn’t make JB into a religious play. In his forward he claims the only justification he can plead is “I badly needed an ancient structure in which to build the contemporary play which has haunted me for five years past and the structure of the poem of Job is the only one I know into which our modern history will fit.” Perhaps he thinks theatre and God are incompatible, or merely that God is a puerile superstition. At any rate his urbane nihilism which reads God and faith in a future life out of the picture leaves much to be desired in the minds of most Christians.
MacLeish's paraphrasing creates a serious distortion. The Job of the Bible never loses his trust in the Lord. The character of Job and unwavering, persevering faith have been synonymous in the minds of Christians for centuries. It is true that the dignity of man is emphasized in Job as nowhere else, but man enjoys the position he does, not in spite of God, but because God has so elevated him.

What is man, that thou shouldest magnify him? and that thou shouldest set thine heart upon him? And that thou shouldest visit him every morning, and try him every moment.

—Job 7:17, 18

The same exalting idea is beautifully echoed by the psalmist:

What is man, that thou art mindful of him? and the son of man that thou visitest him? For thou hast made him a little lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honour.

—Psalms 8:4, 5

This theme is much more vital, is potentially just as dramatic, and could contribute so much more stimulation and inspiration to our daily problems than the question of meaningless suffering which dominates MacLeish's fine drama and which he tries to answer is his newly revised ending. JB's concluding speech in response to the previously quoted lines of his wife, Sarah, which ended the original version is:

We can never know.
He answered me like the stillness of a star
That silences us asking.
No, Sarah, no:
We are and that is all our answer.
We are and what we are can suffer.
But... what suffers loves.
And love
Will live its suffering again,
Risk its own defeat again,
Endure the loss of everything again
And yet again and yet again
In doubt, in dread, in ignorance, unanswered,
Over and over, with the dark before,
The dark behind it . . . and still live
. . . still love.

Unfortunately for a generation needing assurance and security the muted message of hope and faith of the earlier ending is thus negated. It at least speculated:

. . . we'll see by and by . . .
We'll know. We'll know.

---

**Rorschach Blot**

**Martha Haskins Hume**

One either does or does not,
As simple as that, Love!
More complicated than a Rorschach blot,
Who can define the Psyche knot
Shall immortal be—but not—
in love!
Thoughts on Reading Croce’s Theory of Aesthetic

STEPHEN L. ALLEY

In accordance with the plan of the poem of Dante’s *Divine Comedy*, the entrance to the Inferno “is by a gate bearing an announcement partly explanatory and partly terrifying. The moralist begins to exercise his judgment and to graduate the sins and vices of mankind. He places the lazy, the timid, the perpetually irresolute, unfit for good or evil, almost out of this graduation, according to a fantastic law of retribution. Contempt envelops them, and their true punishment is in the verses which score them forever: ‘these wretches who never were alive’; ‘who lived without infamy and without praise. . .’; ‘displeasing to God and to His enemies. . .’; ‘who made through cowardice the great refusal. . .’; ‘let us not speak of them, but look and pass on. . .’”¹

There is another category which I have felt aestheticians have desired to cast beyond the pale: the inartistic. Croce rescues them in the second chapter of his book *Theory of Aesthetic*. He identifies the aesthetic or artistic fact with intuitive or expressive knowledge, taking works of art as examples of intuitive knowledge and attributing to them the characteristics of intuition and vice versa. I find this frank identification startling for, to pursue its implications, it would seem that there is no difference in species between intuition and the artistic sense, and perhaps not even any difference in intensity. And so it proves to be to Croce, for he says, in contradiction to those who thought that art is intuition but that intuition is not always art and that artistic intuition is a distinct species differing from intuition in general by something *more*:

It has sometimes been thought that art is not a simple intuition, but an intuition of an intuition, in the same way as the concept of science has been defined not as the ordinary concept, but as the concept of a concept. Thus man would attain to art by objectifying, not his sensations, as happens with ordinary intuition, but intuition itself... What is generally called *par excellence* art collects intuitions that are wider and more complex than those which we generally experience. These intuitions are always of sensations and impressions.

Art is expression of impressions, not expression of expression. While agreeing with Croce that this process of raising to a second power is perhaps inappropriate—he says that it does not even exist—is it not the case that surrealist art in its unceasing search for more vital expression may be attempting that very thing, the raising to a second power, the objectifying of an intuition rather than a sensation? Croce goes on to deny that artistic intuition differs from ordinary intuition of the simplest popular love song and the complex intuition of a love song by Leopardi, although the former is, naturally, so much more limited extensively. What then is the difference? "The whole difference is quantitative," says Croce, "and as such is indifferent to philosophy." It is just that certain men have a greater aptitude and a more frequent inclination fully to express certain complex states of the soul, and these men are called artists.

This seems like a minimizing of a vastly important distinction—a minimizing that lends substance to the illusion or prejudice that we possess some more complete intuition of reality than we do; that, to put it into popular parlance, we have many great and beautiful thoughts in our minds but that we are just not able to express them. Nonsense, says Croce. We never have had those thoughts if we are not able to express them. He says that people commonly think that all of us ordinary men imagine and intuit countries, figures, and scenes as painters do, and bodies as sculptors do but that painters and sculptors know how to paint and to carve such things while we bear them unexpressed in our souls. Nothing, Croce insists, can

---

be more false than this view. Raphael was Raphael not only because he could express the intuitions he had, but also because he had those intuitions.

The Cult of the Aesthetic

Repeated often enough to give rise to a suspicion that the book has a proselytizing motive is the thesis that Aesthetic has been withdrawn from humanity. The author’s preface (in which he notes that the volume is composed of a theoretical part—herein reviewed—and a historical part, the two forming independent but complementary parts) first gives a hint of his feelings in this respect. “If language is the first spiritual manifestation and if the aesthetic form is language itself taken in all its true scientific extension, it is hopeless to try to understand clearly the later and more complicated phases of the life of the spirit when their first and simplest moment is ill-known, mutilated, and disfigured.”

But before pursuing this thesis, I think it useful to present more of the Crocean concept of the Aesthetic. Aesthetic is, he says, the science of art, but it is more than that. It is also the language of art, the science of intuitive or expressed knowledge which is the aesthetic or artistic fact. But this is a labored definition and not as illuminating as the concept he describes in these words, “And this Aesthetic is the true analog of Logic, which includes, as facts of the same nature, the formation of the smallest and most ordinary concept and the most complicated, scientific, and philosophical system.”

Croce tells us in elaborating the subthesis of the false cult of the Aesthetic that “the cult of the genius with all its attendant superstition has arisen from his quantitative difference having been taken as a difference of quality,” and will not admit that the word genius or artistic genius has any more than a quantitative signification. He notes that it has been forgotten that genius is not something fallen from Heaven, but humanity itself, and those who claim unconsciousness as the chief quality of an artistic genius hurl him from an eminence far above humanity to a position far below it. Intuitive or artistic genius is always conscious, keenly so, and perhaps lacks only the reflective consciousness of the historian or critic, which is not essential to it.
Other errors have contributed to the false cult. Some of them have come from those men who first had some suspicion of the close connection between Aesthetic and Logic. They conceived, so Croce thinks, Aesthetic as a Logic of sensible knowledge and were peculiarly addicted to applying logical categories to the new knowledge. Thus they talked of "aesthetic syllogisms," etc. Croce, however, recommends that Logic be freed from Aesthetic forms, rather than applying Logic to Aesthetic.

He opposes, too, Aesthetic hedonism, which looks upon the aesthetic as a simple fact of feeling and confounds the pleasurable expression (which is the beautiful) with the simple pleasurable and all its other species. Among these species of hedonism is the theory that the beautiful is that which pleases the highest senses—that is, sight and hearing. The refutation is simple. Croce shows that the aesthetic fact does not depend upon the nature of the impressions and that all sensible impressions can be raised to aesthetic expression but that none need of necessity be so raised. He adds slyly that anyone who holds that the aesthetic fact is something pleasing to the eyes or to the hearing has no defense against the person who consistently proceeds to identify the beautiful with the pleasurable in general and includes in Aesthetic the activity and result of cooking or "the viscerally beautiful."

He criticizes the theory of play, the idea that the aesthetic arises only when man begins to play (that is, when he frees himself from natural and mechanical causality and works spiritually). He points out that this makes the aesthetic function a game and every game an aesthetic fact. He further rejects the notion that the explanation of Aesthetic can be found in the origins of the human race in rejecting the theory that the pleasure of art can be deduced from the echo of that of the sexual organs. He scoffs at the confidence of those who find the genesis of the aesthetic fact in the pleasure of "conquering" or in the wish of the male to conquer the female. He rejects, too, the less vulgar current of thought which considers Aesthetic as the science of the sympathetic, as that with which we sympathize; which attracts, rejoices, arouses pleasure and admiration. All of these species of hedonism he rejects, not
being able to do otherwise and be consistent with his stand against philosophical hedonism in general.

As a refutation to hedonistic theories, the theory that art is "pure beauty" has often been advanced. Croce applauds the concept of a beauty "free from all that is not the spiritual form of the expression" but is unable to conceive of a beauty mystical and transcendent, nor one that should be "purified of expression" or severed from itself.

Errors of Other Theories

In his chapter on "Historicism and Intellectualism in Aesthetic" Croce reveals the errors of a series of theories which have been or are presented as theories of Aesthetic.

First among these theories is a theory of the "probable" as the object of art, where probability no longer means the artistic "coherence" of the representation, its completeness and effectiveness, its actual presence, but where it is taken to mean the historically credible, or that historical truth which is not demonstrable but conjecturable, not true but probable. Croce requests that the word coherent be substituted for probable, and says that then the discussions and judgments of the critics who use the theory will make better meaning. In addition to the historically credible, sometimes the reproduction of historical reality has been imposed upon art, which is another of the erroneous forms taken by the theory of the "imitation of nature." Here too is the spectacle afforded by verism and naturalism of a confusion with the processes of natural sciences of the aesthetic fact by aiming at some sort of an experimental drama or romance.

Croce criticizes another idea concerning confusion of art with the philosophical sciences. He attacks the notion that it is the task of art to expound concepts to represent ideas or universals, declaring that art cannot be put in the place of science, or rather that the artistic function in general must not be confused with the particular case in which it becomes aesthetico- logical. In like manner, he claims false the theory of art as supporting theses, or the aesthetic theory of the typical, when by type is understood the abstraction of the concept, and it is affirmed that art should make the species shine in the individual. Don Quixote is taken as the example of a type. But, Croce
asks, a type of what? Of all other Don Quixotes? A type, so
to speak, of himself? Certainly not, says Croce. Is he a type of
abstract concept such as the loss of a sense of reality or of a
love of glory?

He continues to correct the errors of the theory of the use
of the symbol and the allegory, and of the theory of artistic
and literary kinds, the last being characterized as "the greatest
triumph of the intellectualist error." Symbol and allegory are
"expressions eternally added to another expression." The
theory of artistic and literary kinds is attacked and destroyed
thoroughly bit by bit in a manner that reminds one of the
sowing with salt of the Carthaginian soil.

Externalization

Croce dislikes the persistent tendency of humanity to cate-
gorize and to analyze. One has the feeling that he regards the
tendency as characteristic of minds too small to retain and
comprehend the whole in its unity. The persistence of critics
who praise the "new technique" of a writer or a dramatist is
particularly irksome to Croce, who points out that the "new
technique" is precisely the new novel or new drama itself; or,
in the case of a painter, the new picture itself, and nothing else.
He wants understood that technique is the complex of various
kinds of knowledge preceding the volitional fact of the exter-
nalization of aesthetic vision, and not the distribution of light
in the picture itself—as the technique of a dramatist is his dra-
matic conception itself.

Technique is further defined as the "knowledge at the
service of the practical activity directed to producing stimuli
to aesthetic reproduction." The possibility of this knowledge is
what has led minds astray to imagine the existence of an aes-
thetic technique of internal expression leading to the doctrine
of the "means of internal expression," a thing, Croce says,
altogether inconceivable. The reason for its inconceivability is
that expression is a primary theoretic activity preceding practice
and intellectual knowledge illuminating practice, and is really
independent of both.

Restating his delineation of the function of technique, he
says that the production of physical beauty implies a vigilant
will which sees that certain intuitions are not lost and which
acts either rapidly and instinctively or after long and laborious deliberations. The practical activity thus enters into relations with the aesthetic as a really distinct moment of it and not a simple accompaniment. This practical activity, if the exteriorization of the aesthetic vision is willed, must be preceded by technique, the complex of knowledge necessary to the exteriorization. By inference the technique may be acquired by anyone with the physical aptitude and ability; one must be born with the vision. But what of him who is born with the ability to intuit but has never acquired the knowledge, the technique necessary to externalize his intuition? Then is he not one of those earlier identified by Croce as not-artists? Or is he not a Raphael without the technique to become Raphael? Croce denies the existence of such people, saying that Raphael—the artist—is the artist precisely because he possesses intuition which we ordinary men do not, and says further, that if such intuitions are possessed they are expressed. Or, if not expressed, they were not possessed in the first place. Then again, what of the man who has intuition but not technique? Unless one accepts the Crocean dictum that he does not exist, one is driven into a cul-de-sac. By his admission that technique is necessary to exteriorization of aesthetic vision, Croce is driven to deny that intuitions can exist without expression, or what is the same thing, that the artist can exist without expressing himself. Presumably then, the converse is true that within many men the artist lies latent, not expressing, not intuiting, until aesthetic vision is awakened by effort to express and by the acquisition of technique.
Murmuring, prattling,
leaf-tongues
whirl in the wind,
scattering
to curl
inarticulate.
The last leaf
turning, burning
whirls
in the fire-blue air
and falls.
But on the skyline
adamant
the evergreen
defies, denies
the wind,
the tongue-destroying
wind.

Mountain Parable
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The Crusades Against the Masons, Catholics, and Mormons: Separate Waves of a Common Current*

MARK W. CANNON

The tradition-upsetting election of Senator John F. Kennedy as the first Catholic President of the United States provides a remarkable contrast to the crusade against Catholics a century ago.

The theme of this article is that the anti-Catholic movement, which reached its zenith in the 1850’s, was not unique. It reveals common features with the anti-Masonic crusade, which flourished in the early 1830’s, and with the anti-Mormon movement of the 1870’s and 1880’s. A comparison of these movements suggests the existence of a subsurface current of American thought which, particularly in the nineteenth century, could erupt in a geyser of hostility upon a tight-knit minority.

The Anti-Masonic Party

The immediate origin of the anti-Masonic Party was the abduction of William Morgan in Batavia, New York, in 1826. Morgan was a disaffected Mason, who had threatened to reveal the secrets of the movement. The subsequent fear that the judges and juries which were to try Morgan’s alleged abductors, and also the Legislature of New York, were under Masonic influence led to the formation of a political party designed to destroy the power of Masonry.

The anti-Masonic Party promptly achieved surprising success, electing fifteen members to the New York Assembly in the fall of 1827, more than the twelve assemblymen elected

*For a different comparative treatment of these three movements, see David Brion Davis, "Some Themes of Counter-subversion: An Analysis of Anti-Masonic, Anti-Catholic, and anti-Mormon Literature," The Mississippi Valley Historical Review, XLVII (September, 1960), 205-24.

Dr. Cannon is associate professor and chairman of the department of political science at Brigham Young University.
by the Adams Party, the National Republicans. In the Presidential election year of 1828, most anti-Masons supported Adams, who was not a Mason, against Jackson, who was a Mason. The coalition produced sixteen electors in favor of Adams as against twenty for Jackson. The anti-Masons and the Adams party could not agree on a gubernatorial candidate, but their combined votes for their separate candidates exceeded the votes for Van Buren, who was elected.

In the New York Legislature the anti-Masons elected four senators and seventeen assemblymen. The anti-Masonic leaders included many who intransigently opposed Masonry by conviction as well as many shrewd political leaders, who were often more pliable. Among the prominent political leaders were Thurlow Weed and William H. Seward in New York, and Thaddeus Stevens in Pennsylvania.

Following the election of 1828, the radical anti-Masons were subordinated to the practical politicians and the party became in effect an anti-Jackson party of discontent, partly concealed by the outward show of anti-Masonry, with its fervent verbiage and proscriptive declarations. The party became established in other states, and in New York came within a hair of electing its candidate for governor Francis Granger in 1830. In the presidential election year of 1832 the anti-Masons and national Republicans again failed, after a strenuous effort, to turn New York against Jackson and his State candidates. Internal conflicts became more conspicuous after this loss and the party suffered an overwhelming defeat in 1833. After this blow many of the leaders and members of the Party were translated into the new Whig Party.

Much of the anti-Masonic strength grew out of the political vacuum created by the weakness of the Adams party and the resentment of many western New Yorkers at the Democratic opposition to the Erie Canal. There was in addition, however, a mistrust and fear of the power of secret societies, such as the Freemasons, which attracted enthusiastic support for the party, and gave it much of its fervor. The attacks upon Masonry cen-

2Ibid., p. 425.
tered upon the theme that free institutions and their spirit were threatened by the invisible concentration of power in such secret societies. There was special objection to Masonic oaths as "profane" and "shockingly unchristian," particularly the oath to "aid and assist a companion" Mason in any difficulty "whether he be right or wrong." 3 Strenuous objection was also raised to the oath: "I swear to advance my brother's best interests by always supporting his military fame and political preferment in opposition to another." 4 Such oaths were attacked as superseding the obligations of citizenship and destroying political equality. 5 It was believed that such secret mutual support had established a private government more powerful than, and actually in control of, civil government—the judiciary as well as elective legislative and executive positions. Consequently, Masonry was regularly labeled "subversive." 6

A further element of the criticism of Masonic power was its alleged control of the press, and the establishment of free newspapers was called for. 7 A final criticism of Masonic power was its alleged control over the lives of its members and its alleged persecution and destruction of the rights of nonmembers. Furthermore, Masonry was called odious to a free people because it assumed titles and dignities and created an aristocracy incompatible with democracy.

Virtually every one of these anti-Masonic arguments was subsequently used against the Mormons with the modification that only Mormon oaths, and not Mormon membership, were supposed to be secret. The anti-Mormon arguments, however, were supplemented by the attacks upon polygamy, the foreign birth of many Mormons and the charge that the Mormon consolidation of power was of a theocratic type, violating the separation of church and state. Finally, the allegation of a state within a state was more flagrant in the Mormon case because

---

4 Ibid.
6 McCarthy, op. cit., p. 375.
7 McMaster, op. cit., V, 118.
the anti-Mormons could point to a specific federal law which the Mormons deliberately rejected, the anti-polygamy law.

The common element of anti-Masonry and anti-Mormonism was the attack upon the power of a dynamic consolidated, corporate group in what was, at least theoretically, an individualistic society. Even without the benefits of polygamy and the other additional targets of the anti-Mormons, the anti-Masonry attacks produced a widespread response and attracted able political leaders. This suggests that there was a subsurface, but widespread, element of the American character, ready to erupt in hostility against what appeared to be a threatening corporate domestic body, and it seems partially to corroborate the conclusion that much of the substance of the anxiety about the Mormons was the concern about the strength of their independent cohesive unity.

Not only was the basic hostility toward the Freemasons similar to that toward the Mormons later on, but the supporters of the two movements were the same types of people. The common sources of support for the two crusades were New England, the rural areas, and the Protestant ministers. For example, McCarthy has concluded that although there were exceptions, anti-Masonry was essentially a New England movement, the party finding greatest strength in New England, New York and the path of New England emigration. The movement was called by Democrats "a Yankee concern from beginning to end." The whole New England belt, "from Boston to Buffalo fairly teemed with anti-Masonic newspapers."9

It was similarly true that the opposition to the Mormons was spearheaded by New Englanders. George Q. Cannon even narrowed the region further and expressed his wonder that so many of the unyielding enemies of the Church came from Vermont, some of them having emigrated to other states, which they represented in Congress. New England was clearly the most solidly anti-Mormon section of the country, as evidenced by a regional analysis of House and Senate votes on Mormon issues in 1882.10
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9 McCarthy, op. cit., p. 547, citing Pennsylvania Reporter, September 17, 1830.
10 McMaster, op. cit., p. 120.
McCarthy notes, as another peculiarity about anti-Masonry, that "everywhere throughout the country the anti-Masons boasted of their strength in the rural districts and acknowledged the strength of Masonry in the cities."\(^{11}\) Similarly, the vote analysis on the Mormon issue revealed that outside of the South the few votes cast in favor of the Mormon position were generally cast by Democrats from urban constituencies, whereas the rural areas overwhelmingly favored harsh measures against the Mormons.

Even before the disappearance of Morgan, the Presbyterian Church had condemned Masonry. The activity of the Congregationalists was such that in New England anti-Masonry was looked upon as "nothing more than orthodoxy in disguise."\(^{12}\) Methodist leaders were unexcelled in aiding the anti-Masonic cause.\(^{13}\) Other sects which condemned the Masons included Baptists, Dutch Reformed, Mennonites, Dunkards and Quakers. Similarly a great part of the propaganda against the Mormons was carried on through books and sermons of Protestant ministers, and a good share of the pressure upon Congress came from resolutions adopted by Protestant congregations.

**The Anti-Catholic Movement**

Nurtured by anti-Catholic propaganda of previous decades, political American nativism burst forth in the 1840's. In addition to the hatred of the Catholic Church, the fear of the economic, political and social threat of immigrants generally was responsible for the movement. In 1842 new immigrants passed the hundred thousand mark, and five years later they had more than doubled.\(^{14}\) Between 1830 and 1840 the immigrants amounted to only about 3 per cent of the total population, but in the following decade they were nearly 7 per cent.\(^{15}\)

The attacks upon the immigrants were as follows: they were depriving American workers of jobs, and depressing wages; they brought an increase in crime and bred lawlessness

\(^{11}\)McCarthy, *op. cit.*, pp. 546-47.

\(^{12}\)Ibid., p. 542, citing Adams' Diary, IX, 71.

\(^{13}\)Ibid., p. 543.


\(^{15}\)Ibid., p. 194.
by their feuds and riots; they were idle paupers and a public burden; they were intemperate and lowered the moral tone of areas where they settled; they were ignorant and despotically trained and, consequently, were unable to learn and contribute to the American form of government; they were heedless of civil restraint, promoting anarchy, radicalism, and revolution; they brought unprecedented political corruption, voting in blocs and bartering their votes for favors.¹⁶

The natives feared they would soon be ruled by foreigners, who only a few years before, scarcely knew America existed. The preponderance of the foreign-speaking immigrants were Catholic, and many Americans feared they were part of a papal plot to capture America by force of immigration. This fear had its primary origin in a series of lectures delivered by Friedrich Schlegel, adviser to Metternich, in 1828. His lectures were to the effect that Protestantism favored democracy while Catholicism supported monarchy; that European political upheavals were the result of the Reformation, and that the nursery of the destructive principles which threatened Europe was North America. It remained to be inferred that democracy should be destroyed in North America by founding Roman Catholic missions.

At the close of the lectures the Leopold Foundation was organized in Austria and spread to Hungary, Italy, Piedmont, Savoy and France. In the United States the Leopold Foundation was denounced as a plot to build the power of Rome in America by encouraging emigration of Roman Catholics to the United States.¹⁷ Once here, the Catholic immigrants were charged with continuing to owe primary loyalty to the priests, as was allegedly demonstrated by incidents where civil authorities could not quell Catholic mobs, but priests did so easily.

The belief that the Roman Catholics were a danger to America was accentuated, when, in 1840, they fought to obtain a share of public school money for their parochial schools. Lengthy agitation resulted from the school question.


THE CRUSADES AGAINST RELIGIONS

The discontent aroused by the propagandists found its political expression in the organization of Native American Parties. Beginning in 1839 communities of the West and South began to form Native American associations, which gradually multiplied in numbers and influence. The Democrats were viewed as having bartered their birthright for foreign votes. The Whigs flirted with nationalistic ideas, but they refused to translate them into political action. Consequently, the native groups felt compelled to establish a party of their own as an alternative to the two parties.

In New York natives organized the American Republican Party in 1843, which polled an amazing eight thousand votes in the fall elections. In the spring elections in 1844, American Republican candidates were swept into office in New York, and the party organization was expanded into other areas. A national convention was called for September 1844, but it failed to establish a central organization. However, the Whigs sought American Republican backing for their national ticket of Henry Clay and Theodore Frelinghuysen in exchange for Whig support for local nativist candidates. As a result the nativistic ticket was completely victorious in New York City, and in Philadelphia, the other center where political nativism was well organized, three of the four Congressmen elected were advocates of American ideals.

Leaders of the American Republicans were encouraged by this success. They organized a national convention on July 4, 1845, changed the name of the party to Native American, and issued an address calling for support for their anti-Catholic and anti-immigrant efforts. However, new forces were already on the horizon which brought the eclipse of the nativistic party.

The party principles advocated by the American Republican party during its brief career were: (1) require twenty-one years' residency for naturalization (as required of the native born before receiving the right to vote), (2) restrict authority over naturalization to the federal courts, (3) reform party corruption. Other minor aims were agitated, including the restriction of public office to natives, continuation of the Bible as a schoolbook, prevention of all union between the church and

---

state, reduction of street riots, and a guarantee of freedom of worship.\textsuperscript{19} The party accomplished little toward these goals, although New York did change its immigration laws in 1847 and the importation of pauper immigrants was restricted.

The Native Americans participated in riots in Philadelphia in 1844, resulting in bloodshed, property destruction, and church and home burning.\textsuperscript{20} This caused a wave of revulsion against the nativists, and their ranks were depleted. The country became absorbed in new issues while nativism entered several years of quiescence, from which it was to emerge with the development of the Know Nothing party.

The Know Nothing party had its origin in the establishment of a secret patriotic society, the Order of the Star Spangled Banner, in New York in 1849. The order was designed secretly to support the more nativistically inclined candidates of both major parties. In April, 1852, James W. Barker obtained control and the order grew rapidly having some influence in municipal elections that year, but operating still as a hidden political force.\textsuperscript{21}

In 1852 Franklin Pierce was elected President. Both Whigs and nativists attributed this Democratic victory largely to the foreign vote, which helped to stimulate further growth of the order. An efficient nationwide political machine was constructed with district, county, state and national councils operating variously in their own jurisdictions. The order continued its secrecy, partly to avoid the opprobrium attached to nativistic societies after the Philadelphia riots, and partly because fraternal societies and the Order of United Americans had demonstrated wide appeal for secret groups. Consequently, there were grips, passwords, signs, phrases of recognition, signals of distress, and other formulas charming to curious Americans. It was this secrecy and unwillingness of members to admit any knowledge of the activities of the order which caused Horace Greeley to dub the group the Know Nothing Party, which became its appellation.\textsuperscript{22}

\textsuperscript{19}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 203.
\textsuperscript{20} McMaster, \textit{op. cit.}, VII, 376-82; Billington, \textit{op. cit.}, 234.
\textsuperscript{21} Billington, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 381.
To be admitted to the first degree of membership, American-born Protestants of Protestant families swore to use their influence to exclude foreigners and Roman Catholics from public office, to renounce other party allegiance, to support the nominees favored by the order for public office, and to work persistently for a change in the naturalization laws. Holders of the second degree were eligible for office within the order, and for public office as well.

Although members of the Know Nothings disagreed on many issues, they were united in their overriding hatred of Catholicism, even to the extent of admitting some foreign-born Protestants into the organization. In 1854 and 1855 the party achieved phenomenal success in striking down foreign-born and Catholic candidates from both parties’ tickets. In many cases whole slates of men who had not been nominated were written in and elected. In support of the no-popery cause, about seventy-five Congressmen were sent to Washington. It was widely expected that the new American Party, as the Know Nothings were officially called, would win the presidency in 1856.

In addition to the growth of a sincere nativist movement, there were two other factors which contributed to the striking success of the party. The first was the party dispersion. The dozens of parties in the field in 1854 and 1855 included Democratic, Know Nothing, Anti-Nebraska, People’s, Free Soil, Temperance, Rum-Democrat, Whig, Adopted Citizen, and even Know Something. The unity of the Know Nothings might have meant little in a normal election, but it was invaluable with such scattered opposition. Even more than the party confusion, the growing importance of the slavery question helped the Know Nothings to succeed. The passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854 stimulated a controversy to be settled only by the Civil War. The weaker of the traditional parties, the Whigs, died a speedy death during this storm, and many Northern Democrats opposed the Democratic popular sovereignty doctrine. This left a vacuum for many citizens, who drifted into the Know Nothing party, which was neutral on

23McMaster, op. cit., VIII, 212.
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the slavery question and loudly promised to preserve the union.25

Equally influential in bringing the Know Nothing victories was the propaganda build-up of the previous decades which was at its height in the early 1850’s. The upper classes had been won to the cause by the American Protestant Society, the American and Foreign Christian Union, and church sermons. The lower classes had been recruited by inflammatory lectures, street preachers, and a persistent outpour of propaganda in newspapers and books.

However, the almost complete failure of the Congress or the state legislatures, controlled by the Know Nothings, to carry into effect the measures advocated by the anti-foreign and anti-Catholic propagandists contributed to a surprising decline of the Know Nothing organization.26 Other factors which contributed to the downfall of this once burgeoning party were violence and bloodshed—for which the Know Nothings received more than their share of the blame and stigma; criticism and ridicule of the party’s secrecy; and internal dissension.27 Finally, interest on the Catholic question was dissipated because of the focus of interest on the slavery question, due to the repeal of the Missouri Compromise and the tales of “Bleeding Kansas.” By the middle of 1855 the nation was divided into two warring camps, which the Know Nothing party, built on a basis of union and nationalism, could not survive. The nebulous fears of foreign influence and papal invasion were generally forgotten in the new crisis.

The anti-Catholic literature, which was so effective in building up prejudice against Catholics, centered on three broad allegations. These were: (1) that Catholicism was not Christianity but an idolatrous religion; (2) that popery was irreconcilable with American democratic institutions; and (3) that the Catholic Church had very low morality.28

In order to prove Catholicism to be unchristian, such doctrines as transubstantiation, worship of saints, purgatory, extreme unction, penances, and confession were vigorously at-
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tacked as unscriptural man-made doctrines designed to increase the power and wealth of the priesthood.\(^{29}\) Also attacked were the elaborate clerical garb, impressive ceremony of mass, feasts, processions, and holy water. Miracles were branded as superstition.

As part of the charge that this powerful religion was inconsistent with American free institutions, it was said that Catholicism was intimately connected with monarchy and that the papal system itself was despotic with the Pope, through the hierarchy, having power over the most humble worshiper. History was luridly painted to show that wherever Catholicism had been in power, liberty had vanished through the inquisition, the massacre of Protestants, and the index. It was charged that the hierarchy were compelled to swear to yield nothing to "principalities or powers," and that, for Catholics, the Pope's authority was superior to any political authority.\(^{30}\) Furthermore, it was alleged, once Catholics were in the ascendacy, they would grasp control of temporal authority for their own ends, and would stamp out science, free press, free speech, and religious freedom.

In regard to morality, the Catholics presumably were willing to lie, steal, or murder for the benefit of their religion—expecting to be forgiven through the confessional. The attack particularly centered, as in the Mormon issue, on alleged sexual immorality. The Catholic priests' and nuns' failure to marry was as hard to accept as the Mormons' plural marriages. Consequently flagrant novels depicted the plight of innocent Protestant girls who were snatched and placed in gloomy cells in a convent to supply the lecherous demands of the priests. One of these novels by Charles W. Frothingham sold forty thousand copies the first week of publication and went through five editions.\(^{31}\) Thus, priests were accused of using the confessionals to seduce both married women and young innocent girls. The nunneries were regarded as popish brothels, and abortions and infant murders were popularly reported to have been carried out by the thousands. Billington concluded that

\(^{29}\)Ibid., pp. 351-56.
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"these accounts of Catholic immorality were accepted without question by perhaps a majority of the evangelical Protestants in America."\textsuperscript{32}

The American Party was supported more solidly in the Northeastern states than in any other section.\textsuperscript{33} In Massachusetts the Know Nothings in 1854 elected all of the State senators and all but two members of the State house of 376 members. They won a similar victory in 1855. A Know Nothing governor was elected with 63 per cent of the popular vote in the Bay State.\textsuperscript{34} In addition to Massachusetts, Know Nothing majorities were elected in Rhode Island, Connecticut, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, and New York in 1854 or 1855.

Next to the Northeast, the border states gave the greatest victory to the American Party. In 1854 and 1855 it carried Delaware, Maryland, California, and Kentucky, and nearly added Tennessee and Virginia to this list. The people in the border states feared the effects of serious sectional conflict and were attracted to the American Party partly because it appeared to be a compromise party.

The South had few Catholics, and most of them were long established. However, the Southerners feared the increased political power which the North was attaining through immigration and resented the fact that many aliens were abolitionists. In addition, many of the rural inhabitants of the South were taught by their Protestant ministers to fear Catholics. The combination of this nativistic sentiment with the desire of many Southerners to settle the troublesome slavery question brought numerous near-victories for the Know Nothings throughout the South.

The least successful region for the American Party was the Northwest, partly because most of the immigrants who had settled there had become sober, hard-working farmers who believed the Know Nothing image of immigrants.

\textit{Comparison of Anti-Catholic, Anti-Mormon, and Anti-Masonic Movements}

Although Catholicism and Mormonism were quite different

\textsuperscript{27}Ibid., p. 366.
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\textsuperscript{29}Hamilton, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 4.
in many respects, numerous charges against the two were similar. Both were thought to be balkanized groups within the American body politic. Both were thought to be composed primarily of immigrants of a slavish, ignorant type. The economic competition of Catholic workers was emphasized much more than that of immigrant Mormons. Both were thought to have primary allegiance not to the United States Government but to the heads of their churches. In the case of the Catholics, this charge was made all the more dramatic because the Pope was depicted as a foreign power with designs on control of the United States Government and suppression of American freedom. In the case of the Mormons, the prophet of the Church was located in the United States, and the Church was too small to be seriously depicted as threatening to control the national government. However, the Mormons were pictured as hostile to the government. The fact that they persisted in violating the federal anti-polygamy law was used as conclusive evidence of Mormon disloyalty.

Thus, because of the immigrant composition and because of church doctrine and organization, both Mormons and Catholics were thought to be opposed to American free institutions. Both groups were thought to violate the separation of church and state. However, this issue was of major consequence principally in the efforts of the Catholics to obtain public funds for their parochial schools.

Finally, although the spectacular polygamy issue, which was so helpful in exciting public hostility toward the Mormons, was not available to the anti-Catholics, the lack of marriage of the Catholic hierarchy was subject to similar abuse. The insinuation of lechery among the Catholic priests was as prevalent as the corresponding accusations concerning Mormon leaders. In addition, both groups were accused of other types of crime such as lying, stealing and even murder, for the sake of their faiths.

In both cases there was a feeling that American purity was being contaminated by these alien groups. The question asked about Catholic immigrants: "Can one throw mud into pure water and not disturb its clearness?" indicated the same kind
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of anxiety as was implied in the use of such epithets as "stain" or "cancer" in the body politic, in reference to the Mormons.

The anti-Masonic, anti-Catholic, and anti-Mormon movements each had distinguishing characteristics. Yet there was sufficient similarity among the arguments used in the consecutive attacks upon the Masons, Catholics, and Mormons to suggest that the three crusades were separate waves produced by a continuous underlying current in the stream of American thought. This often subsurface current seeks to preserve the purity of American institutions against any groups or influences which appear to be alien.

The conclusion that the staggering attacks variously leveled against secret societies, popery and its immigrant emissaries, and Mormonism came largely from the same stream of thought, is further substantiated by the similarity of the crusading groups in each case. There were three primary sources of support which were common to each crusade. These were Protestant ministers, New Englanders, and rural inhabitants. Furthermore, joint attacks were sometimes made on two alien institutions at a time. For example, popery and Freemasonry were denounced together as "schemes equally inconsistent with Republicanism." 36 McCarthy concluded that the spirit of the opposition to Masonry "led naturally to the Native American doctrines of the future; indeed many of the prominent anti-Masons became leaders of that excitement." 37

The Democratic Party traditionally stood by these "alien" groups, whereas the major opposition party tended to be allied with the American purists. The partial alliance was noted between the anti-Masons and Adams' National Republicans, as well as the fact that when the anti-Masonic party declined, many of its leaders moved into the new Whig party. It was the Whig party which flirted with the subsequent Native American movement, although the Whigs would not go so far as to adopt the Natives' platform. Finally, the Whigs and the American Party were important elements in launching the successful new Republican Party. After the slavery issue became paramount, it became impossible for the American Party to

36 McCarthy, op. cit., p. 544.
37 Ibid.
continue to try to be a compromise party. In the North, Catholi-
cism and slavery became linked, as illustrated by the following
resolution: "That there can exist no real hostility to Roman
Catholicism which does not embrace slavery, its natural co-
worker in opposition to freedom and republican institutions." 38

The strong Native American orientation of the emerging
Republican Party is shown by the fact that in 1856 there were
elected to the United States House of Representatives 108 Re-
publicans of whom seventy had been or were members of
Know Nothing lodges. 39 Furthermore, Abraham Lincoln was
nominated partially because he was the only candidate accept-
able to the Know Nothings as well as to regular Republicans.
In spite of a letter Lincoln wrote expressing disapproval of the
objectives of the Know Nothings, he insisted that assiduous
efforts be made to obtain their votes. 40 This objective was
achieved and Hamilton went so far as to conclude: "The Know
Nothings were clearly responsible for the election of Lin-
coln." 41

As has been noted, Protestant ministers and New England-
ers were listed as two common sources of support for these
purism crusades. Thus, it is significant that Hamilton attributes
to "the numerous Protestant ministers, including Unitarians, in
the Republican party" considerable responsibility for the inte-
gration of many of the Know Nothings into the Republican
party in New England, and Michigan, Wisconsin and Minne-
sota which were "idealogical extensions of New England." 42
It is also significant that subsequent high Republican office
holders such as President Ulysses S. Grant and his two vice
presidents, Henry Wilson and Schyler Colfax, had all been
members of Know Nothing lodges. In further linking the op-
opposition to allegedly un-American practices and groups, it is
finally significant that former Know Nothing Republicans such
as Schyler Colfax and Ulysses S. Grant also became leaders in
the fight against the Mormons. It was also the Republican

38Billington, op. cit., p. 425. See also for example Facts for the People of
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Party, that was so heavily impregnated with Know Nothing influence, which in 1856 linked polygamy and slavery as the twin relics of barbarism which had to be attacked. And finally, it was the Republicans (with their nativistic tinge) who pursued the anti-Mormon crusade in Congress in the 1870's and 1880's, whereas the Democrats of that period were considerably less anxious to employ the might of the Federal government to force Mormon conformity.

Why Did Anti-Mormon Crusade Succeed
Where Earlier Crusades Failed?

Since these impulsive movements came from essentially the same source, the question can be raised as to why the anti-Masonic and anti-Catholic movements of the 1830's, 1840's, and 1850's failed to put into legislation a single one of their major objectives, whereas the anti-Mormons succeeded in enacting most of their principal objectives.

Both the anti-Masonic and anti-Catholic movements won phenomenal election victories. However, there appears to be an American tendency to react against purism as powerfully as the proscriptive prejudice itself was exerted, and to choke it out. Thus in both the anti-Masonry and anti-Catholicism cases, promptly after each movement reached its zenith of power, other forces dissipated and extinguished the proscriptively oriented organization—before either one had the time to establish and win its legislative goals. Considering these facts, the typical slowness of the legislative process may be desirable insofar as this slowness may protect minority groups against whom there may be a temporary wave of prejudice, which will subsequently subside.

In the case of the anti-Mormon campaigns there were also waves of prejudice which subsequently ebbed. Twice while George Q. Cannon was in Congress, anti-Mormon sentiment reached a crescendo resulting in enactment of anti-Mormon laws (1874 and 1882). Yet it is significant that, following the enactments, anti-Mormon sentiment died down and those who promoted the punitive legislation failed to be re-elected.43

THE CRUSADES AGAINST RELIGIONS

Several factors, which did not exist to aid the anti-Masonic and anti-Catholic movements, helped the anti-Mormons put their objectives into law. A difference of overriding importance was that the two earlier movements preceded the Civil War, whereas the anti-Mormon movement came after the Civil War—which radically changed the willingness of the nation to exercise federal power in attaining desired objectives.

For example, one of the legislative objectives for which the Know Nothings had had the strongest support was the prohibition of the immigration of foreign criminals, lunatics, and paupers. Yet when such a bill was considered in 1855 it was killed because of the sole objection that the Constitution had given Congress only the power to establish uniform rules of naturalization. The prohibition of classes of immigrants was among the reserved rights of the states, which could not be infringed by the federal government.

However, the Civil War was a triumph of nationalism over states' rights. The war created a national currency, a national banking system, a national army, and new national taxes. The jealous restrictions against the power of the central government were broken in a score of ways. Congress assessed a direct tax upon the states, raised a national militia within their borders, exercised full sovereignty in all the territories, gave homesteads to western farmers, endowed agricultural colleges in all the states, made large grants of land to a Pacific railroad and underwrote its bonds. An earlier National Republican could hardly have conceived of these national developments.44

Enactment of the Thirteenth Amendment vanquished the remaining conviction that such matters as slavery should be locally controlled. The effect of the Civil War in promoting subsequent federal intervention has been depicted as follows:

A war is a test of the utmost strength, and the utmost strength is brought to bear. But after the war, the muscles and sinews which have been strengthened and tested by the great effort, which in fact have been called into being by that test, remain ready and eager for new uses. Seldom are these new powers allowed to atrophy: there are too many people who

want them used, and the old resistance against their employment is weakened.\textsuperscript{45}

This increased willingness to use federal power, after the Civil War, was vital to the enactment of punitive anti-Mormon legislation. Closely allied was the fact that harsh measures were justified on the grounds of stubborn Mormon disobedience to the federal anti-polygamy law, which had been declared constitutional by the Supreme Court—this with memories of nullification still fresh in mind.

Another important element which favored the anti-Mormon crusades in contrast with the anti-Masonic and anti-Catholic crusades, was that most Mormons lived in territories which were much more subject to federal control than were states. Had Utah been a state, the more cumbersome constitutional amendment process would undoubtedly have been required in case the federal government attempted to abolish polygamy. One more factor which made the Mormons vulnerable to federal legislation was the national fascination with and hostility toward polygamy, which facilitated the outpouring of inciting propaganda, leading to congressional action. Finally, the lack of any significant voting group of Mormons or their friends which could retaliate made them vulnerable. This is in contrast to both the Masons and the Catholic immigrants, who represented significant power blocs which could fight their attackers with considerable effect.

Theodore Dreiser: Naturalist or Theist?

DUSTIN HEUSTON

In literary criticism, Theodore Dreiser’s name has become synonymous with “naturalism.” Naturalism, however, has certain philosophical problems attending it. While apparently freeing an individual from the tensions of normal ethical systems, such as a religion, naturalism fails, finally, to provide any relief for the one problem that most of the systems profess to answer: the problem of death. Similarly, when an individual adopts a naturalistic ethic, he is apt to become a hedonist because a naturalistic ethic gives apparent sanction to the gratification of his senses, since these are natural by-products of his chemical make-up. The adoption of this hedonistic view, in turn, offers some serious problems, particularly on the nature of the universe.¹

Although Dreiser was concerned with some of the problems that attend a hedonistic life,² it was his inability to solve the problem of death that ultimately led him to abandon his philosophy of naturalism in favor of a theistic solution. In *The "Genius"* (1915), and *An American Tragedy* (1925), Dreiser has his protagonists investigate religion while under...

---

¹Mr. Heuston is instructor in English at Brigham Young University.


³For example, in *The Financier* Dreiser predicts that Cowperwood will find great fame, but “sorrow, sorrow, sorrow . . . for in the glory was also the ashes of Dead Sea fruit—an understanding that could neither be inflamed by desire nor satisfied by luxury; a heart that was long since weared by experience; a soul that was bereft of illusion as a windless moon.” Again, in *The Titan* he has Cowperwood comment that beyond beauty there is nothing save “crumbling age, darkness, silence.” And in *The "Genius"* Eugene’s “hedonistic tendencies” lead to the view that “life was nothing save dark forces moving aimlessly.” In pursuing beauty, also, the problem of death becomes magnified, for life and happiness depend on health and success; disease and weakness bring death, and death is nothingness: “The abyss of death! When he looked into that after all of life and hope, how it shocked him, how it hurt! Here was life and happiness and love in health—there was death and nothingness—aeons and aeons of nothingness.”
severe pressures, but they find that it fails to offer them a satisfactory solution. Eugene, in *The "Genius,"* abandons his search of Christian Science, and the book closes with a ringing quotation from Spencer's *First Principles,* Dreiser's bible of naturalism. Clyde, in *An American Tragedy,* accepts religious conversion while in the death house awaiting execution, but it is a desperate conversion by a man who still has some doubts. In these two novels Dreiser has specialized in bringing forth the questions that torture a man in search of a faith, but while noting the attraction that a religion offers when the problem of death is raised, he has refused to accept the commitment of a faith. This changed, however, with the publication of his next novel, *The Bulwark,* in 1946.

In *The Bulwark,* Dreiser is no longer discussing death as an intellectual question, but he is now facing it as a man in his seventies who realizes that he has not much longer to live. The setting of the story is meant to be timeless and the problem universal: it is the story of a religious man and the difficulties that he meets in life as he matures. The story is really a vehicle for a philosophical presentation of the price and rewards of a religious faith. We know that Dreiser was writing with an active faith at this time, not only from the tone of the novel, but also from people who were acquainted with him. His wife commented that

I knew he was putting a lot of himself into this story of the Quaker, and I saw in his eyes the realization that his own life might end at any time and that he felt he might have done differently at times in the past. Often he quoted: '... this night thy soul shall be required of thee.'

Robert Elias, in his biography of Dreiser, states that from long conversations with him he learned that the book was intended as a gesture of atonement on Dreiser's part for his earlier attacks on God. "'It's funny,' he remarked on one occasion after he had completed the how a fellow can go along for years and not get it. when it's there all the time.'"*  

---

Dreiser was a realist and recognized fully what a religious commitment meant. In the introduction to the novel, which is a short discussion of the wedding of Solon and Benecia with an outline of the Quaker faith as promulgated by George Fox, he states the terms of the ultimate religious commitment with a quotation from Job: "Though He slay me, yet will I trust Him." Until now, Dreiser has chastised religion in the final judgment because it has not offered worldly success to the supplicants, but here we have a statement that indicates the degree of faith that a man must accept in religious maturity. The remainder of the book is devoted to showing what pressures the acceptance of this proposition might entail in a man's life.

The very first scene of the book, when Solon is a child, involves the discussions of the effect of accidental evil on a religious temperament. Solon has borrowed a slingshot from another boy and fired a chance shot at a distant bird. Although the odds are heavily against it, he hits the bird and kills it only to discover that it was the mother of four baby chicks. His friend takes them home and feeds them to his cat because they will die without a mother. Solon's mother discovers that he is very upset about something and learns, upon questioning him, what has happened. Through her speculation, Dreiser makes his point:

Hence, while she found herself loving and forgiving her own son . . . she found herself not a little religiously and intellectually troubled by the fact that so much ill could come about accidentally when plainly no cruelty or evil was intended.6

The next problem that is taken up as the story progresses is the difficulty of effecting religious principles in actual life. Solon starts to become quite successful in commercial ventures and suddenly is puzzled as to the rightness of his path:

And yet, pleased as he was over these ventures, he was becoming more and more mentally disturbed as to where lay the dividing line between ambition and an irreligious greed, between the desire for power and wealth and a due regard for Quaker precepts.6

6Ibid., p. 113.
The next incident that Dreiser raises is to illuminate the conflict between religious mercy and the laws of justice. Solon obtains a position in the bank for a Quaker neighbor's son who turns out to be a thief, and Solon has difficulty in resolving the conflict of whether he should intervene on the boy's behalf or let justice take its course. The latter course of action will be easier because he is personally involved in the case, and this is the one that he chooses. After the boy is sentenced to four years in the state reformatory, however, he changes his mind and decides that he has committed a great spiritual offense:

In the light of his religion, he should have assisted him—and he had not. This weighed on him. It was the first and most serious offense against his religious principles that Solon Barnes had ever committed.\(^7\)

Until now, Dreiser has been raising intellectual problems that are not easily solved, but he now starts introducing personal tragedies into the life of Solon which are "calculated to bring him face to face with reality."\(^8\) First his father dies, and then he discovers that his oldest daughter, who is rather plain in appearance, is being hurt socially by her looks. She is so hurt that she shocks her mother by stating, "I wish sometimes I were dead!"\(^9\) Solon looks for the religious significance of this but has a hard time settling the question:

It was sacrilegious, he was compelled to admit, to question the divine order in anything. But still so many queer and unfortunate and terrible things happened in so many walks of life . . . why did an all-wise and all-merciful Providence allow them to happen?\(^10\)

From these introductory personal tragedies, Dreiser increases the misfortunes of Solon's family until his life seems to be surrounded by a solid mass of tragedy. Under the influence of a girl friend from school, his youngest daughter refuses to attend the college her parents have chosen for her, and by stealing some of her mother's jewels, she finances a trip to the University of Wisconsin to study. Solon follows her out there but is unable to persuade her to return home. She later migrates

---

\(^7\)Ibid., p. 120.
\(^8\)Ibid., p. 121.
\(^9\)Ibid., p. 127.
\(^10\)Ibid., p. 128.
to Greenwich Village with this same girl friend and becomes the paramour of an artist. During this latter period, one of her brothers, who is developing into a playboy, becomes involved in a manslaughter charge when he and some of his male friends administer a drug to a young girl to ease her inhibitions, and she dies because of a weak heart. He is so ashamed at what he has done and how he has disgraced his family that he kills himself in prison while awaiting trial. To make matters worse during this period, Solon learns that the board of trustees of the bank at which he is the treasurer are overextending the use of the bank's funds in unsound personal speculation. He corrects this matter by personally informing the Treasury Department bank investigators of what is transpiring, and then he resigns from the bank. Shortly after this, his wife's health declines, and she dies from a series of strokes.

After all this tension and difficulty, Dreiser trains his sympathy on the character of Solon as, broken in health and slowly dying of cancer, he tries to hold his world together. The crisis is reached in a scene from nature that represents the conscious renunciation of Dreiser's naturalism. Solon is pictured as wandering around the grounds of his home and speculating on the various forms and beauty that the "Creative Force" has fashioned. He spies a beautiful green fly perched on, and eating the bud of a beautiful flower. This is a remarkable opportunity for Dreiser to inject a discussion of the impersonality and cruelty of nature and to have Solon's eyes opened to the purposeless nature of a Godless universe. The personal tragedy in Solon's life has all but killed him, and he will be receptive to such a view at this time if he ever is to be. Indeed, Dreiser even has him wonder at the meaning of this apparent tragedy:

Was this beautiful creature, whose design so delighted him, compelled to feed upon another living creature, a beautiful flower? For obviously, as it ate, it was destroying the bud of this plant, and in so far as he could see or know, the plant had no way of defending itself.11

Solon then wanders around the garden and looks closely for the first time at all the forms of nature spread before him.

11Ibid., p. 317.
His final decision, however, is one of trust and belief as Dreiser reaffirms the earlier motto, "Though He slay me, yet will I trust in Him." Solon, "then, after bending down and examining a blade of grass here, a climbing vine there..." turns in "a kind of religious awe and wonder" and decides:

Surely there must be a Creative Divinity, and so a purpose, behind all of this variety and beauty and tragedy of life. For see how tragedy had descended upon him, and still he had faith, and would have.12

A more specific description of Solon's, and Dreiser's, final understanding of this Creative Force and his view of what God would have man do in his life is given in a description of a second walk in the garden. Solon meets a puff adder which puffs up and threatens to strike. Solon, realizing the harmless nature of the snake, talks to it gently and tells it that he knows it is harmless and that it may go its way without harm. At this, the snake relaxes and starts to go on its way. Solon steps forward to see how long it is and inadvertently frightens it again, but after talking to it and calming it once again, he backs away to observe its departure. Then the snake turns towards him and glides right over his shoe as he leaves. In relating this incident to his oldest daughter, Solon comments:

Good intent is of itself a universal language, and if our intention is good, all creatures in their particular way understand, and so it was that this puff adder understood me just as I understood it... And now I thank God for this revelation of His universal presence and His good intent toward all things—all of His created world. For otherwise how would it understand me, and I it, if we were not both a part of Himself?13

In the end, Etta, his wayward daughter, returns from Greenwich Village. And it is in her growth and understanding of what her father has gained from his religion during his life that Dreiser offers his final message. Her understanding is interesting because it is the first time that Dreiser has acknowledged the efficacy of following a religion for mental contentment. Through her service to her father she

---

12Ibid.
13Ibid., pp. 318-319.
could see what it might mean to serve others, not only for reasons of family bonds or personal desires, but to answer human need. . . . In this love and unity with all nature, as she now sensed, there was nothing fitful or changing or disappointing—nothing that glowed one minute and was gone the next. This love was rather as constant as nature itself, everywhere the same. . . . It was an intimate relation to the very heart of being.\(^\text{14}\)

Thus we find in *The Bulwark* that Dreiser has concentrated on the eschatological question raised by his own impending death, a question that he showed a great deal of interest in before, but one that he never fully resolved. From a realistic statement of the terms of a religious commitment, "Though He slay me, yet will I trust Him," Dreiser systematically traces the problems that a man might meet in retaining his faith. He never wavers; he states the conditions for the religious contract, carefully develops the difficulties which may undermine this ideal, and concludes still retaining his belief in the ideal.

Shortly after finishing *The Bulwark*, Dreiser started to complete the third volume of his financial trilogy which included *The Financier* (1912) and *The Titan* (1914). Of this third volume, entitled *The Stoic*, he finished all but his last chapter before he died. He had, however, discussed this last chapter with his wife and left a projected outline, so the volume contains an appendix which informs the reader of his intended conclusion.

In this final volume, Dreiser maintains the same interest in religion as his previous novel. Because of the characterization of his protagonist from the first two volumes of the trilogy, however, Dreiser is faced with a problem of how to develop his religious theme in this third volume without obviously changing the character of his naturalistic business tycoon. He solves this problem by having the businessman, Cowperwood, under the pressure of impending death, question at various times the efficacy of his previous path in life. This questioning is as far as he dares go, however, so to get on with his real interest, Dreiser has his protagonist die and then transfers the protagonist's role to his companion, Bevy. And in her depres-

sion at the finality of Cowperwood’s death, Dreiser finds the means to begin his active religious speculation through her search for spiritual growth. In the end, she comes to find the same values in religion as Etta did in *The Bulwark*: that religion is not an escape, or the formal worship of an inscrutable God, but something that one should live both for his own needs and those of others:

But now she knew that one must live for something outside of one’s self, something that would tend to answer the needs of the many as opposed to the vanities and comforts of the few, of which she herself was one.\(^\text{15}\)

The tone of Dreiser’s final two novels suggests that a careful study would have value in discovering whether this strong spiritual stand is a sudden conversion away from his earlier works, or a natural consequence of them. Such a study,\(^\text{16}\) in fact, indicates that Dreiser was not a naturalist who adopted a last-minute theistic solution, but a theist who, for a period, was a naturalist of varying degrees prior to his final acceptance of the theistic terms, “Though He slay me, yet will I trust Him.”

Dreiser was first a theist: he was raised in a deeply religious household by a fanatical Catholic father, and although he later repudiated this earlier heritage for a naturalistic position, the earlier influence remained in his life and works.\(^\text{17}\) The attempted naturalistic solution was never completely satis-


\(^{16}\)The size of this article naturally precludes any lengthy proof of this point; however, there is a wealth of evidence awaiting the reader who goes back over Dreiser’s early works in search of this theistic influence. My master’s thesis at Stanford University was devoted to such a search, and my main problem lay not in finding the material, but in screening the overabundance of examples. Even in his two most deliberately naturalistic novels, *The Financier* and *The Titan*, in which God has been carefully ignored except for occasional jibes, Dreiser closes the novels with epilogues that rail against God, as if the object of a deliberate snub must be made cognizant of the dimensions of the snub. As T.S. Eliot says, “It is only the irreligious who are shocked by blasphemy. Blasphemy is a sign of Faith.” (See his “Dialogue on Dramatic Poetry” in his *Selected Essays*, New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1950.)

\(^{17}\)H. L. Mencken, for example, was a close friend of Dreiser’s and wrote as far back as 1917 in *The Seven Arts* that Dreiser should not be classified as a naturalist or realist, for “he is really something quite different, and, in his moments, something far more stately.” Mencken, however, deplored the obviously “believing attitude of mind” that Dreiser displayed and considered it a “heritage of the Indiana hinterland.”
factory to him, and as some of the perceptive critics have pointed out, such as Charles Child Walcutt,\textsuperscript{18} his naturalism was constantly changing. Finally, though, as I have pointed out, the problem of death forced him back into an acknowledged theistic position after this unsuccessful sortie into naturalism. And now that all the evidence is in, it appears that we should reverse the current critical emphasis which shackles him with being simply a "naturalist," and say that his life and works may be more profitably studied in terms of a theological struggle and resolution.

\textsuperscript{18}See Charles Child Walcutt, \textit{American Literary Naturalism, A Divided Stream} (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1956).

\textbf{Ingratitude}

\textsc{Klea Evans Worsley}

The giant with silver raiment  
Strides on distant lands scattering manna.  
Then from his height he pulls the strings;  
Twisted, tangled strings.  
The small disheveled creatures eat the manna  
But spit at the giant.  
He turns away,  
Tears falling from cardboard eyes.
Valse from "Little Dance Suite, Opus 39"

CARL FUERSTNER

The Little Dance Suite, of which this waltz is a part, was commissioned by and written for Phil Keeler, well-known Utah dancer and choreographer, and is still in the stage of being completed. The composer has utilized traditional dance forms to be filled with present-day musical language, including a recurring 12-tone "motto." The six movements are held together by a loose scenario and will give ample chance for execution of time-honored choreographic patterns. The Little Dance Suite will be premiered this spring.

Prof. Fuerstner is instructor in music at Brigham Young University, a composer, conductor, and pianist with wide experience in America and Europe.
When All Has Been Given

and all taken
(and both have been taker and giver)
time's womb is the room they wake in;
what bauble will it deliver?
Have charged poles, pronged and plussed,
uniting themselves in desire,
lost Venus' cross, Mars' arrow of lust:
smoke rings from the Phoenix fire?
Or popped to birth Donne's hemispheres?
whose torrid equators might
merge in the flux of flea-bitten years
if not cooled by equilibrious sneers
congealing by polar night
to thicken a skin around captive fire
and drive an axis through poles of desire.

—Edward Hart
Dostoevsky on Crime and Revolution: 
A Study in Russian Nihilism
LOUIS C. MIDGLEY

Fyodor Dostoevsky has received considerable attention for his literary accomplishments, and at present his attractiveness to those interested in Russian intellectual history is certainly not on the decline. Philosophers and theologians, especially those influenced by existentialism, devote considerable attention to his thought. Even students of politics have indicated some interest in Dostoevsky. However, greatness as a novelist did not endow Dostoevsky with commensurate political wisdom, the least impressive features of his thought being a passionate jingo spirit, racism, an especially crude form of anti-Semitism, and extreme nationalism. His imperialistic political program for Russia was founded on questionable religious considerations.

The significance of Dostoevsky for political thought is at least partly grounded on his attempts to check the advance of the evils he saw being generated. Politically his appeal is based on his "prophecy" of the character of the nihilistic revolution threatening Russia. Dostoevsky pictured the Russian revolutionary as a man who has lost touch with reality. The revolutionary "nihilist" is a wandering, restless, rootless individual, and he is always radically estranged from traditional ideals and authentic values. Much of Dostoevsky's immense notoriety is founded on his brilliantly portrayed insights into the darker

Mr. Midgley is instructor in political science at Brigham Young University.

1Existentialists often see in Dostoevsky a precursor of their own movement. See, for example, William Barrett, Irrational Man: A Study in Existential Philosophy (Garden City, New York: Doubleday Anchor, 1958), pp. 120-124.


3See Midgley, "God and Immortality in Dostoevsky's Thought," Brigham Young University Studies, II (1959), 55-69.
side of man—the gloom, despair, despondency, and melancholy anxiety that often appear in the depths of human existence. Dostoevsky was pleased to think that he had succeeded, at times, in his novels and stories "in discovering certain people who considered themselves sound and then proved to them that they were unsound" (DW, II, 931).

It was Dostoevsky's opinion that Pushkin, Russia's famous poet, "was the first to detect and record the principal pathological phenomenon of our educated society, historically detached from, and priding itself on, the people." Pushkin revealed the Russian "negative type—the restless man, refusing to be reconciled, having no faith in his own soil and in the native forces, denying Russia and ultimately himself". . . (DW, II, 959). The "separation" or "segregation" of what has come to be known as the "superfluous man" from his foundations, his rootlessness, was seen by Dostoevsky as the direct result of the efforts of Peter the Great to introduce into Russia European ideas, technology, and institutions. Aleko, the hero of Pushkin's poem Gypsies, was a kind of prototype of the unhappy "wanderer"—a man who roams his native land, suffers intense inner humiliation, and endures everything in the hope of finding "salvation." Aleko's sickness was so intense that he even joined a band of Gypsies; his spiritual descendants became socialists for the same reasons. At first the superfluous man seeks genuine values, and authentic goals by vast expenditures of energy. With matchless enterprise these "homeless Russian ramblers" seek universal human happiness because nothing short of that will satisfy them.


The first signs of the growth of the revolutionary bacillus are found in the many cases of Russian intellectuals who began playing at "liberalism," and at a somewhat later date with socialism. However, not everyone, at least at first, feels the urge to wander. Dostoevsky asked:

What of the fact that one man has not even begun to worry while another, encountering a locked door, has already smashed his head against it?—in due time all will meet the same destiny . . . . And even if not many meet this destiny: it suffices if "the chosen," one tenth, start worrying, the great majority will lose peace through them (DW, II, 969).

The rootlessness of the Russian wanderer was compared to a blade of grass "torn from its roots and blown about by the wind." Dostoevsky felt that the wanderer was "a fantastic and impatient creature, he still awaits salvation pre-eminently from external causes" (DW, II, 969).

The Russian wanderers felt strongly indignant over the many abuses in their society, were highly disturbed by the pitiful plight of the poor, and felt considerable "civic sorrow" for the unfortunate peasants. These superfluous men had a humane feeling for the people; "nevertheless," according to Dostoevsky, "they remained corrupted Russians, detached from their soil." The superfluous man finally profoundly despised and abhorred his people (DW, I, 5). The Russian wanderer, in spite of his original high mindedness, and in spite of his lofty idealism, was somehow forced to adopt an extreme position from which he frequently was willing to crush the people in the name of the people. The wanderer after having first imbibed intoxicating Western ideologies at last becomes a demon desiring only terror and destruction. Wanderers ultimately see themselves "like flies caught in a web by a huge spider" (P, 561). The spider was many things for Dostoevsky; as a symbol of evil it was "nihilism, profligacy, and godlessness" (P, 30).

The Russian "Liberal"

Dostoevsky’s most striking treatment of nihilism was his
"political pamphlet," *The Possessed.* The novel is based, at least in part, on the notorious Nechaiev murder case, but Dostoevsky always insisted that *The Possessed* was really not an attempt to provide portraits of contemporary figures or events, and that there was "no literal reproduction" of Nechaiev. Dostoevsky explained that he
took a phenomenon and merely sought to explain the possibility of its occurrence in our society as a social phenomenon and not in an anecdotal sense of a mere depiction of a particular Moscow episode . . . . The face of my Nechaiev, of course, does not resemble that of the real Nechaiev. I meant to put this question and to answer it as clearly as possible in the form of a novel: how, in our contemporaneous, transitional and peculiar society, are the Nechaievs, not Nechaiev himself, made possible? And how does it happen that these Nechaievs eventually manage to enlist followers—the Nechaievtsi (DW, I, 142f.).

There are some dramatic differences between Pushkin's prototype of the superfluous man, Aleko, and the violent revolutionary Pyotr Verkhovensky, Dostoevsky's Nechaiev. The main argument of *The Possessed* is that the superfluous man inevitably degenerates into a destructive, violent, amoral nihilist—a Nechaiev. The Russian "wanderer," as we have seen, began by accepting Western "liberalism" and eventually a dreadful shift produces the revolutionary.

The fictional character that opens Dostoevsky's *The Possessed*, Stephen Trofimovitch, is an "old liberal"—a father of the young nihilist, Pyotr Verkhovensky. The "old liberal," Stephen Trofimovitch, was the spiritual contemporary of such Russian liberals as Tshaadaev, Belinsky, Granovsky, and also of Hertzen (P, 4). Stephen Trofimovitch, pictured by Dostoevsky as a dreaming, languid, ineffectual idealist, is indicted

---

1Dostoevsky set great hopes on *The Possessed*, but not "as a work of art, but because of its tendencies; I mean to utter certain thoughts, whether all the artistic side of it goes to the gods or not. The thoughts that have gathered themselves together in my head and my heart are pressing me on; even if it turns into a mere pamphlet, I shall say all that I have in my heart." See Dostoevsky's letter of March 24, 1870, to Strachov, L, 184.

2Dostoevsky was pleased when a friend wrote him to claim that the nihilists of *The Possessed* "are Turgenev's heroes in their old age." Dostoevsky felt that these few words expressed "in a formula" the entire purpose of the book. See letter to Maikov in Dostoevsky's, L, 214. Turgenev's hero of *Fathers and Sons*, Bazarov, is the literary prototype of the "nihilist."
along with the other "liberal fathers" for creating a generation of violent nihilists.

Man should not step out of childhood into life without the embryos of something positive and beautiful; without these a generation should not be permitted to start on its life journey. Look: do not the contemporary fathers, from among the ardent and diligent, believe in this? Oh, they fully believed that without a cohesive, general moral and civic idea it is impossible to bring up a generation and let it start on its life journey! But they themselves have lost the general idea, and they are dismembered. They are united only in the negative, and even this in a negligent manner. They are disunited in the positive; besides, essentially, they do not even believe in themselves, since they are echoing somebody else's voice, they have joined an alien life, an alien idea, and they have lost all connection with their native Russian life (DW, II, 762).

Dostoevsky believed that Russian liberalism was without genuine meaningfulness because it was the intellectual product of the "separation" or "segregation" of the intelligentsia from their cultural roots. He maintains in The Possessed that: "'The higher liberalism' and the 'higher liberal,' that is, a liberal without any definite aim, is only possible in Russia" (P, 31). The Russian liberal lacks direction precisely because he is a "wanderer," a "seeker," and a superfluous man. Dostoevsky is never tired of stressing the superficiality, the shallowness, and the ineffectual nature of liberalism.

The young men of Russia were restless because "they are, precisely, the children of those 'liberal' fathers who, at the beginning of Russia's renaissance during the present reign, detached themselves en masse from the general cause, imagining that therein lay progress and liberalism" (DW, I, 271). In The Possessed Shatov says of utopian dreamers: "Those men of yours never loved the people, they didn't suffer for them, and didn't sacrifice anything for them, though they may have amused themselves by imagining it" (P, 35). "You can't love," Shatov added, "what you don't know and they had no conception of the Russian people." Those who centered their "whole attention on French Socialist beetles" went further than overlooking the people. "You've not only overlooked the people, you've taken up an attitude of disgusting contempt for
them" (P, 35). The Russian wanderer began by being conscience stricken by the awful plight of the peasants and the privileges of the aristocracy. This was all very genuine. The fact that the suffering was genuine is actually the cause of the problem. The wanderer joined a Gypsy band, but in this symbolic act he was still unable to find relief from terrible anguish. Instead he stained his hands with blood.

Nechaievtsi

In 1873 Dostoevsky wrote an editorial for his Diary of a Writer entitled "One of the Contemporaneous Falsehoods." In this essay he explained the purpose of The Possessed. The occasion for such an explanation was an article that appeared in The Russian World which said in part: "An idiotic fanatic of the Nechaiev pattern manages to recruit proselytes only among idlers, defectives—and not at all among the youths attending to their studies" (quoted in DW, I, 143). The thing that really set Dostoevsky to writing was a statement by the Minister of Public Education: "in recent years the youth has adopted an infinitely more serious attitude toward the problem of learning, and has been studying far more diligently" (also quoted in DW, I, 143).

After all the humorous aspects of the article had been discussed Dostoevsky explained his views on the causes of the nihilist revolutionary of the Nechaiev pattern. He began by asking:

What if it should happen that some case [of nihilism] were to involve by no means "defectives"—not the unruly ones swinging their feet under the table, and not merely idlers—but, on the contrary, diligent, enthusiastic youths precisely attending to their studies, even endowed with good, but only misdirected, hearts? (DW, I, 146). (Italics supplied.)

Dostoevsky emphatically denies that revolutionaries are necessarily "defectives." His argument was that society had produced the potential for Nechaievtsi as it had segregated its "Russian boys." Dostoevsky proclaimed: "I am an old 'Nechaievtsi' myself" (DW, I, 147). Of course, he was referring to an event in his youth, the so-called "Petrashevsky affair." Dostoevsky belonged to a circle of intellectuals who were interested in nothing more than remodeling society on utopian socialist lines.
They were followers of the French writers Fourier and Saint-Simon. The Petrashevsky group planned among other things to run a printing press. For this, on April 24, 1849, the circle was arrested after the Petrashevsky house had been raided by police. Twenty-one members of the circle were condemned to be shot as a result of the arrests.

"I also stood on the scaffold," wrote Dostoevsky, "condemned to death; and I assure you that I stood there in the company of educated people . . . . No, Nechaievtsi are not always recruited from among mere idlers who had learned nothing" (DW, I, 147). Dostoevsky argues that the "Petrashevtsi" have the potential of becoming Nechaievtsi. "How do you know," asked Dostoevsky, "that the Petrashevtsi could not have become the Nechaievtsi, i.e., to have chosen the 'Nechaiev' path, would things have turned that way?" (DW, I, 147).

Dostoevsky recognized differences between what he called the "theoretical" socialism of his youth and the "political" socialism of the next generation. But the differences were mostly of degree and not of a really controlling nature. Dostoevsky mentions the "rosy and moral light" which bathed his early socialism. The whole movement had "great appeal" and "seemed holy in the highest degree and moral, and—most important of all—cosmopolitan, the future law of all mankind in its totality" (DW, I, 148). Dostoevsky recognized that there had been some major shifts in socialist doctrine since his youth. But the same kinds of shifts in doctrine might have occurred in the Petrashevsky circle had it been provided with the necessary historical pressures.

Those among us—that is, not only the Petrashevtsi, but generally all the contaminated in those days, but who later emphatically renounced this chimerical frenzy, all this gloom and horror which is being prepared for humankind under the guise of regeneration and resurrection—those among us were then ignorant of the causes of their malady and, therefore, they were still unable to struggle against it. And so, why do you think that even murder a la Nechaiev would have stopped—of course, not all, but at least, some of us—in these fervid times, in the midst of doctrines fascinating one's soul . . . (DW, I, 149).
The purpose of *The Possessed* was to indicate some of the many motives that cause otherwise rather high-minded people to perpetrate the most awful crimes in the name of some cause. The thing that makes it possible for the otherwise honorable man to involve himself in what, in any other circumstances, would be considered complete depravity, is simply the common idea that allows the "criminal" to think that he is not a villain at all, but a "saint" working for the good of humanity. The concept that justifies the Nechaievtsi is the nihilistic notion that "everything is lawful" (BK, 65, 623) taken seriously and raised to the political level.

Dostoevsky experienced considerable sympathy for the young men of Russia who were brought up in corrupt families, who saw nothing admirable in their fathers, who were taught right from the first to despise everything. What could one expect except that the sensitive ones would strike out against tottering materialism and moral decay, and who else could they ultimately blame except Russia?9

**The Question of Socialism**

In *The Possessed* Shatov is by all odds the most common bearer of Dostoevsky's ideas. Shatov experiences a profound spiritual struggle and out of this intense crisis he regains his faith in the Russian people. "But," asked Shatov, "what have I broken with?" The answer was:

The enemies of all true life, out-of-date liberals who are afraid of their own independence, the flunkeys of thought, the enemies of individuality and freedom, the decrepit advocates of deadness and rottenness! All they have to offer is senility, a glorious mediocrity of the most bourgeois kind, contemptible shallowness, a jealous equality, equality without individual dignity, equality as it's understood by flunkeys or by the French in '93. And the worst of it is there are swarms of scoundrels (P, 589).

---

9In April of 1878 Dostoevsky wrote a long letter "To a Group of Moscow Students" who had demonstrated against the arrest of some of their colleagues. The university students appealed to Dostoevsky, and he responded with a long letter presenting his advice and comments on their plight. Dostoevsky believed that the demonstration was proof of the decadence of the Russian society. L, 244. Dostoevsky was certain that the students were not to blame for the incidents. He said to the students: "You are but the children of the very society from which you now turn away, as from 'an utter fraud.'" L, 241.
At another time Shatov took the opportunity to affirm that the "Russian liberal is a flunkey before everything, and is only looking for someone whose boots he can clean" (P, 137; cf. I, 371). Why should Shatov, upon coming to his senses, strike out against the liberals? Shatov's enemy should have been the nihilists. Or was Dostoevsky again attempting to associate at least the Western brand of liberalism and Russian revolutionary nihilism?

Dostoevsky saw Utopian Socialism—he liked to call it "theoretical" Socialism—as the connecting link between high-minded, socially conscious, but aimless, directionless liberalism on the one hand; and the total denial of all values—nihilism—on the other. If the evil of the Russian "liberals" is that they are flunkeys and aimless drifters, then an even greater evil is generated when the liberal finds some real direction. When the teachings of Cabet, Fourier, or Saint-Simon were really taken seriously, when they were subtly transformed by Russians, they became a deadly cancer that would eventually devour society. Behind the apparent demand for justice in the socialist program there was a value system that would sanction the worst crimes in the name of abstract, futuristic goals (see BK, 331). "They [the socialists] openly declare," according to Dostoevsky, "that they are seeking nothing for themselves and that they are laboring for humanity, that they seek to establish a new order of things for its happiness" (DW, II, 620).

The socialists, at least at first, argue that man can be brought to accept the new society because it will be pointed out to him that it is "rational" for him to accept it, that is, that it is for his own good, in his own self-interest to conform to the pattern. Dostoevsky wrote an entire book attacking materialistic, utilitarian ethics. The Notes from the Underground not only offers a violent objection to the factual validity of the assumed "rationality" of man, but the Notes present a systematic defense of the "irrational," and the "free" aspects of human existence (NU, 132, 139f.). Dostoevsky argued that man is such that he is bound to revolt against mechanical self-interest. Man, for the author of the Notes, is something more than just reason, man is among other things passion and will. And this is how it should be. Dostoevsky would not change
man into just a rational creature even if he had the opportunity. Dostoevsky believed that socialism, using the "scientific," rationalistic, materialistic ethics, is bound to deny freedom both in principle and most certainly in fact.

At this point Dostoevsky doubles back upon the socialists and argues that in the end those supreme believers in man's rationality will see that there is only one way they can build their system: "that man can be reduced to this state [socialism] only by means of terrible violence and on condition that dreadful espionage and unceasing control by a despotic government are established over him [man]" (DW, II, 620).

Environment and Responsibility for Evil

One feature of Dostoevsky's society caused him much anguish—the tendency of the liberals to condone crime on the basis of a belief that the environment was responsible. Frequently Dostoevsky used his novels as a vehicle to attack what he thought were gross and pernicious errors. Dostoevsky's novels are full of pot shots at the theory that environment is the sole cause of, and is responsible for, crime. An example is Stavrogin's emphatic declaration that he was conscious of his monstrous crime, the violation of the little girl, which is now included in the confession "At Tihon's" in The Possessed. Stavrogin declared that he did not wish to claim freedom from responsibility for his crimes "on the grounds of either environment or disease" (P, 704; see also BK, 333, and I, 373).

Dostoevsky was heavily involved all during his career in the questions of crime and guilt. His novels are sometimes dominated by these themes. His famous novel Crime and Punishment is an example of an entire work of art developed on the theme of human guilt. Any attempt to lift the ultimate responsibility for choices involving good and evil from man would tend to dissolve all values and make man irresponsible. If environment is responsible for evil there can be no personal

---

10 Dostoevsky wrote a letter to his niece, Sofia Alexandrovna, from Geneva, Switzerland, on September 29, 1867, to describe a Peace Congress. "Only when fire and sword have exterminated everything, can, in their belief, eternal peace ensue." L, 130. See also Dostoevsky's Winter Notes on Summer Impressions, with forward by S. Bellow (New York: Criterion, 1955), p. 151.

11 Dostoevsky hated the idea that "if everyone were provided for, everybody would be happy; there would be no poor and no crimes." DW, I, 337.
responsibility. The result of such reasoning is the awful thought that "everything is lawful" (BK, 623). The entire plot of The Brothers Karamazov is built around Ivan who holds that "everything is lawful" on intellectual grounds, and his half-brother, Smerdyakov, who accepts this doctrine literally and is led to murder as a result of it.

Dostoevsky felt that each man must be held personally responsible for his crime—his evil. He expressed this responsibility for evil in terms of guilt. Dostoevsky's soteriology involves the belief that suffering for sin somehow saves. "If the pain is genuine and sharp, it will purify us and make us better" (DW, I, 13). There is no need to review the numerous passages in Dostoevsky's novels that extol the virtue and necessity of suffering as a means of purification and ultimate salvation. It is necessary to realize that Dostoevsky was, for various reasons, opposed to fixing the responsibility for crime, or evil on environment. This he believed would destroy all genuine freedom.

According to Dostoevsky:

Making man responsible, Christianity . . . also recognizes his freedom. However, making man dependent on an error in the social organization, the environmental doctrine reduces man to absolute impersonality to a total emancipation of all moral duty, from all independence; reduces him to a state of the most miserable slavery that can be conceived (DW, I, 13).

By perpetually refusing to admit that man can be personally guilty of crime or responsible for evil, "by-and-by, we may reach the conclusion that there are no crimes at all, and that 'environment is guilty' of everything. We will come to the point . . . that crime is even a duty, a noble protest against 'environment.' 'Since society is wickedly organized, it is impossible to struggle out of it without a knife in hand' " (DW, I, 13).

The theory that evil is the sole product of environment saps the moral strength of man, and creates within man "the conscious liking for perversity" (DW, I, 100). Man, under the influence of the environmental explanation of evil, "is not naively vile . . . but lovingly; he adds to meanness something
of his own” (DW, I, 110). “Tragic fate! A human being is converted into some rotten worm, fully content with itself and its pitiful horizon” (DW, I, 110). The argument that evil exists because society is abnormally organized leads directly to the judicial acquittal of man for deeds of crime. Dostoevsky states the logic of the argument in the following way:

To overcome crime and human guilt it is necessary to overcome the abnormality of society and its structure. Since it takes long to cure the existing order of things, and besides, inasmuch as no medicine has been discovered, it is necessary to destroy society in toto and to sweep away the old order as it were with a broom. After that everything has to be started anew, upon different foundations, which are still unknown, but which nevertheless cannot be worse than the existing order and which, contrariwise, comprise many chances for success. The main hope is in science (DW, II, 787).

Dostoevsky rejected this easy solution. He argued that “evil in mankind is concealed deeper than the physician-socialists suppose; that in no organization of society can evil be eliminated” (DW, II, 787).12

From the Notes from the Underground we learn that man would never submit to a mechanically perfect universe. Dostoevsky’s fame is based partly on his insights that involve his profoundly negative evaluation of man. What prevents the complete success of formal or mechanical solutions to human problems is the fact “that men still are men and not keys on a piano” (NU, 136). Society cannot be reformed by “science” or rationalistic plans because man possesses deep in his soul the capacity for radical evil with which “science” cannot cope.13

---

12From the Notes from the Underground we read: “But these are just golden dreams. Oh, tell me who was it first said, who was it first proclaimed that the only reason man behaves dishonourably is because he does not know his own interests; and that if he were enlightened, if his eyes were opened to his real normal interests, he would at once cease behaving dishonourably and would at once become good and honourable because, being enlightened and knowing what is good for him, he would see that his advantage lay in doing good, and of course it is well known that no man ever knowingly acts against his own interests and therefore he would, as it were, willy-nilly start doing good. Oh, the babe! Oh, the pure innocent child!” NU, 125f.

13Dostoevsky reflected on the revolutionary activities in Paris in 1848 and 1849 and noted that “at bottom, the entire movement is but a repetition of the Russian delusion that men can reconstruct the world by reason and experience . . . . Why do they cut off heads? Simply because it’s the easiest of all things to do . . . .” See Dostoevsky’s letter to Strachov, May 18, 1871, L, 218.
Attempts to reform society on rationalistic or mechanistic grounds produce a marvelous edifice—what Dostoevsky liked to call "the ant-hill" (NU, 138).14

The socialists "are looking forward to the future ant-hill, and meanwhile the world will be stained with blood" (DW, II, 787). Because the socialists overlook the darker sides of human existence they inevitably succeed in liberating demonic forces in man. Dostoevsky saw an ant-hill under construction in Europe (DW, II, 1003). The demons who are to possess Russia's once high-minded, liberal wanderer have their homes in Europe and are not indigenous to Russia.

*The Religion of Nihilism*

From *The Possessed* we learn that socialism has wide appeal because of a religious quality. The socialists "are fascinated not by realism, but by the emotional side of Socialism, by the religious note in it, so to say, by the poetry of it" (P, 75). The key to the meaning of revolutionary movements is in their religious nature. The rootless revolutionary had lost touch with the people. This means, among other things, that the wanderer, in spite of his original lofty idealism and genuine humanitarian motives, is an atheist (see BK, 22f., 239; P, 144, 254f., etc.). Atheism, for Dostoevsky, was not so much a lack of religion, as a false religion—a substitute for the real thing. Atheism was the chief cause of Dostoevsky's disaffection from his early socialist leanings.

Dostoevsky's Shatov admitted that he did not "know either why evil is hateful and good is beautiful" (P, 257). Shatov was certain that "Socialism is, from its very nature, bound to be atheism" simply because the socialist organization of society was to be established "exclusively on the elements of science and reason" (P, 253).

Dostoevsky does not attempt to make a complete identification of the superfluous man's separation from the people and his hated atheism, but he comes very close to doing so. The revolutionaries "had to perjure" themselves "and praise the peasant all the same for the sake of being progressive" (P, 257).

---

1"Dostoevsky believed that "no ant-hill, no triumph of 'the fourth estate,' no elimination of poverty, no organization of labor will save mankind from abnormality, and therefore—from guilt and criminality" DW, II 787.
The revolutionaries “never loved the people, they didn’t suffer for them, and didn’t sacrifice anything for them, though they may have amused themselves by imagining it!” (P, 35). The nihilist exhibits, as he begins to develop, “an attitude of disgusting contempt” for the people, “and he who has no people has no God.”

The supreme example of the collapse of genuine values was human suicide. The nihilist Kirillov argued that suicide was the necessary outcome of the belief in the non-existence of God (P, 627ff.). Suicide was the highest value for self-willed man—for those men who “had suddenly lost their roots, as though the ground were giving way under everyone’s feet” (P, 334). Kirillov argued that, since there isn’t any God, then man is god.

The man-god is a self-willed man, a man who has exalted himself above all values—an extreme nihilist. The man-god is the ultimate, final, and direct opposite of the god-man. Self-deification is the social manifestation of the spirit of the anti-christ.

At this point in the argument Dostoevsky seeks to make an identification of suicide and murder—the most extreme extension of despair, self-will and atheism. Of course all this takes place on the individual level. When this analysis is played out in terms of society it becomes apparent that the nihilist will stop at nothing until the world is consumed by fiery destruction. The revolutionary nihilists argue that they “should unite and form groups with the sole object of bringing about universal destruction” (P, 412). Berdyaev accurately sums up Dostoevsky’s position: “The question whether ‘everything is allowable’ is put before society at large as well as to particular men, and the same roads that lead an individual to crime lead society to revolution.”

It is necessary, according to Shigalov’s theory, to sacrifice many heads in order to lighten the burden to make it possible to “jump over the ditch more safely” (P, 413). When man realizes that there is no God or that he is god, he also realizes

---

that "there is no crime!" Suicide is only the radical manifestation in the life of the individual, of the fire that is in the heart and mind of man; the fire that burns the town is nihilism (P, 524)—"the fire is in the minds of men and not in the roofs of houses" (P, 525). Shigalov represented accurately Dostoevsky’s view of the revolution: "Starting from unlimited freedom," we were told, "I arrived at unlimited despotism. I will add, however, that there can be no solution of the social problem but mine" (P, 410). In Shigalov’s system "one-tenth enjoys absolute liberty and unbounded power over the other nine-tenths" (P, 410). Pyotr Verkhovensky, Dostoevsky’s Nechaiev, gave the secret away when he argued that the goal of the revolutionaries "was to bring about the downfall of everything—both government and its moral standards . . . . The intelligent we shall bring over to our side, and as for the fools, we shall mount upon their shoulders" (P, 617). The world was to be bathed in blood because, according to Pyotr Verkhovensky, "We’ve got to re-educate a generation to make them worthy of freedom" (P, 617).

The Inquisitor

Dostoevsky’s Grand Inquisitor was a fictional Spanish cleric who recognized Jesus in a crowd, had him arrested and forced him to submit to a bitter indictment for having caused untold suffering among mankind by having taught the moral freedom of man. The Inquisitor was certain that moral freedom was not a blessing to mankind, but, instead, a terrible curse. Jesus was told that to ask man to live in freedom was to demand too much from him. To require that man live in freedom is to ask him to embark upon a journey that is bound to be both a pure and endless hell.

The Inquisitor and his Church had determined to betray Christ in order to be able to successfully minister to what is weak and mean in man. There is no doubt that the Inquisitor is a grand humanitarian. He lets it be known that he has made a hard and profoundly serious decision in casting aside Jesus

16 "They aim at justice, but denying Christ, they will end by flooding the earth with blood, for blood cries out for blood, and he that taketh up the sword shall perish by the sword." BK, 331.
and freedom for the good of mankind. The Inquisitor was not simply made into a foil for Jesus.

The Grand Inquisitor repeats one idea that Dostoevsky hated above all others: "there is no crime, and therefore no sin; there is only hunger!" (BK, 259). This is the old environmental theory again. The Grand Inquisitor supported his position by affirming that science will always be unable to provide sufficient bread for mankind as long as man is free. The Grand Inquisitor was certain that: "In the end they [the people] will lay their freedom at our feet, and say to us, 'make us your slaves, but feed us'" (BK, 260).

The Inquisitor's Scepter

It should not be difficult to see the image of the Catholic Church lurking in the background of the legend of the Grand Inquisitor. However, at least one writer has attempted to argue that Dostoevsky was really sympathetic with the Inquisitor and on the side of the "enslavement" of humanity. The Catholic writer, Romano Guardini, maintains that the vision of Christ given by Ivan was unacceptable to Dostoevsky.\(^3\) The weakness of this point is indicated by the fact that Dostoevsky really hated the Catholic Church (see, for example, BK, 62, 328; I, 584 ff.). Dostoevsky felt that "the key to the present and future events in all Europe lies in the Catholic conspiracy" (DW, II, 821). The ideological background of the legend of the Grand Inquisitor is to be found in a number of editorials in The Diary of a Writer.

According to Dostoevsky: "Catholicism sold Christ when it blessed the Jesuits and sanctioned the righteousness 'of every means for Christ's cause'" (DW, II, 911). Dostoevsky raises the same fundamental objection to Catholicism that he raised against the socialists and nihilists; namely, they bless any means to secure their ends and this is bound to ultimately produce slavery and a blood bath. In the name of lofty ideals, even in

---

\(^3\) For a discussion of this entire matter see J.C.S. Wernham, "Guardini, Berdyaev and the Legend of the Grand Inquisitor," Hibbert Journal, 53 (1955), 157-164. Guardini's argument is developed in chapter 5 of his Religiose Gespräche in Dostojewskis Werk, trans. in Cross Currents, 13 (1952), 59-86.
the name of God, the Catholic Church has taken man’s freedom, and in the name of the “third temptation,” attempted to rule the earth with the sword. All this was later spelled out in greater detail in the legend. For just as the Catholic Church has resurrected “the ancient Roman idea of world dominion and unity” and sold “the true Christ in exchange for the kingdoms of the world” (DW, I, 256), the socialists dream of a future Babylon. Dostoevsky provided the link. The protests against the church in France did not really produce anything new. “When Catholic mankind turned away from the monstrous image in which, at length, Christ had been revealed to them . . . endeavors arose to organize life without God, without Christ” (DW, II, 911). But all that was actually changed was the exterior form of the movement, not the substance.

French socialists dreamed of constructing “something on the order of an unmistakable ant-hill” (DW, II, 911). According to Dostoevsky the socialist creed was not at all better than the Catholic creed. The socialist had a plan, intelligible to everyone, “to rob the rich, to stain the world with blood, after which somehow everything will again be settled of its own accord” (DW, II, 911).

Dostoevsky saw that it was inevitable that the socialists would be bettered. European socialism was nothing more than a secularized, but still a religious, Catholicism. The fact that socialists talk a somewhat different language from their Catholic compatriots does not really change matters. The goal of the socialists was materialistic—their values were values of this life and they were primarily concerned with the acquisition and distribution of “bread.” The socialists dream of the time when there will be “no more material privations, there is no more of that degrading ‘milieu’ which used to be the cause of all vices, and how man is going to become beautiful and righteous” (DW, I, 192).

This socialist dream, in spite of all that is commendable about it, is the religion of material bread and is nothing but the demon’s “third temptation” in a new form. Dostoevsky’s Grand Inquisitor also appropriated the materialism of “the stones turned into bread.” Still Catholicism is secularized as far as it has yielded to the “third temptation.” In this respect socialism
and Catholicism are brothers under the skin. The relationship could actually be expressed better as a relationship of father and son. Catholicism is in the process of decay; the entire society it has nurtured is also in decay.

The decay of European society produced the bacillus infecting the Russian intelligentsia. Dostoevsky maintained an optimistic faith that the Western sickness would not prove fatal for Russia. After all, nihilism had an appeal only to the Russian intelligentsia, the Russian people remained free of such deadly infections. Dostoevsky felt that a return by the intellectual to the Russian soil and the people offered Russia the only hope of escaping the desolation that awaits Europe. "Do you know," asked Shatov, "do you know who are the only 'god-bearing' people on earth, destined to regenerate and save the world in the name of a new God, and to whom are given the keys of life and of the new world . . . . Do you know which is that people and what is its name?" The reply: "it is the Russian people" (P, 250).

An obvious but nevertheless crucial factor in Russian intellectual history is the violent, destructive character of the Westernization process. Peter the Great commenced a process that created institutions alien to traditional Russian institutions and culture. Into a Russia that had not really experienced a Renaissance, or a Reformation; and into a Russia little affected by the scientific and technological developments of the West, Peter imported alien Western thought and especially technology. This radical process split Russia into two classes: those who accepted the Western culture and those unable to accept.

---

18In The Idiot Dostoevsky's Prince Mizhshin denounces the Catholic Church. Catholicism "is an unchristian religion, in the first place . . . and, secondly, Roman Catholicism is even worse than atheism." The Prince asserts that Catholicism preaches antichrist and "believes that the Church cannot exist on earth without universal temporal power." This has significance beyond theology: "For socialism, too, is the child of Catholicism and the intrinsic Catholic nature! It, too, like its brother atheism, was begotten of despair, in opposition to Catholicism as a moral force, in order to replace the lost moral power of religion, to quench the spiritual thirst of parched humanity, and save it not by Christ, but also by violence! This, too, is freedom through violence. This, too, is union through the sword and blood." I, 584-586.

19Nicholas Berdyaev's The Origin of Russian Communism, trans. by R. M. French (new ed.: London: Bles, 1948) treats Russian intellectual history as a series of reactions to Peter's reform which "was a fact so decisive for all subsequent Russian history that our currents of thought in the nineteenth century were distinguished by the value they assigned to it" (p. 12).
There were, of course, always a vast number caught between the two cultures and left in a condition of unbearable tension.

Doestoevsky, even though he was under the spell of Western "liberalism" in his youth, never really accepted Western culture. He stands in the broad tradition of those extreme enemies of the West—the Slovophiles and the Old Believers. The entire treatment of the revolutionary intelligentsia is coloured by a radical commitment to "our holy Russia," i.e., non-western Russia, a Russia unaffected by the bacillus of Western thought. Nihilism is the function of Westernization. It is the evil disease of the "sons," to use Turgenev's famous figure of the political generations of "'Fathers and Sons."^20

Doestoevsky's biased point of view is a weakness in one respect, but his bias also is a certain advantage. We are able to see the impact of one culture on a second culture. The entire process is viewed from the point of view of "'holy Russia." What was not seen was that Russia was destined by the inexorable forces of history to ultimately yield and be transformed by those who desired the technological blessings of the West. From this point of view the success of the Bolshevik revolution in 1918 was the consummation of the work of Peter the Great in remodeling Russia. Doestoevsky's confidence in "'holy Russia" was misplaced. His vision of violence was somewhat more authentic.

^20See note 11, supra.
Crematorium

CLINTON F. LARSON

At Auschwitz, where the SS Guard abide,
The ingenuous await strategic genocide:

Naked, they loiter in the square,
Shameless before the puffing stacks
That cough smoke and char
As for the final hour of lost Pompeii.

The pall tides into the glades beyond the wire
And pools in the afterglow of sun;
They feel the sun, the gas and heat
Of noon until they must forget, or weep.

They forget the vanishing love of other gone before
Or keep it in the dusting night;
The night through, they wait before the chamber door,
Whispering of talismans and myrrh and Galilee.

The cage and wire and shreds of cloth remain;
The Guard survey their bone in its relief
But do not find awareness surely there,
In the sorrow by the sheds,
Against the thorned wire their bodies stain.

Past the riot of hunger and death,
They dismiss the guard of their flesh
From the surveillance of their shining eyes.
Look at their eyes!
Book Review


This short monograph about the Mormon conflict with the federal government in 1857-58 not only points up one of the most interesting periods of Mormon history, but it also carries much value as a political study in federal-territorial relations. The author is primarily interested in the history of the period, however, and his purpose is to cut away the myths and misconceptions about the conflict, leaving the naked truth of the events exposed—and well documented.

The book is well organized, giving the reader a rather adequate background in the events leading to the conflict, evaluating critically the causes, narrating interestingly the events of the "war," and summarizing satisfactorily the aftermath.

The author evaluates the possible causes of the conflict, *e.g.*, monetary gain for the contractors, political purposes of the Administration, public indignation about polygamy, the personal pique of territorial officials and mail contractors, the handling of Indian affairs, etc., and concludes that the Buchanan Administration was sincere in its belief that a state of rebellion existed in the territory and that the execution of civil law required the support of a military force. This basic conclusion to the study is not an apology for President Buchanan, the Administration, or the Democratic party, however, as the author is devastatingly critical of the government's bungling of the entire affair. On the other hand, he does not sympathize with the Mormons, as he indicts them on grounds of dictatorial policies, merging church and state, abusing and blackening the character of their opponents, indifference to constitutional guarantees in Utah, arbitrariness in court procedures involving Gentiles, obstructing the legitimate work of various territorial officials, and other acts bordering on lawlessness and sedition.

Mr. Furniss deserves commendation for the detailed documentation; the use of public documents, letters, and records available only in the National Archives and Americana collec-
tions in the east, which previously have been ignored; and the examination of the influence of Indian affairs in the Mormon conflict. Credit is also due the author for his objectivity. He is sensitive about the lack of objectivity in studies on Mormon history—including in his study an interesting bibliographical essay to assist the reader in evaluating the conflicting commentaries on this period. But his admirable detachment and objectivity are somewhat offset in his failure to grasp the essence of Mormonism. If the knowledgeable Mormon cannot write an objective history of the Mormons because of unavoidable bias, the non-Mormon who fails to comprehend the *élan vital* of Mormonism also will fall short in his quest for objectivity.

J. Keith Melville