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Origin of the Welfare Plan of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints

Leonard J. Arrington and Wayne K. Hinton*

During the Great Depression of the 1930's the First Presidency of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints announced in an open letter in the church-owned newspaper, *The Deseret News*, a plan to improve the economic welfare of its members. Originally titled "Church Security Program," it was renamed the "Church Welfare Plan" in 1938. The program was based upon the findings of a survey undertaken in September of 1935 which sought to determine relief conditions within the L.D.S. Church. The survey indicated that 88,460 Latter-day Saints, constituting 17.9 percent of the church population, were receiving some form of relief. Some 16.3 percent of the church population (80,553 persons) were receiving relief from public sources, and another 1.6 percent (7,907 persons) were receiving church funds. Of the members on relief, 13,455 were unemployed. The others were working on depression-inspired projects of the federal government. The report also stated that between 11,500 and 16,500 of the church members on relief "did not need" such assistance.

In view of the findings of the survey, the First Presidency outlined a program whereby "those now on relief would continue thereon," and those 13,455 unemployed members who were receiving outright relief, or "a dole," were to be taken care of under a church program at an estimated cost of $842,-000 per year.1

*Leonard J. Arrington is a professor of economics at Utah State University. Wayne Hinton received the M.S. degree in history from Utah State University in 1963 and is now teaching in the Cedar City, Utah, Junior High School. This article was written under a grant from the Utah State University Research Council. The writers wish to express thanks for the suggestions and assistance of Susy Kean and Brigham D. Madsen.

1Deseret News (Salt Lake City), April 7, 1936; Albert E. Bowen, *The Church Welfare Plan* (Salt Lake City, 1946), p. 41.
It is commonly asserted that the Church Welfare Plan originated as a conservative gesture opposed to the "degrading tendencies" of the New Deal and that it was politically motivated. Hardly had the program been announced than the conservative press lauded the church for its proposal "to transfer all Church members from government relief to Church relief."\(^2\) Conservative magazines and journals, such as the *American Banker*, *Cosmopolitan*, *Saturday Evening Post*, and the *Reader's Digest*, interpreted the program to represent an anti-New Dealer's dream come true.

A year and a half ago [stated the *Reader's Digest*] 84,460 Mormons, about one-sixth of the entire church membership, were on direct relief. Today none of them are. The Church is taking care of its own . . . Within a year every one of the 84,460 Mormons was removed from the government relief rolls all over the country.\(^8\)

The article was inaccurate, for not all of the 84,460 were on government relief. Moreover, the church at no time succeeded in removing all of its members from government relief, and at the outset the church did not even attempt to do so.

This interpretation of the Welfare Plan as a gesture of defiance against the New Deal was compounded by the "liberal" press. "Although it ridicules federal work projects," wrote Martha Emery in *Nation*, "the church attempted to solve the unemployment problem among Mormons by creating projects of its own." The Welfare Plan, she asserted, "was an ultra-conservative gesture of withdrawal into the old isolation which in the past was a major source of the Church's strength."\(^4\) Mormon leaders, wrote a Utah political scientist, generally opposed federal social security and relief measures.\(^5\)

"Angered and alarmed by . . . the flocking of its members to federal relief and public works payrolls, it [the church] issued an open announcement . . . endorsing the presidential candi-

---


dacy of Republican Alf Landon," and simultaneously established its own welfare program.6

While there can be no question that the Mormon Welfare Plan came to be praised by ultra-conservatives as an effective alternative to the "demoralizing relief handouts" of the New Deal and by ultra-liberals as a "step backward," a review of the events and thinking which led to the establishment of the plan will show a completely different motivation.

II

It is well known that the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints had long believed in "caring for its own." This doctrine, according to Mormon belief, had come directly from God, who, in the early days of the church, had said, "it is my purpose to provide for my Saints . . . . But it must needs be done in mine own way . . . ." At first this "way" was the Law of Consecration and Stewardship, whereby each member was asked to turn over to the bishop all his surplus property and income to be used in supporting the poor.8 After 1841, members were asked to contribute a tenth of their income—either in cash or kind—and to pay "fast offerings." When the Latter-day Saints organized for the Great Migration from Nauvoo, Illinois, to the Salt Lake Valley, such property as wagons and teams was mobilized so that all could be moved. In Utah there were many programs designed to help out those in need, and a relatively equalitarian society was maintained. One church official summarized Mormon economic policy under five headings:

1. The acquisition of worldly riches was not a worthy goal.
2. "Every man should esteem his brother as himself."
3. The church should care for the temporal needs of those whom the Lord called into church service.
4. The worldly goods of the members, beyond family necessities, should be made available for the Lord's work.
5. The church should see that its poor are cared for.9

---

6Frank H. Jonas, Western Politics (Salt Lake City), p. 278.
7Doctrine and Covenants, 104:15-16.
9Bowen, The Church Welfare Plan, p. 6, quoting the late President J. Reuben Clark, Jr.
A sixth doctrine was "Thou shalt not be idle; for he that is idle shall not eat the bread nor wear the garments of the laborer." The application of this doctrine was stated as follows by Brigham Young:

My experience has taught me, and it has become a principle with me, that it is never any benefit to give, out and out, to any man or woman, money, food, clothing, or anything else, if they are able-bodied and can work and earn what they need, when there is anything on earth for them to do. This is my principle and I try to act upon it. To pursue a contrary course would ruin any community in the world and make them idlers.

Under this thinking, the Mormons had often maintained work relief programs. A church public works department had supported workers' families by employing those otherwise unemployed in building theaters, tabernacles, temples, walls, and canals. During the depression of 1873-1876, when the resources of each Mormon community were mobilized to counteract unemployment and poverty, the Deseret News commented:

It is indeed surprising, in these days of controversy concerning reform, political and domestic economy, communism and the like kindred subjects, discussed by the greatest intellects of the age without practical results that... a Mormon community at that, should be steadily and successfully demonstrating the feasibility of uniting the industries of a whole community and resolving them into a commonwealth.

That the Mormons had built something of a reputation for favoring work relief, as opposed to an outright dole, is indicated by the acknowledgment of Harry Hopkins, administrator of the Works Progress Administration, that work relief in the United States was originated by Brigham Young.

III

Serious thinking about a program of economic assistance for Mormons affected by the Great Depression of the 1930's apparently began in 1931. The Deseret News in that year

10*Doctrine and Covenants*, 42:42.
13*Deseret News*, September 20, 1876.
carried an editorial stating that, although it was not subject to argument that the needy must be fed, clothed, and have shelter whether or not they had work, money should not be spent for charity, but to provide work for the unemployed. The paper suggested that a good means of helping to relieve the desperate situation would be for state and local government units, with the help of federal aid, to undertake road building and improvement projects. The News felt that if such permanent projects as lining ditches and canals with concrete to eliminate water wastage were undertaken, it would not only help the employment situation but also create wealth which would benefit communities for years to come.15

Following this line of thought a number of local Mormon units initiated local programs of relief. Liberty Stake in Salt Lake City, for example, initiated a program in 1932 through which an expected 2,500 persons would receive wood, blankets, quilts, clothing, and canned peaches and tomatoes. The stake project was expected to furnish "steady work" for 75 men, recommended by their bishops according to their need. Others were given work renovating chapels and cutting wood. Some persons were given the opportunity of helping farmers harvest crops in return for produce to be used for relief purposes. The Bamberger Electric Train Company Warehouse in Salt Lake City was rented, at a cost of $100 a year, in order to store goods which were donated to the stake. Some of these goods were given outright to the needy. The surplus was sold to members in the stake who could afford to pay, and the money received was used to buy blankets and quilts for the poor.16

At the October 1932 general conference of the church in Salt Lake City, Anthony W. Ivins, a member of the First Presidency, reported that in ten stakes in Salt Lake County $177,438 had been disbursed for relief from September 30, 1931, to June 20, 1932. Of this amount, $34,027 had been collected from fast offerings and donations, $28,471 from the Women’s Relief Society, and $105,114 from tithes. During the same period, the church had expended $361,243 for relief. President Ivins encouraged fuller tithes and offerings so that more relief could be given.17

15Ibid., August 7, 1931.
16Ibid., September 4, 1933.
17One Hundred Third Semi-Annual Conference of the Church . . . , October 7, 8, 9, 1932 (Salt Lake City), pp. 16-17.
At the same conference, Presiding Bishop Sylvester Q. Cannon, who was charged with improving the temporal interests of the Mormon people, reported that he had never seen such a spirit of cooperation as was then being demonstrated by the stakes, wards, and Relief Societies. He added that many of the needy were helping to gather foodstuffs in order to earn their own relief. Bishop Cannon felt that, although the nation should give great consideration to emergency unemployment relief, those who could carry on without aid should do so. He said:

There are people . . . who feel that the world owes them a living and that others ought to do for them things that they should do for themselves . . . . I have no time to go into detail regarding these things, but call your attention to the fact that it is vitally important that everyone who is in distress and trouble seek as far as possible to help himself.  

As the depression deepened and relief rolls lengthened, the First Presidency continued to consider the implementation of a church-wide program in order to supplement programs established in the various stakes. Commenting upon a survey made in 1933, the First Presidency declared:

Reported conditions in the state and nation suggest that a considerable burden may rest upon our Church Relief activities in the near future. While it seems our people may probably look, as heretofore, for relief assistance from governmental and perhaps other sources, it cannot now certainly be foretold either what or how fully sufficient this assistance will be, and we must therefore prepare ourselves to meet the necessities that may fall upon us . . . . No one must be permitted to starve or freeze in our midst.

When the newly-elected national president, Franklin Roosevelt, urged the nation to redouble its efforts to care for those people who were victims of the depression in order to prevent the disintegration of home life, Presiding Bishop Cannon responded that his office would do everything possible to provide adequate relief. It was the primary desire of the church, he said, to help men and women help themselves. To this end, he explained, the church expected to establish a plan whereby the unemployed among its own members could obtain

19 Deseret News, September 2, 1933.
work and thus have no need for private or public charity. Above all, said Bishop Cannon, those in need would be cared for—none would be allowed to suffer; the church would cooperate with government and private relief agencies in meeting the problem.20

This declaration was supported by other church officials. President J. Reuben Clark, Jr., gave primary emphasis to the necessity of members becoming independent of government relief. He chastized members with cattle, hay, and chickens who had, nonetheless, accepted relief. He warned the people that relief was not for those who did not need it:

The thought that we should get all we can from the government because everybody else is getting it, is unworthy of us as American citizens. It will debauch us . . . We must be as careful with the government's funds as with our own or as with the Church's.21

Apostle Stephen L Richards, later a member of the First Presidency, also supported the statement of Bishop Cannon, stressing that the church would support "the government and the leaders in the great recovery experiment." "Wherever our people are located," he said, "they are admonished to support, not only the form of government under which they live, but those who preside over them . . . . It is part of our creed."22

IV

The subsequent measures of relief adopted by Franklin Roosevelt and the Congress in 1933, 1934, and 1935 are well known. Since antidepression legislation involved the twin aims of relief and recovery, measures designed primarily for relief were often criticized because they did not contribute to recovery, while recovery measures were often deemed inadequate in providing relief. A degree of recovery having been attained by 1935, President Roosevelt went before the Congress to declare that "the federal Government must and shall quit this business of relief."23 He presented Congress with a program of government planning which was to prevent the federal government from giving direct relief, but which would put 3

20One Hundred Fourth Semi-Annual Conference of the Church . . ., October 6, 7, 8, 1935 (Salt Lake City), pp. 31-35.
21Ibid., p. 102.
22Ibid., p. 65.
to 4 million Americans to work on government emergency work-relief projects. Under this plan the President hoped to cut the cost of federal relief and at the same time give citizens more security. Roosevelt echoed the view of church officials when he said that the direct dole was contributing to "spiritual and moral disintegration."

A governing principle of the new work projects was that all work undertaken must be useful. Leaf raking and lawn mowing, the President thought, were just another form of dole. The projects must be designed to provide permanent improvement and create new national wealth. On the other hand, the projects must be designed to provide work for the largest number of unemployed. Wages were to be higher than relief had been under the direct dole, but not high enough to encourage workers to reject employment in private industry. It was intended that approved projects should not be competitive with private enterprise.24

President Roosevelt’s message, stated the Deseret News, was "gratifying" and was received with "marked approval and enthusiasm." "The message is of a spirit and character to take fear and despair out of the hearts of the people and put courage, faith and confidence in their place."25 Nevertheless, the probable implementation of the President’s message through Congressional legislation led church officials to warn members to prepare for the day when Federal Emergency Relief Assistance would be cut off. President J. Reuben Clark, Jr., said that the former policy of giving something for nothing had created precedents which spelled trouble ahead for both communities and individuals. Commending the government for its new relief policy, President Clark added that the ideal policy was one of "working for what we receive."26

When the Works Progress Administration was established in 1935, every attempt was made to get it into full operation before the winter of 1935-1936. Many felt that another hard winter could be avoided if "those entrusted with the spending of $4,800,000,000 in works funds show the proper initiative and determination in attacking their task."27 Nevertheless, although federal relief work projects under such agencies as the

24Ibid.
26Ibid., February 6, 1935.
27Ibid., October 23, 1935.
Works Progress Administration, Public Works Administration, National Youth Administration, and Civilian Conservation Corps increased in activity and more persons were employed, the relief demands from state and local governments (asserting their inability to carry the load) were such that the plan to end federal "dole" was never fully executed.

During the winter of 1935-1936, however, it seemed clear that the administration in Washington fully expected to end federal direct relief assistance. It was at first announced that all direct federal relief payments would end on July 1, 1936. This plan was now "definite." Because of claims by states and local governments that they were not in a position to assume the heavy burden of direct relief, this plan was later modified to provide that federal aid to those not working on relief projects would be cut by 50 percent. Still later, it was stated that federal relief through the Federal Emergency Relief Administration would cease in November 1935. All employable men were to be put to work under the Works Progress Administration, and all direct relief would be turned over to the states and counties.

It seems clear that this intended shift of the burden of relief from the federal government to the states and localities was the immediate factor which led L.D.S. officials to announce the Church Security Program in April 1936. Aware that the local governments in Utah and surrounding states were not in a position to assume a large burden of this nature, the church established the Security Program to assure that at least its own faithful members were taken care of. "Where preparation is being made to meet this problem [the reduction of federal relief]," it was stated, "there will be but little difficulty. But where no preparation has been made, suffering, difficulties, and bloodshed are not remote possibilities." The latter reference may have been prompted by a riot at the Federal Emergency Relief Administration headquarters in Salt Lake City, when a crowd of about 200 unemployed and police officers demonstrated against the intended slash in relief. "Oh, I pray you, my brethren and sisters who are the dole,"

---

28Ibid., April 10, 1936.
29Ibid., August 22, 1936.
30Ibid., June 1, 1937; Joseph L. Wirthlin, "Church Watches Temporal As Well As Spiritual Welfare," Deseret News, Church Section, August 17, 1940, p. 1.
said Apostle Melvin J. Ballard, "get off relief just as soon as you can. If you don't you will be thrown off and it will be a sorry day when that time comes. Get off and get on your own feet...."\(^3^1\)

When Elder Ballard warned church members to quit relief before they were "thrown off," some interpreted this to include the benefits provided under the federal Social Security Act of 1935. When asked if he meant "legal pensions" under the Social Security Act, Elder Ballard replied, "No, not at all."\(^3^2\) Church officials seem to have classified public aid under two general plans: direct relief and earned benefits. Direct relief consisted of old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to adult blind, and general relief. Under the Social Security Act, these programs were administered through the state and county welfare departments, with the federal government providing approximately half of the necessary funds. Earned benefits included receipts from employment on federal work projects, unemployment insurance or compensation, and Old Age and Survivor's Insurance. (Unemployment Compensation and Old Age and Survivor's Insurance benefits were, of course, financed from payroll taxes on employers and employees.) Church members were counseled against seeking or accepting direct relief (likely to be cut), but were encouraged to accept earned benefits (likely to be permanent).\(^3^3\)

Those members who had accepted, or would be forced to accept, direct relief were to be cared for under the Church Security Program. Aged persons who were not covered by Old Age and Survivor's Insurance, and who had no other means of support, would contribute funds and labor to the Security Program in their productive years and then draw it out after retirement or when they became incapacitated. Under the church plan many old persons could also earn their welfare by doing vicarious work for the dead in one of the church's temples.

There was no intimation in these announcements that the church was opposed to the work-relief measures of the New Deal. In June 1936, two months after the Church Plan had
been announced, a Deseret News editorial stated: "Of course, it would be impossible to cut off the flow of 'recovery' funds immediately. The unemployed must not be permitted to starve."\textsuperscript{34} Indeed, Presiding Bishop Cannon found it necessary to explain to church members that there had been "some misunderstanding in Utah regarding the Federal appropriations." "The so-called 'dole,'" he said, "was abandoned in 1935 and replaced by work relief for all able-bodied persons in need, and by direct relief for those who are incapacitated."\textsuperscript{35} It was not the purpose of the church to take members off WPA projects, but simply to encourage them to be scrupulous in doing "an honest day's work for a day's pay."\textsuperscript{36}

The sequence of events at the time of its establishment makes it clear that the Church Security Program was essentially a reaction to the prospective curtailment of federal relief. Each time there was uncertainty as to the amount and extent of federal relief assistance, the church renewed its efforts to strengthen its own program of relief.

Speaking to the general conference of the Relief Society, President J. Reuben Clark, Jr., pointed out that the relief needs of the Latter-day Saints rose and fell with the business cycle. By 1936, he said, "with government relief to be cut down appreciably in the near future, a much greater burden is to fall on church and private organizations, and the Relief Society will have to devote its greatest energy to its prime objective of succoring the needy."\textsuperscript{37} A contemporary statement of the First Presidency added that "The curtailment of Federal aid which is now forecast, makes it imperative that the Church shall, so far as it is able, meet this emergency."\textsuperscript{38}

V

The Church Security Program, as outlined in April 1936, was designed to help out the "worthy poor" by establishing agricultural and factory enterprises which would provide work for the unemployed and produce goods which could be used by the poor; and by establishing a chain of "storehouses" to

\textsuperscript{34}Deseret News, June 9, 1936.
\textsuperscript{35}One Hundred Seventh Semi-Annual Conference of the Church . . ., October 2, 3, 4, 1936 (Salt Lake City), p. 84.
\textsuperscript{36}Deseret News, April 7, 1936.
\textsuperscript{37}Ibid., April 3, 1936.
\textsuperscript{38}Ibid., April 7, 1936.
which goods produced by these projects would be taken, and where food would be made available to the poor or to their bishops. The central agencies in establishing and managing these production and distribution enterprises were those which had long been set up to look after the temporal welfare of the Mormons: the ward bishoprics, the men's "priesthood quorums," and the women's Relief Societies. Contributions were to consist primarily of donations of labor and supplies to the various wards and stakes. The regular sources of tithes and fast offerings were of particular importance. The surplus foodstuffs and other products raised in one area were to be transported to deficit areas, which in turn produced other surplus crops for exchange. Indeed, through this form of labor and commodity donation, some 70 percent of all Church Security requirements were produced by the church, and only 30 percent had to be purchased through commercial channels. Every attempt was made to keep dollar costs at a minimum. No cash value was placed upon labor: A man was paid according to his needs; \textit{i.e.}, a man with dependents would be given more than a man with no dependents.

"The underlying principle of the assistance program," said an official description of the program, "is that one gives what one has and gets what one needs." The assistance was to be given primarily to those whose resources were inadequate and to those to whom public work had not brought relief.\textsuperscript{41} Outright relief, said the First Presidency, should not be extended as charity except to the sick or disabled, and able-bodied members should not have to be embarrassed by accepting charity "except as a last resort."\textsuperscript{42}

Thus, the three main objectives of the Church Security Plan were: (1) to supply food, clothing, and shelter to those who were unable to otherwise obtain these necessities; (2) to find employment for all able-bodied members who were unemployed; (3) to improve the conditions of employed members whose meager incomes provided only the bare necessities of life. Employment to idle able-bodied persons was furnished

\textsuperscript{49}\textit{Delbert L. Stapley, The Lord's Plan} (Salt Lake City, 1956), p. [7].
\textsuperscript{40}\textit{Helping Others to Help Themselves: The Story of the Mormon Church Welfare Program} (Salt Lake City, 1941), p. 8.
\textsuperscript{41}\textit{Deseret News}, September 2, 1935.
\textsuperscript{42}\textit{Deseret News}, Church Section, September 2, 1933, p. 1.
"through a large number of make-work projects, supplementing the work projects of the federal government."

An objective of equal importance was the stress on spirituality.\(^{44}\) Thus, officials strove to instill attitudes toward material goods which were in harmony with prime Latter-day Saint virtues, \textit{i.e.}, industry and thrift. Church members who accepted relief which they did not really need were regarded as involving themselves in a form of dishonesty and greed. By encouraging people, where possible, to decline government relief and work for their own economic welfare, the church was helping members to cultivate honesty, sympathy, service, a love of fellowmen, and a willingness to give.\(^{45}\) Work, it was stressed, was not only a basis of economic advancement, but also a moral virtue. True wealth, said church officials, could be produced only through the intelligent application of human industry to natural resources—all the materials of life, both the necessities and comforts, were products of human labor. Thus, it was a moral, as well as an economic, necessity that every person be put to work; that people should be thrifty, for waste was an evil second only to idleness; and that people should live within their means. "Economic prosperity requires that men go without things rather than to go into debt for them."\(^{46}\) As with the church, individuals should avoid a hand-to-mouth existence by storing goods for a year in advance. In this manner no emergency would catch them unprepared.

The idea of work-relief was so pertinent to the church relief program that the President of the Church, Heber J. Grant, said that the primary purpose of the plan was that the

\[\ldots\] curse of idleness would be done away with, the evils of a dole abolished, and independence, industry, thrift and self-respect be once more established amongst our people. The aim of the Church is to help the people to help themselves. Work is to be re-enthroned as the ruling principle of the lives of our Church membership.\(^{47}\)


\(^{44}\)Bowen, \textit{The Church Welfare Plan}, p. 52; address of David O. McKay in \textit{One Hundred Seventh Semi-Annual Conference . . .}, October 2, 3, 4, 1936, p. 103.

\(^{45}\)J. Reuben Clark, Jr., \textit{Church Welfare Plan: A Discussion}, a talk given at Estes Park, Colorado, June 20, 1939 (Salt Lake City [1939]), p. 5 et passim.


\(^{47}\)\textit{One Hundred Seventh Semi-Annual Conference . . .}, October 2, 3, 4, 1936, p. 3.
The exact number of persons to be helped was not known, but it was thought that it might run as high as 15,000. The plan intended that "those now on WPA projects shall continue on these projects making sure to give a full day's work for value received but they are expected to contribute of their time when not so employed to the carrying out of the Plan."48

In contrast with the statements later made about it, the Church Security Program was not ultra-conservative. In many ways the church program actually supplemented parts of the New Deal. For example, both the New Deal and the church instigated resettlement programs in order to make better use of productive land. In western Canada members were transported from unproductive land to fertile areas where they could become self-sustaining. In some areas land was opened up for purchase. Young men who wanted to farm, but who lacked the funds with which to purchase farms, were assisted by the Program. Aid was also given in obtaining implements and seed—a plan not unlike the New Deal long-term low interest loan and seed loan plans. Another feature of the program was the vocational education provided for unskilled workers.49

Under the federal Social Security Act, as originally passed, the farmers were not covered and often had little to look forward to in old age. The L.D.S. farm population—especially in Idaho and Utah—were included in the Church Security Program by laboring on church projects during their productive years. Later, in old age, they were entitled to receive welfare assistance. While the church encouraged elderly persons to retain title to their homes and sufficient ground for a garden and facilities for keeping livestock for milk and meat purposes,50 these persons were expected to give the state a lien against their home or property in order to secure government pensions.

Utah's Governor, Henry H. Blood, a Democrat, said while visiting California that the church program was an aid to the "already sound financial status of Utah." He called the church plan a "progressive step" and added that the program was a large undertaking, but had a fine goal and would give a big

48Ibid.; also Deseret News, April 7, 1936.
50L.D.S. Church Welfare: Handbook of Instructions, p. 62.
lift to Utah’s relief problem.\textsuperscript{51} Similarly, Salt Lake’s Mayor J. Will Erwin, also a Democrat, said that big cities and counties were crippled financially and could not stand for a heavy cut in federal relief. That Salt Lake City was now in better shape from an employment standpoint than other first-class American cities, said the mayor, was due to the Church Security Program.\textsuperscript{52}

When church leaders stated that “Any activity or project which tends in the direction of ‘helping the people to help themselves’ to a position of security is in harmony with the great objectives of the plan,”\textsuperscript{53} it was not illogical for Latter-day Saints to conclude that the PWA and WPA were such harmonious projects.

It is also clear that contemporary New Deal officials did not feel that the church was opposing federal relief efforts. Details of the church’s program were put into the \textit{Congressional Record}, May 25, 1936, and in late May and early June, Elder Melvin J. Ballard of the Council of the Twelve, who was also first manager of the program, met with Utah’s liberal New Deal Senator, Elbert D. Thomas, and President Roosevelt in Washington to explain the church plan. Elder Ballard reported that the President gave his personal commendation of the Security Program and promised “full cooperation” on the part of the federal government. Apostle Ballard went out of his way to assure Roosevelt that the church was “anxious to be in full cooperation with the government.” The motives behind the church program, he said, were pride in caring for church members and a sympathy for the unfortunate. According to the report, not only did Roosevelt endorse the program, but also expressed hope for its ultimate success. He hoped, he said, that the program might inspire other groups to do something of a similar nature.\textsuperscript{54}

VI

Experience during the months after the announcement of the Church Security Program may not have merited the exaggerated compliments paid by certain national magazines, but were nevertheless encouraging to the church. In 1935, church appropriations for the care of the poor, hospitalization, and

\textsuperscript{51}\textit{Deseret News}, April 27, 1937.
\textsuperscript{52}\textit{Ibid.}, June 1, 1937.
\textsuperscript{54}\textit{Deseret News}, June 9, 1936.
other charities had amounted to $183,810. Fast offerings, tithes, and Relief Society contributions amounted to $402,939, so that the total cash value of church welfare in 1935 was $586,749.\textsuperscript{55} One year later, after little more than six months of the Church Security Program, charity for the care of the poor amounted to $234,019; fast offerings, charitable contributions, and Relief Society assistance totaled $554,350. (Fast offerings had risen 107 percent in the period.) Total church assistance to the poor was $788,369. In addition, $24,450 was appropriated for the Primary Children’s Hospital, and $50,350 was collected from cash donations. The total cash value of the Church Welfare in 1936 was $1,097,188. In addition to cash assistance, 2,292 persons were provided with temporary or permanent employment in private industry during 1936. A total of 3,865 needy persons and 13,712 who did not need relief were given work in farming, canning, or sewing for the church. Moreover, the erection and improvement of church buildings, stimulated by larger contributions, amounted to $769,473 appropriated by the general church and $513,000 raised by the localities, for a total of $1,282,473 in 1936.\textsuperscript{56}

In the October 1937 general conference, after eighteen months of the church plan, Presiding Bishop Cannon reported that tithes were increasing, fast offerings were up 53 percent over the six-month period from April to October, and the amount dispersed to the needy through the Church Security Program was up 97 percent. The number of persons assisted by direct relief was 16,163 and those helped on work relief was 8,110. This was an increase of 51 percent over the previous year.\textsuperscript{57} It was reported that a nonprofit financial organization, the Cooperative Security Corporation, had been incorporated in April 1937 to handle the legal and financial transactions of the Church Security Program. In 1938, as the program began to establish more permanent progressive features, the name was changed to the Church Welfare Plan. By 1938, welfare expenditures had increased to $1,827,000, a considerable part of which was cash, and there was left on

\textsuperscript{55}One Hundred Sixth Annual Conference . . . , April 4, 5, 6, 1936 (Salt Lake City), p. 3.

\textsuperscript{56}One Hundred Seventh Annual Conference . . . , April 4, 5, 6, 1937, pp. 5-4; Bowen, The Church Welfare Plan, p. 34.

\textsuperscript{57}One Hundred Eighth Semi-Annual Conference . . . , October 1, 2, 3, 1937 (Salt Lake City), pp. 45-46.
hand at the end of 1938 some $127,450 worth of preserved foodstuffs, clothing, and fuel.\(^{58}\)

In 1938 the Deseret Industries were instituted. Using discarded goods and reprocessing them at church-owned and -operated plants and factories, the goods were marketed at church-owned Deseret Industries stores in the more populated areas at less than normal retail prices for such items. Deseret Industries also provided employment for the unskilled and handicapped.

The Church Welfare Program has found other uses since the time of the depression. President Clark had spoken of the possibility of war and of future depressions worse than the one of the 'thirties and said that while many may have believed that the Security Plan would end with economic recovery, "we are only at the beginning."\(^{59}\) In 1940, when the war was underway in Europe, Presiding Bishop Joseph L. Wirthlin declared: "I do not hesitate in declaring that the future will hold a greater need for it [the Welfare Plan] than there has been in the past."\(^{60}\)

The Church Welfare Plan today owns and operates approximately 700 separate enterprises throughout the country. They include peanut farms and peanut butter factories in Texas, cotton farms and grapefruit orchards and canneries in Arizona, orange groves and canneries in southern California, apple orchards in Washington, pineapple and sugar plantations in Hawaii, dairies and cheese plants in northern Utah, salmon canneries in Portland, Oregon, a gelatin factory in Kansas City, Missouri, a soap factory in Salt Lake City, and cattle ranches in Wyoming. They include some 32 fruit and vegetable canneries, as well as approximately 600 separate farming projects producing a wide variety of crops: sugar beets, hay, beans, peas, soybeans, and dairy, poultry, sheep, and hog farms. The value of all welfare properties has never been published, but would aggregate more than $25,000,000. Welfare projects produce 90 percent of all welfare needs, including such items as soap, shoe polish, bowl cleaner, clothing, blankets, dairy products, and canned fruit and vegetables. These are distributed to those in need through some 150


\(^{59}\)One Hundred Seventh Annual Conference . . . , April 4, 5, 6, 1937, p. 25.

\(^{60}\)Wirthlin, *loc. cit.*
bishops' storehouses located at Latter-day Saint centers throughout the nation. In this way, some 90,000 persons are given approximately $6 million in cash and welfare products each year. The plan has furthered economic development by establishing "demonstration" or model farms and industries, by providing gainful employment for church members otherwise unemployed, by utilizing in a productive way the leisure time of employed members of the church, and by salvaging many consumer and producer goods which would otherwise be wasted.

VII

A continuation of traditional church policy toward the problem of involuntary unemployment and economic disaster, adapted to the new needs and demands created by the depression of the 1930's, the Mormon Church Welfare Plan was not in essence a political move. Church leaders joined with national leaders in proposing the abolition of the dole—i.e., relief unaccompanied by a program of work. At a time when the nation began to suspend direct relief in favor of a program of work-relief, the church proposed to mitigate suffering among its own members by instituting its own program of work-relief. Such action was welcomed by the administration in Washington and followed with intense interest. The Security Program progressed satisfactorily and helped to ease the relief burden of local units of government as the federal government abandoned direct relief.

It was perhaps too much to hope that in the heat of political campaigning the Mormon Program would not be involved. Conservative magazines praised the program as a welcome alternative to the New Deal, while liberal journals condemned it as being a politically-inspired reactionism. President David O. McKay reported in 1937 that the First Presidency had received a letter which accused the church of launching its Security Program "merely for political reasons." Replied President McKay: "There has never been a more false accusation . . . three years ago, yes, back as far as ten years ago, this plan was visioned." Deseret News, Church Section, February 13, 1937, pp. 1, 7.
lief rolls did not perceive that its primary object was simply to assist its members in a time of dire emergency.\textsuperscript{62}

\textsuperscript{62}In an address to regional church officials in May 1936, Elder Melvin J. Ballard stated that the Church Security Program was originally designed as a stop-gap to help in the transfer of members from government relief, the appropriations for which would soon cease, to positions of permanency. The church, said Elder Ballard, was "deeply concerned to help the government, and we are not criticizing or fighting the government." The objective of the church, he said, was to care adequately for those who were already on church relief, and to be in a position to care for those on government relief when the heavy appropriations for relief ceased. The church plan should be a blessing to the government, he added, for the latter is striving to find a practical way to stop its vast expenditures on relief. \textit{Deseret News}, May 9, 1936.
Mouse in a Furrow

Sand-dappled mouse in a furrow,
His past, his small burrow;
His present, three wind-scattered seeds;
His future—obsured by a tangle of weeds—
A sleek, silent falcon,

To whom the small, scruffy-silken
Brown body’s a knot in a skein,
Its unwindings quite plain,
For, from just under the sun,
His past-present-future’s all one.

Jeannette Morrell
Curse upon a God
Classical and Elizabethan Thought Blended

CHARLOTTE WINZELER*

One unusual result of Ben Jonson's lifelong zest for learning was his distinctive critical method. Intensely interested in classical literature, he blended classical thought with Renaissance enthusiasm in a natural manner.\(^1\) He applied Horatian-Aristotelian critical theory to English literature, not as a direct imitator but as a mind thoroughly familiar with it, fusing it with his own ideas of beauty and structure. His light satire "An Exegation Upon Vulcan" is a playful tongue-in-cheek curse on Vulcan, the Roman God of fire, whom Jonson accuses of intentionally burning the author's cherished library. In both form and content the poem illustrates this coalescence of classical and Elizabethan thought, the product of a lifetime of energetic study.

The atmosphere in which Jonson's judgment developed was one charged with almost as richly varied stimuli as the Hellenic environment of Aristotle. Old conceptions of the universe were being shattered by discoveries of new countries and by emerging science; religious tenets were being challenged; landed aristocracies were being weakened by the increasingly wealthy middle class. The sanctions of moral and political life were shifting from the supernatural and authoritatively to the rational and independent.

There prevailed a sense of inadequacy of human knowledge, consequent sensitivity to dualism and contradictions, concern with paradox as expressing complexity of truth, belief in wholesome effect of doubt, conviction that where knowledge falters, a right life can supply the only confidence known to man.\(^2\)

Christian dogmas were pitted against some basic needs of

---

*Mrs. Winzeler is an English instructor at Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Ohio.

\(^1\)Although Jonson is frequently called Jacobean, his ideology is based on Elizabethan thought.

man's nature, and the result was questioning thought. From
the midst of this struggle, learned men welcomed the classical
optimism in man's inherent goodness as a clue to more mature
understanding of Christianity. The middle class showed great
faith in learning, not only for economic and social advance-
ment but also as a means of religious salvation; for, since
reason, understanding and will were believed to be in the
upper hierarchy of the brain, their development was sup-
posedly conducive to growth of one's righteous will.3 To such
stimuli Jonson responded enthusiastically.

As a child, he had experienced tension-creating controversy
between a bricklaying stepfather who valued work done with
his hands and young Ben's thoughts of his own deceased
father, a minister descended from gentry who wanted him to
become well versed in Latin. In addition to this, Jonson him-
self had had a fairly unstable childhood personality, as evidenced
by his constant need for recognition and the habit of
boasting which stayed with him all his life. Fortunately he
compensated by a grim determination to show the world that
his study habits were of great value, and the result was a rapid
advance to the position of leading poet of England. His social
mobility gave him an emotionally detached knowledge of both
the middle and upper classes—excellent equipment for satire.
He emerged with "an elaborate wit wrought out by his own in-
dustry."4 That this industry continued in full force was ob-
vious from the number of works he had in the process of com-
pletion at the age of fifty-one, when his library burned; trans-
lation of Aristotle's "Art of Poesie" with notes derived from
Horace, a grammar, a story of his journey into Scotland in
verse, three books of history, and religious poems. Following
his customary habit of boasting, he implied they were worth
far more than the popular literature of his time, and called
them "some parts . . . of search, and mastery in the Arts."5

Critics who believed this statement of unpublished works to be the main value of "An Exeoration Upon Vulcan" have
missed Jonson's main purpose. A superficial reading does give

3E. M. Tillyard, The Elizabethan World Picture (New York: MacMillan,
1944), p. 65.
4Thomas Fuller, The Worthies of England (London: Blackfriar Press,
5The Poems of Ben Jonson, ed. Bernard H. Newdigate (London: Oxford,
1956), "An Exeoration Upon Vulcan," lines 88-103—hereafter found in text
within parentheses.
the impression of hodge podge (see McEuen, *Classical Influence Upon the Tribe of Ben*, p. 46), but closer scrutiny rewards the discerning reader with humorous insights into the popular taste of the seventeenth century. The author looked regretfully across the charred ruins of his own carefully selected books to the material being read by the public. Had he been given warning, Jonson moans, he could have sent Vulcan reams of worthless writing to devour, and he points out the shoddy, though popular, works of his day.

Perhaps one reason the poem seems jumbled is that its unusual form is not evident in the first reading. Following his custom of fusing the classical and the Elizabethan, Jonson intertwined the forms of an Anglican prayer of praise and a classical satire. The praise is, of course, parodied into a curse on Vulcan, the Roman god of fire who had burned his library. As in classical satires, the poem moves from a statement of Vulcan’s specific crime to a denunciation of the god and then to a proclamation of his other crimes, such as the burning of the Globe theater. Knitted into the poem is a facetious appeal to reason which is typically seventeenth century:

Had I wrote treason there, or heresie,
Imposture, witchcraft, charmes, or blasphemie,
I had deserv’st then, thy consuming lookes,
Perhaps, to have been burned with my bookes . . .
If none of these, then why this fire? Or find
A cause before; or leave me one behind.

(14-17, 26, 27)

Yet it ends with the satirist’s curse, the formal execration which was so powerful a force in Greek thought:

Pox on thee Vulcan, thy Pandora’s pox,
And all the Evils that flew out of her box
Light on thee; Or if these plagues will not doo,
Thy Wives pox on thee, B(esse) B(raughton)’s too.

(212-215)

There are other evidences of classical satires, but also striking differences. Classical satires were written for the aristocracy; this was written for the middle class, who were busy collecting books which Jonson considered “not worth the paper they are written on.” Use of the complete poem as a curse, and its address to a god rather than to the people being satirized, differed greatly from the formal satires of the
seventeenth century. While most of the latter are semi-serious poetry with a deadly serious purpose, Jonson’s waggish poem has a purpose considerably less caustic than its pose. Herford and Simpson state that it "pleasantly simulates satiric invective—almost unmatched in verse of serio-comic bravery." Any reader who is conscious of Johnson’s profuse love of fun would recognize it for what it is: a continued haranguing, as much for the author’s own pleasure as for his readers.

Thou mightst have yet enjoy’d thy crueltie
   With some more thrift, and more varietie:
Thou mightst have had me perish piece by piece,
   To light Tobacco, or save roasted Geese;
Sindge Capons, or poore Piggies, froping their eyes;
Condemn’d me to the Ovens with the pies;
And so, have kept me dying a whole age,
   Not ravish’d all hence in a minutes rage. (49-56)

The basic skeleton of "An Execration Upon Vulcan" is a prayer form of the Elizabethan Anglican church, to which Jonson belonged. A comparison of the poem’s sections to those of an Anglican prayer of praise, such as that written by Bishop Andrews in Preces Privatae, emphasizes not only the parallel structures, but Jonson’s jocosely inverted meaning as well:

   Jonson: "Thou lame God of fire!" (1)
2. Confession—A. I repent my sins.
   J. What have I done to deserve such treatment?
   J. Request for Vulcan’s ruin of substitute material.
4. Thanksgiving—A. Praise of God, listing His blessings.
   J. Denunciation, listing Vulcan’s most devastating acts.
5. Intercession—A. Prayer for others.
   J. Why the Whitehall and Globe fires?
   J. Request for Vulcan’s presence—elsewhere. Curse.

---

The parody follows traditional prayer form throughout: the address to the god, the petition containing reasoned thought, the praise (which in this case was reproach), the recounting of the god’s “blessings” (listing their most devastating effects), the adoration (revilement), the request for God’s presence (elsewhere), and the ending of praise (the curse). Although the poem would have benefited by the omission of the god’s grosser misdemeanors, this confusing addition was necessary because Thanksgiving and Intercession were integral parts of seventeenth century Anglican prayer.

Not only the poem’s form, but its content, blends the theories of such classical writers as Horace, Martial, or Juvenal with Elizabethan vigor and originality. Classical literary theory has been used as a guide to criticism of seventeenth century literature. Jonson loved to call himself “Horace,” but he lacked the subtle skill of his idol. Nevertheless, it is to Horace that he is indebted for his basic idea that good literature should be the product of consistent self-correction necessary for art.8

Like Horace he considered it beneficial for an author to imitate the material of other skilled authors, adding and changing as he wishes. The Roman author’s attitude toward the function of poetry was to instruct by pleasing, or, as Jonson interpreted it, to absorb the attention in order to communicate a body of wisdom. This is the reason Jonson stated that the “learned library of Don Quixote” (30) should be more fit for the fire than his own: it contained little wisdom. Perhaps he felt a kinship to Horace, for one might easily assume that Morris was speaking of the seventeenth century poet rather than the Roman when he stated in his introduction to Horace—the Satires and Epistles (London, 1909), p. 13:

For the work of the critic he was all the better qualified because his own work was not inspired, but was the result of a conscious process. He had thought much of the choice of words, of the combination of the phrases, of the enlargement of vocabulary, and all that he says on such things as weighty with authority.

Jonson was one of the few Elizabethan writers to realize the necessity for using Aristotle’s thought to aid in under-

---

standing Horace’s literary theory. It was a great loss that “All the old Venusine, in Poetrie,/And lighted by the Stagerite” (88-89) should have perished in the fire. Aristotle also originated the ideas of unity, harmony and proportion which his seventeenth century admirer was to expound.

Jonson believed his contemporaries could learn much from Martial about variety and dignity of form, and attempted himself to write epigrams in all the variety of forms Martial had used. This may have been the incentive for writing an execration instead of the customary satire. From Martial also came Jonson’s idea that wit should arouse intellectual appreciation primarily and an emotional reaction only secondarily. His attitude toward the “heathen abominations” Talmud and Alcoran and those following (64-70) is similar to that in Juvenal’s satire, as is the gloomy critical attitude toward the burning of Whitehall and the Globe. (154-7, 131)

Jonson, whom Herford and Simpson label “the chief of Jacobean humanists” (II, 343), drew his pattern of what ought to be from what had been done well previously and scrutinized classical literature for clues it could give to better techniques of writing. He reacted as a disciplined classical scholar to the watery sweetness of Amadis de Gaule (28) and other similar works. Following Horace’s theory that poetry should have improvement of society as its principal aim, Jonson looked for sermonizing in literature. He believed literature, like painting, should abstain from vice, “lest they spoil men’s manners while attempting to better their minds.”

Were Jonson alive today, he would be viciously attacking modern books in which exploitation of sex covers a deficiency of subject matter, for his moral judgment was based not on the conventional Christian attitude but on the belief that virtue lay in the improvement of one’s thought and that sin lay in ignorance and stupidity (Baum, p. 33). Literature, therefore, should be the product of and stimulant for great intellectual energy. It should induce “not reverie but intellectual interest, not romantic rhapsody but humane concern” (Discoveries, p. 58). Thus, we can readily understand his disgust with “The whole summe/ Of errant Knighthood, with the Dames,

---

the Dwarfes; the charmed Boates, and the enchanted Wharfes" (65-67). The melodious soft poetry he repudiated lacked too much of the sterner stuff which his mind demanded. In 1623 such literary criticism was startlingly different, for most authors were placing heavy emphasis on artistic method.

Through close association with the classics Jonson realized that to be remarkable wit must contain more than mere word-play, and would gladly have offered "spun out Riddles" (32) to satiate Vulcan's appetite. However, classical restraints could not dim Jonson's appreciation of Elizabethan exuberance in wit. This energetic exbricklayer thoroughly enjoyed startling his readers with extreme statements which masked a barb, such as:

See the World's Ruines! nothing but the piles
Left! and wit since to cover it with Tiles.
The Brethren, they straight nos'd it out for Newes,
'Twas verily some Relique of the Stewes.

(136-140)

His comprehension of beauty in literature, as in life, lay primarily in his appreciation of the underlying symmetry. He searched for similarities and bonds between the various planes of existence: the divine, the universal, the national, and the individual (Tillyard, p. 69). In poetry he found beauty of order representative of the patterns he found in the numerous aspects of life. Such emphasis upon structure is evident in his "Discoveries" wherein Jonson recommends that a piece of writing be knitted together, with each part having such a relation to the whole that if it were taken away the whole would either be changed or destroyed (p. 85). The anagrams, acrostics and such pretensions as "A paire of Scisars and a Combe in verse" (34-38) he abhorred, because they subjected the thought to an unnatural, useless form.

Paramount in his idea of beauty also was a concern for the choice of language. Like Horace, he believed an author should choose his words carefully, weighing their effect. He preferred simple words in a natural syntax rather than pretentious words. Note the simplicity in the poem's opening:

And who to me this, thou lame Lord of fire,
What had I done that might call on thine ire? . . .
I ne're attempted Vulcan 'gainst thy life;
Nor made least line of love to thy loose Wife; (1,2,5,6)
However, Jonson’s demand for a natural did not mean a limited diction. His zeal for study prompted an enthusiasm for beautiful new words or forgotten words which fitted the tone of a poem. Dryden (Works of John Dryden, ed. Scott-Salsbury, London, 1892, p. 737) noted that Jonson witnessed and aided not only a tremendous growth in vocabulary but also progress toward uniformity in grammar, pronunciation and spelling. The seventeenth-century critic realized that language was constantly changing, but he differed from our modern view in that he felt the change should be stopped. It was this desire for stability that he had in mind when he wrote the Grammar to teach “The purtie of Language” (92). Herford and Simpson found that, owing to his habit of searching for perfection, he valued brevity, terseness and emphasis (II, 412). Consequently, linguistic satire was a natural form of expression for Jonson himself. For example:

Had I fore-knowne of this thy least desire  
T’have held a Triumph, or a feast of fire, 
Especially in paper; that, that steame  
Had tickled thy large nosthrill, many a Reame 
To redeeme mine, I had sent in enough, 
Thou should’st have cry’d, and all been proper stuffe. 

(58-63).

I suggest that the playful poem “An Exeaction Upon Vulcan” fuses classical and seventeenth century thought into a judgment of literature far superior to others of that time. Jonson’s lifelong habits of energetic deliberation are directly responsible. Drummond, in recording the former’s conversations during his Scottish visit, stated, “Where he refers to poetry in general he speaks as the habitual critic, concerned to maintain a scale of values in literary appreciation, in defiance of the world’s indifference, and according to Aristotle, distinguish between poet and verser.”11 At a time when few were critical, this boisterous humorist led England toward a clearer understanding of literary values.

11Ralph S. Walker, Ben Jonson’s Timber or Discoveries (Syracuse, 1953), p. 127.
The Sheriff of Powder River

DAVID D. GEDDES*

There is still something endearing about the cussedness of Grandpa. Those less close to him described him as the meanest man that ever lived. His grandchildren, nephews, and nieces regarded him with a peculiar awe—for he was a teller of tall tales, a fighter of wicked Indians, and a gold mine prospector who knew the secret locations of a dozen mines, all bearing nuggets the size of a pullet’s egg, like the nugget which always hung from his watch fob. What Grandma felt, she never told us, but there was a certain bliss or peace about her the time she got a forty-eight hour rest from being with the meanest man on earth.

It started on a Saturday night before Halloween in the little town of Powder River in Eastern Oregon. The music from the Saturday night barn dance had lulled me to sleep several hours earlier, but the noise had grown louder and finally awakened me. It sounded like a big commotion over at Jarman’s livery stable. I could hear Grandpa grumbling to Grandma from their bed in the next room. I slipped out of the covers, tiptoed over to the window, and kneeled down, stretching my head toward Jarman’s livery stable. I watched the flickering lights filtering through the cracks of the old building. Suddenly there were voices shouting and several high pitched screams. Someone bolted out through the livery stable door, running toward our house. I watched until he vaulted over our front gate then I jumped back, pulling the starched curtains in front of me. He banged on the front door!

“Sheriff!” he shouted, “sheriff, wake up! You’re needed real bad over at the dance!”

Grandpa was awake in the next room but didn’t answer. The banging on the front door grew louder.

“Luther Perkins, wake up!” the man outside continued. "Pee Wee Marshall’s got a broken beer bottle over at the dance and he’s gonna cut the guts outa Wilmer Ogg if you don’t get over there and stop him.”

*Dr. Geddes is professor of physical education and health at Brigham Young University.
"William!" Grandpa shouted to me, "who in the hell is it and what does he want? Go on out there and let him in!"

I ran to the front door and unlocked it, stepping back as Elmer Fosnot rushed past me into the living room.

"It's Elmer, Grandpa," I shouted. Elmer Fosnot was a hired hand for Big Bill Buchanan and called the dances on Saturday night.

Grandpa walked out of the bedroom carrying a kerosene lamp. He stood there barefooted in his long nightgown, slowly turning up the flame of the lamp.

"What the hell are you bothering me this time a night for?" Grandpa asked, angrily.

Elmer told Grandpa how Pee Wee Marshall and Wilmer Ogg had got drunk and started fighting over at the dance and that they got pretty mean and called each other a lot of dirty names. He said that Pee Wee had broken a beer bottle and threatened to cut Wilmer's guts out, right on the spot, and everybody at the dance said that someone better run right over to the sheriff's and bring him back to handle the ruckus that Pee Wee and Wilmer were causing.

Grandpa told Elmer that Pee Wee and Wilmer were good friends and that they weren't going to hurt anyone, and Elmer had an awful time getting Grandpa to go with him for what he said was his rightful duty.

Grandpa went back into the bedroom cussing at everything and put on his shoes and pants. He was strapping on his gun when he came out again.

"Let's get the hell over there," Grandpa shouted to show his authority as he slapped the holster of his gun. "The sooner I get this over with the sooner I can get back to bed."

They hurried out the front door and down the steps.

"Can I go too, Grandpa?" I shouted after him.

"Hell, no, you can't go," he said. "That dance ain't no fit place for a kid your age—get back in there to bed!"

Grandpa and Elmer were half way down to Jarman's when Grandma shouted from her bed, "William, get in here to bed!"

"I'll be careful, Grandma," I said as I jumped down from the porch and ran through the gate. "I'll be careful!"

I got there just as Grandpa and Elmer were entering the livery stable door. I ran around to the back window where I'd watched lots of dances before and saw Elmer Ogg climb-
ing the hay-loft ladder with Pee Wee Marshall right behind him, a broken bottle in his hand. Wilmer looked pretty scared and lots of women were screaming bloody murder. Grandpa took one look at Pee Wee and Wilmer and drew his gun. He pointed it up in the air above the two men. The women screamed louder than ever, but Grandpa shot the gun straight up and didn’t even come close to Pee Wee and Wilmer. The shot exploded with such a noise that everyone stopped screaming and Wilmer and Pee Wee stopped climbing.

"Pee Wee, you drop that bottle and get your big fanny down here right now," Grandpa said, "and Wilmer, you get right down from there too!"

Pee Wee and Wilmer climbed down and looked pretty sheepish. They started laughing and said that they really didn’t mean any harm and were just having a little fun. Grandpa said that like hell they were having a little fun and that they could just have a little fun by cooling off in jail for a few days. Wilmer didn’t take too kindly to Grandpa’s remarks because he said that it was all Pee Wee’s fault. Pee Wee said he’d be damned if he’d spend any time in that jail, especially the old town jail where that drunken Indian had died a few years back. Grandpa still had hold of his gun, and Pee Wee and Wilmer kept looking at it as if they would run hell bent for election if Grandpa didn’t have it and wasn’t waving it in their faces. Grandpa told them that they were going to jail and that was all there was to it and suddenly Pee Wee started to run for the door. Bruce Orburton headed him off and tackled him around the ankles; several of the men, being already good and mad at Pee Wee and Wilmer, got a rope and tied him up. Then they all took Pee Wee and Wilmer to the jail. Pee Wee cussed all the way and Wilmer just said he wanted another drink. Grandpa locked them up and everyone laughed as Pee Wee and Wilmer cussed Grandpa with quite a string of cuss words that I’d never heard before. Everyone laughed at Pee Wee and Wilmer cussing until they were blue in the face. Grandpa said that they would just stay in there and cool their heels for two weeks if they didn’t watch what they were saying.

Grandpa and the men were laughing and carrying on when they left the jail and walked back over to the dance. When they got there the dance was lively again and someone said
that Grandpa deserved a drink and Grandpa thought he did too, so he tipped up a bottle and began drinking. I went home because there wasn’t much to interest me, and besides I had seen Grandpa drinking before, and that never was very interesting, so I walked home and went to bed.

Grandma said something, scolding me as I crawled in through my window. About an hour later Grandpa stumbled up onto the front porch and opened the front door. I heard each of his heavy boots fall to the floor as he took them off. Grandma said something to him, and Grandpa cussed her for a long time and then bragged about how he had captured Pee Wee and Wilmer single handed and taken them to jail. Pretty soon he went to sleep and so did I.

The next morning I was sitting in the front yard playing mumble-peg when I saw Old Lady Comer making a bee-line for our front gate. I stuck my knife into the grass with a left-handed "over-the-world." Since it was almost noon it didn’t surprise me to see Old Lady Comer, for she had a nose for Grandma’s cooking and an appetite to go along with it. She was always arriving at someone’s house just in time for dinner.

Old Lady Comer was a grass-widow and surprisingly skinny for the amount she ate. Most of all, she was very hard of hearing. To make up for being nearly deaf, as some deaf people do she had developed a habit of talking very loud. Grandma always had to shout at the top of her lungs to make the old woman hear what she had said.

"Good morning, William," she shouted to me as she marched right up the front porch steps.

"Hullo, Missus Comer," I mumbled and did another left-handed "over-the-world."

"Yoo hoo, Katie, are you home?" she shouted through the front screen door. I picked up my knife, closed the blade, and walked slowly up the steps of the front porch. Grandma shuffled into the front room from the kitchen, wiping her hands on her apron.

"Come on in, Matilda," Grandma smiled, "and sit a spell." "I’m just getting Pa’s dinner on the table. He’s got to take Wilmer Ogg and Pee Wee Marshall’s dinner down to the jail; so I’m a feeding him a little early."

"I hear they caused quite a ruckus over at the dance last night," Old Lady Comer said, and then she cackled like a chicken with the fits.
Grandma smiled at the old woman, but Grandpa never did—he always cussed her for all he was worth and called her every name in the book—especially when she couldn’t hear him or was too far away to read his lips.

I opened the screen door with my foot and slipped into the front room. Grandpa was sitting in his rocking chair reading a newspaper. The old hickory chair creaked with his weight as he rocked back and forth.

“Good morning, Luther,” Old Lady Comer shouted as she noticed Grandpa. Her voice reflected warmness as it always did whenever she just happened to drop over in time for dinner. Grandpa kept rocking back and forth—staring hard at the folded top half of his paper.

“Good morning, yourself, you skinny old witch,” Grandpa mumbled without turning his head or looking up from the newspaper, for he knew of her knack of reading lips. “I see you dragged your carcass over her to eat off’n us again!”

“What’s that you say, Luther?” the old woman shouted as she walked around to where she could see his face.

“I said ‘it’s a damn nice day, ain’t it, Missus Comer?’ ” Grandpa shouted. He leaned over and spat a big gob of tobacco juice toward the spittoon at the bottom of the old pot-bellied Franklin stove. She jumped back out of the way, but Grandpa’s aim was true and the familiar “twang” of tobacco juice splattered against brass.

Old Lady Comer turned to follow Grandma into the kitchen. As she did Grandpa slid his reading glasses down his big nose and muttered, “Go on home you damn’ old scarecrow, ’fore I sic my dogs on you.”

Old Lady Comer turned and smiled, “What’s that, Luther—what’d you say?”

Grandpa stood up and walked into the kitchen, smiling artificially. “It’s nice weather, ain’t it?” he shouted.

Old Lady Comer smiled right back at Grandpa. “It sure is, Luther,” she said. “What’s that you’ve made, Katie?” she asked curiously as she turned her attention toward the cook stove.

“Oh, this is just my old apple cobbler,” Grandma replied, knowing full well that Old Lady Comer had seen her make it a dozen times. “Would you care for some, Matilda?”

“Oh, now, Katie, I don’t want to put you out.” Old Lady
Comer replied as she sat down quickly across the table from Grandpa. He was just dumping the last of four spoonfuls of gravy on his mashed potatoes.

"Like hell you don't want to put us out, you skinny old goat," Grandpa muttered with amazing clarity, not taking his mouth away from a slice of bread.

"What's that, Luther?" Old Lady Comer shouted as she reached for an ear of corn.

"I said 'how's that sick calf of yours doing?'" Grandpa shouted as he watched the old woman shove a whole slice of buttered bread into her mouth. Old Lady Comer continued stuffing food in like the seven-year locusts were coming to gobble up everything before she got her share.

"I hope you choke to death," Grandpa said, reaching for the apple cobbler.

"That's nice, Luther," Old Lady Comer smiled, apparently catching something different. She filled her plate with mashed potatoes and gravy and reached for another large ear of corn.

"I do think I'll try a little dab of your potatoes and gravy, Katie. And a little ear of corn. Your corn has been so good this year."

As I sat beside Grandpa I watched her eat. She clacked her store-bought teeth and shoveled the food into her mouth in big, heaping forkfulls. When the plate was empty, she took another piece of bread and wiped up the gravy that she had been unable to get with her fork. She belched contentedly.

"Belch your damn' head off, you old turkey neck," Grandpa said, getting up from the table. "Gimme that food, Katie. I gotta get down to the jail with it!"

"What's that you say, Luther?" the old lady asked.

"I said come over again," he shouted, "when you can stay longer!" Grandpa walked out through the back door carrying a tray of food for Pee Wee Marshall and Wilmer Ogg.

I quickly grabbed a slice of bread, buttered it, dabbed two spoonfuls of strawberry jam on it, folded it over and ran after Grandpa. I could hear Grandma calling after me to come back, but I pretended that I didn't hear and raced after Grandpa, whose big strides already had taken him down past the old vacant lot.

He turned around as he heard me coming and said, "William, you get on home, right now!"
I caught up with him, gulping down the bread.  
"Please, Grandpa," I begged, "can't I go with you?"

He looked down at me contemplating an answer. Then he gave me the tray to hold and cut off a chew of tobacco from a Red Star plug, plopping it into his mouth. We started walking again and I tried to match his big steps, stride for stride.

"I don't allow no kids around that jail," he said and spat at a grasshopper.

"Please, Grandpa," I begged.

"I said you ain't goin' and that's final," he said.

"Then can I just walk as far as the pool room?" I asked. He looked at me, half smiling, half frowning.

"All right," he said, "you can go as far as the pool room and then you skedaddle right back home—do ya hear?"

I was pleased with the compromise and happier still when he said I could keep carrying the tray of food.

We crossed the street and started across a vacant lot where Mr. Pugh always pastured a few goats. As we approached the goats, one little billy tied to a stake with about thirty feet of rope came bucking over toward us. Grandpa stopped and so did I and we looked at the goat. It bucked toward Grandpa and looked him straight in the eye. The little goat bleated "baa," and Grandpa spat a big gob of tobacco juice right into his face. The goat blinked and bleated "baa" again and Grandpa said, "Now hump up and bawl, you bearded baboon!"

We left the bewildered goat on Pugh's lot and crossed Main Street, stopping in front of the pool room. Grandpa took the tray from me and said, "Get on home, William. If I catch you up town when I get back from the jail, I'll tan your hide."

I knew he meant it, so I found an old tin can and kicked it all the way home.

That night we waited supper on Grandpa, who had not yet returned from the jail. I asked Grandma where she supposed he was. "I don't know, William," she replied softly; "probably off drunk somewhere again."

The next morning I could smell bacon frying and the sweet aroma of coffee clear through my bed covers. I walked into the kitchen where Grandma was putting a batch of baking powder biscuits into the oven. I yawned hard, silencing the tea kettle as I did. "Did Grandpa come home last night?" I asked.
"I haven't seen hide nor hair of him," she said rather pleasantly. This wasn't the first time that Grandpa had stayed out all night long.

"At least he didn't get drunk in town," she said, "because no one has seen him since he went to the jail yesterday with Pee Wee's and Wilmer's dinner." She checked the baking powder biscuits in the oven. "Maybe he went off to Wingville with those Roper boys again," she said.

All that day Grandma whistled contentedly as she busied herself with a dozen tasks. She sneaked out the mail order catalog from its secret hiding place, worked on a new dress for herself, and even walked over to Old Lady Comer's for a little visit. Grandpa didn't come home that night either.

It was nearly noon the next day, while I was whistling on a soft piece of yellow pine, that Big Bill Buchanan rode up on his bay mare. Big Bill lived on down the road from us and was real friendly with everyone in town.

"Where's your Grandma, William?" he asked, stopping the mare at our gate.

"She's in the house, I think," I replied, walking over to the gate to admire the mare. "Grandma," I shouted, "Big Bill's here!" I stroked the mare's sleek black mane as we waited for an answer.

"I guess she's down at the chicken house, Big Bill," I said. "I'll go and fetch her."

I ran down past the coops, rushing inside the chicken house. Several white leghorn hens flew off their nests past Grandma, who was gathering eggs in her apron.

"William--!"

"Grandma! Big Bill's here. He's out front!"

She asked me what he wanted and I said I didn't know and she said that she would take the eggs in the house and then talk with him. When she came out the front door, Big Bill was getting a drink out of the pump.

"Hello, Katie," he said.

"Hello, Big Bill," Grandma smiled, "what can I do for you?"

Big Bill wiped his mouth with the back of his shirt sleeve. "I found Luther," he said. "He's been locked up in jail for two days!" He began laughing. "It's the funniest damn thing I ever heard of," he laughed, wiping his face. His laughter
increased to a roar and before he could say anything more, tears were streaming down his face and he had to take out his big red handkerchief to wipe his eyes and blow his nose. He finally stopped laughing and told Grandma how Grandpa had taken Pee Wee and Wilmer their dinner and how Pee Wee grabbed Grandpa's gun as Wilmer twisted his arm behind his back and got his keys away from him. Then they locked Grandpa in the jail and ate their dinner while Grandpa cussed his head off. Big Bill said that Grandpa screamed his lungs out until he was hoarse trying to make someone hear him but because the jail was clear out in the middle of the old Smurthwaite pasture, no one heard him. Big Bill said that it wasn't until Pee Wee's little sister Darlene came by the jail thinking that Pee Wee was still there that Grandpa was able to let anyone know that he was locked in jail. Little Darlene stopped Big Bill and told him about Grandpa being locked in jail and he rode over to see Grandpa. After Big Bill had a good laugh, Grandpa told him to go on down to get an extra set of keys from Grandma.

Grandma saddled a horse and let me jump on behind her and we rode over to the jail with Big Bill. He unlocked the door and let Grandpa out. Grandpa cussed Grandma for a long time, saying that she ought to have sense enough to know where he was and why in the hell didn't she come looking for him. When Grandma said that she thought that he was just off drunk again, Grandpa cussed her some more.

That evening after a supper during which Grandpa didn't say a word, he started a fire in the Franklin stove. When the kindling was burning well he threw on a big cherry knot. The old iron stove soon took on a dull red glow. Grandpa settled back in his old black rocker and took out his knife. He peeled a big winesap apple and sliced off a piece. I sat on the floor watching him as he carved off chunks around the core, stuffing each piece into his mouth. I looked up at him.

"Can I have the core, Grandpa?"

"There ain't gonna be no core," he said.

I sat at his feet with a dejected look and he winked at me. It was then that I realized that it would take more than forty-eight hours in jail to take the cussedness out of my Grandpa!
Sunset

"Sure purty, ain't it."
His words, called out across the grass, could only
Desecrate the truth and desecrate my thoughts and mood.

But what words, then?

How define that lovely light?
Chiaroscuro in technicolor?
On edge of clouds a red-gold glow that makes my mountains
  glow?
Refracted light from sun on edge of mist?
Light wavering at upward to seven thousand A's per second?
Beauty because we're there to see?

No words—there are none.
None could catch and hold a sky thus caught
And held by light. Caught and held to catch
And hold my breath, to catch and hold in awe
The sweep of sky and eye.

And if no words there's only he—and I
And all the rest. We see. We sense. We come to know
And love the light, that play of Holy Light.

Words fail.
The light fades now. He's long since gone.
But like the light he still reverberates.
"Sure purty, ain't it."

Marden J. Clark
View of the Hebrews: Substitute for Inspiration?

Spencer J. Palmer and William L. Knecht*

Recent imputations against Joseph Smith contain the charge that the Isaiah chapters of the Book of Mormon were purloined by the Prophet from a popular book first published in 1823 by a Protestant clergyman named Ethan Smith, under the title View of the Hebrews: Exhibiting the Destruction of Jerusalem; the Certain Restoration of Judah and Israel; the Present State of Judah and Israel; and an Address of the Prophet Isaiah Relative to Their Restoration.1 Joseph Smith’s detractors look upon this alleged act of plagiarism as a betrayal of his claim of a sacrosanct origin of the Book of Mormon.

Writers like Fawn M. Brodie and G. T. Harrison approach these “Isaiah parallels” with particular rejoicing and ridicule.2 To quote Brodie:

... in writing the early portion of the book [The Book of Mormon] his [Joseph Smith’s] literary reservoir frequently ran dry. When this happened he simply arranged for his Nephite prophets to quote from the Bible. Thus about twenty-five thousand words in the Book of Mormon consist of passages from the Old Testament—CHIEFLY THOSE CHAPTERS FROM ISAIAH MENTIONED IN ETHAN SMITH’S VIEW OF THE HEBREWS... . . . a (Emphasis added).

Fortunately this allegation can be tested empirically. In an effort to judge the validity of the charge, we have taken the so-called Isaiah portion of the Book of Mormon (i.e., II

*Spencer J. Palmer is assistant professor of history and religious instruction at Brigham Young University. William L. Knecht is an attorney at law in Berkeley, California.
1Printed by Smith & Shute at Poultney, Vt., in two editions: 1823 and 1825.
2This is not to say that Harrison and Brodie are of the same scholastic stripe. Harrison’s Mormons Are Peculiar People (New York: Vantage Press, Inc., 1954) often reaches the absurd. His tongue-in-cheek style is undisturbed by documentation. Brodie, on the other hand, takes her project seriously and uses footnotes regularly in her book: No Man Knows My History; The Life of Joseph Smith the Mormon Prophet (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1946). But see Hugh Nibley, No M'dam That’s Not History (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft Publishers, 1946).
3Brodie, 58.
Nephi) and recorded every identifiable reference, allusion, quotation, near (or partial) quotation in it, from Isaiah. Because Isaiah repeats himself (or rather repeats allusions) sometimes there is more than one Isaiah reference in any particular verse in II Nephi (e.g., II Nephi 7:2 is a quotation [Isaiah 50:2] and has identifiable reference to Isaiah 65:12 and 66:4.) We have limited the count to one identification unless it is in a verse common to both View of the Hebrews and to II Nephi. In that case, we have tabulated and counted all the references to see if any of the identifications or uses of a given verse are common.

We have attempted to carry an analysis of the common use of Isaiah beyond the broad brush technique of Mrs. Brodie. Table 1 lists the verses within each of the two works from Isaiah. A total of 459 identifiable references from Isaiah have been found in the book; 361 of that total are found in II Nephi; 116 in View of the Hebrews; 23 verses are common to both. It will be noted that there is no reference to Isaiah 66 in Table 1. This comes from the fact that although both View of the Hebrews and the Book of Mormon contain possible allusions or quotations from this chapter, the former uses verses 18, 20, and 21, while the latter refers only to verse 19.4

A total of 37 chapters of Isaiah are source for allusion, reference, quotation, near-quotation, or "mention" in the two works. Ethan Smith confined his "mentionings" to 24 chapters (giving credit for a "mention" when he simply makes a partial quotation from one verse even though he does not give credit for the quotation, e.g. see View of the Hebrews, 135 (232). The Prophets of II Nephi "quote" from 20 chapters and make allusions and/or references to (parts of) two more chapters, making a total of 22. There are nine Isaiah chapters commonly used in View of the Hebrews and the Book of Mormon.

Brodie bases her claim of plagiarism from View of the Hebrews upon the common use of Isaiah chapters. Does this existence of similar material in the two books damage the Latter-day Saint claim of the divine origin of the Book of Mormon?

Though it is proverbial that liars can figure, there is one test that can be applied to the statistics generated from this

---

4Typical examples of the use of Isaiah references by Ethan Smith and by the prophets of II Nephi are set forth in Table 3, in parallel columns.
study which is valid in judging the claim of Brodie that Joseph Smith cribbed from another’s work, when he could not find any other source of inspiration. Following a method of analysis widely accepted by statisticians—the test for hypergeometric distribution—we shall assume that the two authors worked independently, that there was no collusion. Under this method of analysis, the probability is that a certain number of chapters will appear in common.

By using the figures applicable in this case, one should assume that eight chapters should most frequently appear in common. As indicated in Table 2, our survey finds nine such common chapters: 5, 7, 10, 11, 14, 49, 51, 60 and 66. This is an insignificant variation from eight, and one which, statistically speaking, should be expected a large proportion of the time. In fact, nine or more chapters in common under the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book of Mormon References</th>
<th>Isaiah Ch.</th>
<th>View of the Hebrews Description</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Ed. 2nd Ed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR 235 Allusion</td>
<td>5 26</td>
<td>Allusion</td>
<td>2 Nephi 29:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR 236 Part Quote</td>
<td>7 8</td>
<td>Quotation</td>
<td>15:26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR 235 Allusion</td>
<td>7 18</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>17:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR 256 Quotation</td>
<td>10 20</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>20:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR 256 Quotation</td>
<td>10 21</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>21:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR 256 Quotation</td>
<td>10 22</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>20:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 56 Quotation</td>
<td>11 11</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>21:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 56 Quotation</td>
<td>11 12</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>21:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73 70 Part Quote</td>
<td>11 12</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>21:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143 242 Quotation</td>
<td>11 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73 72 Part Quote</td>
<td>11 13</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>21:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 56 Quotation</td>
<td>11 15</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>21:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 56 Quotation</td>
<td>11 16</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>21:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR 63 Quotation</td>
<td>14 1</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>24:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR 62 Allusion</td>
<td>14 25</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>24:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159 260 Part Quote</td>
<td>49 1</td>
<td>Allusion</td>
<td>10:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 63 Allusion</td>
<td>49 22</td>
<td>Quotation</td>
<td>6:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 73 Allusion</td>
<td>49 22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 63 Allusion</td>
<td>49 23</td>
<td>Quotation</td>
<td>6:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161 261 Part Quote</td>
<td>51 3</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>8:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 58 Quotation</td>
<td>60 9</td>
<td>Allusion</td>
<td>10:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136 233 Part Quote</td>
<td>60 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
data of this test should appear 46 percent of the time, or in other words, have a .46 probability.  

The validity of this test is suggested by the following analysis: If Joseph Smith had foreseen and tried to avoid an attack such as that Brodie lays to him, he might well have avoided all references to Isaiah which were quoted by Ethan Smith, since Ethan had already referred his reader to that text. The absence of any common Isaiah chapters would have been suspicious indeed, since this would strongly suggest a deliberate effort to avoid suspicion particularly if it is realized that the book of Isaiah is a primary source for anyone dealing with the subject of the dispersion and gathering of Israel. The odds are approximately one in one million against there being no common Isaiah chapters in the Book of Mormon and View of the Hebrews. Judged on the basis of this analysis, neither Brodie nor Harrison has yet solved the enigma of Joseph Smith's inspiration.

a. Parallel listing of pages from the two editions reflects the same reference, quotation, or allusion. In rewriting the text for the second printing, Reverend Smith made some additions and deletions; hence there are not always parallel references and the designation "NR" (no reference) appears.

b. All chapter and verse references are to editions of the Book of Mormon printed subsequent to 1920. The initial division into chapters and verses occurred in 1879. A revision of the footnotes was made in 1920. It is upon these notes that the writers relied in tabulating the Isaiah references.

---

*The writers are indebted to Melvin W. Carter, of the Brigham Young University faculty, for suggesting the application of the test for hypergeometric distribution to this problem and for working out the probability upon the basis of our tabulations. A discussion of this method of analysis is found in B. W. Lindgren & G. W. McElrath, Introduction to Probability and Statistics. The Macmillan Company, (New York: 1959) 146-147.

Our conclusions are based upon the following exercise:

a. Classify each chapter of Isaiah as being in View of the Hebrews (Q) or
b. as not appearing in View of the Hebrews (R).

c. Q plus R equals N (the total number of Isaiah chapters).
d. y equals the number of chapters common to both works.
e. n equals the number of chapters used by II Nephi prophets.
f. Solve the formula

\[ P(y) = \frac{\binom{Q}{y} \binom{R}{n-y}}{\binom{N}{n}} \]
c. Quotation, but without verse reference; always true of Book of Mormon quotations.

Table No. 2
ISAIAH REFERENCE COMPARISON
(Chapter by chapter)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>View of Hebrews*</th>
<th>Book of Mormon*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2 Nephi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The number indicates Isaiah chapter from which the respective works make mention, quotation, allusion, citation or reference.
Table No. 3
ISAIAH REFERENCE COMPARISON
Textual Comparison

View of the Hebrews

But that it may appear that the prophetic writings unite to exhibit this as a great object of the Christian's belief, I shall note some of the other predictions of it.

In Isaiah xi, the stem from the root of Jesse is promised. The Millennium follows, when the cow and the bear shall feed together, and the wolf and the lamb unite in love; and nothing more shall hurt or offend. 11. "And is shall come to pass in that day that the Lord shall set his hand again, the second time, to gather the remnant of his people, who shall be left, from Assyria and from Egypt, and from Pathros, and and from the isles of the sea.

12. And he shall set up an ensign for the nations, and shall assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather together the dispersed of Judah, from the four corners of the earth." Here just before the Millennium, the Jews and ten tribes are collected from their long dispersion, by the hand of Omnipotence, set a second time for their recovery.

This standard of salvation at that period, is a notable event in the prophets. See Isa. xi. 12, where God sets his hand a second time to gather his Hebrew family from all nations and regions.

Book of Mormon

(2 Nephi)

Isaiah

9. "They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain, for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea.

10. And in that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people; to it shall the Gentiles seek; and his rest shall be glorious.

11. And it shall come to pass in that day that the Lord shall set his hand again the second time to recover the remnant of his people which shall be left, from Assyria, and from Egypt, and from Pathros, and from Cush, and from Elam, and from Shinar, and from Hamath, and from the islands of the sea.

12. And he shall set up an ensign for the nations, and shall assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth.

---
a. 1825 Edition
b. 1830 Edition
13; “The envy also of Ephraim shall depart; Ephraim shall not envy Judah, and Judah shall not vex Ephraim.” Here the mutual jealousies between the two branches of the house of Israel, which before the expulsion of the ten tribes kept them in almost perpetual war, shall never again be revived; which passage assures us of the restoration of Israel as Israel.

In Jer. iii. those two branches are distinguished by “backsliding Israel, and her treacherous sister Judah.” Israel was already put away for

A body of the Jews, and some of several other tribes, were recovered from ancient Babylon. God is going, in the last days, to make a second, and more effectual recovery from mystical Babylon, and from the four quarters of the earth. The prophet proceeds: 15. “And the Lord shall utterly destroy the tongue of the Egyptian sea; and with his mighty wind he shall shake his hand over the river, and shall smite it in the seven streams, and make men go over dry shod. 16. And there shall be an highway for the remnant of his people, which shall be left from Assyria; like as it was to Israel in the day that he came up out of the land of Egypt.” Mr. Scott, upon this passage, says; “For the Lord will then remove all obstacles by the same powerful interposition, that he vouchsafed in behalf of Israel, when He sep-

13. “The envy of Ephraim also shall depart, and the adversaries of Judah shall be cut off; Ephraim shall not envy Judah, and Judah shall not vex Ephraim.

14. But they shall fly upon the shoulders of the Philistines towards the west; they shall spoil them of the east together; they shall lay their hand upon Edom and Moab; and the children of Ammon shall obey them.

15. And the Lord shall utterly destroy the tongue of the Egyptian sea; and with his mighty wind he shall shake his hand over the river, and shall smite it in the seven streams, and make men go over dry shod.

14. But they shall fly upon the shoulders of the Philistines towards the west; they shall spoil them of the east together; they shall lay their hand upon Edom and Moab; and the children of Ammon shall obey them.

15. And the Lord shall utterly destroy the tongue of the Egyptian sea; and with his mighty wind he shall shake his hand over the river, and shall smite it in the seven streams, and make men go over dry shod.

16. And there shall be a highway for the remnant of his people which shall be left, from Assyria, like as it was to Israel in the day that he came up out of the land of Egypt.
Upon this final restoration of his brethren, this prophet exults in lofty strains. Several of the many of these strains shall be here inserted. Isai. xlix. Listen O isles unto me; (or ye lands away over the sea) hearken ye people from afar. 11. I will make all my mountains a way; and my high way shall be exalted. 12. Behold these shall come from far; and lo, these from the north, and from

49: 1

ness in the latter days.” Here is a description of the present dispersed state of Israel; and a prediction of their national restoration, “in the latter days.”

This restoration is a great event in the prophets; and we find it in the New Testament. Paul (in his epistle to the Romans, chap. xi.) notes their being again grafted into their own olive tree, as a notable event of the last days, which shall be the “riches of the gentiles;” yea, “life from the dead” to them. See also Isaiab, xlix. 18-23. One passage more I will adduce from the writings of Moses; Deut. xxx. The long and doleful dispersion of this people had been predicted in the preceding chapters. Here their final restoration follows. “And it shall come to pass, when all these things are come upon thee, and thou shalt call them to mind

20. And now, my beloved brethren, seeing that our merciful God has given us so great knowledge concerning these things, let us remember him, and lay aside our sins, and not hang down our heads, for we are not cast off; nevertheless, we have been driven out of the land of our inheritance; but we have been led to a better land, for the Lord has made the sea our path, and we are upon an isle of the sea.

21. But great are the promises of the Lord unto them who are upon the “isles of the sea;” wherefore as it says isles, there must needs be more than this, and they are inhabited also by our brethren.

22. For behold, the Lord God has “led away from time to time from the house of Israel, according to his will and pleasure. And now behold, the Lord remembereth all them who have been broken off, wherefore he remembereth us also.

5. And now, the words which I shall read are they which Isaiah spake concerning all the house of Israel; wherefore, they may be likened unto you, for ye are of the house of Israel. And there are many things which have been spoken by Isaiah which may be likened unto you, because ye are of the house of Israel.

6. And now these are the words: “Thus saith the Lord God: Behold, I will lift up mine hand to the Gentiles, and set up my standard to the people; and they shall bring thy sons in their arms, and thy daughters shall be carried upon their shoulders.

49:22

7. And kings shall be thy nursing fathers, and their queens thy nursing mothers; they shall bow down to thee with their faces towards the earth, and lick up the dust of thy feet; and thou shalt know that I am the Lord; for they shall not be ashamed that wait for me.

49:23

8. And now I, Jacob, would speak somewhat concerning these words. For behold, the Lord has “shown me that those who were at Jerusalem, from whence we came, have been slain and carried away captive.
almost like the conversion of dragons and owls of the desert. Rivers of knowledge and grace shall in such wilds be opened for God's chosen. It will then truly be fulfilled, that God in comforting Zion, will "make her wilderness like Eden and her desert like the garden of the Lord," Isai. ii. 3. Such passages will have a degree of both literal and mystical fulfillment.

A signal beauty will then be discovered in such passages as the following; Isai. xli. 14. "Fear not, thou worm Jacob, and ye men of Israel; I will help thee, saith the Lord God, thy Redeem-

The same thing is noted in Isaiah lx. The Jewish church is called upon; "Arise, shine, for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee. The gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising. 8. Who are these that fly as clouds, and as doves to their windows? 9. Surely the isles shall wait for me, and the ships of Tarshish first, to bring thy sons from far, their silver and their gold with them, unto the name of the Lord thy God, and to the Holy One of Israel, because he hath glorified thee." Here are ships conveying

CHAPTER 8.
Jacob's teachings continued—Compare Isaiah 51.
1. Hearken unto me, ye that follow after righteousness. Look unto the rock from whence ye are hewn, and to the hole of the pit from whence ye are digged.
2. Look unto Abraham, your father, and unto Sarah, she that bare you; for I called him alone, and blessed him.
3. For the Lord shall comfort Zion, he will comfort all her waste places; and he will make her wilderness like Eden, and her desert like the garden of the Lord. Joy and gladness shall be found therein, thanksgiving and the voice of melody.
4. Hearken unto me, my people; and give ear unto me, O my nation; for a 

20. And now, my beloved brethren, seeing that our merciful God has given us so great knowledge concerning these things, let us remember him, and lay aside our sins, and not hang down our heads, for we are not cast off; nevertheless, we have been driven out of the land of our inheritance; but we have been led to a better land, for the Lord has made the sea our path, and we are upon an isle of the sea.
21. But great are the promises of the Lord unto them who are upon the isles of the sea; wherefore as it says isles, there must needs he more than this, and they are inhabited also by our brethren.
22. For behold, the Lord God has led away from time to time from the house of Israel, according to his will and pleasure. And now behold, the Lord remembereth all them who have been broken off, wherefore he remembereth us also.
The Wealth of Knowledge

If I do not learn what is in the world from first to last, somebody will be wiser than I am. I intend to know the whole of it both good and bad. Shall I practise evil? No; neither have I told you to practise, but to learn by the light of truth, every principle there is in existence in the world.

Every accomplishment, every polished grace, every useful attainment in mathematics, music, and in all science and art belong to the Saints, and they should avail themselves as expeditiously as possible of the wealth of knowledge the sciences offer to every diligent and persevering scholar.

The catalogue of man's discipline he must compile himself: he cannot be guided by any rule that others may lay down, but is placed under the necessity of tracing it himself through every avenue of his life.

—Brigham Young
Is Anthropology "The Study of Man"?

Problems in the Study of Complex Societies

John L. Sorenson*

Anthropology claims to be, by derivation, "the study of man." Three related questions are raised by this ambitious title. Is a systematic, objective study of man possible? If so, what must be some of its salient characteristics? And what will be the place of anthropology and anthropologists in the effort?

Is a study of man really essential, we may first ask? I am firm in the belief that man must work out his behavioral salvation—a sound, sane society, a dynamic culture, a rewarding personality—with the same fear and trembling with which he is more frequently urged to labor toward spiritual salvation. As Brigham Young has said: "All men should study to learn the nature of mankind, and to discern that divinity inherent in them. A spirit and power of research is planted within [us], yet they remain undeveloped." And there are practical benefits to striving for objectivity in any such study. Of what does understanding consist? Can we know man, then? There are those who believe it impossible, or undesirable, to attempt a full understanding. Eventually, but not in anticipation, we may be forced to admit that it is impossible. But I cannot agree that it is undesirable. Betz exaggerates when he opines that to "Know thyself may be the worst possible advice. A moth that undertook to study itself would never become a butterfly . . . . He would be just another professor." It is of no small moment that professors, or someone, come to understand even professors!

Does the mystic understand man? Perhaps. But his understanding is of a sort which cannot be communicated readily; it cannot cumulate to become a comprehensive understanding of all the kinds of behavior of all men. It is rather the com-

---

*John L. Sorenson is an associate professor of sociology and anthropology at Brigham Young University. This paper was delivered to the first Faculty Forum, College of Humanities and Social Sciences, on November 12, 1963.

ponent of understanding which Jenkins has called the affective. He supposes that man's experience in relation to the world has three parts to it: an aesthetic component, which focuses upon the "particularity" of phenomena; the affective, whose function is to keep us sensitive to our vital needs and concerns; and finally a cognitive component, in which attention is focused on causes and consequences of an occurrence and on the similarities and connections of things and events.\(^2\) Vital as the two former enterprises may be for the guidance of life, it is only the third, the cognitive component, which is readily communicable and potentially cumulative. The preliminary aim of science is, of course, precisely to arrive at consensus concerning our cognition of the phenomena of nature.

That study of man which can give us an operationally useful and reliable understanding must be scientific. "For a scientist, a phenomenon is understood provided he possesses a satisfactory theory for this phenomenon."\(^3\) A theory is simply a systematic statement of the relationships among the variables in the situation under consideration. The value of a theory is two-fold: it satisfies our need to quell our curiosity, and it assists us in dealing with phenomena and situations successfully.

It may distress those who see themselves primarily in the role of artist or humanist or religionist for me to say that a cognitive, even scientific, understanding is superior to the aesthetic or affective kinds. As desirable and important as those dimensions are, clearly they usually do not, as does the cognitive, assist us in dealing with phenomena confidently and successfully. They are not cumulative and communicable. The distinction is reflected in Whitehead's paradoxical observation that "Everything of importance has been said before by somebody who did not discover it."\(^4\)

Accepting, then, the desirability of a systematic, objective understanding of man, will it be possible to carry out such study? Without entering into lengthy justification it may be said that we already have reason for confidence that it is possi-


\(^3\)Warren Weaver, "The Imperfections of Science." *American Scientist*, XLIX (March 1961), 104.

ble to come to this kind of understanding. The basis for confidence is the already substantial accomplishments of several disciplines.

But why is it that there exist a number of competing, and sometimes conflicting, bodies of scientists and their ideas instead of just one? We may compare each of the disciplines to kingdoms which, like the Nephites, think of themselves as isolated on an isle of the sea. Let me speak particularly of Anthropologia. The elders here tell their children, "We are the true men. We are the chosen people. Have we not the name to prove it—anthropos + logia—The Study of Man?" They maintain their initiation rites, elaborate the subtleties of their arcane language, hold their seasonal ceremonies, pass on their folklore and mythology, preserve tenaciously their structure of traditional stratification and power, firmly resist most technological change, and worship at the shrines made sacred first by such great high priests as Boas and Radcliffe-Brown. It is true that they welcome with bemused tolerance a few weekend tourists from Historia, Economia, and Psychologia, but the obvious inability of such people to give up their own strange customs or to learn to speak the pure language without an accent merely confirms the suspicion of the elders that such intruders are really people who simply cannot accept God's truth when they hear it. It is also correct that a few of the poorly enculturated young of Anthropologia talk of going off to see the sights in those other lands of which they have a little knowledge, but much of such talk is enough to lead the elders to cut off the dissidents' inheritance.

Meanwhile in other kingdoms the elders say much the same thing. The languages differ there and the priests are strange to outsiders—Durkheim, Cooley and Parsons, or Watson, Terman, and Freud. Yet in each land the young learn the same discipline-centrism, the same intellectual nationalism. "Psychology is the science of the behavior of organisms," the young of one kingdom are assured grandiosely in a recent first-grade reader, for example.

It is time we seriously ask ourselves the question "Is a unification in the study of man possible?" There seems to be three obstacles. The first is the present division into jealous societies. Then there is the lack of suitable language and customs to bridge the gaps which hold us apart. Finally, there
are the differences in modal personality of the persons who have been attracted to work in each field.

The experience of anthropologists in overcoming these obstacles, while far from spectacular, is at least instructive. The greatest impact has come from applied projects—interdisciplinary activities which have focused on accomplishing practical tasks without regard to which intellectual domain comes to be involved. Some of these have been among so-called primitive peoples, but all have involved a concern with modern complex societies.

These applied problems have constituted a test for anthropologists, determining whether they could make their methods and ideas extend to new ranges of phenomena and to be meaningful to people who didn't know a *sib* from a *moiety*. In reality this is the same kind of test which each discipline must face if there is to be a unified science of man. Can professional jargon be translated to a universal language? Can expert findings from each discipline be incorporated in a combined corpus of observations on, and theory of, behavior in humans?

In 1954 John W. Bennett wrote out for his fellow anthropologists some observations on the limitations of traditional anthropology with which he had been faced in applied, interdisciplinary projects. He concluded that one such as he "becomes, through his experience, a different kind of anthropologist." He is correct, I can attest personally. My own experience has been of two kinds. The first came from the study of a modern Utah industrial community, a project which I did alone, but which led me to discover the inadequacies of much of traditional ethnology because the task was located in a sizable modern community. More recently a year and one-half in interdisciplinary travail, studying Vietnam and Venezuela as milieus for unconventional warfare, has confirmed and clarified that view.

There appear to be three kinds of obstacles to the application of traditional ethnology to the study of current situations in complex societies. The first is that the scale of information needed, and consequently the techniques required and assistance involved, are changed drastically. Instead of the lone, jack-of-all-trades field anthropologist in a tribal...

---

setting who personally gathers biographies, linguistic texts, folktales, details of land tenure, production figures, demographic statistics, and Rorschach responses, often inexpertly, the worker in the complex society is faced by a scale of information which virtually forces specialization of labor.

The second problem is in the area of conceptualization and explanation. Whole new series of concepts must be utilized when the question at hand is the behavior of 14 million people instead of a reservation or island community of 1,400 or so. Here is a crucial problem for a unified science of man; will it be possible to conceptualize human behavior in terms applicable to all men in all places and times?

A third difficulty in the new applications of anthropology lies in the fact that prediction and dynamics suddenly become crucial. So long as chiefly hindsight was involved—whether in problems of culture history or of small societies which have little connection with the modern world, both favorite retreats for the traditional anthropologist—there was little necessity to put theory to the test. However, in research situations where application is of the essence, the anthropologist finds his moment of truth; he may nostalgically wish for the comfort of the ivory tower, but he is forced to meet reality head-on instead.

Let me expand on each of these three problems by referring to what my own work has encountered.

The one-man-studying-a-Utah-community problem was partly one of suitable techniques. With almost 8,000 people involved, it was manifestly impossible to do the traditional intensive study of individuals and households, particularly when a large portion of the people spent at least part of each working day out of town. Census records proved useful. On the basis they provided, a sample of households was surveyed using student help. Some content analysis of newspapers and sermons was done. Statistical comparisons of various sorts served to specify the extent and nature of social change in time, the key aim of the project. These ways to gather data, most of them more used by sociologists than by my own disciplinary colleagues, served as the basis for erecting a picture of the community's structure. The whole view was fleshed out, however, by the use of more traditional techniques, such as participant observation and use of informants to con-
firm and supplement. There simply was not time to get to all the normal tasks using conventional means.

Large scale data-gathering was made more difficult in the Vietnam unconventional warfare research by the need for urgency. Three thousand bibliographical items had to be checked, as far as possible, and the relevant extracted data filed in a standard manner. The Human Relations Area Files scheme proved particularly useful for this purpose. All this, and more, had to be done with inexperienced help by graduate students, and the results had to serve as a basic research resource for professional workers from five different disciplines. The mechanical problem of cross-referencing data for service in several analytical schemes yielded to the edge-punch card system, a most flexible device. Another necessity for standardizing procedures to accommodate the variety of personnel involved in the project was that common sorts of information had to be provided for each analytical unit. The describing of each role, group, and functional system in the society was made reasonably uniform by confronting the fact files with a fixed paradigm of queries. Some thirty questions, for example, were used to prepare a capsule description of each group of importance, ensuring inclusion of such data as size of membership, geographical concentration, ideology, internal organizational pattern, special problems, resources, etc. The same type of thing was done for most roles and for functional systems. Implicit in all these procedures was the problem of having to handle and save data which were "useless" from the point of view of some single investigators. Still another problem in connection with the scale and scope of data involved in the Vietnam project was the impossibility of carrying out usual kinds of field work. One response to this which we developed, but did not implement, was to phrase specific data requests, to fill out our paradigms, which our sponsoring agency, the U.S. Navy, could furnish through its intelligence or other sources where requests might be honored. All these problems of data-gathering and handling are precisely the kind which must be faced, wrestled with, and solved, if anthropology is to be applied successfully to the large-scale phenomena of modern civilization.

There is another class of difficulty to be faced, however, that of the development and application of concepts and
theories suitable to this expanded data scale. For example, my Utah community study raised the question of what is a "community"? The inadequacy of any simple conception of community as a geographical area, when the daily dispersion of the population is so wide as industrial work demanded in this case, required developing a new conceptual frame. A picture was derived of society organized into hierarchical planes corresponding to major settlement units: the household plane, neighborhood plane, hamlet, village, district, province, region, nation, etc. The units of society were seen as centered on one or another of these planes but extending their influence to levels above and below in patterned ways.

The same conception proved essential in dealing with Vietnam and Venezuela where data on the family and individual communities had somehow to be combined in a rational way within the entire national structure. Key concepts utilized in this task were role, group, system, cultural factor, and urbanization.

These developments are illustrative of the problems of conceptual innovation which the anthropologist must face as he turns to cultivate broader fields. Our necessity to arrive at idea tools which would be both understandable and useful to workers from five disciplines involved in the warfare project is precisely the same as face all the behavioral sciences as they move toward a unified science of man.

A final type of problem to be met is that of changing the static analysis which we usually engage in for something more dynamic and time-oriented. The anthropologist’s usual pattern of field work—of getting a snapshot in time, so to speak, of how a people has organized its life—almost pushes him into the time-constant approach. The necessity in the Vietnam and Venezuela study, on the other hand, was to develop a means for extrapolating and predicting change into the future. The procedural and conceptual change is comparable in significance to that between Newtonian and modern physics. Our particular means for solving this problem proved of only limited usefulness, but the fact remains that time had to be of the essence in our treatment. It is exactly this reorientation to dynamics which must characterize the developing, combined science of man which may come.

These are some of the problems and possibilities in the application of anthropology to the study of complex societies.
The question may well have sprung from these observations, "Is all this anthropology?"

What is a discipline? Earlier three features were pointed out which tend to keep the present disciplines from uniting into a single study of man. These same three, rephrased slightly, describe what it is that defines a discipline. First there must be a historically-derived subsociety of practitioners who habitually speak each other’s language and interact with each other. Then there is a modal personality type which is attracted to participate in such a group, being selected through the recruitment processes of the professional subsociety. Finally there is a language and set of ideas—or call them theories or models—shared and utilized by the practitioners. Note the omission of any mention of a body of phenomena or subject matter which is distinctive of a discipline. Ultimately each of the disciplines in science will find that it must pay some attention to all phases of nature. Medicine does so, psychology does so, and so do sociology and anthropology, at least potentially. No a priori boundaries can be set up which will specify that such and such phenomena belong to one field but cannot be treated by another. As I have pointed out above, what is characteristic of a discipline is (1) who does the study, (2) what his interests are (as an expression of his personality), and (3) the intellectual tools he uses in his study. All of man’s behavior is then fair game for any of the human-studying disciplines including anthropology.

Has anthropology been successful in making a transition to the study of modern societies? Yes, in some cases it has. On the other hand, could sociology successfully study "the primitives"? Assuredly yes, although the practical problems would be formidable. Any of the established fields of study has the potential to make a contribution to the understanding of any of the phenomena derived from humans observed as part of nature.

Shall we say now that anthropology is "the study of man," as its title somewhat arrogantly claims? We cannot, for it is clear that even as far as anthropologists already have gone in extending their work to a wider sample of man’s activities, the workers themselves have had to change—to use new techniques, new methods, new concepts, and new theories. Sometimes the new methodological features seem suspiciously
like what sociologists, psychologists, communications specialists, and others have been using. Concepts and theories too have proved interchangeable.

Still there remains a core of unique personality features and interests which ties each discipline together. For the anthropologist what is central is a desire for firsthand experience with the people he is studying. There is also a love of the color and texture of life in an exotic setting. Ann Roe has shown some other marked characteristics we anthropologists tend to share, such as verboseness, aggressive feelings, conflicts at home, and even deriving from relatively well-to-do families! I too can witness to the pull of the siren voice of romantic, boy-scout anthropology, a kind of fantasy reaction to difficult interdisciplinary effort. I confess that at times I prefer the fleshpots of Mesoamerican excavation to the duller promised land of applied or theoretical anthropology. A. L. Kroeber has phrased the matter superlatively:

The times and utilitarianism have caught up with us, and we find ourselves classified and assigned to the social sciences. It is a dimmer atmosphere, with the smog of jargon sometimes hanging heavy. Generalizations no longer suffice; we are taught to worship Abstraction; sharp sensory outlines have melted into logico-verbal ones. As our daily bread, we invent hypotheses in order to test them, as we are told is the constant practice of the high tribe of physicists. If at times some of you, like myself, feel somewhat ill at ease in the house of social science, do not wonder; we are changelings therein; our true paternity lies elsewhere.

But if intellectual adulthood instead of the pleasures of childhood is the penalty we must pay for a usable science of man, it will be worth giving up some of our little pleasures. After all, as Kroeber continues, "The routes of fulfillment are many."

What is true of the anthropologist is true of each of the other specialists. The separate disciplines and their rewards are not going to disappear overnight, and perhaps never. Yet we must mature, we must increase intercommunication, the interchangeability of data, and the sharing of theories.

---


Such unity as we attain in this effort will be largely above, or at a different level of abstraction from, much of our run-of-the-mill professional conceptualizing. To begin with there are at least a few promising points of conceptual contact among all the disciplines. “Role” is one of these. “System” is another.

It is time that Anthropologia enter into a federation, at least, with its neighbors. The depth of distinctions still remaining probably precludes really serious integration of the disciplines. The futile example of the Department of Social Relations at Harvard shows that. But can we not agree that as the day of isolated nationalism is past in the political world, so professional nationalism must be abandoned for at least the federative principle? We much need an institutionalized structure within which cooperative intercommunication can be fostered in the hope of developing a unified science of man.

Does my view of unified science mean that I aim to abandon my chosen field, anthropology? Not at all. It will continue to be important to me as a base, and for the personal and professional satisfactions it can give me. Besides that, my experience to date leads me to conclude that the very breadth and holism of the anthropological approach provides the best single approach to the human sciences.

In conclusion, let us re-examine Jenkins’ three components of man’s knowledge of the world. I have emphasized the cognitive element and think it of crucial social importance, because we know least about it. But a complete understanding of what man is, necessarily involves the aesthetic and affective—or emotional and moral—as well. And each scientist neglects those components at the risk of his own personal understanding of what man is.

*Little is being done nationally or internationally to provide these ties. It is time that Brigham Young University takes the lead in this area, rather than waiting for guidance from the Ivy League or elsewhere. It is time that the oversized College of Humanities and Social Sciences be divided, at least functionally if not formally, so that anthropology, economics, geography, political science, psychology, and sociology be grouped under arrangements which will assist both scholars and students to work toward a unified systematic, objective study of man.
Dear Editor:

It is a truism that the L.D.S. Church stresses education, that Utah spends more per capita on education than any other state, and that Mormon scholars figure prominently in Who’s Who. Yet collectively we have made no particular impression on ourselves or on others. We have had no voice or esprit de corps. Only a few Mormon scholars are well known both in and out of Mormon circles. It is about time some group consciousness was effected and an “order” for the learned defense of the Mormon faith formed. Such an “order” could be created from among the nearly 4,000 educators listed in the latest (1961) Directory of Members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in Higher Education and School Administration. If such an objective could be accomplished among even a representative group of L.D.S. scholars, it would benefit the Mormon Church and society, and lead to a better “public image” of Mormons as a people. One of the best ways for such a group to coalesce, to communicate among themselves, and to be heard is through a journal, a journal such as B.Y.U. Studies.

The promotion budget of the Studies is such that I was fully aware of its existence only when a friend at the “Y” sent me Vol. IV, No. 1 (Winter 1962). After reading it, I immediately ordered the complete back-run and, upon arrival of these numbers, read them through at one sitting. The value of the publication and the quality of some of the articles were most apparent. I was convinced that an awakening and potentially powerful cadre of L.D.S. scholars now had a potentially satisfactory voice.

Aside from the worth of articles and similar contributions fostered and disseminated by the Studies, this organ should augment its offerings with the usual book reviews, shorter notices, lists of periodical literature, news of the profession, notes, communications, bibliographies, and such features regularly found in scholarly journals. Of these offerings the most
important without question is that of book reviews. The editors are aware of this desideratum, but in the eight issues to date only eleven books have been reviewed. This part of the journal should be greatly expanded to include most publications of the L.D.S. book trade, which is in dire need of constructive criticism. We also need bibliographic essays on Mormon literature. Such an essay on the various studies of Joseph Smith, for example, would be welcomed by many. Speaking of the studies on Joseph Smith, when are we going to write some good scholarly biographies of our Church leaders. There is a real need, furthermore, for specialized bibliographies of Mormon subjects along the line of those by Dale Morgan.

There are, however, other important dimensions to the role of the Studies which at the moment either are not envisioned by the editors or are seen only through a glass darkly. Mormon culture has no effective and comprehensive judge, jury, or police system, no journal to point out the frequent disparity between the idea, the dream, the concept, and the realization, the production and the result. The best and worst of Mormon writers and artists face no Mormon critic of their work. The most unqualified amateur with scissors and paste can throw together a poorly conceived, half researched, carelessly written, and popularized pot-boiler, find a publisher, and be acclaimed throughout Mormondom as an authority.

Studies could and should assume the role of critic of our culture. Its pages ought to carry the best possible reviews not only of books about and by Mormons, but of all major creative activity about and by Mormons. A few examples from the recent past will serve as illustrations—Promised Valley, Sand in Their Shoes, All Faces West, The Book of Mormon Pageant, the "This is the Place" Monument, the Los Angeles Temple design, the Book of Mormon Oratorio, The Cody Murals, B.Y.U. Film Studio productions, and significant Church programs such as those developed annually to commemorate the restoration of the Aaronic Priesthood. Such a service properly provided by Studies would tend to restrain writers, publishers, and artists of all kinds from prematurely rushing into print and production, would protect the mind and money of the buying and witnessing public, and, hopefully, would curb the rash of nonbooks which are a blight upon Mormon Culture.
It would further result in better works by and through which the non-Mormon world would judge us.

The role of such service was ably stated in the first issue of the Studies by William Wilkes in his article on "John Tullidge: Utah's First Music Critic." He wrote, "Certain spirits among us sense this [disparity between the ideal and the reality] keenly enough to tell us when we should do better than we are doing. And they also praise us when we do satisfyingly well enough. These mandarins are a thorn in complacent societies, but a spur to the progressive. Although as humans they often err, mistaking the subjective for the objective, the specific for the universal, prejudice for taste, and pessimism for incorruptibility, still the effect of their critique in the long run is healthy, for they provoke hunger [for better things] . . . ."

One word from this quotation should be elaborated upon—the word complacent. Perhaps if the number seven had not held such mystic significance to earlier minds there would have been eight deadly sins—the eighth being that of complacency. We as a people are woefully afflicted with complacency since religiously we are completely free from all that is good and bad in professionalism, we have built up a tradition of self-satisfied, tolerant, amateurishness in our endless church activities. We are so concerned over the individual, his growth, and his feelings that, for example, when I used to judge M.I.A. festivals the lowest possible rating an individual or ensemble could receive was "good." While all this good fellowship and "you just done grand" level of criticism may be laudable in Primary, Sunday School, and M.I.A., it does condition us to demand and expect little, even in what we pay for, and it certainly does little to prepare Mormon youth for the cold, cruel world. It is of course intolerable in respect to adult creative activity.

In conclusion let us consider how Studies can better fulfill its unique role. At the moment it is a fledgling publication, a "quarterly" which appears two or three times a year. It is also rather parochial in concept inasmuch as the Editorial Board is all at the "Y" and since 84% of the articles in the first eight issues came from Utah, 74% from the "Y" alone, and 37% from individuals at the "Y" under the rank of associate professor.
Of uppermost concern is how to bring Studies to the attention of all L.D.S. educators and how to improve the balance in geographical distribution and rank of its contributors. Sending out thousands of complimentary copies and commissioning some articles might help solve these problems. Once, however, the editors of Studies, who should be commended highly for their vision and courage to launch this journal, realize the full potential of their creation and after Studies more completely assumes its unique role as voice of Mormon scholars and critic of Mormon culture, it will sell itself.

Stanley B. Kimball
Southern Illinois University
Alton, Illinois
Book Reviews


Some years ago this reviewer wrote in the old Far Eastern Quarterly that the history of the United States in Eastern Asia was, at best, imperfectly known and that the narratives, theories and interpretations based on this scanty information were, to say the least, archaic. What was not, out of courtesy, stated was my conviction that it would take hard, grinding work to repair the deficit. A toiling through masses of ill-written and unorganized documents to ponder them and select in a lucid order the record of events and ideas was in mind. My reason for not adding such an obvious statement was the reflection it might be assumed to have on the then-rising tide of works on American policies and experiences in Asia, which were based more on bright generalities than on spade work.

The volume here reviewed is the kind of careful and enduring work that goes far to establish the record of history. Here, viewed through Americans in Korea, is the story of the last eight turbulent years in which Korea could pretend to be an independent kingdom. These Americans had a singularly intimate view of the proceedings. The United States representatives, the private experts hired by the Korean government and the missionaries were extremely sympathetic with the Koreans, and this emotional overbalance constantly embroiled Americans in Korean affairs and intrigues. These involvements not only affected the course of affairs but because of the intimacy of Americans with the court (and this was an enormously centralized government on the grand and archaic Confucian model) we are privileged, as in probably no other series of American diplomatic documents, to perceive and grasp the inner operations of a foreign state.

Equally important and interesting is the illumination of the ambivalences of American policy and the thought behind that policy in the age of the "New Imperialism." We see easily, now the deep friendship for the Korean land and people and now the deep impatience with the backwardness and arch-
conservatism. We see, now the distaste for Japan's ambitions in Korea and now the pride in Japan's "Americanization" and hope for the same progress in Korea. The same ambivalences plagued Washington. We recognized a neutral and independent Korea and we wanted to see her remain so. Washington would take no positive steps to effect this desire (or to maintain our treaty provisions). Washington's agent at Seoul, Sill, wanted Korea to throw off Chinese influence through the assistance of progressive Japan although he distrusted Japan. The whole collection of documents makes fascinating reading. Not the least interesting is the view given in the dispatches of 1893 and 1894 of the descent into the Sino-Japanese War. If Mr. Palmer can continue with a Volume III for the last tragic years 1896-1904, he will have accomplished the first privately edited and complete series of United States diplomatic correspondence with a foreign country and will further place diplomatic historians in his debt.

J. A. Harrison
University of Florida

The Mormon trek from Nauvoo to the valley of the Great Salt Lake is becoming an increasingly popular subject for literary and historical exploration. The contribution of Helen Hinckley Jones in her *Over the Mormon Trail* is unique in that it combines the clear simplicity and straightforward language of a work designed for young readers with accuracy and unusual depth of detail and peremptiveness.

Mrs. Jones is editor of *Reveille for a Persian Village* and co-author of *Persia Is My Heart*, both with Najmeh Najafi.

The subject of this review is a rather brief work of one hundred and twenty-eight pages. It covers a thirty-two year period beginning in Nauvoo, Illinois, in 1845 and continuing to the death of Brigham Young in 1877 in Utah. A final chapter entitled "The Mormon Trail Goes On" entices the reader to yearn for more distant frontiers.

The author includes several phases of the Mormon movement often neglected in works designed for young readers. These include an extensive account of the Pueblo Detachment of the Mormon Battalion, including its arrival at Fort Laramie; a discussion of the efforts made by Joseph Smith to acquaint himself with information about the West; and a penetrating look into the voyage of the ship *Brooklyn* carrying Mormon immigrants around the horn to California. The latter includes such detail as the sighting of the Cape Verde Islands after being blown off course in a storm, the death of six children during the voyage, and the landing at Mas-a-tierra to take on board 18,000 gallons of water.

The author's able perception of the character and spirit of Sam Brannan and Brigham Young is implicit in the work. Concerning the early days in the Valley of the Great Salt Lake, Brigham Young is quoted as saying: "We will work hard. We will pray as if God were going to do everything for us. Then we will work as hard as if we were going to have to do everything for ourselves." (p. 67)

The handcart companies are given adequate treatment, but it is regrettable that the author makes no mention of the historic passage of the Donner Party through Utah just one year prior to the Mormon Pioneers, hacking out the last thirty-six miles into the great valley which the Saints followed. Two
other points should be mentioned, first, the common error of placing the site of the driving of the golden spike at Promontory Point instead of Promontory; and second, naming Sutter’s River as the location of Marshall’s famous discovery of gold in California on January 24, 1848, instead of the American River near Coloma.

The valuable map in the front of the book would be more meaningful to the reader if a date were included since important territorial changes took place between 1847 and 1850, the period largely dealt with in this work.

In spite of the errors mentioned and a few less important ones such as calling P. St. George Cooke Colonel Cooke in one place and Captain Cooke in another during the march of the Mormon Battalion, this excellently written and beautifully illustrated work on the trek of the Mormon Pioneers is an outstanding contribution to the history bookshelf of the young reader.

Lyman C. Pedersen, Jr.*

*Graduate assistant, History Department, Brigham Young University

*What Is History?* by Edward H. Carr, the eminent Cambridge professor of international politics and modern history, is an outstanding addition to the growing body of literature devoted to the examination and interpretation of the nature and meaning of history. Few such studies since Marc Bloch’s *The Historian’s Craft* in 1953 have revealed such a breadth of vision and perceptiveness of historiographical insight as this careful yet fast-moving historical testimony. It consists of six lectures delivered at Cambridge University in early 1961 under the headings The Historian and His Facts; Society and the Individual; History, Science, and Morality; Causation in History; History as Progress; and The Widening Horizon. So significant were these lectures deemed by the directors of the B.B.C. that they were subsequently broadcast to the entire British Isles. Now they are conveniently available to us in this first American edition.

While recognizing the justifications in some of the Collingwood School’s criticism of “scientific history” and the “objectivity of historical facts,” Professor Carr is clearly not one of the “relativists” in his interpretation of history. Accepting Pirandello’s quip that “a fact is like a sack—it won’t stand up till you’ve put something in it,” and Professor Barraclough’s observation that “the history we read, though based on facts, is strictly speaking, not factual at all, but a series of accepted judgments,” Carr nevertheless insists that the value of history grows in proportion to the historian’s objectivity and precision in discovering truth and perceiving meaningful relationships and interpretations of past events (all events are past).

Carr’s opening query, “What is history?” is more subtle and profound than its surface appearance, but his carefully pursued answer is a masterpiece of modest good sense and inspiring challenge, not only to historians, but to all who read and think. First, he observes, history is a process of reciprocal actions between the historian and his facts, “an unending dialogue between the present and the past.” By that he means that neither the scientific school’s reliance upon the autonomy and objectivity of facts nor the Collingwood emphasis on interpretation and subjectivity is entirely sufficient, although each contains part of the truth. Carr points out that the his-
torian's first selection of material and interpretation must always be provisional; then as he proceeds, both his interpretations and ordering of the facts are altered by their interaction. Neither historian nor facts can stand alone. Opinions without data are mere opinions; facts without interpretation are meaningless. Pertinent questions must be asked of the facts, but "the historian who accepts answers in advance to these questions goes to work with his eyes blindfolded, and renounces his vocation." (p. 108)

So also is the relationship between society and the individual. They are not in conflict, protests the author; they are complimentary, necessary, and even inseparable. Like all persons, the historian is shaped partly by his social environment, and his view of historical phenomena is partially a reflection of his society. Carr does not believe that great men are outside that stream of history, acting upon it only as external forces. Men are at the same time both products and agents of the historical process, creators and created.

Thus Carr's social view of history is closely related to his faith in the future. "The belief that we have come from somewhere is closely linked with the belief that we are going somewhere. A society which has lost belief in its capacity to progress in the future will quickly cease to concern itself with its progress in the past . . . . Our view of history reflects our view of society." (p. 176) Carr's own view of history, which is the essential lesson of this provocative book, is that the past, the present, and the future are inseparably "linked together in the endless chain of history." And the dual function of the historian is to help us understand past society and its interrelations with the present in order that we may gain mastery over our environment and insure a continuing progress in the future.

The optimism and uplifting candor of Professor Carr's book is a welcome antidote to the flood of despondent and even morbid literature which floods the modern market. Those who are familiar with Carr's many published works will not be surprised to see the clarity and even occasional eloquence of his style, as well as the charming intimacy by which he communicates with the reader. It is this reviewer's hope that What Is History? will be read by people of all walks of life. It should certainly be on the shelves of every serious historian.

De Lamar Jensen