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Imagination and
the Soul's Immensity*

Thomas E. Cheney**

Many people today are victims of the disease of modern living. The cry of "sick society" is not new in the world, but it now is epidemic and insidious. It appears in city riots and looting, in college student revolts, in hippie and yippy movements, in disrespect for law and order. It shows in advocacy of repeal of laws of living as old as Adam. "I did not ask to be born," says one, "therefore, the world owes me subsistence. I have no obligation to contribute anything to anybody."

For the present world to overcome the disease and become a utopia is not beyond the dreams of aspiring men. Yet any hope of attaining a utopia would of necessity require leadership of super wisdom. It would need to be schooled in the wisdom of the ages—it would have to encompass the whole of human experience. To move toward a new utopian world, we would have to draw the best from all the products of human creativity. We would have to recognize the immensity of the human soul and involve as many of its capacities as can be explored and understood.

First of all, to go beyond the corporeal, we must believe in an ideal; we must believe that ideals can be attained. Without vision of a better world, the world is doomed. We must accept the truth that young men may have visions of a better world.

Many great writers have inspired strivings for goodness and greatness. Many Renaissance writers—Sir Thomas More, Sir Francis Bacon, Shakespeare—had the vision. Romantic writers

*Given as the Sixth Annual Faculty Lecture at Brigham Young University, March 26, 1969.

**Mr. Cheney, professor of English at Brigham Young University, is the author of Mormon Songs of the Rocky Mountains (1968) and numerous articles.
explored the ideal almost to a fault, and Matthew Arnold was the advocate of dynamic search for culture and light.

Wordsworth spoke of man as an entity "whose exterior semblance doth belie Thy soul's immensity." True words—the exterior of man does indeed belie the soul's immensity. I am going to explore one phase of the soul's immensity—imagination. The exploring I will do into this vast area will be but negligible probings. I might hopefully get a few pictures as the astronauts did of the moon, but the millions of moons and worlds, of suns and systems in my field of exploration are beyond my ken. I want to examine the imagination of man as it deals with the supernatural, the occult, the unknown.

Man is imprisoned in the world but his imagination is free. Hence part of his reality is the world of the imagination. Man is what he thinks, and by means of thought he is capable of voyaging into a world of great expanse. Like Blake's sunflower, man has his roots in the earth, yet he counts the steps of the sun. The youth pining with desire and the pale virgin shrouded in snow, "Arise from their graves, and aspire/Where my sunflower wishes to go."

The poets and prophets and great ones of the world as well as humble folk at times feel earthbound, confined, limited. Distraught King Lear called man "a poor, bare, forked animal." Disillusioned Macbeth said life was "a tale told by an idiot." Melancholic Byron called life "an uneradicable taint of sin."

But Byron says also, "The race of man becomes a hopeless flight/To them who walk in darkness: . . ." suggesting that all men do not walk in darkness. He also said:

All heaven and earth are still— . . .
Then stirs the feeling infinite, so felt
In solitude, where we are least alone;
A truth, which through our being doth melt,
And purifies from self: it is a tone,
The soul and source of music, which makes known
Eternal harmony, . . .

Shakespeare, through Hamlet, spoke of man as "noble in reason, infinite in faculty, in action like an angel, in apprehension like a God."

3*Childe Harold's Pilgrimage* III. 666-667.
4*Childe Harold's Pilgrimage* III. 833, 842-847.
Not only Shakespeare and Byron recognized the immensity of the soul of man but innumerable others. Shelley, Keats, and Wordsworth all yearned to transcend themselves and to in some way lose life to find in it something better. All mankind, the rich and the poor, the lofty and the lowly, yearn to arise above their own microcosm.

Reasons for this discontent and aspiration may be classified under four headings. First is a need and desire for security. Given a modicum of reason, man wants to know answers to unanswerable problems of life and death and all the overwhelming questions of how and why about the universe. He cannot feel secure unless he can put trust in some all-powerful source of justice; he must have a protector. If life is good, he must have a feeling of eternality.

The second reason for man's discontent is his need for freedom of thought. The goal of the mental process is spontaneity. Although men are not all alike, every man wants to feel free; he will resent any fettering of his right to think freely, following his own initiative. Every healthy mind of every man has a private compulsion to be free.

The third reason for man's discontent is his conscious or unconscious need for food for the soul. The motivating power which has impelled men to follow Christian faith is his inner sense of a need for rapport with the cosmic force. Wordsworth expressed that sense when he said:

And I have felt
A presence that disturbs me with the joy
Of elevated thoughts; a sense sublime
Of something far more deeply interfused,
Whose dwelling is the light of setting suns,
And the round ocean and the living air,
And the blue sky, and in the mind of man;
A motion and a spirit, that impels
All thinking things, all objects of all thought,
And rolls through all things.

Man's soul is nourished through worship of the divine and through response to beauty, both what the eye sees and what the deeper sense perceives.

A fourth reason for man's discontent with his lot is a result of his divine origin. If we come to this life "trailing

---

3"Lines Composed a Few Miles Above Tintern Abbey," 93-102.
clouds of glory from God”; if we are begotten in spirit by God, then we could do nothing other than revolt against any seemingly immutable law which binds us to earth. If man were only of the earth earthy, he might be at home in the world. But he is not, for he is from God; he awaits the time when this corruption can put on incorruption.

Being aware as we are of man’s discontent in the world and of his penchant for adventure into the unknown, we can see why man attempts to conquer space, orbit the earth, fly to the moon. We can also see why he is always striving to break the bands of the known world of the senses and follow mind-directed explorations into the macrocosmic immensity of dimensionless eternity.

The mind also is stirred and altered by body chemistry. This may explain why men attempt to get away from themselves with the use of alcohol, opium, marijuana, LSD and other drugs.

Flights into outer space give to man a portion of the soul-satisfying adventure he needs, but the drug voyage is a round trip ticket which returns him to his animal self or robs him entirely of identity.

Another way to satisfy our aspirations, to transcend the mundane, is through the imagination, to fly with Keats

Not charioted by Baccus and his pards,
But on the viewless wings of Poesy.

Without reserve I advocate flights on the wings of poesy. I lament with Coleridge the absence of “the shaping spirit of imagination.” With Wordsworth I want the mind of man not only to perceive but to create. Need anyone shrink from seeking an intellectual or imaginative beauty spoken of by Shelley, which,

dost consecrate—
With thine own hues all thou dost shine upon
Of human thought or form, . . .

Surely if we ever extend our reach beyond the flesh, we must soar into the world of the ideal. We must knock on the doors of eternity or they will never be opened for us.

1“Ode to a Nightingale,” 32-33.
In our materialistic and naturalistic world anyone who advocates any brand of idealism is in danger of being called an ineffectual angel flapping his luminous wings in vain. Emerson has been out of favor for a half-century. The reason—he was a transcendentalist. And any student of philosophy can tell you what is wrong with transcendentalism. As a philosophy it is inconsistent, illogical, and indefensible in any system of logic. Its language is abstract; its ethical system unscientific. But it has imagination and insight.

Another reason for Emerson's unpopularity is that he had no vision of evil. To count in philosophy nowadays, you must have a vision of evil. At Harvard Emerson studied and lectured; later a building was erected in his honor. Recently his statue in that building, even his statue, mind you, was smothered with hats and coats of rioters.

Years ago in the nineteenth century, Matthew Arnold hinted that Emerson did not understand human weakness. Ours is the tranquilizer age; we understand human weakness. Arnold, however, allowed Emerson one virtue: Emerson, he said, was the aider of those who would live in the spirit. But our grossest failures, individually and politically, are failures of the spirit. There is no strength or salvation in unanimity of evil hearts. There is strength in the spirit. So again I repeat, we must allow the imagination freedom to explore the ideal.

Certain members of society have declared war on all phases of imagination. A child runs in to his unimaginative mother, exuberant, eyes flashing emotion, saying, "Forty cats are fighting in our garage!"

"Forty cats, child? Did you count? Were there forty cats?"

She talks him down to twenty, to ten, to five, and on, until he says in cold truth, his imagination and exuberance gone, "Well, there was our and another."

A mother says, "We want our children to be realists. We teach them that there is no Santa Claus."

Some people imprisoned in the little world of getting and spending interpret all experience in terms of the marketplace. A priesthood class heard the biblical message of the power of the Divine over devils, as presented in the story of the possessed man living in the tombs, who cowered before Christ and said his name was Legion. Then he became sane after the legion of devils came out of him and entered a herd of
swine which ran into the sea and were drowned. A class member hearing the story asked the question, "I would like to know, who is going to foot the bill for them hogs?" This man never got out of the marketplace.

I knew a child about two years old who stood by a glass door, looking at the full moon that was big and bright with fluffy clouds floating by, who said quite casually, "Moon, don't pick your nose. There's some kleenex right by you." A matter-of-fact person who refuses to believe in the man in the moon could kill that delightful metaphor rising from the spontaneous imagination of that child.

People who do not cultivate some of the transcendent elements of the human soul, yet who accept Christian philosophy as an answer to problems of the world of the unknown, may interpret the spiritual with a matter-of-factness that strips all the wings off everything heavenly. By this metaphor I mean that heavenly things become earthbound. God becomes too much of a man. In their unimaginative interpretation God gives his revelation much as a man would dictate a letter to a secretary. In his earthbound mind man too often brings God down to his own yard instead of ascending to any vantage point of heavenly dimensions.

To be completely born into the world of the imagination does not mean that one needs to lose sight of the everyday world in which he must give attention to his own physical needs. Even the supersensitive poet may see cesspools as well as hear angels sing; yet to deny to anyone the right to hear angels sing is vile murder. Without possession of the intellectual beauty of imagination man will remain an animal. A person reading Eliot's "The Hollow Men" without imagination will not see in it man's aspirations to see beyond, through the author's references to "eyes" and "stars" and "death's other kingdom"; nor will he visualize the upward struggle expressed in his haltingly voiced, "for Thine is the Kingdom." He will only see the scarecrow with its head filled with straw—the immutable hollowness. I say again that to kill in man what Coleridge calls "the shaping spirit of imagination" is murder. May heaven free us from "mind-forged manacles" which would deny freedom of the spirit.

Flights into imagination can be indulged in to excess—this we must recognize. And that it can lead to falsehood,
error, and sin is so evident in all ages of human existence that
it has become suspect in all areas. Ancient folklore or super-
stition submerged history until the only historical truth of
that time to be relied upon is the truth of man’s thought. The
world of the folk and particularly that of the pre-Hellenistic
world was peopled with supernatural beings, most of them
malevolent: vile witches, wizards, demons, dragons, giants,
monsters, sorcerers, elf knights and fairies, both good and bad,
and innumerable animal-man combinations: mermaids, vam-
pires, goat men, werewolves, cat women, lamias, silkies and
sphinx. Various kinds of spirits made the invisible world more
populous than the visible.

In attempts to explain the unknown, men customarily have
turned to the supernatural. An example is the ballad "Willie’s
Lady." Willie’s wife is pregnant and cannot be delivered of
her baby. The reason provided is that she is under the spell of
the mother-in-law witch.

But his mother wrought her mickle care
And mickle dolour gard her dree
For lighter can she never be,
But in her bower she sits with pain,
And Willie mourns o’er her in vain.
And to his mother he has gone,
That vile, rank witch of vilest kind.

His pleas are answered with

But she shall die and turn to clay
And you shall wed another May.

The wife and child are saved through the intercession of Billie
Blin, a kind of household, grown-up brownie, who suggests a
trick which the couple use to force the witch to reveal the
charms she has imposed on the mother to prevent delivery.
Now they remove the charms.

And now he’s gotten a bonny young son,
And meikle grace be him upon.

The creatures of terror, who peopled the unknown, were
often appeased by human sacrifice. One example, Moloch,
about the eighth century B.C., was appeased best with the fry-
ing flesh of the firstborn child.

—Child Ballad (6).
Out of this cesspool of superstition grew the great world of classical mythology. This Greek mythology is significant, for it was a forward step in human thought. Looking at it today, it reveals that men were close to the earth, to nature; the myths are related to trees, seas, flowers, hills and human beings. The imagination was vividly alive, but it was tuned to see beauties, not horrors. It rose triumphant above the savagery and fierceness of other cultures. This Greek culture is important to us, for the winds of time have abrassively worn down their monuments and carried their culture to us. We are their descendants politically, intellectually, and artistically.

Douglas Bush says, “The folk who made the myths in Greece disliked the irrational and had a love for facts, no matter how ridiculous some of their stories appear.” The Greeks made their Gods in their own image, like superior men—no dragons, no animal-gods. They knew what they looked like, made statues of them, made them companionable and capable of human error. One could both argue and laugh with them. The Greek myths were basically an about face from demon lovers, vile witches, and wicked stepmothers. Though often associated in common thought with the romantic and trivial, Greek mythology is shot through with strange lights of imagination and feeling. It shows a struggle to emerge from the depths of primitive vagueness to a summit of artistic significance. Its sheer beauty shows the artist’s dreams of symbols beyond themselves.

The Christian has a problem in determining the religious value of Hellenism. Gilbert Murray in *Five Stages of Greek Religion* says, “Religion like poetry cannot be defined. But one may give some description of it... it deals with the uncharted origin of human experience... and the region is apparently infinite” (p. 4). He goes on to say that to draw distinction between religion and superstition is difficult. All religion might be false if analyzed into intellectual beliefs—some wrong if not wickedly wrong.

But the religion of Greece debarbarized people and worked toward concord and fellow feeling and individual worth. The human being began to count.

---

A distinguishing feature of Greek religion is that poets were prophets. The poets were inspired by the gods. This calls for a story: The God of Gods, Zeus, and Mnemosyne (Memory) begat nine daughters, the muses. Like the trinity in Christian philosophy the muses were one in purpose. In objectives, their hearts were set upon song, and their purpose was to free man from care. He was happy whom the muses loved. At the service of the muses was Pegasus, the winged steed unwearying of flight. And though his flight schedule covered the universe, yet mythology brought his home to his stable in Corinth every night. Wonders attended him. Flying too near the earth his hoof struck the hill side, and like a stroke from Moses' staff, a spring gushed forth, the spring of Hippocrene, sacred to the muses and poets. Poets drinking from the spring could speak what Gods would have them speak. No wonder Keats wished for a draught from the pool of Hippocrene.

Next in order to the Gods came a few mortals so excellent they almost equaled the Gods. The greatest was Orpheus, son of a goddess (the muse Calliope) and Thracian prince. His mother gave him the gift of music. Presented a lyre by Apollo, with his music he enchanted men and charmed wild beasts until their savage growls were hushed and their snapping jaws relaxed. The very trees and rocks strained to break loose from their moorings and follow him. With his harp he even turned the courses of rivers. After the loss of his new bride, Eurydice, he went to the world of death to retrieve her. In the underworld he struck his lyre and charmed all Hades to stillness. Tantalus forgot his thirst, the eyes of the dread goddesses the Furies were wet with tears. No one could refuse him anything—such was the power given to man by the muses.

Pagan myths have flourished through many Christian centuries. Christianity in its inception assimilated elements of Pagan religion and thought, and after the first clashes between the new and the old faiths the Christian community recognized that in secular, aesthetic, and moral life it had much to learn from the ancients. During the Renaissance widespread reverence of the Greeks as a superior race gained support. The Christians saw that to the Greeks, Homer's works were a sort of Bible, even though his gods and goddesses were not always circumspect. St. Paul, using a concept which is also Greek, said, "... the invisible things of him from the creation of the
world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made” (Acts 17:18).

Plato reminds us in his Republic that allegorical interpretations of the myths had already come to the rescue of religion and morality. The allegorical interpretations have also come into the Christian era. In the sixth century Fulgentius turned the Aeneid by allegory into a kind of Pilgrim’s Progress.

On the same basis one could turn the Orpheus story into allegory: Orpheus was Christ, for he like Christ was son of God and man, a reversal from virgin birth, for Orpheus was son of a goddess and a man. Orpheus’ music like Christ’s words touched the hearts of men so that they would follow him with unreserved devotion. Like Christ he had power over nature. As Orpheus could turn rivers, Christ could still the waves. Orpheus’ beloved Eurydice is fallen man and Orpheus leading her from Hades is symbolical of Christ leading man to salvation. Man like Eurydice is prone to cast a longing look behind and thus fail to gain salvation with his Savior.

The allegorical uses of myth can enlarge the soul. How feelingly they touch the heart! Shelley’s drama Prometheus Unbound is a striking example. Prometheus was capable of divining the future, as his name, which means forethought, suggests. Some traditions account for the creation of man by having the gods delegate to Prometheus the right to create him. Accordingly Prometheus made man noble, shaped him, not like animals, but upright like the gods. Then he lighted a torch on the sun and brought men fire, a protection better than fur or feathers, or strength or swiftness. For this Jupiter was furious. To punish man he had Vulcan, lord of the forge, create woman. Thus Pandora was forged, an exquisite creature, given a grace or a beauty by each of the gods. Jupiter gave her as a gift to Prometheus. Suspecting Jupiter’s motives, Prometheus refused to accept her, but his brother, Epimetheus, did accept her as a wife. As a dowery she brought a huge jar which she had been asked not to open. Curiosity, however, overcame her and she opened it, thus releasing from it all the plagues and evils which since have followed mankind. Prometheus, however, for his blasphemous acts was bound to a cliff in the Caucasus Mountains, where he was to remain eternally and an eagle, or vulture, would peck at his liver each night, only for it to grow back to be eaten again. After generations of
suffering Hercules, flitting by, released him from his torment—how and why mythology does not say.

Using the myth, Shelley has Prometheus bound to the cliff—his body bound, but his spirit free. Before he is unbound he attains courage and a state of patient opposition to tyranny. The hate for his persecutor, the envy, the desire for revenge, all are replaced with love. Supported then by Earth, his mother, and by Asia, the spirit of love and of Nature, and by the primal power of Earth, Jupiter, the very symbol of tyranny, is driven from his throne, and Prometheus is freed. Yes, by this means Shelley says that love will triumph over hate. Later, in *Hellas*, he identifies Prometheus with Christ. He says,

A Promethian conquerer came; he trod . . .
The thorns of death and shame. . . .
The Power of earth and air
Fled from the folding star of Bethlehem,
    Apollo, Pan, Love
    And even the Olympian Jove
Grew weak, for killing truth had glared on them.8

Truth being our objective, killing truth must glare on all falsehood. In all of our exploratory flights into the unknown and immense world of the soul, truth must stand guard to subdue evil. Herein lies our human dilemma—recognition of truth in the area of the imagination where dire perplexities and powerful ambiguities appear.

Christian poets have blended pagan elements into Christian writings. The noble Milton and deeply religious Spencer were most ambivalent in this respect.

But the Christians, too, have myths which cry out for allegorical or symbolic interpretation. Some years ago a married couple came to my home obviously to get some help in settling a dispute. The husband maintained that a man has one less rib than a woman. Genesis proved it, for one of Adam’s ribs was taken to make Eve. Thus woman was made whole, but man left one rib short. That night I gained in favor with the wife. Since that time I have learned that all Christian folk can be divided into two classes—those who believe in skeletal equality of men and women and those who believe that man is one rib short.

---

8“Worlds on Worlds are Rolling Ever,” 16-18, 34-38.
Within Christian faith, folk imagination has often led people astray. Henry Adams thought that Christian gullibility for the supernatural had been exploited to build great churches which could rightly be called monuments to superstition and ignorance. Within Christian faiths are many problems related to spiritual experience. William Blake's life is one such problem. As a child he had visions of God and angels, and as a man he received visits from the spirits of great men. When his brother died, Blake saw his spirit pass from his body and ascend upward clapping his hands with joy. He said he wrote what angels directed, and he spoke of his visions as "majestic shadows, gray but luminous." He believed and implicitly trusted the visions. All nature to him was a vast and spiritual symbolism. Yet he was a radical with ideas contrary to those current in his day. His great prophetic work, "The Marriage of Heaven and Hell," challenged established virtues. He was thought insane. Yet Henry Crabb Robinson said, "There is something in the madness of this man which interests me more than the sanity of Lord Byron and Walter Scott."

Blake's forte was the Bible, his prophetic books reminiscent of the Book of Revelation; his great message was, "Be free and love all things."

Another case study in this area is Joan of Arc and her mystic experience. The skeptic, Mark Twain, studied her life and wrote a book, Personal Reflections of Joan of Arc. He had an iconoclast's itch to shatter the world of sham and superstition, yet he viewed Joan of Arc's visions with sympathy and acceptance.

Mormon faith, born as it was through the supernatural powers of heavenly visitations and communion of God with man, and accepting biblical dictum as it does that mystical signs shall follow them that believe, is a powerful affirmation of faith in the great world of the spirit.

But the spiritual eyes of Church folk are not always clear, and some have been too quick to see miracles, too prone to see the diabolical devil himself operating a Ouija board, too ready to interpret a peregrination of the mind as a possession of the devil, or too eager to call a stranger who does a kindness an ancient Nephite of supernatural power, too much inclined to hear the voice of the dead or to die and experience a few hours...
of celestial living, or even to embark into wild fantasy in the name of religion which is little short of schizophrenia.

In keeping our minds open to imagination we must take care not to sponsor ignorance and superstition. In no area of human endeavor does man need to exercise his powers of selectivity with such care as in the area of mind probings into the unknown. Great myths of the past and present, used correctly are teachers of beauty and truth. Hopefully we rise above superstition. If we are in tune with nature and can see the reflection of God in the sea, the stretches of eternity in our lengthened insights; if we are not out of tune with our universe, we will have no need to say, "Great God I’d rather be/A Pagan suckled in a creed outworn," as Wordsworth affirms, for we would have passed to the higher level.

In the history of Porter Rockwell we have a story reflecting something of the tradition of Achilles and something of Sampson. The Prophet Joseph Smith told Rockwell that if he would not cut his hair he would be invulnerable to enemy bullets. With but one exception, he met the requirements, and the daring and fearless deputy marshal and gunman died a natural death in his bed.

We have no need to place this story under the harsh judgment of rationalization. The truth is that it was a fact in Rockwell’s private faith.

Many Christian people believe implicitly in prayer. We would not have it otherwise. Many people privately promise their Heavenly Father devotion and service in payment for a received or anticipated blessing. Many people have premonitions interpreted as divine guidance, many sick are healed through faith, many feel the presence of God, many are expurgated from hate because divine love comes into their hearts —these are rewards of imagination under controls of faith.

Tradition in song and story preserves for us a legacy of faith, faith in the guiding and protecting power of God. In answer to prayer sea gulls came to devour crickets that would have destroyed crops. We have no need to destroy what has become legend.

Projecting ourselves into the world of the spirit is a very real necessity, for only through this projection can we believe

"The World is Too Much With Us," 9-10.
even basic Christian concepts. There were no human eyewitnesses to the greatest event in Christian faith. No one saw the resurrection of Jesus. No canonical gospel presumes to describe Jesus emerging from the tomb. Our faith in Jesus’ resurrection is based on testimonies of those who saw the risen Lord. All the historian can do is assemble evidence upon which faith can be based.

In our fear of giving credence to falsehood in the world of the supernatural, we must be aware that we cannot with impunity shut ourselves out of the great eternal and beautiful world of the soul’s aspirations. Through imagination our world of eye and ear is beautified. Feelings are touched with music that gives dimension to life. Out of the minds of men comes art that elevates; structures of transcendent beauty arise—architectural monuments to imagination. Word pictures come to us through literary devices to move us into new worlds. Myth, tradition, legend contribute to this richness.

One of my fellow English teachers said, “Literature class is teaching Thoreau in a windowless classroom.” To anyone who cannot project his mind beyond the stretch of eyesight, all life is a windowless classroom. If on a clear day I stand on the highest mountain and view the great stretches open to my vision, the experience is ecstatic. But the greatness of that experience is the feeling of eternal immensity that it inspires. Were I to sit at Waldon Pond with Thoreau, I would still be in the windowless classroom if I did not have something of the visionary insight of the soul’s potential.

To reach the hoped-for Utopia, to make our world a present pleasure, we should abolish hate from our hearts, transcend the trivial and crude, and achieve the great adventure, the exploration of the soul’s immensity by full use of our imaginative and creative powers.
Student Protests:  
A Threat  
and an Appeal*

John R. Christiansen, James T. Duke, John F. Seggar,  
and William D. Payne**

Even if a person were trying to, he could hardly avoid receiving information on student protest activities. Not only do newspapers, radio, and TV fairly scream out with protest stories almost daily, but a considerable amount of people’s day-to-day conversation also includes some reference to the what, why, where, and when of the protest movements.

Opinions about these protests range widely. In attempting to describe “what” protests are, opinions range from a description of them as a “fad” which will soon pass away, to that of a movement which will eventually result in the complete change of higher education as we know it. The range of opinions about the “why” of student protests includes analyses of metabolic processes and theories of social evolution. Opinions about the “where” of protests involve focusing on the “multiversity” with its depersonalization and “identity-losses” to universities having “weak-kneed” and “lily-livered” administrators. Opinions of the “when” of the campus protests have included statements like, “They’ll end after the elections,” to, “We can count on something like this from now on.”

In this article we will attempt to provide information which will enable the reader to develop more considered opinions as

---

*This paper was given at the Western Conference of the Council of State Governments in Los Angeles. It has also been presented to both houses of the Utah legislature.

**Dr. Christiansen is professor of sociology and chairman of the Department of Sociology at Brigham Young University, where Dr. Duke is associate professor, Dr. Seggar is assistant professor, and Mr. Payne is instructor of sociology.
to the what, why, when, and where of student protest movements.

Data Collection

In doing this, we certainly do not claim to know many, much less all, of the answers to questions being raised. As sociologists we suffer from the fact that there is a considerable time lag between the time that problems are first encountered until the time that reliable information is provided which is based on solid, empirical research. Such is the case now; our research is not yet producing definitive answers to these problems. The information given here is based on an intensive analysis of scientific and nonscientific articles in journals, newspapers, magazines, and books; and interviews with educators, dissidents, right-wingers, and legislators throughout the past year. Nevertheless, the views presented here remain relatively nonscientific and subjective even though a broad spectrum of facts and opinions have been encountered.

To understand these student protest movements, it is necessary to understand something about the students themselves, and particularly how they differ from students of the past—
from us!

For the most part, they have never known hunger, prolonged pain, physical infirmity, hard labor, lack of clothing, inadequate housing, or lack of job opportunities, at least until they became part of the protest movements. They have never been in a depression, cranked a car, fought in a war, seen anyone die, held a permanent job, painted a house, milked a cow, saddled a horse, or eaten vegetables they helped grow in a garden. Hence, their background of experience is such that you might conclude that they have lived in a different world from most of us.

They are impatient. They have grown up in the jet age when minutes can bring about as much change as weeks did in the past; when fifteen minutes can bring a missile from Russia to their own back yard. They have grown up in a time when sufficient energy is available to literally move mountains, to send men to the moon, and to destroy the world.

They live in places where sufficient wealth and know-how exist to adequately clothe, house, feed, educate, and care for all people, and they know it. Through television, radio, paper-
backs, newspapers, magazines, and their own travels, they are better informed of the world around them than any student generation in history has ever been. Not only are today's students more aware of the world around them, they are more involved in it than previous generations were. The entire world is their concern, even more perhaps than the United States was our concern when we were students.

Moreover, they have a greater commitment to solving the world's problems than students of the past have had. Why? Because they believe their own existence and that of others to be in real jeopardy unless the world's problems are solved. They want to solve these problems now, today! Why not wait until they are out of college to solve these problems? Because being in school is the only real existence; the only life they remember has been one in which they have been in school.

Moreover, the student today has recognized, perhaps more than any of the rest of us, that today's colleges and universities have vast actual and potential power for making and changing society. Student activists feel, therefore, that they can accomplish more by remaining a part of the university scene than by leaving it.

Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), for example, in the "Port Huron Statement" have said:

The university is located in a permanent position of social influence. Its educational function makes it indispensable and automatically makes it a crucial institution in the formation of social attitudes. In an unbelievably complicated world, it is the central institution for organizing evaluation and transmitting knowledge. ... Social relevance, the accessibility to knowledge, and internal openness—these together make the university a potential base and agency in the movement of social change.

The "what" of student protests might be described then as attempts to solve problems of local and worldwide interest by using the universities as a change vehicle, and to accomplish these changes through violence, actual or threatened.

Determining the "why" of any social movement as complex as that of the student protests is no easy task. One of the factors responsible for the student protests is the active support given by Communists, of both the Moscow and Peking variety.
### Goals and Means of Three Radical Groups

*(compiled from their official publications)*

#### Students for Democratic Society (SDS)

**Goals**

**I. General**
- A. Destroy American society
- B. Participate actively
- C. Regard nothing as sacred
- D. Cut through the significance and meaning of policy statements
- E. Disengage oneself from all institutional concerns

**II. Disorder**
- A. Disturb the peace
- B. Disarm the police
- C. Tear apart the institutions
- D. Develop guerilla forces for urban areas

**III. Civil Rights**
- A. End racism
- B. Defend the right of black people to defend and liberate themselves by any means necessary

**IV. Military Affairs**
- A. Support the people’s struggle in Vietnam
- B. Hinder the American war effort

**V. Government**
- A. People should have democratic powers in all major institutions
- B. Government will listen to the needs of the people, not big business that controls it

**VI. Education**
- A. End the grading system

**Means**

**I. General**
- A. Wrest control of the editorial process from administrative bureaucracy
- B. Contact allies in labor and civil rights and other liberal sources off the campus

**II. Disorder**
- A. Set up barricades
- B. Fire Molotov cocktails
- C. Jam radio equipment
- D. Drop bombs down manholes and plumbing systems
- E. Halt vehicles causing traffic problems
- F. Demonstrate individual dissent by use of questions, speeches, and all kinds of heckling

**III. Civil Rights**
- No specific means indicated

**IV. Military Affairs**
- A. Disrupt draft boards by registering under false names so federal agents will lose time tracking down the problem
- B. Picket recruiting areas
- C. Hold war crime trials for recruiters
- D. Disrupt recruiters by getting tables next to theirs and causing a rucus
- E. Place war crime and other dramatic posters at recruiting sites or training classrooms
- F. Remove recruiters by force, fear, or threat
- G. Make appointments with recruiters to harass, debate, and take up time

**V. Government**
- Pick public fights with welfare workers

**VI. Education**
- A. Start trash-can fires in high schools and set off the alarms

#### Black Panthers

**Goals**

**I. General**
- We want freedom now

**II. Military**
- A. We want all black men exempt from military service
- B. We want peace

**III. Economic**
- A. We want land—forty acres apiece
- B. We want bread
- C. We want decent housing
- D. We want clothing
- E. We want full employment
- F. We want an end of exploitation by the white man

**IV. Political**
- A. We want to determine the destiny of the black community
- B. We want an immediate end to police brutality and murder of black people
- C. We want black juries from black communities for black trials
- D. We want justice

**V. Education**
- A. We want an education that teaches us our true history
- B. We want to know our place in this society

*(SDS continued)*

B. Achieve "student power"

C. Disrupt the educational system
GOALS AND MEANS OF THREE RADICAL GROUPS  
(compiled from their official publications)

Black Panthers

Means

I. General
Achieve our goals by any means

II. Military
Refuse to fight for a government that does not protect us

III. Economic
A. Make federal government responsible for giving every man employment and a guaranteed income
B. Put means of production in the hands of the community, not in the hands of big business
C. Put land and housing in cooperatives

IV. Political
A. Maintain the right to separate under provision of the constitution
B. Organize black self-defense groups dedicated to defend the black community
C. Bear arms
D. Free all blacks from jails—they were imprisoned by biased judges and juries

V. Education
Organize youth groups for indoctrination sessions

(SDS continued)
B. Disrupt meetings of student body officers
C. Win a majority of the seats in government elections
D. Boycott classes
E. Get student teaching assistants to strike
F. Instigate mass demonstrations
G. Instigate sit-ins
H. Make appointments with university officials to hinder their work
I. Check out all the library books to hinder library function
J. Make debate and controversy the common style for educational life

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Hippies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Means</strong></td>
<td><strong>I. General</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. Military</strong></td>
<td>A. Give to persons who are in need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III. Economic</strong></td>
<td>B. Promote nudism, sexual promiscuity, and drug usage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. Military</strong></td>
<td>C. Participate in hallucinogenic experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III. Economic</strong></td>
<td>D. Heighten experiences through sensory experiments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hippies

**Means**

**I. General**

A. Promote nonviolence
B. Oppose acquisition of material goods
C. Promote complete freedom of expression
D. Explore meaningful experiences
E. Advocate gentleness in human interaction
F. Live for the moment
G. Maintain a political stand
H. Oppose asceticism
I. Oppose academism but not intellectualism
J. Include everyone in the realm of social interaction
K. Participate, not spectate, particularly in the arts
L. Support female equality—no double standard of morality, allow women to be as equally promiscuous as men

**II. Military**

End the war in Vietnam

**III. Economic**

A. Do away with pay toilets
B. Provide free food
C. Use hippie guides on bus tours through Haight Ashbury
D. Work should be a sideline, not the main time consumer
E. Oppose technology, commercialism, and careerism
F. Support communalism as a way to minimize cost of living
G. Oppose commercialization of hippiedome by Madison Avenue

**IV. Law and Order**

A. Oppose legislation prohibiting use of psychedelic drugs
B. Maintain better communication with authorities
C. Abolish laws preventing self-expression
D. Oppose organization
E. Support communalism
F. Oppose bureaucratization

**IV. Law and Order**

A. Use of drugs such as LSD and Speed
B. Talk things out with people
C. Stage protests, such as the Golden Gate Park "strip-in"
D. Combine efforts to prevent leadership from emerging
E. Live in coop apartments, 20 to 30 in each apartment
The organized protest groups such as the SDS make full use of tried and proven communist tactics including the use of popular social reforms as a means of attracting "fellow travelers," "opportunists," and "dupes" to their programs of subversion, revolution, and violence.¹

The student who walks into an SDS meeting today hears Marxist rhetoric which is virtually indistinguishable from Radio Moscow. SDS organizers denounce "oppressors," "exploiters," and the "Al Capones who run this country." Goal orientations of the different "New Left" groups as given in their newspapers such as the SDS New Left Notes, The Black Panther, and The Berkeley Barb show remarkable similarities. Favoritism is shown to Peking communist styles rather than Moscow.

In SDS New Left Notes of October 7, 1968, they give a prescription for violence which has been closely followed:

Our strategy therefore must be an attack on the entire institution of the university, a challenge to its purpose and to its right to exist. Wherever possible, we must strive to shut it down—shut it down rather than "reform" it, because as long as the society exists in its present form the university can only function to achieve the ends we have just discussed.

The "ends" referred to happen to be the perpetuation of our society as we know it.

These tactics and concerns of the American student movement parallel those of student movements around the world. On the issue of university reform, the two major world confederations of student unions agree. The International Union of Students headquartered in Prague, Czechoslovakia, and the International Student Conference with offices in Leiden, Holland, have issued official statements urging their member national unions to engage aggressively in university reform.

University reform refers to greater participation by students in university governance, to reduction of control over students' private lives, and to the guarantee of freedom to criticize society and activate reforms without fear of penalty by the institution. Students in the countries where these student unions are powerful believe that the university should protect their groups from laws and prosecution when they do engage in "reform" activity which takes a revolutionary turn. In some

Latin American universities where student power is unrestricted, we have the situation in which professors are afraid to assign grades which reflect students' actual performance for fear of personal harm.

These students strongly advocate that the university should be a sanctuary from the laws and authorized law agents. In many foreign countries they have virtually achieved this goal, and in our own country they are pushing toward this by demanding that university administrators keep "outside" law officers from entering the campus and give them amnesty during campus protests.

As important a factor in student protests as are the communist related and supported New Left activists organizations, they are not the only factors responsible for the protest movements. There are many other important contributing factors to the phenomena of student protests. These include concerns and frustrations which make it possible for students to be organized and activated on issues of local and nonlocal concern.

In the words of Dr. Robert H. Shaffer, former Dean of Students at Indiana University,

Society would be making a grave mistake if it were to dismiss current student unrest and student militancy as the work of a few troublemakers, political leftists, or disturbed individuals. While it is important not to exaggerate the total number involved, the fact is that many students are genuinely disturbed at a society which seems to them to be hypocritical, rigid, unresponsive, and incompetent in meeting its problems.


Much of the tension which results in student protests arises from an awareness of the inconsistency, or, as they put it, hypocrisy existing in society. They have been taught that two and two make four, and this simple logic is appealing, even when applied to the most complex problems. They see a contradiction in the Judeo-Christian ethic which most accept in the United States and our treatment of one another. This contradiction has to do with the majority's espousal of, but non-practice of, values which emphasize the good of loving neighbors as ourselves, and of sharing our "all" with the poor. These young people maintain that our society has the capability of caring for its own, its sick and indigent, but does not ade-
quately do so, contrary to its own professed values. It is overly materialistic and refuses to share its wealth and energy. While this explanation is too simple to fully explain the economics of poverty in our complex society, there is truth in it.

Many students also find it difficult to understand why the U.S., a first-rate military power, should be challenged by a third-rate power, accept the challenge, and then not win the war. Moreover, they are disturbed by our professed commitment to racial equality and the fact that massive segregation still exists in public schools. They are repelled by what they see as pure hypocrisy in society's prohibition of marijuana, LSD, and other hallucinogenic drugs, and, at the same time, its toleration and even encouragement of drug use and abuse on a vast scale.

They know that the average family in the United States uses five "psycho-active" drugs a day and that many mothers' medicine cabinets contain diet pills, sleeping pills, sedatives, and tranquilizers; not to speak of other drugs and "pep" pills. In addition, caffeine is used to get parents off to a good start in the morning, nicotine and caffeine keep them going during the day, and a cocktail is their evening reward for standing on their own two feet and successfully fighting the battles of life. All this means that attitudes toward drug usage are learned from the family at a very early age. These young people tend to believe that alcohol and cigarettes are just as harmful as, if not more harmful than, marijuana. When we recall that there are over seven million alcoholics in the U.S., that alcohol is a factor in more than half of the fatal highway accidents, and that over 58,000 people died of lung cancer last year, they have a point.

When Dr. David Smith, medical director of the Haight-Ashbury Medical Clinic, visited the BYU campus in 1968, he pointed out this inconsistency. He spoke of a TV program on which he participated which was designed to give a message against drug usage. But, in giving the one anti-drug message, they gave five pro-drug messages through the "commercials" which "sponsored" the program.

Students are perplexed by the inconsistency of a society whose ideal standard of morality is so far removed from its actual standard. A song satirizing this theme has recently been very popular with teenagers: "The Harper Valley P.T.A."

Another factor which contributes to student unrest is the changed orientation of higher education. Students come to col-
lege expecting to learn answers to most of life's perplexing problems through personal contacts with men and women of wisdom, compassion, and breadth, but are often bitterly disappointed. Instead, they find themselves identified not by name, but by number, in large classes, memorizing information, with most of their actual learning coming through interaction with other students. In Riesman and Jencks' terms (*The Academic Revolution*, Doubleday and Company, Inc.) they are too often faced with "pendantry and alienated erudition," by a faculty member who is narrow in his field and getting narrower, being led in his search for status to sacrifice his teaching for an overbalanced emphasis on research and/or consulting. A double tragedy is that the direction of his research is more often dictated by government support agencies rather than the needs of his discipline.

Owing to their relatively great contact with national and world events, their limited experience with history, their ideas concerning society's hypocrisy, disillusionment with their learning experience in colleges, and other factors, some students will be fair game to be organized by their dedicated, revolutionary-prone peers. Activist leaders need only find a focus which will draw attention and sympathy of these and other students to foment a protest.

If a protest is organized by the SDS or some similar organization—and certainly not all are—it will be designed to accomplish both the majority's goals and also those of the minority organizers. In the violent confrontations, you can be quite sure that the trained agitator will only rarely be in a position which may result in his being arrested or being seen as the instigator. He, like the pyromaniac, will be back in the crowd eagerly watching the result of his carefully-planned work.

Now, finally what are some recommendations for handling and preventing student protests? The general approach ought to be one of eliminating as far as possible the issues which activists can use to foment campus disturbances. And then, through establishing communication channels and involvement of representative student leaders, keep all informed as to the work involved in solving the issues that remain. At the same time efforts must be made to preserve the integrity of the
campus from any and all threats. More specifically, we should accept the point of view of the activists that the university "is a most important" institution in our society. It is a source of supply for trained, contributing manpower. But it is much more than that: it is a factor in the shaping of public opinion, attitudes, and values. The universities play a large part in determining not only the quality of training our young people receive, but also the quality of the young people themselves.

With the university viewed and declared to be a "vital national resource," we would not permit a threat to its operation to go unchallenged any more than we would permit a disruptive attack to be made on the White House, the San Francisco Mint, or a SAC missile base. We would meet all such threats with all resources available. We should commend rather than condemn university administrators who immediately call for help from outside law agencies when their campus security forces fail to stop destruction. To do otherwise is to invite appeasement by those overly concerned for their careers rather than principles. The universities cannot be permitted to be sanctuaries for those who are not willing to abide by the laws of the land. In dealing with less serious offenses, college officials should quickly impose penalties commensurate with the seriousness of the infractions, including expulsion. To do this, however, a system of due process acceptable to constitutional law should be established on every campus. Serious violations should be referred to civil authorities immediately.

Now what can we recommend about prevention? First, hypocrisy, poverty, segregation, unemployment, and other of society's ills could be reduced with better laws and more efficient administration of them. Legislation and enforcement concerning drug usage and other dysfunctional behavior should be updated and made more consistent. In some states, for example, the punishment for marijuana use is about the same as that for second-degree murder, punishment for drunken driving is minimal, and no laws exist concerning use of "speed—methamphetamine.

Law enforcement and court practices need to be made more consistent with the times and knowledge we have about militant protest movements. For example, the October 7, 1968, SDS New Left Notes, quotes J. Edgar Hoover as follows:
The New Left is composed of radicals, anarchists, pacifists, crusaders, socialists, Communists, idealists, and malcontents. This movement, best typified by SDS, has an almost passionate desire to destroy the traditional values of our democratic society and the existing social order.

Beneath this quotation is a description of six protest demonstrations. The thrust of the article is that despite what Hoover has said, you can break the laws in protests and get away with it.

Parents may wish to evaluate their own behavior to determine whether it is inconsistent with their professed value system. Violations of highway speed limits, hunting or fishing laws, income tax regulations, and gossip are the kinds of norm evasions from which children learn and use as rationalizations for their own behavior. Parents might create a strong subculture within their families by presenting and discussing their own value systems with their children on a regular basis, so that any misunderstandings the children have about their parents' values and behavior may be eliminated.

Now, very briefly, following are a few preventative measures that might be applied to the university scene:

1. **Insure** that student government organizations are a powerful, democratic, important, functioning part of the university. **Student governments** can portray the best of our democratic ideals if permitted to do so. Most universities, however, in Samuel D. Gould's words,

   ... put the student leaders out to pasture in some remote corner of the institutional ranch where, with adequate fencing, they can graze peacefully and wax fat and docile. They will then always be properly deferent, will be grateful for any little attention tendered them, and will never ask embarrassing or challenging questions.

Last year through the efforts of BYU's dynamic student body president, Paul Gilbert, we saw student government working within the framework of law to solve the off-street parking conflict with Provo city. Student leaders, acting on issues important to the students, won the support of the vast majority of the student body and the respect of law enforcement and city officials. Some colleges, like Eastern Oregon, are providing stipends for their elected student body officers
comparable to those received by varsity athletes. This action tends to upgrade the offices and makes it possible for the officers to devote time and energy to their positions.

2. Provide for students to be informed through elected representatives of the considerations going into decisions that are made concerning them. If students know of the many factors which must be weighed and balanced in making important decisions, they are much more likely to support the decision than if they are faced with fiat.

3. Provide for greater involvement of faculty members with students. Personal relationships must be established. This can be encouraged if both quality teaching and research are rewarded.

4. Provide preschool orientation in which all students are informed about acceptable and unacceptable conduct, and the consequences of both. If misbehavior occurs, immediate steps should be taken through due process to handle it. In a positive way, this orientation could begin the task of letting students know of their importance to the university, and the importance of the university to them, the state, nation, and the world. They could start to become identified with a cause which they as self-sufficient, trained, and dedicated young people—together with the university—can help achieve, the betterment of all mankind.

Much more could be said, but only this will be said: we have never had greater challenges presented our youth than we have today, nor have we had more able and sensitive youth. We have never had a greater threat to our universities, nor have we had finer universities. We have never had so much knowledge, but so little knowledge of our most pressing problems.

If we will listen to the message that our youth are trying to give us and have the courage to change our behavior and institutions in keeping with our finest democratic and religious principles, we will be able to respond to that message properly, and in doing so will not only preserve our youth, but our country and ourselves.
Some Answers
to Campus Dissent*

SPIRO T. AGNEW
Vice-President of the United States of America

I guess you’d like to know how I’m learning my new job. Well, Senator Bennett will tell you that I’m learning how to sleep with my eyes open in the Senate. Also I’ve found out that the vice-presidency is totally removed from politics. I learned that when I got my salary check last week through the Ford Foundation.

For me the Brigham Young campus offers a refreshing change of pace. Its virtues are readily apparent. Here the scenery is magnificent, the buildings are handsome, and you can still tell the boys from the girls. Now don’t misunderstand me, I don’t have anything against long hair, but I didn’t raise my son to be my daughter.

When you read of campus violence day after day and when you survey a strident student minority, long on locks and lean on faith, there appears reason to despair. More Americans should learn about Brigham Young University. Our nation’s largest private school does honor to the public spirit. Much credit belongs to President Wilkinson, to The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, and to those who come to teach and those who come to learn here.

The founder of this school, Brigham Young, once said: “The first great principle that ought to occupy the attention of mankind, that should be understood by the child and the adult, and which is the mainspring of all action, whether people understand it or not, is the principle of improvement.”

Improvement is the purpose of education. It’s the work of the school, the college, and the university. Improvement cannot be achieved in a condition of anarchy or uproar. Today, our colleges are under siege.

*A Forum Address at Brigham Young University, May 8, 1969.
What we have witnessed in the past weeks is not mere delinquency nor mere disruption. Both words dismiss too lightly the grave implications of college disorders and the reaction to them that is reverberating across the country.

Not in every case, but in too many cases, we have young adults hell-bent on "nonnegotiable" destruction.

We have college administrators confused and capitulating. We have sophisticated faculties distraught and divided over issues as basic as assault and battery, breaking and entering, theft or vandalism, all of which we understand to be crime.

We have a new breed of self-appointed vigilantes arising—the counter-demonstrators—taking the law into their own hands because weak and equivocating officials fail to call the law enforcement authorities.

We have a vast faceless majority of the American public in quiet fury and with good reason over this situation.

Not one of these elements is constructive—compounded, they create first chaos and then repressive reaction.

The anatomy of violence is unpleasant and difficult to understand. Sometimes we wonder how we reached this route.

I offer you a few answers, and I offer them from this framework—there is little the federal government can do in this situation. But if the people who can do something don't start acting, I'm fearful of what forces could fill this vacuum.

I recognize that only a small minority—less than two percent—of America's six, nearly seven million college students participate in disruptive dissent. But the damage they do to the spirit of academic freedom—and, in fact, all freedoms—is vastly greater than their numbers. These students whose recourse to reform is demand rather than debate, lawlessness rather than logic, have the same philosophy as dictators.

Condemning the tactics of violence is not concluding that there is no need for change. But as you all learn from your first course in philosophy, the difference between a free society and a totalitarianism is one—the treatment of ends versus means.

In a totalitarian society, only the ends are important. The means to reach them, whether just or brutal, are irrelevant. In a free society, the means are just as important as the ends.

The law is our means. In America, constitutional government provides for elected officials, elected officials who are
responsible to their electorates, the people who put them in office to change the law. Structured law differentiates human civilization from animal anarchy. Representative democracy permits change and prevents totalitarianism.

Democracy is sustained through one great premise: the concept that civil rights are balanced by civil responsibilities. My right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness is secure only so long as I respect your right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. I can claim no right as a human being or a citizen that you cannot claim equally under the law. The two-edged sword of rights and responsibilities is the defense of a free society.

When any group asserts rights without commensurate responsibilities, a privileged class emerges creating an atmosphere of abuse, paving the way to the ultimate abuse that is totalitarianism.

Now the time has come for America's colleges under siege to assert themselves. This is not to say we can't improve our colleges. I sincerely believe that every sector of society should question the present fundamentals that shape our systems of education. Certainly if even two percent of our students will resort to violence and a far larger percentage will stand silently by, perhaps even stand sympathetically by, we are failing somewhere along the line.

Compelling questions over the validity of our present system must be asked and answered.

For example, does every high school graduate need or desire to spend four years in college? Should education be a terminal process, or a continuing one? Is it not possible that the most relevant role of the college would be enlarging the availability of enriching adult education?

Among the competing priorities for the public dollar, should the four-year college take precedence over strengthening compensatory education, improving vocational-technical programs, and expanding community colleges to make two years of practical, usable higher education available to all?

I think one of the most neglected fields of education in our time is that of vocational-technical training. And I think we've failed because we've classed this particular type of training at the high school level alone. It seems to me that it should be possible to discern among certain students, that their fortes lie not in formal education of the typical college type, but in voca-
tional-technical training where they will learn a useful skill and be able to make an adequate living.

Discussion should take into account the views of such experts as Dr. Bruno Bettelheim, the renowned psychologist-psychiatrist at the University of Chicago, who in a recent testimony before the House Special Subcommittee on Education stated this:

... all too many who now go to college have little interest, ability and use for what constitutes a college education. ... They would be better off with a high level vocational education which is closely linked to a work program, which gives scope to their needs for physical activity and visible tangible achievement. The complaint of many of these students is that nobody needs them. They feel like parasites of society and hence come to hate a society which they think makes them feel this way.

Certainly, our institutions of higher education must take the initiative in asking the hard questions and in achieving internal reforms.

Many colleges and universities—the ones we do not read about—have developed legitimate and immediate methods for students to articulate their grievances.

These schools have done more than simply offer courses on democracy; they have assured their students of "due process" which is an integral part of our democratic system.

A society as sophisticated as ours can establish practical, workable degrees of student participation. We can navigate some middle course without students locking teachers up or administrators locking students out.

Another middle ground which must be found is the place of the college in the community. Higher education can only benefit from a close, introspective look at such policies as "publish or perish"; a voice for faculty below the professorial level; the proper balance in decisions between administrators and academicians.

An insistence on relevancy in curriculum is not an unreasonable request within bounds that are applicable and just. But when students simultaneously demand an increased social conscience on the part of the university, and an end to ROTC programs which some of them desire, there is an absolute lapse of logic.
What is the ROTC if it is not education to serve our country? I want to tell you that I am most disturbed about the lack of freedom on the part of those students who would like to learn the fundamentals of officer training in college, the lack of the ability of those students to have that training because a small dissident minority, who wants training of a specialized sort that it desires, refuses to stand still and let someone else elect what he wants to study.

Not only does that disturb me; I think it disturbs most people across the country. But when you consider that this country's strength in time of trial and turmoil has come from its citizen army, and that the freedoms that we enjoy we enjoy because we understand among our responsibilities as citizens lies the inherent, basic need to defend this country in time of crisis. And that defense comes best from our citizens and not from any elite, professional military organization. Oh, certainly we need the cadres of our military academies, but the balance that has always existed in our large citizen armies comes about because the people who are trained to lead those armies are basically civilians and not soldiers, and they respect and understand the need to get this country back to a peaceful civilian status as quickly as possible. And that's what we are trying to take out of our colleges today, or the defense department will have to respond if there is no way to train officers in the colleges of this country. The defense department will have to create some other professional way to train them, and when that is done the sensitivity of the civilian soldier that I spoke about will be lacking.

Each college must determine its own middle ground somewhere between ivory-tower retreat and settlement-house immersion. In a recent article, journalist William Shannon delineated the role of higher education. And he said this:

It is to transmit knowledge and wisdom and to enhance them by research and study. The university is not a forum for political action. It is not a training ground for revolutionaries. It is not a residential facility for the psychologically maladjusted. It is not a theater for acting out racial fears and fantasies.

And I agree with those words. And he went on to say:

The university is a quiet place deliberately insulated from the conflicts and pressures of the larger society around
it. Reason and civility are essential to its very nature because its aim is truth not power. Questioning and criticizing and listening must be done objectively, logically, and above all, lawfully. When administrators and faculties capitulate before storm trooper tactics, they are not only doing a grave dis-service to academic freedom but all freedoms.

Finally, not only the institution of education but every institution comprising our society must share in this drive for renewed responsibilities. The family remains the fundamental institution. Parental discipline is the gateway to knowledge. Permissive parents do their children no favors because no self-discipline can come without discipline being there first. And it is a lack of discipline in the family that has led to the abusive conduct of the small minority of students that I talked about earlier.

The family alone can provide the bedrock security of the soul which enables the mature individual to look within rather than from without for moral direction.

Organized religion—regardless of denomination—is an institution possessing a moral-ethical mandate.

The conduct of Brigham Young University offers inspiring evidence of the serenity and strength which stems from strong faith.

The media—our free press—are not exempt from constructive introspection. All too often the media have been too quick to assume that confrontation is a necessary catharsis to a sick society; to report want and destruction in terms of noble causes; to publicize the least responsible leadership in any self-proclaimed crusade.

How many businesses, for example, are out ahead—attacking problems in advance of requests or regulations from government? The industrial community also needs to involve itself more heavily in these problems. It's the failure of the private sector to act which prods the public sector to enter.

Now, if our society is ever going to protect itself from perpetual, violent assaults, every institution must work together. For our society is nothing more than the sum of its institutions.

If the family fails, can we expect the school to succeed? If the school fails, can free enterprise compensate? If the media or the church do not inculcate conscience, should government fill the vacuum? My answer is an emphatic, "No!" Governa
ment's role is to enlarge opportunity and to protect competing ideologies in the hope that the best will prevail.

When I say that I don't mean to say that government should not be moral, but government's morality should be drawn from the traditional institutions of our society responsible for imparting ethics to the individual.

America is not yet two centuries old. It is hard to believe that we are that young a country. In our evolution we have seen social, economic and political progress without precedent in the history of the world. We have made this progress through freedom, law and order structured by the world's oldest enduring constitution.

We have resisted every assault upon democracy by totalitarian forces from without. And I am confident that our society will defend itself from attempts to impose absolutism or create anarchy from within.

The American system has never been stronger, never been more vital. The American conscience is awake, and the American spirit is very much alive.
How to Have
a Quiet Campus,
Antique Style

HUGH NIBLEY*

BOUND TO SUCCEED

With the collapse of the old sacral kingship all around the
Mediterranean in the middle of the first millennium B. C., men
were everywhere asking themselves what forever after remained
the golden question of the civilized world: “Who’s in charge
around here?” By way of answer, a breed of ambitious and
often capable men, the tyrants, moved in and took over in the
name of law and order; the fatal weakness of their position
was that their authority, resting neither on birth nor election,
could be legitimately challenged at any time by anybody that
was strong enough to stand up to them. So the world shouted
paens of gratitude and joy when hard on the heels of the ty-
rants another and a very different kind of task-force appeared, a
saintly band of prophets, a generation of wandering wisemen,
the Sophoi, best represented by the immortal Seven Sages. These
men of matchless intellect and sublime compassion, after cor-
recting the political and moral disorders of their own societies,
wandered through the world free of earthly passions and at-
tachments, seeking only wisdom and imparting freely of their
vast knowledge and perception to distraught and disorganized
communities throughout the ancient world. It was their self-
less activity that put the Greek world on its feet after the Dark
Ages, or so it was believed.

Young men everywhere, fascinated by the powerful minds
and godlike independence of these great teachers, followed

*Dr. Nibley, professor of history and religion at Brigham Young Univer-
sity, is a frequent contributor to BYU Studies. He is the author of numerous
books on Church subjects.
them from city to city in droves, begging to become their disci-
plines and vying for the privilege of serving them and of plac-
ing their fortunes (which were often considerable) at their dis-
posal. Great cities and mighty potentates were willing to of-
fer anything for the healing ministrations which the Sophoi
gave to all free of charge. It was a shame to see such a highly
marketable product going for nothing, and it was not long
before a new type of wisemen appeared—the Sophists, meaning
so-called or pseudo-wisemen. They diligently imitated every
detail of dress, manner, and speech which had endeared the
real Sages to the whole of mankind, by which bait they too
gathered disciples in their highly-publicized travels, and were
soon able to settle down and establish expensive and fabulously
profitable schools in the big cities.

The special education in which these schools excelled went
under the name of rhetoric, which was boldly and unashamedly
defined and advertised as the art of giving people exactly
what they want in order to get exactly what you want out of
them. To palliate their sordid commercialism, the Sophist
teachers always insisted that they were frank, searching, un-
sparing crusaders of the Emancipated Mind, and it was So-
crates’ dangerous calling to expose the fraudulence of that
claim. He accused the brotherhood of training their pupils “to
appear, in the eyes of the ignorant, to know more than those
who really know”; to which they replied that they could see
nothing wrong with that since experience showed that such
clever sales techniques always paid off. But what is that, So-
crates protested, but “a mere knack and a routine—busy work
. . . I call it foul, as I do all ugly things.” Socrates also fore-
saw and prophesied that any system of hard and honest educa-
tion would be forced off the market in short order by a com-
peting system which offered its students fun and games at
school and top administrative jobs and big pay afterward. For
of course, the Sophists, as would-be successors to the Sophoi,
specialized in preparing the young for important public office
and private fortunes: rhetoric was the manipulation of people,
especially in the mass, and its professors promised wealth, fame,
and power to those who took their courses, from which it can
be readily seen that Socrates was a troublemaker who would
have to be removed. And removed he was, by that very class
of professors who forever after proclaimed him their patron saint.

Also removed from competition, as Socrates predicted, was any field of serious study that might distract the young from the business of life—the business of making money. This was done neatly and effectively by setting up counter-courses in science, philosophy, mathematics, etc., which, while pretending to be the real thing, were much shorter, easier and spicier than the old courses, promising the student exactly the same results but with the assurance (so said the brochure) that "you can do it all lying down!" Teachers of rhetoric, having thus forced all other teachers out of business, soon began to employ their irresistible weapons with deadly efficiency against each other. The escalation of competitive simplification, sweetening, and spicing soon brought the schools to that state of total inanity which never ceases to amaze and appall the student of ancient rhetoric, the most astounding phenomenon of all being the endless succession, generation after generation, of world-renowned scholars and students who have absolutely nothing to say but derive their vital nourishment from the mere fact of association with a tradition and institution of learning.

**KEEPING OUT OF TROUBLE**

The century before Christ was a time of chronic and mounting social unrest that by the time of Caesar had become quite unbearable—it was a world gone mad. When it began to appear that Augustus Caesar was the man to put an end to the worldwide *acosmia*, all power was put into his hands by a grateful humanity, and whenever he modestly suggested laying down the burden of his absolute and ever-growing powers people simply panicked. By shrewd economics and iron control of the military, Augustus gave a feeling of security to the whole world; his vast construction projects were meant to give his people a pleasing, nay a magnificent, environment; by taking over the supervision and financing of the youth-clubs throughout Italy, the *juveni*, he brought under control the most dangerous and irresponsible expression of the general social malaise. But the cornerstone of his grand design for preserving peace and order in the world was education.

As a boy, Augustus had been sent by his uncle Julius Caesar to study with the great Apollodorus in Apollonia. Apollo-
dorus was a typical Sophist whose writings have probably done more to wreck the cause of real education (by supplanting the reading of original authors by his own required college survey) than those of any other man. Now the theme song of the Sophists was that education is the solution to all social ills, and Augustus firmly believed what the secretary of a later emperor wrote, that education alone gives Rome the right to rule the world. Accordingly he spared no pains in searching out and encouraging any sign of talent in the young. He would agree with Pliny that the education of the poor is the responsibility of the Princeps. Pericles had made Athens "the teacher of Hellas" by bringing together under his hospitable roof the greatest thinkers in every field; the Scipionic circle in Rome had tried the same sort of thing. Augustus, following their example, drew the professors of the East to Rome with fabulous salaries and total indulgence of their vanity: he not only allowed them complete freedom of speech but patiently suffered their outrageous insolence. After the death of the dull and busy grind Hyginus, the presidency of the great Palatine academy went to M. P. Marcellus, an ex-boxer who told the emperor, "You supply the people, but we supply the education,"—and he got away with it. So did his successor, Paelemon, an ex-slave who announced that real education had begun at his birth and would perish at his death; though two successive emperors, Tiberius and Claudius, both declared Paelemon utterly unfit to teach the youth because of his gross and vicious immorality, his position was never in jeopardy, because he had written a handbook of rules for correct speech. Timogenes came to Rome from Alexandria as a cook, got a job as a litter-bearer, took up rhetoric, and ended up as a close friend of Augustus, who tolerated his unbelievable impudence in hopes that there might be real intelligence behind it. There was not. The Egyptian Apion was lured to Rome from the presidency of the University of Alexandria; Pliny called him "the drum of his own fame," and the salty Tiberius gave him the title of "the cymbal of the universe" to describe his brash and ceaseless boasting and self-glorification. He produced nothing of value.

Space will not allow us to unfold the long catalogue of men who guided the thinking of the civilized world for a thousand years. Let it suffice to name Symmachus, perhaps the most influential man in scholarship and government the Roman
world ever saw, of whose greatest writing Professor Raby wrote: "The ordinary reader ... seeks in vain some glimmer of reasonableness, some promise of sense." What more compelling testimony could there be than the careers of such men to the miraculous powers of that system of Education for Success inaugurated by the Sophists of old? In time every town in the empire was provided with schoolmasters at government expense: three Sophists for a small town, four Sophists and four grammarians for county-court towns (agorai dikon), and five rhetors and five grammarians for cities. From Vespasian on, the Imperial government paid the salaries of teachers, including, under Severus Alexander, the elementary teacher in every village. Justinian issued his pragmatic sanction "that the youth may be trained in liberal studies throughout the domain."

The student registering in any of the schools was entering a world of make-believe. Indeed schole and its Latin equivalent, ludus both mean "play"—the school is a little universe of its own where one engages in such "liberal" activities as are not prescribed by the exigencies of real life. The "education for life" idea, Dio Chrysostom noted, really turned the schoolroom into a playroom and rendered the student peculiarly unfit for life. One of the main functions of the school was to keep the young out of trouble by channelling their energies into traditional and accepted areas of expression. The system was originally designed for upper-class youths, brought up by slaves who spoiled them rotten, traditionally permitted to indulge in properly-directed political rioting and midnight depredations against the lower classes and their leaders. They were petted and envied by the whole society, which officially prolonged adolescentia and its licences to the age of forty. "Nature itself suggests desires to youth," wrote Cicero, "and if they injure no one else's life, whatever they do is endurable and pardonable ... only a crank would deny youth their amours with courtesans." Philostratus blasts the Romans for their scrupulous attention to harbors and roads while "neither you nor your laws show the slightest interest in the children of your cities, or in the young people or women." St. Augustine bears this out: if a boy was in school his parents could forget about him; if he was not in school nobody cared about him.
The hell-fire clubs of Athens and the scandalous rioting of Alcibiades and his crowd were a direct result of the "emancipated" and permissive teachings of the Sophists. Of course such behavior was disavowed by the professors, who made a special point of insisting that a teacher was never to be held responsible for anything a pupil might do; for that matter, a teacher was not responsible for what he might do. Lactantius says that the most immoral and greedy professor he ever knew specialized in courses on virtue and the austere life. And why not? "What good does it do," wrote John Chrysostom, the greatest teacher of his day, "to pay high salaries to teachers and raise up a host of experts when the actions of our society speak so much louder than their safe, conventional platitudes? For discipline of the mind is as far beyond mere lectures on education as doing is from talking."

The schools, designed to please and attract the youth, made no attempt to limit their fun, but only to channel it. Quintillian, after some hesitation, decided that the corruption of morals which was a natural and expected part of life at the bigger schools was after all a price worth paying for the stimulation, associations, competition and professional openings they offered. Everywhere, as Rhode puts it, "people of every class became inflamed with a desire to achieve the new 'success.' " Parents pushed their children into it: "Full of ambition for their children," wrote Petronius, "they don't want to see them study the hard way . . . and of course everybody is going to school in such numbers that you can't even count them." They all want to begin at the top, says Pliny, "want to know everything at once . . . and are quite satisfied with themselves as they are." Should institutions which cater to adolescent minds, Quintillian wondered, be allowed to set the tone of the whole civilized world? That is the very thing, he decided, which brought about the dire intellectual decline of the times. But still, it was precisely because the students were not given to any serious thinking that even their wildest actions were looked upon with indulgence: the students of Carthage, St. Augustine reports, "commit all kinds of outrages with perfect insolence and immunity, things punishable by law, but permitted by custom" to the students.

What kind of "protest" would one expect from such students? The idealism of youth had been harnessed and con-
tained from the beginning in the high-flown and altruistic clichés of standardized speeches to be learned by heart. Ly-sias’s “Twenty-fifth Oration” (his very worst), was the model for the schools because of its stereotyped treatment of the prescribed theme, “No Man is born an Oligarch or a Demo-

crat.” The so-called Pagan Martyrs of Alexandria were a band of professors who collided with a mad emperor on the subject not of human rights but of professorial prerogative, and so lost their heads. Real idealism is hard to find—there were teachers with great hearts and great minds, like Dyscolus, Eratosthenes, Valerius Cato, and Aetius, but they all found the doors of the schools closed against them. Only Eratosthenes held his own against the united malice of the faculty of Alex-

andria.

In Egypt, where priest-led student factions had been rioting for untold centuries, the Romans shrewdly put responsibility for social order in the hands of the gymnasiarth, the local school-
teacher, who was made president of the town council and/or of the assembly of archons in the home capital where he lived. But the rioting went right on, with the gymnasiarth usually leading one of the factions. “There is the man who stirs up all the trouble!” cried the Jews of Alexandria when the school-
teacher Hierax entered the theater. Like the later qadi, the gymnasiarth was out to promote himself and sometimes rose to giddy heights of power.

But everybody was playing the same game. As Dio Chrys-
sostom told his students who hesitated to go the Sophist path: “Do you think you are any wiser than Croesus, who was the richest man in the world and took the advice of Sophists?” “What’s wrong with studying to get rich?” the great Isocrates would ask, “why else do we exercise piety, justice and the other virtues if not to promote ourselves?” If one is sincere, he ex-

plains, there is no moral default, and any properly trained rhetor knows how to make himself really sincere. The student, Cicero says quite frankly, “must refer everything to his own ends” and never cease asking, quid mihi utilius—what is there in it for me? The program geared to “the naked self-interest (which) ruled in the rhetorical schools” from Isocrates on (Wm. Schmid) was all that any ambitious boy could ask for; they all took to it like ducks to water. “What song is sweeter?”
asks Cicero, "than that of the rhetorician, . . . what is fuller, more subtle, intellectual, admirable, fulfilling, satisfying?"

**MANUS MANUM LAVAT**

Discipline was not severe because the student was in a position to blackmail the teacher and they both knew it. It was common practice at Rome, according to Augustine, for students to avoid paying a teacher when the fees were due "by conspiring together and all of a sudden removing to another teacher in a body." This would mean disaster to the professor, whose name, fame and fortune naturally depended wholly on the number of students he could attract. So professors would pay students to attend their lectures (a sound investment since the state paid them by the numbers), and every teacher at a great university had to have his "chorus" of supporters among the students, a devoted band who would recruit more students (often by force), applaud their hero hysterically at the end of every sentence, heckle rival professors, and fight rival choruses in the streets and at the games and shows. At first the choruses were made up of students from a single country—like the Syrians at Athens who supported Eunapius because he was a Syrian—but membership soon became general as the gangs would wait at the docks to carry off newly-arrived students as pledges (the "foxes") or send their scouts out into the provincial cities to pledge boys intending to come to Athens to school.

So from beginning to end the first principle of rhetoric—that size and number are everything—dominated the schools. In return for their support, the students were spared all discipline. The most famous professor of them all, Libanius, has told how his students would laugh, talk, yawn, catch flies, look out of the window, sleep, draw pictures, and do anything but listen to his celebrated lectures, and then leave the hall for the games, shows, parties, stews, markets—anything but study. Why didn't the most influential teacher of his day make an effort to check this sort of thing? Because the boast and glory of his life was that he had more students than anybody else. He was enormously vain of his success as a teacher, and well illustrates how the pact of mutual corruption kept things going: in return for his complete permissiveness he insisted on one thing—that nobody ever criticize him; because of his enormous following his shallow letters (1600 of which survive) carried great
prestige and his name bore irresistible authority: Libanius could make or break any man's career. And because of his great influence and renown it was very much in the interest of any student to say he had studied with Libanius. So who held the whip handle after all? A multitude of students made a Libanius, an Iamblichus, or a Stilpo (at one time he had 30,000 students) great, and the hordes had no choice but to follow the great man whose name alone could give them prestige. The astounding thing is that none of the great professors ever produced anything of any value—the game is the purest make-believe, and yet it went on and on for centuries as the self-serving giants of education were able to "keep up the appearance of success by mutual praise and admiration." (Raby.) It was the education-government complex that kept things going: the great professors were all related by birth or marriage to each other and to the imperial family; everybody knew everybody else, and the school remained, as the Sophists designed it to be, the door to top-level positions in public life. The students knew what they were after and that only the school could give it to them. Why should they ever rock the boat?

The collapse of ancient civilization was marked by the rise, in the words of Fr. Blass, of "despotism, servilism, and scholarship." Note that scholarship does not go down with the ship. It torpedoed it. Years ago we wrote that "the very thing that stifled learning was pure oxygen to the schools," namely that preoccupation with office-work, with classifying and compiling and grading and processing, became the whole concern of scholarship in the Dark Ages. Of course there is plenty of learned noise all the time—the one thing that kept professors going, wrote Epicharmus, was their constitutional inability to shut up whether they had anything to say or not. (Indeed, Boethius of Tarsus became the richest man in the empire by guaranteeing to teach anyone to speak on any subject for any length of time.) But aside from that, the well of scholarship could never run dry as long as the art of literary criticism survived; professors took sides in critical debates which endured literally for hundreds of years as a learned pretext for those wonderful academic feuds which of course centered around personalities, spread throughout the entire world, and gave to the careers of the learned an appearance of real emotion and enthusiasm: the smaller the minds, the greater the vigor and dedication they
brought to the feuds. The favorite issue for taking sides was not Homer or Virgil but the "New (Asian) Education" versus the "Old (Attic or Classis) Education": they were of equal age and as alike as peas in a pod, but they provided the unfailing topic for discussion that kept generations of professors in congenial and remunerative employment. The busywork of the schools looked impressive from the outside, but as Clement of Alexandria noted, there was really nothing to it, "babbling away in their own special jargon, toiling their whole lifetime about special definitions . . . itching and scratching. . . ." It was all as easy as sneezing once one got the knack of it. "It was their own lack of productivity which forced (the professors) to address themselves ever and again to these same threadbare issues," wrote A. Norden.

One theme above all provided the great professor with a subject worthy of his pen, namely the lives of the great professors, beginning with his own. Favorinus, who knew Fronto and Plutarch, was a friend of the Emperor Hadrian, and taught at Ephesus and Rome where the fabulously rich Herodas Atticus attended his lectures, achieved the pinnacle of fame by an oration on the subject of his own greatness, and left as his life's work a great chaotic opus in twenty-four volumes—about himself. Illustrious men travelled ceaselessly from library to library gathering material on the lives of illustrious men who had spent their lives travelling from library to library gathering materials, etc., etc. When one entered the school one automatically ceased to be one of the vulgar—and that is why the vulgar clamored in their thousands, at the invitation of the emperor, to get into the school. And because the door was kept open and the prize was never beyond the hope of even the stupidest boy, provided only he had ambition, the school maintained its marvellous equilibrium and stability for centuries. The ambitious boys, the kind who lead student riots, were the least inclined of all to protest.

The only real danger was serious thought. This is well illustrated in the career of Apuleius, who was showered with honors and had statues of himself erected in a hundred cities in recognition of his rhetorical compositions in praise of smoke, of dust, of sleep, of indifference, in short, of nothing, but had to face mobs in the streets and prosecution in the courts when it leaked out that he had private opinions of his own—very de-
vout, religious opinions, to be sure, but unconventional—and had been up to such sneaky nonconformist tricks as inventing a tooth powder.

Whatever happens to the world, Seneca assures us, the school is bound to survive because there is nothing left to take its place after 1) the natural law of decay has done its work, 2) the growth of luxury softens and corrodes a civilization, and 3) the centralized government of the principe leaves no issues for public debate. The impression that the schools of every age make on Eduard Meyer is one of “perpetual decline.” Actually the ancient school did not decline, for as Dionysius says, it was already decadent in the time of Alexander; it was born sick. The trouble is, according to Dio Chrysostom, that there is really nothing significant for young people to do; there is no real demand for their services, and so they all converge on the university, the one place where doing nothing is respectable. He mentions the phenomenal growth of the big new universities, such as that of Kelainai, where countless droves of people flock together, people interested in all sorts of litigation and business deals, rhetoricians, political scientists, promoters, flunkeys, pimps, procurers, teamsters (muleteers), hucksters, harlots, dealers, and con-men in every line—the new super-university had become all things to all men.

**DORMITE SECURE, CIVES!**

In its victorious career the school overcame its two most serious opponents with surprising efficiency and dispatch. They were the church and the barbarians. Christianity offered the world the one good chance it ever had of breaking the vicious cycle of corruption and fraud centering in the schools. But the schools had a monopoly on the Things of This World as well as the Honors of Men, and the voices from another world that might have brought men to their senses were soon silenced. As early as the second century, in the approving words of Dr. R. Milburn, “uplifted eyes . . . turned back to earth to find their assurance in hard facts.” St. Augustine’s immortal *De Doctrina Christiana* is but a rhetorician’s invitation to the church to attain mental maturity by signing up permanently with the university. At the Council of Nicaea when the Christian doctors were displaying themselves as typical vain and wrangling professors, a poor layman, one of the “confessors,” arose in the
audience and rebuked and abashed them: Which was it to be, the Kingdom of Heaven or the University? When the church went to school and became respectable, and when a bishop had to hold a university degree in rhetoric, then the Christian populace, cheated of their promise of another and a better world, everywhere burst out in appalling demonstrations of helpless rage. The wild monks who attacked the University of Alexandria were acting like hysterical children, but what course was open to them against the entrenched power of the schools? In the end the police power of the state, at the insistent demand of the great orating bishops, mowed the protestors down in hundreds of thousands. They made a desert and they called it a peace, and so, as Raby puts it, "the old life of the schools continued, and men could think of nothing better to aim at than what they had been doing unimaginatively for centuries."

As the barbarians, Franks, Goths, Visigoths, Vandals, Saxons, Arabs, and what-not, whatever else they may have destroyed, they were completely captivated by the schools; their kings and princes, stunned with admiration of what they took to be a flowering civilization, diligently set themselves to composing letters and verse in the learned, tasteless, and trivial manner of the schools, and went all-out in large-scale crash programs of civilizing their followers through the offices of the old established educational system. "The grammatical art is not used by barbarous kings," wrote the unbelievably insipid secretary of the barbarian Theodosius to his master, who took it all in, "It abides uniquely with legitimate sovereigns." And so the warlords of the steppes submitted to the authority of the schoolmen as willingly as the Christian doctors had.

The school year at the University of Athens was opened with prayers, offerings, and a formal oration welcoming the students to the "sanctuary." Every school with its sacred groves, temple, and library was in theory a shrine of the Muses, a place of inspiration and retreat from the world. Not the least important factor in maintaining the marvellous stability of the institutions was the carefully-cultivated atmosphere, the image of deep and dedicated study, the look of learning. The aura of sanctity which the Sophists cast about themselves and their schools, with their robes, their titles, and their ceremonies, was the crowning touch of their art, the ultimate answer to the critics and the doubters. However prone to riot in the streets
and stews, the shows, baths, and games, the students of the ancient university always seemed to behave themselves pretty well on the campus. The formula for preserving order emerges with striking clarity from an ample mass of documents covering a long period of time. Whoever would avoid serious student protest or dangerous demands has simply to follow the rules of the Sophist schools:

1) Free the student from the necessity of any prolonged or strenuous mental effort.

2) Give him a reasonable assurance that the school is helping him toward a career.

3) Confine moral discipline to the amenities, paying special attention to dress and grooming. The student will have his own sex-life anyway.

4) Keep him busy with fun and games—extracurricular activity is the thing.

5) Allay any subconscious feelings of guilt due to idleness and underachievement by emphasis on the greatness of the institution, which should be frequently dramatized by assemblies and ceremonies; an atmosphere of high purpose and exalted dedication is the best insurance against moments of honest misgiving.

Here, then, was the secret of order and stability in the ancient schools.
William Faulkner:
The Substance of Faith

Elmo Howell*

The young generation in the United States today, the generation of the Vietnam war, must be unique in at least one way: it is the first to call into question its country’s moral position by rebelling, in sizable numbers, against its policy at home and abroad. But this defection is only a part of a general retrenchment from faith and commitment. The magazines and moving-picture screens flash pictures of nudity, they publicize the break-through of Victorian taboos in accounts of aberration, drugs, promiscuity, and violence. They give ample coverage of one of the major discoveries of the generation that God is, after all, dead. The whole country is, in one way or another, gathered up in this melee of excitement in the breaking of old images; and even those who have been around long enough to be aware of the fads of social change must yet recognize the altered premise on which young Americans today are facing the future. It is our national conviction, says John Steinbeck, “that politics is a dirty, tricky and dishonest pursuit and that all politicians are crooks.”¹ It was not always the case. The nation was founded by a tremendous act of faith, in God, in our leaders, in the righteousness of our cause, a faith which permeated every element of American life. In the eyes of the European, the American’s faith became his earmark, the source of his simplicity and naiveté and at times of his truculence, but always of his strength.

The fiction of William Faulkner is one of the strongest affirmations of faith that American literature has produced. Ironi-

---
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¹John Steinbeck, America and Americans (New York, 1966), p. 35.
cally, the first decade of his writing, beginning with the publication of *Sartoris* in 1929, which represents his finest achievement, was condemned by many as it appeared for negation of values and for an emphasis on the sordid and violent. Southerners were offended by an unpleasant picture of their society, while beyond the South Faulkner's introspection and brooding concern over a small segment of life in north Mississippi seemed morbidly parochial. He was, in fact, a mind turned in on itself, not just indifferent to the outside world but actually afraid of it. New York was a horror, and California a siren's land of "men and women without age, beautiful as gods and goddesses, and with the minds of infants." Home was nowhere but Oxford, Mississippi, where he could listen in atavistic seclusion to the sound of rain on the roof of his back porch. The broken roof of the South—that was the image that stirred his imagination during his great creative period. From *Sartoris* to *Absalom, Absalom!* his protagonists are men who have been defeated, who disintegrate in madness or despair, caught as they are between two worlds in the cultural backwash of Southern history, where enough of the old lingers on to make them unfit for the new. "If you could just ravel out into time," says Darl Bundren in *As I Lay Dying*. "It would be nice if you could just ravel out into time."

**Faulkner's Sense of Life**

But these protagonists, these "sick heroes," as Mr. Melvin Backman calls them, do not command interest for long; Faulkner's robust sense of life drowns out their dying wail. The South of his youth crowds his canvas, country and village, black and white, and the red man too: their houses, food and clothing; their speech and singularities of manner and attitude; the interrelation of class and caste—all presented against the natural world of bird and beast and flower and tree and in the context of seasonal change. By temper, Faulkner was buoyant and cheerful, and though grieved by the decay of the old order and the decline of an ideal, he was enough of a realist, like old Aunt Jenny DuPre of the Sartoris family, to survive the heartbreak

---

and to make the best of the world as he found it. And so the reality of his fiction is not in the nihilism of the central characters but in the teeming life of his country.

Faulkner's faith is not to be identified with the creed of any particular church. He is, in fact, severe on the religionists, who in his case are usually Baptists, the dominant group in his country; but his complaint is against what he considers an obtrusive interest, in the name of religion, in the other person's business. He belonged to no church himself; in a sense perhaps he was not even a Christian. And yet all of his work is suffused with the virtues of humility and forbearance and the Christian concept that he who loses his life shall find it. He has no gift for the mystical and he is impatient with theology, but he still reflects, unconsciously perhaps, the values of a Christian culture. Above all he is reverent. One of the effects of reverence is good manners, the "automatic courtesy," as he called it, in the saying of "Thank you" and "Sir" and "Ma'am," which he valued in Southern life.6 Unfortunately, outside Faulkner's country this custom is sometimes looked upon as somehow degrading in a society where all are supposed to be equal. But obeisance of servant to master, of child to parent, the young to the old, native to stranger is a grace of manner, a social modesty, which finds ultimate expression in man's relation to God.

In his best work, Faulkner participates in a communal faith of the Southern people. Through Absalom, Absalom!, at least, he seems to think of the South as having a destiny apart from the rest of the country. History reveals no sadder spectacle, perhaps, than the death of a civilization, and however the North may have looked upon the South in 1860, it looked upon itself as a separate nation, with the despair of Appomattox five years later only confirming it in a hopeless defiance. But defeat in battle was not the end; by slow attrition of morals and manners the South was to be shorn of its distinguishing qualities and remade in the national image. This is the South of Faulkner's fiction, just before the consummation of the final Northern victory, when enough of the old remains to suggest (perhaps in grandiose terms) what the past was like and what the future might have been. "For every Southern boy fourteen years old,

not once but whenever he wants it, there is the instant when it's still not yet two o'clock on that July afternoon in 1863. . . It's all in the balance, it hasn't happened yet, it hasn't even begun yet . . . This time. Maybe this time with all this much to lose and all this much to gain: Pennsylvania, Maryland, the world, the golden dome of Washington itself to crown with desperate and unbelievable victory the desperate gamble."

Faulkner draws his generation of the South with two faces, despair and defiant hope. Miss Jenny (Jenny Sartoris DuPre) is one of his best representatives from the aristocracy who even in the twentieth century still approaches life with assurance, though invariably marked with the Southern experience of failure. Though a commonplace of criticism that Faulkner's fiction reflects the grotesque end of a society founded on wrong principles—an aristocracy gone to seed—in actuality, the leaders of Jefferson three generations after the war (with the important exception of Flem Snopes) are drawn from the old families where the blood still courses strong: DeSpain, Stevens, Edmonds, Priest, Mallison, Sartoris. Miss Jenny, the sister of old Colonel Sartoris, is one of Faulkner's best portraits of old ladies, of whom he was particularly fond. "I think that as fine an influence as any young man can have is one reasonable old woman to listen to, an aunt or neighbor, because they are much more sensible than men, they have to be. They have held families together and it's because of families that a race is continued." Miss Jenny presides over the household of her nephew, and it is primarily through her manipulations that Young Bayard, the sole survivor of the young generation of Sartoris, is brought to marry and perpetuate the name. While all the time reviling the impossible Sartoris male, her family pride is fierce. A relict of the old order, simple, unassuming but adamant, she is the last of the "quality," says the servant Elnora, Quality is something the young people know nothing about, "because you born too late to see any of it except her."

Miss Jenny is not drawn in the romantic terms of most heroines of Old South fiction. Her speech is sometimes crude and her grammar peculiar. (Her English is authentic, however. The use of substandard terms like "ain't" and "it don't" persists

---

in informal Southern speech today, even among cultivated people, as it did among the English upper class well into the nineteenth century.) Unlike the lady of tradition, she finds amusement in her vacant hours, not with a Waverley romance, but a lurid Memphis newspaper, filled with "arson and murder and violent dissolution and adultery." She is very much at home in her world, though her roots are in the past. Elnora recalls her coming to Mississippi to join her brother John Sartoris, after her husband had been killed, bringing only some flower seed and a wicker hamper of broken colored glass from a window in her destroyed home in Carolina.

She got here at dusk-dark on Christmas Day and old Marse John and the chillen and my mammy waiting on the porch, and Her setting high-headed in the wagon for old Marse John to lift Her down. They never even kissed then, out where folks could see them. Old Marse John just said, "Well, Jenny," and she just said, "Well, Johnny," and they walked into the house where the commonalty couldn't spy on them. Then she begun to cry.10

Miss Jenny died when she was ninety, sitting in her arm-chair by an upstairs window; her death brought on by a violation of her standards by her niece-in-law Narcissa, who according to Elnora shouldn't have been a Sartoris in the first place. "Born Sartoris or born quality of any kind ain't is, it's does."11

Faulkner's world has been looked upon as one of decay and degeneracy, but the characters and incidents which represent a defection from the old standards are after all exceptions rather than the rule. His country is made up largely of men and women whose lives are quietly molded by tradition and prejudice, a people still close to the earth, a particular piece of the earth which their ancestors fought to defend in an old war, and where the bones of their fathers lie buried in some obscure churchyard bordered by fields of corn and cotton.

In such a world the past is always present—not only to those who dream, like Miss Jenny occasionally, of faded glories, but to those to whom the past meant chattel slavery. Faulkner's Negroes are tied to the past, not through battlefields and a lost cause, but through their intimate association with the white people and their acceptance of a common destiny. There are only

9*Collected Stories of William Faulkner*, p. 733.
10Ibid., p. 732.
a few instances of the "new Negro" in Faulkner, those who go away and put on new clothes and new ways (like Caspey in Sartoris), and usually they don't fare very well, either at home or abroad. By an ironic twist, the last surviving descendant in the male line of old Carothers McCaslin, one of the pioneers of Yoknapatawpha County, was the mulatto Samuel Worsham Beauchamp, who broke the pattern with his Hollywood attire and "expensive coiffure" and an attitude towards society that Jefferson would not tolerate. He was electrocuted in Joliet, Illinois, for killing a policeman, but even in death the long arm of the past enfolds him again, when his old grandmother Mollie Worsham Beauchamp goes to the District Attorney in Jefferson and says, "I don't know what he is. I just knows Pharaoh got him. And you the Law. I wants to find my boy."\footnote{William Faulkner, \textit{Go Down, Moses} (New York, 1955), p. 371.} Gavin Stevens, after a public subscription, has the body returned, and with her white folks attending, old Mollie has the satisfaction of a funeral procession and a proper burial.

Then, with Miss Worsham and the old Negress in Stevens' car with the driver he had hired and himself and the editor in the editor's, they followed the hearse as it swung into the long hill up from the station . . . until it slowed into the square, crossing it, circling the Confederate monument and the courthouse while the merchants and clerks and barbers and professional men who had given Stevens the dollars and half-dollars and quarters and the ones who had not, watched quietly from doors and upstairs windows, swinging then into the street which at the edge of town would become the country road leading to the destination seventeen miles away.\footnote{Ibid., p. 382.}

One of Faulkner's favorite characters was the Negro Dilsey of \textit{Sound and the Fury}, who raises the children, two generations of them, and holds the family together until her mistress Caroline Compson dies. Then she goes to live, old and half-blind, with her daughter Frony in Memphis—Frony moves to Memphis from St. Louis since her mother will not go farther away from home. Dilsey suffers neglect and abuse, even from those she loves, but she knows what she has to do and she does it. "Dis long time, O Jesus. Dis long time."ootnote{\textit{The Sound and the Fury}, p. 332.} She was drawn, it has been suggested, after an old Faulkner servant, Caroline Barr, who
died when she was a hundred years old, with Faulkner himself speaking at her funeral in his own front parlor. "Miss Hest-
elle," the old woman said to Mrs. Faulkner a few days before she died, "when them niggers lays me out, I want you to make me a fresh cap and apron to lay in." And Faulkner spoke his piece, "hoping that when his turn came there would be some-
one in the world to owe him the sermon which all owed to her who had been, as he had been from infancy, within the scope and range of that fidelity and that devotion and that recti-
tude."16

The virtues of Dilsey and Faulkner's old nurse suggest his approach to the creation of Negro character. This is not to say that his Negroes are not individuals, as much as his white people. They are, but characteristically they reflect the values of the best of the white element who have formed their charac-
ter in a close association that goes far into the past. The Negro, says Quentin Compson, is "a sort of obverse reflection of the white people he lives among."16 In this respect, although they have no conscious affection for the past, they as much as the whites keep it alive and help to perpetuate its values. Mark Twain reduces this penchant of the Southerner's to absurdity in the story of the old Negro mammy in Louisiana who followed her white people in judging everything in the present by the happier days before the war. When she heard a Northern vis-
itor admiring the Southern scene and above all the beautiful Southern moon, she sighed and said, "Ah, bless yo' heart, honey, you ought to seen dat moon befo' de waw!"17 Faulkner is very serious in his attitude towards the past, not in any romantic notion about vanished glory but in the code that informed its moral life: honor, pride, honesty, loyalty. Though the modern world threatens these values—and that is the source of the ten-
sion in all of his fiction—they still survive surprisingly strong in the group consciousness of his people, black as well as white.

In addition to the planter class and the Negroes, there are the poor white people, who have always made up the bulk of the population. In the old days, this element, slaveless for the most part, lived in the upcountry on small farms where they

17The Sound and the Fury, p. 105.
18Mark Twain, Life on the Mississippi (New York, 1904), p. 338. (Chapter XLV)
pieced out a bare subsistence in the frontier fashion. In Faulkner's time, and especially since World War II, they have moved in increasing numbers to the cities, leaving their farms to return to the wilderness, but taking along with them, at least for the present, the values of their rural background. The new urban South is still the Bible Belt. Memphis, Tennessee, the metropolis of the Faulkner country and one of the most progressive cities of the South, still boasts more churches than service stations.

The yeoman farmers of the Old South had little cause to cast their lot with the planter aristocracy, and it was a matter of consternation to Northern observers that they did. However much they may have been exploited by their leaders, as outsiders suggested, when the first guns sounded, they sprang to arms in complete unison with their captains, composing, as W. J. Cash points out, "an extraordinary and positive unity of passion and purpose." They shared the planters' racial pride and, just as important, his sense of independence and personal dignity. However ragged and small his domain, the little man stood on it with the same fierce attachment as the planter on his baronial acres; and "the thing that sent him swinging up the slope at Gettysburg," says Cash, "on that celebrated, gallant afternoon was . . . nothing more or less than his conviction, the conviction of every farmer among what was essentially only a band of farmers, that nothing living could cross him and get away with it." In a rude and wild society, says Sir Walter Scott, whose Scotland is in so many ways parallel with the American South, there is a more intimate mingling of people of all conditions: "the high and the low are more interested in each other's welfare; the feeling of kindred and relationship are more widely extended, and, in a word, the bonds of patriotic affection . . . have more influence on men's feelings and actions."

With some exceptions, these poor white people do not figure prominently in Faulkner's fiction; but their presence is felt in the background—quiet, unhurried, solid, and enduring: the Tulls, Bundredres, Armstids, McCallums, Gowries, Workitts, Pruitts, Quicks, Varners, Ingrums, Frasers. The past is not so

---

19 Ibid., p. 44.
(Chapter XXXVIII)
vivid to them as to their social betters, and consequently their nerves are less fraught, for their main concern today, as in the past, is getting a living out of the earth. However, in their own way they also participate in the South’s history. After the Civil War, Anse McCallum, who had gone to Virginia to do his fighting because “his Ma was a Carter,” walked back home to Mississippi, built a log house and raised a family of six sons, four of whom he named for Confederate heroes. In World War I his youngest son Buddy refused to wear a medal of honor awarded him because it was a “Yankee charm,” and during the New Deal years the McCallums refused to allow government agents on their land to determine their cotton acreage or to distribute subsidies. “Give that to them that want to take it. We can make out.”

SOUTHERN INDIVIDUALITY RESPECTED

Even the lawless Gowries of Beat Four command Faulkner’s respect because of an individuality which he considers the Southerner’s peculiar heritage. (“I admire strong character,” says Miss Jenny, “even if it is bad.”) They are the leaders of a bad element who almost lynch an innocent Negro; but their lawlessness appears ultimately no worse than a foray of minor Scots Highlanders—a parallel that Faulkner suggests—who are committed to their own way of doing things and willing to fight the intruder to the death. It is altogether characteristic of Faulkner that the head of the Gowrie clan, as well as one of his sons, is named for General Nathan Bedford Forrest. In “Tomorrow,” he tells the story of Stonewall Jackson Fentry, “a little worn-out hill man,” whose principal quality is the ability to endure. There is nothing in his present but hard work and deprivation, but his name associates him with a broader experience and gives his life a dignity that it would not otherwise have. He names his son Jackson and Longstreet Fentry, because “Pa fit under both of them.” Like Conrad’s simple heroes, Lord Jim and Captain MacWhirr for example, Faulkner’s little people hang on to what has been passed down to

---

21Sartoris, p. 320.
22Collected Stories of William Faulkner, p. 57.
them, impervious to ideas, with complete assurance in the destiny of their race and nation.

The essential vitality of the Yoknapatawpha fiction is in this underpinning of simple faith. Like the Negress Nancy in Requiem for a Nun, whose philosophy is summed up in her oft-repeated statement "I believes," his characters accept rather than question and dispute. They do not appreciate or understand the cynic's quip; they will have nothing to do with that new chic idea—born of a sterile weakness that cannot face up to unpleasantness anywhere—that our country's wars should be called into question since morally we may be on the wrong side. Young Pete Grier of Frenchman's Bend volunteered after Pearl Harbor, not because of intellectual conviction—he was barely literate—but because the honor of his country had been challenged: "I jest ain't going to put up with no folks treating the Unity States that way."25

In Faulkner's world the continuity of the generations is unbroken. "Nothing is ever forgotten. Nothing is ever lost. It's too valuable," says the grandfather of young Lucius Priest, who wants to be punished for disobedience so that he can forget it.26 The past lives on to inform the present. Can any literature, asks Sean O'Faolain, be "in health and vigor without some form of faith?"27 Faulkner's art communicates a sense of faith and confidence nurtured through generations, in one particular place and quite inseparable from it. It takes into account all elements of experience, individual as well as social—the errors, the pain and ridicule as well as the triumphs, and builds its house on that foundation. The faith of his people still burns strong because it has been tested and not found wanting, and because they refuse to forget.

Mormon Bibliography:
1968

CHAD J. FLAKE*

The 1968 Mormon Bibliography is expanded from the pattern used in previous issues of Brigham Young University Studies. It consists of selected items from the 1968 Mormon Americana (Volume 9), and, in addition, includes periodical articles from the Brigham Young University Studies, Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought, The Improvement Era, and Utah Historical Quarterly. It is hoped that the inclusion of these articles will be advantageous to the reader.

The most important subject of the year 1968 was the finding of the Joseph Smith Egyptian Papyri. The Church should be congratulated on making these materials immediately available to the scholar, and both Brigham Young University Studies and Dialogue should be commended for their presentation of the papyri and the new problems that they introduce in the historiography of the Pearl of Great Price. Although the subject has by no means been exhausted, a great deal of useful information has already been brought to light. In addition, one must not forget that even if nothing scholastically had been gained by the discovery of the papyri, the Church has gained an important group of historical artifacts. One of the fragments, for instance, is in the same frame it was hanging in in the Smith home, and all the fragments are still on the same backing on which they were originally mounted in either Kirtland or Independence.

Announcement has been made of a new Mormon magazine called Mormon History. This periodical is projected to include theses and reprints of out-of-print books. As of this date, nothing has been published by the group, but it is to be hoped that they will be able to accomplish their objective.

*Professor Flake is a special collections librarian at Brigham Young University.
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In the Sun

An Oil Painting

by

J. Alden Wier
A NOTE ON "IN THE SUN"

DALE T. FLETCHER*

There is a pearliness, a pale iridescence with shell pink accents at the vines and clover, lips and hands. In the sun in white against a white stone, she seems about to dissolve in light. She looks down at the white blossom, and we look down at her, as does the sun. She seems absorbed in the flower. She is a flower in which the artist is likewise absorbed—a flower of infinite value.

The light comes down from the sky. You can see it for yourself, a daily miracle. It is God’s revelation to you today if you can receive it. He that hath eyes let him see. It was this “mystery of it all” that J. Alden Weir was after. Her dress, white to honor chastity, ample for modesty, a ribbon and a ring, ruffles around the shoulders, large, soft ringlets for femininity are some of the lovely characteristics that tell of his respect for this girl, for what she is. These feelings are genuine in Weir, though for us today they may be harder to appreciate. “Is she for real?” we ask. In both his life and his art Weir stood for quiet confidence in the world’s fundamental orderliness, the value of work, respect for the great art of the past, Americanism, womanhood, the family, friendship, and especially the inspiration of nature.

Art’s mainstream since Weir has been dramatic, emphatic, expressive, creative, liberating, and revealing, but has largely treated with disdain the ideals just listed for Weir. We hear a contemporary voice: “How can any sensitive artist feel at ease in a society which has at its base neither theology, nor craftsmanship, nor social ownership? Or, the larger society apart, how can anyone’s ego develop without building up reservoirs of aggression and a basic hostility to authorities and traditions of all sorts?” Alienation is the conclusion, based on apostate conditions, that Christianity is a fraud. Only through the restoration of the gospel shall a reconciliation of the arts to Christianity be truly justified.

*Mr. Fletcher is instructor in art at Brigham Young University.

Human Sacrifice
and the Book of Abraham

WILLIAM JAMES ADAMS, JR.*

Some time ago the author had occasion to show Facsimile 1 from the Book of Abraham to some of his fellow students in Assyriology. When these students learned that it pictured Abraham about to be offered as a human sacrifice in Babylon, they immediately responded by claiming that there was no evidence that the Babylonians ever practiced human sacrifice. With their negative response and the renewed interest aroused by the recent recovery of the papyrus from which Joseph Smith took Facsimile 1, the author felt constrained to dig into the matter. The following is the result of his probings.

Did the ancient Babylonian’s practice human sacrifice? The world of scholarship is confused on the issue. Such scholars as Blome,1 Ward,2 and de Vaux3 flatly deny that human sacrifice was practiced in the Babylon of Abraham’s time, though de Vaux concedes that the practice came into use in the seventh century B.C. under the influence of the worship of Molech in Canaan. Other scholars, Jastrow,4 Jeremias,5 Meissner,6 look at the evidence, but remain uncommitted. “On the other hand it is quite uncertain, whether human sacrifice was known in Mesopotamia . . . ” are the words of Meissner and reflect the attitude of the other uncommitted scholars.

*Mr. Adams is a graduate student in Akkadian, Ugaritic, and Old Testament languages at Hebrew Union College.
6Bruno Meissner, Babylonien und Assyrien (Heidelberg, 1925), II, 84.
At this point it seems appropriate to define the term "human sacrifice." We will consider an act as a human sacrifice if (1) a person is killed either on an altar or in a temple or other holy place, and, (2) the killing is being done by a priest, priestess, or god. Both of these conditions should prevail.

With this definition of human sacrifice in mind, let us now look at the evidence. The evidence concerning the practice of human sacrifice among the Semites of Babylonia comes from four sources: (1) the circumstantial evidence from archaeological digs, (2) comments in ancient written texts, (3) human sacrifice as pictured on cylinder seals, and (4) the behavior of other Semitic peoples regarding the practice of human sacrifice.

To date, only one archaeological dig has produced any circumstantial evidence. Excavation at the Anu-Adad Temple in Assur, recovered a stele which describes the activities of Šamši-Adad IV (823-811 BC). The excavator notes: "It is remarkable that a human skull was found under the stele. From the stele's inscription it is unthinkable that this is a grave with a tombstone." If not a tombstone, then what? Meissner suggests that the skull "originated perhaps from a human sacrifice" (p. 84).

All of this is of course very conjectural, but it does leave one wondering what a human skull is doing under a historical stele in a temple.

Several Assyrian legal documents contain penalty formulas which demand that the person who breaks the contract can redeem himself only by burning his eldest child on the altar of a temple. Below are the texts and their translations:

Text K 439 dated to Sulmu-Sarri (698 BC):
Reverse lines 5 and 6 read i šarrāp māras-su rabī-tu itti BANMIN.NU.ERIN a-na Be-liši Sēri i-šarrāp which being translated reads "he will burn his oldest, daughter with 'a quantity of ritual cider' to Bēlti-Sēri, he will burn."

Text K 1492 dated to Šamaš-Kašid-Abi (669 BC):
Reverse lines 7-10 read lu-u apal-šu rabū lu-u māras-su itti 10 imēr ri-qi-e tāb-te a-na Be-la-tu Se-e-ri: i-šarrāp which is translated

---

9Ibid., pp. 227, 228.
as "either his oldest son or his oldest daughter with ten imer of good spices he will burn to Belat-Séri."

Text K 1488 with no date given:10 Reverse lines 7-9 read apal-šu- a-na ־Sin i šarrap māras-su rabī-te itti BANMIN.NU.-
ERIN a-na Be-līt Sēri i-šarrap which reads in translation as "he will burn his oldest son to Sin, with a 'quantity of ritual cider' he will burn his oldest daughter to Be-līt-Sēri."

Text AO 2221 dated to Ṣa-Nabû-Šu (ca. 656 BC):11 Reverse line 3 reads apal-šu rabâ ina ־ha-am-ri ša ־Adad i šarrap and is translated as "his oldest son he will burn in the sanctuary of the god, Adad."

In an old Babylonian text (Bu 88-5-12, 51) a man is mentioned in a list of offerings as a confirmation oath. Lines 33 and 34 read awil-ia alap-ia immer-ia lu-u a-wi-lu-tum lu-u al-pu lu-u im-me-ru which translates as "my man, my ox, my sheep, either a man or an ox or a sheep."12

These texts have been interpreted in four ways: (1) Johns suggested that the verb šarrāpu, "to burn," had lost its force and referred only to a ritual.13 (2) Furlani argued that since the penalty was so severe, the contracts were never broken.14 (3) Jastrow was not sure whether these phrases should be accepted literally or as mere threats. He did feel that they suggested "that at one time children were offered as sacrifices in the way indicated."15 (4) de Vaux finds the argument of Koehler and Ungnad most convincing (de Vaux, p. 59). These two scholars noted that the texts quoted above (except Bu 88-5-12, 51) come from the seventh century B.C. It was at this time that the worship of Molech with its burning of children was introduced to the Hebrews by the Phoenicians. They then speculate that the practice of burning children to a god was passed on from the West Semites to the Assyrians of the seventh century.16

---

10Ibid., pp. 351, 352.
13Johns, Assyrian Deeds and Documents, III, 345, 346.
15Jastrow, Civilization of Babylonia and Assyria pp. 385, 359.
The pictured evidence comes from cylinder seals. Below are the pictures concerning human sacrifice:

This first seal was catalogued by Ward (#138c, p. 53), Jeremias (#171, p. 399), and Boehmer (#482 and p. 82).¹⁷

Ward suggests that this seal represents two distinct scenes. On the left half two gods are talking. The other scene shows a god, drawn twice for symmetry, ready to kill a foe. On the other hand, Jeremias suggests that this may be a victim being dragged to the sacrificial altar at the left.

In lieu of our definition of sacrifice, it is appropriate at this point to define an altar. From the seals studied by Ward the following types of altars have been noted (pp. 360-367):

Stepped Altar

Hourglass Altar

Table Altar

Thus, in our first seal we find both the stepped and hourglass altars present along with a god holding a knife of some sort. Note also the presence of a bird which is very similar to the bird in Facsimile 1 of the Book of Abraham.

This second seal was catalogued by Jeremias (170, p. 399). Jeremias interpreted this seal as a human sacrifice. Indeed, we have a man about to be slain by a god, or a priest in the presence of god.

The third seal of interest to us was catalogued by Osten.\(^{18}\) We have here our best pictured evidence which shows a man about to be sacrificed on a table altar. Concerning this seal Osten says, "Sumero-Akkadian seal No. 153, however, shows a god being killed or sacrificed on an altar. This scene has a mythological meaning, but we may consider it as evidence that in earlier times in the Near East human beings were sacrificed" (p. 155).

We will now look at the practice of human sacrifice among other Semitic and neighboring peoples.

Gurney translates a Hittite text as follows: "If the troops have been beaten by the enemy they perform a ritual 'behind' the river, as follows: they 'cut through' a man, a goat, a

puppy, and a little pig; they place half on this side and half on that side, and in front they make a gate of . . . wood and stretch a . . . over it, and in front of the gate they light fires on this side and that, and the troop walk right through, and when they come to the river they sprinkle water over them."¹⁹

He further notes that in a broken passage a prisoner of war is on a list of items for sacrifice.

Among current-day Arabs human sacrifice is forbidden and unpracticed, but we find hints that it was practiced in pre-Islamic times. An early Christian story tells of the son of St. Nilus who is saved from being sacrificed to Venice, the morning star, because the Arabs overslept.²⁰ A story from the third century a.d. says that the Arabs of Duma sacrificed a child every year and buried it under an altar.²¹ Isaac of Antioch (fifth century) said that when the Arabs of the Syrian desert took Beth Hur in Mesopotamia, they sacrificed many children to the goddess Al Cuzza. A century later an Arab leader, Mundhir III, sacrificed four hundred nuns to the same goddess. Near Kufa are two stelae called "the two stones rubbed with blood." These are supposed to have been set up by Mundhir who rubbed them each year with the blood of human sacrifices.²² During the early days of Islam a story was told of Muhammad's grandfather. The grandfather had vowed to sacrifice one of his sons if he were to have ten sons. At the birth of his tenth son he was advised to offer a hundred camels instead.²³

The Old Testament makes frequent mention of the practice of human sacrifice among the Hebrews. Micah 6:1-8 includes human sacrifice in a list of offerings which are secondary to justice, love, and humility. Isaiah 66:3 gives several parallel lines. The first half of each line gives the acceptable practice, and the second half of each line gives the pagan practice:

slay the ram, smite a man
sacrifice the lamb, offer up a dog

In Leviticus 19:21 and 20:2-5 the sacrificing of a son to

---

²¹Prophry, De Abstinentia, II, 36.
²²Julius Wellhausen, Reise arabischen Heidentums (Berlin, 1897), pp. 40-43.
Molech is forbidden. Mention is made of “passing children through the fire of Molech” in II Kings 3:27, 16:3, 17:17, and 23:10.

Human sacrifice in North Africa is discussed by de Vaux (pp. 75-84). The bones in the sacrificial pits of the Carthage temple were studied by a medical student and revealed the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Human Bones Alone</th>
<th>Animal Bones Alone</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eighth and seventh centuries</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth and fifth centuries</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth through second centuries</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now that we have looked at the evidence from archeology, texts, pictures, and neighbors, what does it all add up to?

When we remember that the Arabs of Duma sacrificed a child each year and put the body under the altar, it is not so surprising to find a skull buried under a stele in the Anu-Adad-Temple.

Also, de Vaux declared that human sacrifice came with the Phoenicians in the eighth and seventh centuries and that the new mode of worship was reflected in the penalty formulas of seventh-century Assyrian contracts. But the human sacrifices of the Phoenicians and Canaanites were to Molech, whereas the human sacrifice in the contracts were to well-established deities, Sin and Belit-Sêri, who had well-established rituals. Why should they adopt a new ritual? It would seem easier to introduce a whole new religion, such as the worship of Molech, than to change an old ritual. Also, de Vaux fails to take into account the Old Babylonian confirmation oath which lists a man among items to be sacrificed. In this regard it should be noted that Abraham’s home, Ur of the Chaldees, was one of the great centers for worship of the moon-god Sin.
Neither can the pictures be brushed aside as weak hints. With the cylinder seal published by Osten (see above) we no longer have weak hints but a strong one.

Further, as we consider how many Semitic and neighboring cultures practiced human sacrifice, it becomes most plausible to think that the ancient Semites of Mesopotamia also practiced it. And it also becomes most plausible to think that an attempt was made to sacrifice Abraham as Joseph Smith declared it was.
REGRETFULLY REQUEST

Please, send back my children.
I gave them away before I realized
They were not myself
Or any part of myself.

Excuse me for thinking
If I sent them out on their own
I would rid myself
Of certain of my soul’s sores.

Forgive me for asking
Them to take the bitter root
Of their parent seed
And sprinkle it over the land.

They were not mine.
They never were.
They came like exploded gems,
New ore, rocks, from caves.
LETTING GO

I have learned the ways of ashes
Since you left
The sudden spitting shower
Echoing through the rooms
As the stubborn log
Finally surrenders.

BUFFERS

Books and pictures
are my stay
against the day.
It dawns.
I am folded back
against the sheets
My covers closed.
HERITAGE

We are fraught with lives: Ammon in his flocks,
Nephi at Laban’s edge, and Alma’s sons.
Lehi spins the Liahona and history talks.
The Finger sparks as Jared’s brother runs
Into the light. To King Noahs everywhere,
Through all the Abinadis of the world,
It bids us shake the scales until there
Can be in silence no more records curled
Where none may see. The talismanic names,
The old and honored builders of the arks,
(Those covenant-laden ships whose rigid frames
Trembled at the mighty cries of patriarchs)
Bid us hone our rusted tools and speak
To other histories, and to men who seek.
Mormon
Political Involvement
in Ohio

MAX H. PARKIN*

The Mormons in Kirtland, Ohio, like the saints in other Mormon centers during the formative years, were involved in politics. The Latter-day Saints in Ohio were neither recluses waiting for the millennium nor passivists ignoring political and social problems. Active Mormon political participation commenced in Kirtland, Geauga County, Ohio, as early as 1834. There the saints, who had strong political beliefs, enthusiastically expressed their views to the public and actively supported candidates of their choice. Some of these activities added to their trouble.

In fact, wherever the Mormons settled as a group, their political strength became a factor—a secondary if not a primary factor—in anti-Mormonism. For instance in Jackson County, Missouri, the mob objected to the probability of the Mormons gaining political power. "It requires no gift of prophecy," wrote a member of the mob committee in 1833, "to tell that the day is not far distant when the civil government of the county will be in their hands; when the sheriff, the justices, and the county judges will be Mormon." After they were exiled from Jackson County, the Mormons gained political ascendancy over all the county offices in Caldwell County following its establishment by the Missouri legislature in 1836. Later in Illinois the Church's interests fostered Joseph

*Mr. Parkin teaches at the Salt Lake Institute of Religion near the University of Utah. His special interest and research have been in Mormon history in Ohio.


Smith's candidacy for the national presidency, only to have him die in 1844 prior to the election. Nevertheless, before the Prophet's death, he laid the groundwork for the political kingdom of God on earth. The Council of Fifty—the kingdom's governing body—reportedly supervised the Mormon migration west to the Great Basin, where Brigham Young directed the political affairs of the Saints as the territorial governor from 1850 to 1858. After that Mormon political involvement continued when the Council of Fifty, separate from the Utah Territorial Government, continued as a phantom governmental body waiting for the day (as Governor Young reminded its members in 1863) when that body of men would "give laws to the nations of the earth." Moreover, Mormon interest in political issues has continued more or less down to our day.

**Andrew Jackson and Mormon Political View**

The Mormons in Ohio first showed interest in national politics when the Democratic president, Andrew Jackson, whom they supported, was forced to act on two vital issues of his administration—those of nullification and the Bank of the United States. In 1832, a year and one-half after Joseph Smith and the New York Mormons had arrived in Kirtland, President Jackson faced the problem of nullification which had been festering since his election; in 1828 Congress passed a protective tariff which proved detrimental to cotton-growing states in the South. The South Carolina Legislature, which took the lead in resisting the effects of the tariff, on November 24, 1832, declared that the federal tariff was invalid within its sovereign boundaries after February 1, 1833. The act of this legislature, if honored, would have given the states power to nullify federal laws to which they would not ascribe and thereby threaten the union of the states. Moreover, South Carolina threatened instant secession if the national government attempted to blockade Charleston harbor or to use force to collect the tax. President Jackson, an avid states righter, but one who opposed disunion, warned South Carolina against nullification and secession. "A high duty obliges me solemnly to announce that you cannot secede," he wrote. "Disunion by armed force is treason. Are you really ready to incur its guilt?" question the presi-

---

dent. Notwithstanding this sobering appeal, South Carolina refused to pay the federal tariff, so the president ordered Fort Sumter and Fort Moultrie reinforced and revenue cutters dispatched to collect the duties if the federal custom officials were resisted.

South Carolina's threatened secession had relevance in Mormon escatology when it prompted a classical latter-day prophecy—ostensibly, the first reference Joseph Smith made to a national political issue. While the country was under the strain of the nullification problem, the Prophet Joseph Smith received the following revelation on Christmas Day, 1832:

Verily, thus saith the Lord concerning the wars that will shortly come to pass, beginning at the rebellion of South Carolina, which will eventually terminate in the death and misery of many souls;

And the time will come that war will be poured out upon all nations, beginning at this place.

For behold, the Southern States shall be divided against the Northern States, . . .

The following month (with the problem still unsettled) a Church editor, W. W. Phelps, reported that "the dissolution of South Carolina from the Union," along with manifestations of other plagues and disasters, was evidence that the end was near. In time, Congress' graduated reduction of the tariff schedules placated South Carolina, and she did not secede. But twelve years later, the Prophet added a reinforcement to his prophecy of 1832 when he wrote:

I prophesy, in the name of the Lord God, that the commencement of the difficulties which will cause much bloodshed previous to the coming of the Son of Man will be in South Carolina.

It may probably arise through the slave question. This a voice declared to me, while I was praying earnestly on the subject, December 25, 1832. (Italics added.)

Besides nullification, President Jackson in his campaign of 1832, repudiated the Bank of the United States, the second

---

2Doctrine and Covenants, 87:1-3. For further consideration of Joseph Smith's reaction to the threatened secession and the revelation he received on the impending war see History of the Church, Vol. I, pp. 301, 302.
3The Evening and Morning Star, I, No. 8 (January, 1833), p. 62.
4Doctrine and Covenants, 130:12, 13.
vital issue of his administration. He argued that the Bank, if continued, would perpetrate an undesirable monopoly which would benefit foreign investors and the privileged American aristocracy. Since Jackson was the first president that came from the American common class, the fact that some of his policies engendered the rise of the common man came as no surprise. After Jackson’s re-election, the government withdrew the deposits from the Bank, and the institution’s charter was not renewed. This national issue may be the first with which the Latter-day Saints aligned themselves politically. Not only did the Mormons sympathize with the President in his anti-Bank views, but they also opposed the American aristocratic class identified politically with the Whig Party. These differences eventually erupted into political strife between the Mormons and the Whigs.

Some Mormons felt that the evils of the Old-World aristocracy would emerge in America in the form of federal privileges and monopolies under Whig sponsorship; such favors, they feared, would transform “the purest government . . . into the rankest aristocracy.” The Mormons showed their displeasure toward excessive government restrictions not only by protesting against the national bank but also by campaigning against the Whig party. During the weeks before the Ohio state election of 1835, the Mormon political editor reported that the Whig candidates resorted to “great strife” in order

To corrupt and buy until they effect their object in defeating the people, and then impose upon them another monster in the shape of a national bank, or something else as bad or worse, and ensure ever after a free control of offices, credit and money to fatten their own ambition and corrupt the minds of the rising posterity, who, coming up under the guidance of these aristocrats, will think it a virtue to enslave the poor and rivet firmer and firmer the fetters of despotism upon all, to prevent the noble spirit of democracy from rearing its head in a land so famed, so exalted, so blessed!8

The Church political editor in Kirtland stated that it was the task of the Democrats, therefore, to defeat the Whigs at the forthcoming state election if the citizens wished to resist encumbering political controls. He added,

9*“The Election,” Northern Times*, I, No. 27 (October 2, 1835), n.p.
A remissness on the part of the democrats may, and indeed will, give the aristocracy their ticket in our legislature, thus subjecting us to whatever scheme of policy their avarice may invent, till we are loaded with shackles [sic] which we can never throw off, and the State disgraced with “life insurance trust companies,” till our necks are sore, and we are subjected to live in the society of men who ride over us in gilded coaches, bought with money thus filched from the pockets of the farmers and mechanics.10

Such statements as “the citizens must burst the shackles of despotism” and “throw off the chains of federalism” continued to appear in the Church’s political paper expressing its preference for minimum governmental restrictions.11 Perhaps the most telling available statement that expressed Mormon disapproval of encroaching governmental powers was the following:

To a liberal spirit, a liberal policy, a liberal government, and free institutions, we owe our present safety and our future prosperity. Take from us these, and farewell to American liberty—deprive us of these, and adieu to our blood-bought freedom.12

In those days, the Mormon political position was a liberal one, and, unhesitatingly, the saints candidly acknowledged that they were “liberal, not only in a religious, but [also] in a political point of view”; accordingly, they believed a liberal political philosophy afforded a greater assurance of free governmental institutions.13

Efforts Toward a Mormon Political Newspaper

The Mormons became involved in party politics, however, not only as a means of expressing their political views but also as an avenue to improve relations with their neighbors. This involvement seemed urgent. Since by the fall of 1833 Church members in both Geauga and Jackson Counties had suffered

10Ibid.

11Northern Times, I, No. 28 (October 9, 1835), n.p. Concerning this matter the Times further elaborated, “Our democratic friends must remember, that they are not to contest this war [i.e. the election] with swords and bayonets, but with their every vote, safely deposited in the ballot box, which if done, will reverberate in the ears of the federalists of all shapes, grades and descriptions, from Hartford Conventionists, to the factious and unprincipled new-fangled Whigs, louder than the artillery at Austerlitz or Waterloo!”

12Northern Times, I, No. 27 (October 2, 1835), n.p.

13Messenger and Advocate, II, No. 7 (April, 1836), p. 295.
considerable anti-Mormon abuse, Church leaders felt that conditions could be improved by establishing a political newspaper in Kirtland in support of the Jackson administration. Joseph Smith wrote from Kirtland to Bishop Partridge in Missouri concerning the matter:

The inhabitants of this country [Ohio] threaten our destruction, and we know not how soon they may be permitted to follow the example of the Missourians...

We expect shortly to publish a political paper weekly in favor of the present administration. The influential men of that party have offered a liberal patronage to us, and we hope to succeed, for thereby we can show the public the purity of our intention in supporting the government under which we live.14

By November Church leaders expected to draw a prospectus for their paper to be known as the Democrat. Their plans to publish it, however, did not materialize. This effort was the first of three attempts by the Church to establish a political journal in Kirtland favoring the Democrats. The next year another attempt failed after the printing of a few issues.15 Then, the following winter the Church editors improved the format of the previous paper and revived it under the title Northern Times. Its first issue appeared in February, 1835.

Since religion was thought to be alien to politics, Mormon support of the Democrats angered the Whig press in Geauga County. Therefore, two papers in the county—the Chardon Spectator and the Painesville Telegraph—editorialized against the Mormons on political issues with an occasional derisive reference to their religion. M. G. Lewis, Whig editor of the Telegraph, derogatorily noted the appearance of the Northern Times:

The Mormonites in this county, as if weary of the dull monotonity of dreams and devotion—of profitless prophecies, and talking in tongues—have concluded to turn their attention to political matters. A paper entitled the Northern Times has made its appearance from

14Joseph Smith, Letter to Edward Partridge, December 5, 1833. Located in Joseph Smith’s Kirtland Letter Book including letters from November 27, 1832, to August 4, 1835, in the Church Historian’s Office.

15When the Northern Times appeared in February, 1835, the Spectator noted that it had previously appeared as “two little black half sheets, under the same title, just before our late [Fall, 1834] election.” Chardon Spectator and Geauga Gazette, IV, No. 32 (February 28, 1835), n.p.
their press in Kirtland, bearing the name of O. Cowdery, one of their leaders and preachers, as Editor. The editor breaks forth with a flood of words, filling seven columns under his editorial head—pounces upon the dead carcass of the United States Bank with most Quizotic ferocity—talks about "WIGS"—praises the President—and says, the nomination of Van Buren "we STILL add, would meet our mind, and receive our warm support." As the editor professes to have communication with the spirits of the invisible world, and certifies that he had seen an Angel, and "hefted" the golden plates of the Prophet, he will be a political anomaly, if not a dangerous oppponent.16

Editor Alfred Phelps of the Chardon Spectator observed the first issue of the Mormon Times with similar ribald humor.17 Understandably, the two papers took swipes at the Mormon religion whenever they felt the political climate warranted it since the Mormons, as "magicians and soothsayers," would be at the service of the Jacksonian cause, noted the Telegraph, and the Northern Times was reputedly at "the helm" of the Democratic Party in Geauga County, reported the Spectator.

Demonstrating interest in local and national politics, the Church's political paper advocated the election of select national, state, and the county candidates. For example, when President Jackson's second term approached its end, the Democratic Party selected a successor—Martin Van Buren, the vice-president. A whole year before the national election of 1836, the Northern Times supported Van Buren's candidacy, and a running announcement for his nomination for president and Richard M. Johnson for vice-president was carried in the Church paper. When the election was held, however, Van Buren neither carried Geauga County nor the state of Ohio, but he did gain a majority of the votes in Kirtland.18

The Mormons were not only interested in supporting party politicians, but also in electing their own people to public

---

16Painesville Telegraph, VI, No. 35 (February 20, 1835), n.p. The editorship of The Northern Times was shared at different times between Oliver Cowdery and Frederick G. Williams. Cowdery apparently functioned as the first editor, but Joseph Sudweeks in his Discontinued L.D.S. Periodicals (BYU, 1955) credits Williams as editor in May, 1835. His claim seems to be justified because a statement in the Warren News Letter (Ohio) noted in June that Cowdery withdrew from the editorial department in favor of Williams filling the office. Actually, there may have been further changes since the available copies of the Times in October credits Williams as the publisher.

17Chardon Spectator and Geauga Gazette, IV, No. 32 (February 28, 1835), n.p.

18Painesville Republican, I, No. 5 (December 1, 1836), n.p.
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Kirtland, Oct. 9, 1835.
NATIONAL NOMINATION!!

FOR PRESIDENT,
MARTIN VAN BUREN,
OF NEW YORK.

FOR VICE PRESIDENT,
Richard M. Johnson,
OF KENTUCKY.

"Union, harmony, self-denial, concession,—every thing for the cause, nothing for men,—should be the watchword, and motto of the democratic party."—Benton's Letter.

Appointment by the President.
George Washington Montgomery to be Consul for the Port of St. John's, in the Island of Porto Rico, in the place of Sidney Mason.

Abolition.

Several communications have been sent to the Northern Times, for insertion, in favor of anti-slavery—or the abolition of slavery. To prevent any misunderstanding on the subject, we positively say, that we shall have no-
thing to do with the matter—we are opposed to abolition, and whatever is calculated to disturb the peace and har-
mony of our Constitution and country. Abolition does hardly belong to law or religion, politics or gospel, according to our idea on the subject.

The Contest.

Next Tuesday decides, for one year, and perhaps for many, the fate of our State in point of political standing. The
office. At first, naturally, their position was weak, but by 1835 they made a special effort to hold a majority of the Kirtland township offices. This caused the non-Mormon citizens "to rally and make an effort," wrote editor Lewis, "which by a small majority, saved the township from being governed by revelation for the year to come." Nevertheless, that same year Oliver Cowdery was elected to the state electoral convention for the national election of 1836; later, both he and Frederick G. Williams were elected justices of the peace in Kirtland.20 By 1836 the Saints had undisputed control of the Kirtland township. This success brought the charge by the Telegraph that the Mormons gained their political ascendancy by mishandling the township ballots. "Thus it is that this clan of fanatics trample upon the laws of the land," wrote Asael Howe. "Their leaders are proud, haughty, overbearing, grasping at all wealth and political power within their reach." But when they "attempt to rob the people of this country of their political rights . . . it is time for the community to be alarmed," concluded the editor.21 He failed to give any evidence for his accusation and expressed chagrin that no other newspaper had reported the alleged balloting irregularity. Nevertheless, the citizens of the county continued to banter rumors about concerning Mormon political ambitions and achievements; one report circulated to the effect that the Mormons intended to control all county offices and elect a member from their own ranks to Congress.22 Doubtless, they would have done it if they could have, but their stay in Kirtland came to an end before such ambitious prospects were realized.

Causes of Unfriendly Political Relations

Although the details as to the causes of trouble between the Mormons and their neighbors over political matters during the first few years of Mormonism in Ohio are not clear (it is not possible at present to reconstruct the events and neighborhood trivia that molded the setting), it is apparent that there existed an undercurrent of bad feeling between the two groups

20 Painesville Telegraph, XIII, No. 43 (April 17, 1835), n.p.
21 Painesville Republican, I, No. 28 (May 25, 1837), n.p.
22 Painesville Telegraph, IV, No. 4 (January 27, 1837), n.p.
23 E. D. Howe, Autobiography and Recollections of a Pioneer Printer, (Painesville) Telegraph Steam Printing House, 1878, p. 44.
because of politics from near the beginning. Before any official Mormon political involvement existed, Oliver Cowdery reported in 1833 that the Mormons in Kirtland were subjects of "abuse and calumny" over a circulation of their interpretation of the Constitution and policies of government. Such a condition prompted him to tell a friend in Painesville that the Saints were suffering under "false insinuations" of a party which cried "blood and murder." Cowdery asserted that these insinuations were drawn up by their political enemies "for no other reason than to feed the mind of the ignorant with falsehoods" in order "to ride into office" their own candidates and thereby control the Mormon citizens.23 The Prophet, similarly, alluded to this undercurrent when he explained that the Church's decision to print its own political paper was to demonstrate to the public the "purity" of Mormon intention in "supporting the government under which they lived."24 Possibly, the climate of suspicion, at first, was enhanced because of the autocratic nature of the religious government of the Latter-day Saints as evidenced in the fact that the Western Courier at Ravenna critically referred to the "Secret Bye Laws of the Mormons" while the Telegraph suggested that Mormon adherents who rejected those bye laws would be "expelled as heretics."25 Similarly, the fact that the Mormons functioned as a potential political block also annoyed their adversaries. "Every man votes as directed by the prophet and his elders," reported one Kirtland non-Mormon citizen; others voiced similar complaints.26 Of course, the decision of the Mormons to take partisan sides in favor of the Democrats, naturally, added to the discord.

Conditions grew worse until in 1835 the Mormons felt a need to give their political views wider circulation, to declare publicly their loyalty to the national government—not just to candidates—and to publish an official statement announcing human subserviency to man-made governments. "That our belief, with regard to earthly governments and laws in general may not be misunderstood," began the statement, "we have

---

23 Oliver Cowdery, letter to Horace Kingsbury, November 29, 1833.
24 Smith to Partridge, letter cited in footnote 14 above.
26 Painesville Telegraph, XIII, No. 43 (April 17, 1835), n.p.
thought proper to present . . . our opinion concerning the same.”27 This “Article on Government”—neither presented as revelation nor published as such—was presented to the Saints in conference in August, 1835, then placed in the first edition of the *Doctrine and Covenants*.

Before the conference of 1835, another source of agitation arose when the fact became known that “influential men” of the Democratic Party had promised the Mormons a “liberal patronage.” With Whig enmity aroused by President Jackson’s use of the spoils system, this report added fuel to the flame. Although the support the Mormons gave the Democratic Party did not benefit them in the form of patronage, political friend and foe viewed the prospect of such a possibility with revulsion. New York’s unfriendly *Evening Star* editorialized concerning alleged spoils promised the Mormons in return for their support:

Being, as his [Joseph Smith’s] disciples all are zealous advocates of General Jackson’s right to appoint his successor, they will of course be immense favorites at the white house; and we look every day to see some of them announced in the Globe as having been appointed to some lucrative station. Josy himself will probably have a “foreign mission,” and to speak sober truth, he is about as fit for such an appointment as some of those who have already been thus rewarded for their subserviency to the court favorite.28

Moreover, the *Buffalo Whig* specifically asserted that Van Buren men had promised the Mormons the return of their Jackson County lands for their support in the election of 1836.29 This report did not please loyal party members either, and the Democrats in Geauga County insisted that it was a “malignant slander” and a “base fabrication,” which they were “authorized” to deny.30

Other political matters of a controversial nature occasionally involved the Mormons: the Saints at various times had a reputation of being pro-Masons, removalists, and anti-abolitionists. The presidential elections of 1832 and 1836 included participation of three parties in Ohio; besides the Democrats and the

29 *Buffalo Whig*, cited in *Painesville Republican*, I, No. 3 (December 1, 1836), n.p.
Whigs (which included the National Republican Party), the anti-Masonic Party was influential enough to establish a national ticket. The Western Reserve area of Ohio, inhabited principally by people geographically connected with anti-Masonic New York and Pennsylvania, was the stronghold of anti-freemasonry in Ohio. In the fall of 1830, representatives of anti-Masonry entrenched themselves into county offices in Ashtabula, Geauga, and Portage Counties. Since the mysterious death in 1826 of William Miller, a Masonic defector and anti-Masonic publisher, some anti-Masons could not look upon a Mormon-Mason coalition with warmth. Within weeks after the Saints first arrived in Ohio in 1831, E. D. Howe, early editor of the Telegraph and a leading anti-Masonic spokesman in Geauga County, became suspicious of a union between the Mormons and the Masons when some "zealous masons . . . beset Jo Smith for 'more light.'" Since a Masonic press in Palmyra, New York, had printed the Book of Mormon, editor Howe intended to uncover a disturbing resemblance between Masonry and Mormonism. He noted that "both systems pretended to have a very ancient origin, and to possess some wonderful secrets."

**Other Papers Disagree with the Telegraph**

Other papers in the Western Reserve, however, disagreed with editor Howe. For instance, Lewis L. Rice, editor of the Ohio Star, insisted that the Mormons were not friends of the Masons at all. "The Mormon Bible is anti-masonic," wrote the editor of the Star, "and it is a singular truth that every one of its followers, so far as we are able to ascertain, are anti-masons." The Geauga Gazette entered the controversy by reporting that Church leader W. W. Phelps, who had been editor of the anti-Masonic Phoenix of Ontario, New York, before his conversion to Mormonism was "one of the most zealous, and self-styled, patriotic anti-masons of his day." The Gazette stated further:

Here we see Mormonism walking in, close upon the steps of political anti-masonry! How far this is the case in

32 Ibid.
33 *Ohio Star*, II, No. 12 (March 24, 1831), n.p.
34 *Geauga Gazette*, I, No. 25 (May 1, 1832), n.p.
this section, we are not positively informed. In the state of New York, most of the Mormons that we knew were first antis.\textsuperscript{35}

This explanation seemed plausible to the public, and the issue soon died. Though certain members had anti-Masonic sentiments, the Mormons officially neither opposed nor sanctioned the Masonic movement in Ohio; thereby the Church lost a potentially dangerous pro-Masonic identity.

Another controversy occurred when a group in Painesville elicited the support of the Latter-day Saints in a plan to remove the seat of Geauga county government from Chardon to Painesville. Residents of the county initiated the movement for economic reasons. Tortuous roads to Chardon; the county seat's inaccessibility to the harbor at Fair Port on Lake Erie (the main northern gateway to Geauga County); the indirectness of the route from northern communities to those of the south by way of Chardon, which discouraged travel throughout the county and adversely effected commerce and real estate values induced the removal action.\textsuperscript{36} The Mormons bolstered the movement by sponsoring removalist meetings in Kirtland, by supporting it in the columns of the \textit{Northern Times}, and by circulating handbills and newspaper extras.\textsuperscript{37} The matter failed to gain sufficient backing, however, and in the summer of 1835, two months before it was defeated in the October election, the Mormons withdrew their support from it. This was done in favor of "other fish to fry," quipped the editor of the \textit{Chardon Spectator}. Although the removal issue did not loom large in political matters, Mormon involvement by invitation in the affair lends support to the fact that the strength of the Latter-day Saint community was sought in political matters.

But some issues did loom large on the political horizon of that period: issues that solicited support—if possible, Mormon support. For instance, the decade of the 1830's brought increased dissension between the North and the South over the slavery problem. Even though there were only six Negro slaves in Ohio in 1830 (and by the same year only a few hundred free Negroes were in the eight counties of the Western Reserve), Cincinnati, a center for Negro immigration into the

\textsuperscript{35}\textit{Ibid.}
\textsuperscript{36}\textit{Painesville Telegraph}, I, No. 32 (August 14, 1835), n.p.
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state, was the scene of a bloody three-day conflict over the Negro problem. Abolition societies were being organized in the North, which were sowing seeds that thirty years later were to grow into the Civil War.

Members of these societies invited the Mormons to participate in the movement, but the Mormons turned them down. The Church political editor rejected repeated appeals to participate with the abolitionists:

Several communications have been sent to the *Northern Times*, for insertion, in favor of anti-slavery—or the abolition of slavery. To prevent any misunderstanding on the subject, we positively say, that we shall have nothing to do with the matter—we are opposed to abolition, and whatever is calculated to disturb the peace and harmony of our Constitution and country. Abolition does hardly belong to law or religion, politics or gospel, according to our idea on the subject.

Abolitionist lecturers traveled through the states of the North to enlist support for their cause. The Mormons made available a meeting house in Kirtland in 1836 to one itinerant Presbyterian abolitionist lecturer. At the meeting a few citizens courteously, but coldly, received the speaker, who presented his arguments "to nearly naked walls." Although a small group of Presbyterians finally supported the lecturer, other inhabitants of Kirtland generally rejected his appeals.

The abolition movement provoked additional concern in the Church, however, when some of the saints requested the Church withdraw fellowship from those members in the South who would not renounce slavery. The Church had enjoyed proselytizing success in the Southern states, and a position against slavery would have been detrimental to missionary efforts in the South—notably in Virginia, Tennessee, and Kentucky—where the Mormons feared an outbreak of persecution similar to the Jackson County trouble. "For you will see," wrote one Mormon, "that if madam rumor, with her thousand poisoned tongues, was once to set afloat the story that this society had come out in favor of the doctrines of Abolitionism, there would be no safety for one of us in the South." The Prophet Joseph
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Smith sensed the precariousness of the situation and took measures to avoid trouble; he and other Church leaders during the spring of 1836 used the *Messenger and Advocate* to voice disapproval of the abolition movement. "I do not believe that the people of the North have any more right to say that the South shall not hold slaves, than the South have to say the North shall," he wrote. Though he taught that the slave master must treat his slaves "with kindness before God," he cited scriptural justification for slavery, maintaining that the Church would not withdraw fellowship from a member in consequence of his holding slaves. Hence, the Church leader shunned another awkward political issue and avoided being entangled in the abolition movement.

**Politics and the Great Trial**

One of the most menacing and potentially dangerous events with an apparent political bearing which occurred with the Mormons in Ohio was a complaint by Grandison Newell, charging Joseph Smith with a conspiracy to assassinate him. Newell, a prosperous manufacturer who lived two miles from Kirtland in Mentor, had demonstrated contempt for the Latter-day Saints by participating in economic boycotts against Mormon workmen and merchants, by threatening a mob attack upon the Mormon community, and by hindering the missionary effort. Because the Mormons suffered from Newell’s malevolence, they in return had little affection for the wealthy industrialist. In May 1837, at a time of national economic turbulence when Joseph’s popularity even within the Church was beginning to decline, Newell disclosed his intention to prosecute Joseph for masterminding a conspiracy to kill him. To Sidney Rigdon, Newell wrote, "Your bosom associate is the impostor Smith, the impious fabricator of gold bibles—the blasphemous forger of revelations with which he swindles ignorant people out of their hard-earned property." After expressing his hatred for the Mormon Prophet, Newell presented the heart of his complaint by accusing Joseph Smith of being an accessory to a conspiracy to take his life. To Rigdon he continued,
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Emboldened by success in his wicked schemes, he [Joseph Smith] hesitates not to use his authority as the revelator of the will of Heaven, to incite his followers to remove those who have opposed his treachery and fraud, by assassination. Deluded and frantic by his pretended revelation, that it was the will of God, that I should be destroyed, two of the saints of the latter day, by concert, and under the express direction of their prophet, this high priest of satan, meet in the night, at a little distance from my house, with loaded rifles, and pistols, with a determination to kill me. But as they drew near the spot where the bloody deed was to be performed, they trembled under the awful responsibility of committing murder, a little cool reflection in darkness and silence, broke the spell of the false prophet—they were restored to their right minds, and are now rejoicing that they were not left to the power of the devil and co-adjutor Smith, to stain their souls with a crime so horrible. While these scenes were planned by the prophet, and promises of great temporal and spiritual good lavished upon these two men, by him, to stimulate them to assassinate me in my own house, in the midst of my family, and in a moment when I was defenseless and suspecting no danger.45

Newell’s accusation was no idle threat. He registered a complaint with Justice Flint of Painesville, who issued a warrant for the arrest of the Mormon Prophet. Self-appointed individuals in Painesville who organized themselves into an unofficial committee proceeded to Kirtland to apprehend the Prophet and remove him to Painesville for trial. But the posse did not find Joseph in Kirtland. Believing the Mormons had concealed him, the committee demanded the leaders to surrender the Prophet to them. When convinced that Joseph was not in Kirtland, the committee members speculated that he would never return; nevertheless, before the month ended, Joseph returned to Kirtland, prepared his case, and traveled to Painesville accompanied by a sizable entourage of witnesses on Tuesday, May 30. Because the prosecution was not ready for him, the trial was postponed until the following Saturday to provide sufficient time for the state to secure evidence in the case. Then, on June 3, 1837, the trial—advertised as “THE STATE OF OHIO, vs. JOSEPH SMITH, JR, alias THE PROPHET”46—was held in the Methodist chapel in Painesville before a crowd of anxious spectators highly anticipating the dis-
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closure of "the murderous projects of the modern prophet," as the press in Columbus (the state capital) reported the case.47

At the trial, the court heard testimony regarding the charge that Joseph Smith had induced Solomon H. Denton and a Mr. Davis to shoot Grandison Newell in his house in Mentor. Although the alleged confederates had both been Mormons, Davis never wholly committed himself to the rules of the Mormon society and young Denton, who had resided in the Smith home since 1835 while working in the Church printing office, was excommunicated from the Church a few months prior to the June trials.48 Other witnesses, including Orson Hyde, Newell K. Whitney, Luke S. Johnson, Warren Parrish, Sidney Rigdon, and Hyrum Smith, responded. Warren Parrish, perhaps the most hopeful witness for the prosecution, a former scribe of Joseph Smith’s and a current officer in the Mormon Bank, was having trouble with the Church. Grandison Newell expected Parrish to give incriminating evidence against Joseph Smith, but he was visibly shaken—witnesses reported—when Parrish refused to incriminate his leader but instead testified that he had often heard the Mormon Prophet "exhort his people to do no violence."49 If Parrish’s testimony pleased the Prophet, not all of the testimonies eulogized him. But the editor of the Republican, Horace Steel, reported that the testimonies rather than being detrimental tended "to raise Joseph Smith in the estimation of men of candor."50 Nevertheless while charging Joseph Smith a five hundred dollar bail bond and Rigdon, Hyde, and Denton fifty dollars bail each, Judge Flint ordered them to appear before the Court of Common Pleas the following week for further execution of the case.

The verdict at the second trial, which was held in the court house at Chardon, Friday, June 9, and presided over by Judge Humphery, came as a surprise to Newell. Insinuating that Grandison Newell’s hatred for the Mormons induced the charges rather than the fear of assassination, Judge Humphery acquitted the defendant.51 But unwilling to abandon the case,
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the plaintiff carried it to the people in the pages of the *Telegraph* where he reviewed at length the evidence presented at the two trials. "Why did Orson Hyde testify that Smith told him that I ought to be put where the crows could not find me; that it would be no sin to kill me?" he asked. And he rehashed numerous other points in the case. After Newell's article appeared in the papers, the editor of the *Painesville Republican* posed some questions for Newell to answer: "Why was the trial held in Painesville before Justice Flint, unfriendly to the politics of the Mormons?" inquired the Democrat editor. While accusing Newell with fabricating the murder charges not only to persecute the Mormons but also to receive any political advantage the trial would give, editor Steel of the *Republican* said,

Mr. Newell resides in Mentor, about seven miles from Painesville and within two miles of the Mormon settlement, where Joseph Smith, Jr. resides. In preferring his complaint against Smith—why did he depart from the common practice, and drag Mr. Smith and his witnesses through his own town a distance of nine miles from home, to Painesville, when there are two Justices of the Peace in Mentor, where he resides. . . . I asked again, why was Mr. Flint selected to sit in judgment in this case. Those who know the circumstances have reason to say, in answer to those questions, that it was done, first the more to harass the Mormons—secondly, that it was desirable to have it before a man favorable to the complainant's views—and thirdly, that is was designed to have a political bearing, and the better to affect this object, one who has hitherto been one of the principal leaders of the opposition, was stationed in a conspicuous position during the trial for that purpose. (Italics mine.)

A year after the trial, hundreds of Mormons and most of their leaders had withdrawn from Kirtland and other Latter-day Saint centers in northeastern Ohio because of apostasy and mob threats resulting from several causes. The five years of refuge the Lord would have had the Saints enjoy in Kirtland turned into seven, and could have turned into an unlimited number—as the Prophet Joseph Smith thought it might—if reverses from within and from without the Church had not been the Mormon lot. In Kirtland the saints were highly inter-
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ested in, but not fully occupied by, politics as they seemed to be in later years; yet their interest in secular political matters contributed to the turbulent Ohio period. But theological goals were paramount. While reviewing the history of ancient and modern governments before he left Kirtland in the spring of 1837, Wilford Woodruff thoughfully journalized,

   It is equally interesting to contemplate the day that is now at hand and hath already begun in fulfillment of ancient prophecy in bringing the church of Christ out of the wilderness in establishing Israel upon the lands by a Theocratical government in fulfillment of the covenants God made with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.53

   This theocratic government was always the preoccupation of the Latter-day Saints, and if a legitimate use of secular political influence could help them in setting up the godly kingdom, they were not adverse to employ its service.


(Reviewed by Milton V. Backman, Jr., associate professor of history and religion at Brigham Young University. The author of *American Religions and the Rise of Mormonism* (1965), Dr. Backman also wrote "Awakenings in the Burned-over District" in the Spring 1969 *BYU Studies.*

The United States is properly recognized as a land of religious pluralism. The people of this nation probably support more different religious societies than do citizens of any other country. Pluralism is also a characteristic of the patterns of belief of members of many denominations for within many congregations a wide variety of beliefs exists.

In an attempt to present "to Catholics" a description of the theological diversity dividing Protestants, Robert Campbell has compiled a most revealing work, *Spectrum of Protestant Beliefs.* He says, "Significant divisions in Protestantism no longer are along denominational lines, but rather depend on the orientation of the individual in the liberal conservative spectrum" (p. v). As one Lutheran Protestant minister confessed, "Frankly, I feel closer to a liberal of any denomination than I do to a conservative of my own denomination" (p. vii).

For organizational purposes, Campbell divided "the left-to-right spectrum" into "five bands" which he calls radical, liberal, confessional, new evangelical, and fundamentalist. Then he selected five prominent religious leaders to represent these schools of thought and to express their beliefs concerning a variety of subjects including God, the virgin birth, the Bible, original sin, Satan, heaven and hell, what a man must do to be saved, marriage and divorce, premarital sex relations, racial integration, the ecumenical movement, and Vietnam.

Rev. Bob Jones, president of the Bob Jones University in Greenville, South Carolina, aptly represented the fundamentalist position; Carl F. H. Henry, editor of *Christianity Today,*
spoke effectively for the new evangelicals; Dr. John Warwick, chairman of the division of church history at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School in Deerfield, Illinois, accepted the assignment to represent the "confessional segment of the spectrum"; Bishop James A. Pike, theologian-in-residence at the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, Santa Barbara, responded to the request of articulating the view of a liberal; and William Hamilton, professor of religion at New College, Sarasota, Florida, elucidated views of radical theologians. All of these scholars prepared excellent, lucid, and succinct descriptions of their beliefs.

One of the apparent problems involved in preparing a work of this nature for publication was that of locating a theologian who might be recognized as a spokesman for a particular band of Protestant theology. This problem was especially difficult when the editor considered the liberal, confessional, and the new evangelical schools of thought. Campbell recognized that not every Protestant would fit neatly into one of the groups in the five-fold division of the Protestant liberal-conservative spectrum and noted that an individual might be conservative regarding one subject and liberal on another. Consequently, not all who might classify themselves as a particular type of Protestant would agree with the statements of the selected representatives for the various bands in the spectrum. This is especially true of the liberal school of thought. In fact, the controversial theologian, Bishop Pike, who was selected to represent the liberal band in the spectrum, is regarded by many liberal ministers with whom I am acquainted as a radical. Therefore, in the opinion of many liberal Protestants, two radicals express their views in this work; and many popular beliefs of the liberals are not reflected in this publication.

Another organizational feature of this work that should be seriously questioned is the establishment of a band in the spectrum labeled confessional. While many Protestants might classify themselves in this school of emphasis, this work was designed to reveal the different theological positions of Protestants, and confessional Protestants are not united by belief. Instead, they emphasize the liturgy and the creeds, but disagree concerning the interpretation of the creeds. As Dr. John Warwick, the representative of the confessional spectrum specified, "Doc-
trinally, confessional Protestants cover the spectrum from center to right [and might have said from left to right]: some are highly orthodox, accepting such key points of high orthodoxy as the reality of Satan and the Second Coming of Christ; others question this or that traditional doctrine, and some verge on the rejection of the physical reality of the Virgin Birth of Christ. Rejection of this would locate a person in the liberal camp." Since there is so much doctrinal diversity among confessional Protestants, this group might have been omitted in a consideration of patterns of belief, except for a reference to and description of this particular school. No one man could have been selected to represent the doctrinal position of this group of Protestants on the issues considered in this publication.

Although one might adopt another system of classification of Protestants by employing four labels (radicals, liberals, orthodox or conservatives, and fundamentalists), many liberals would divide liberalism into a variety of schools such as the followers of Paul Tillich, Karl Barth, Richard Niebuhr, and Rudolf Bultmann.

Another weakness of the publication is the failure of the editor to summarize more fully some of the most significant doctrinal differences separating the different groups of Protestants. Brief explanations of the positions of the five representatives concerning their schools of thought were included, but a more comprehensive description of the conflicting patterns of belief concerning the Bible, life beyond the grave, the fall, the atonement, and other subjects considered in this publication would have been most helpful to the class of readers for whom this work was prepared.

Although there are organizational problems in *Spectrum of Protestant Beliefs* (problems which plague all men who prepare a summary of patterns of belief), Campbell has compiled a most interesting work that accomplishes the primary goal of the editor, that of emphasizing the tremendous variety of belief in modern America and of presenting to lay members a brief description of some of the more popular views held by American Protestants.

(Reviewed by Louis Midgley, associate professor of political science at Brigham Young University. The author of *Beyond Human Nature: The Contemporary Debate over Moral Natural Law*, Dr. Midgley has also published essays in the *Natural Law Forum, Dialogue, Western Political Quarterly, American Political Science Review, BYU Studies*, and the *Improvement Era.*)

The drive for *aggiornamento* (i.e., renewal or updating) within the Catholic intellectual community is now so great that it has moved beyond the original desire for mere changes in the existing forms and doctrines; Catholics are now busy demanding fundamental changes in the doctrine and organization of the church. The questioning spirit is not merely a Dutch proclivity. *Spectrum of Catholic Attitudes* shows that among Catholic laymen questions are now being asked such as, "Who is God? How does he speak to man? What is his Church? How are the people of God to be led?" The sacraments, worship, ritual, structure of the Church, priesthood and most everything else are now open to honest questioning. *Spectrum of Catholic Attitudes* provides an interesting sample of lay Catholic opinion of these and other questions. The book avoids specialized and technical jargon and therefore can be understood by readers who might find the usual responses of Catholic theologians rather difficult to follow.

In a useful "introduction," the editor, Robert Campbell, stresses the magnitude of recent changes in Catholic opinion in contemporary America. He reports that the one thing Catholic intellectuals fear most is the conservative label, for once one is branded a conservative neither invitations to lecture nor opportunities to contribute to symposiums will come. Likewise, a conservative may find it difficult to find a publisher for his books and articles, and he may not be recommended for a full professorship. Campbell describes in detail what he calls the "liberaler-than-thou" gamesmanship now taking place among her Catholic intellectuals: In this game "the most devastating ploy is to tag your opponent a conservative. Of course ultra-conservative, or by extension, Birchite, is even worse." Once labeled he loses credibility in many circles "and his contract as a
teacher is in danger of nonrenewal for "failure to maintain professional standards."

Spectrum of Catholic Attitudes reports the opinion of six prominent lay Catholic intellectuals on twenty-nine topics ranging from the concept of God and the infallibility of the Pope to such questions as contraception and communism. In a few places the opinions of Marshall McLuhan are reported—yes, he of "electric culture" and "the medium is the message" fame is a Catholic, having become one at age twenty-six. Walter Matt and, to a lesser degree, Dale Francis present "conservative" Catholic views. F. J. Sheed and William Buckley are more or less conventional in their views, while Leslie Dewart and Daniel Callahan are each in their own special way less conventional and much more liberal. The book does succeed in presenting a wide spectrum.

Buckley, of National Review and recent TV fame, of course, is always fun. But my personal favorite among the six is Daniel Callahan, who studied at Yale, Georgetown, and Harvard (where he took a Ph.D. in philosophy). Campbell reports that Callahan has "some claim to being the person whose ideas are most likely to gain currency in liberal Catholic circles." Mormons should find his opinions rather interesting.

As is well known, certain young Protestant theologians employ the slogan "death-of-God" and describe themselves as radicals, but actually Callahan is far more radical than any of the so-called "death-of-God" theologians. Callahan observes that "it is not that 'God is dead'; he never was in the first place." Such statements, however, do not really place Callahan in league with Thomas J. J. Altizer's "Christian atheism." It is true that Callahan emphatically denies that he believes in the traditional "God" of Christian theology. He entirely disclaims any belief or any interest in either the transcendent or immanent God of the Christian tradition. But this does not make him a total unbeliever in God. His affirmations are important. "I could," he insists, "... believe in a God who, like myself, has a body, is a very limited mystery, can be seen, felt, and touched—in a word, a God who is a material (even if glorified) body, who is a being who exists, who can be seen, felt, heard, smelled and touched. I think I do believe in this kind of God, but he is a God, I take it, who would be offensive to both tradition and
to the most radical contemporary theists. I am constantly amazed that philosophers and theologians go to such great lengths to show that God can't be like ourselves. Why do we hate ourselves so much?"

Much of the current debate in Protestant and Catholic circles about the possibility of meaningful God-talk has been generated by the honest recognition of certain weaknesses within the traditional doctrine of God. Partly what is meant by the death of God is that God has died in man's heart; he has been rejected by man and we now experience only an "eclipse of God" (Buber). But in a different sense, many are now turning their backs on all God-talk simply as a reaction to the apparent bankruptcy of traditional theology. The current efforts to refurbish the concept of God, however, appear as a series of clever and sophisticated but still highly unconvincing tricks. Kai Nielsen expressed the matter well in a reference to Paul Tillich: "Tillich doesn't put new wine in old bottles, he puts in grape soda and then labels it Chateau Latour." Some are taken in by this sort of thing, but not Daniel Callahan.

Callahan rejects both a transcendent or immanent God; he cannot trust the impersonal absolute of traditional Catholic theology, and he is unimpressed by (Protestant) efforts to find God by looking within man or to the course of history. The philosophers and theologians may struggle to establish the reality (i.e., prove the existence) of God, but Callahan finds their proofs unconvincing, and he refuses to be taken in by sophisticated philosophers who talk about God in merely analogical or symbolic ways. The word "God," for many, may seem like just a mark or a noise, but for Callahan "the Christ of the Scripture remains a powerful, mysterious, and unique person," who cannot be fully contained within the categories of that secularity which now seems so triumphant and persuasive in our worldly culture. His belief is that Jesus Christ is God, but this is a radical departure from the traditional formula. The Jesus of the Bible is his (only?) God-in-a-body.

Though Callahan does not speak of God as finite, perhaps that is what he is actually suggesting. He believes that Jesus Christ "continues to exist in a glorified body" (which is, he tells us, "a body presumably free of the limitations we normally associate with bodiliness"). Furthermore, he insists "that this God-in-a-body is a God who can be seen, felt, heard, smelled
and touched. In a figure, indeed in the corporate person, of the risen Christ, we have a perfect image of God. He is one like ourselves, only more so—I won’t say infinitely more so since I don’t know what that could possibly mean. He is different from ourselves because he has risen from the dead and continues to exist for all time. . . . Callahan then suggests that man may actually be resurrected and thereby be like Jesus. “We have,” he argues, “in the image of the risen Christ an answer to the problem of God: God is a body. We also have an answer to the problem of man: Man is destined to be a risen body.” Clearly Callahan is working out a position on these issues that is radically unlike traditional Catholic doctrine but not unlike certain Mormon views.

Callahan’s views on the Trinity are thus also novel. “I am tempted,” he writes, “to say that the Trinity, like Celibacy, is for those who can bear it. I do not know what to make of the traditional doctrine; it strikes me as wholly obscure, a mere way of playing with words.” “I can’t even start on the Trinity. Once upon a time, I did believe in the Trinity; and I knew all the traditional reasons why I did and why I should. But I can’t recall just now how it all went.”

Spectrum of Catholic Attitudes, though it raises some obviously interesting questions, does not survey the entire range of developments in Catholic theology. For example, nothing much is said about the questions now being raised about the Eucharist by Catholic scholars. Is the Eucharist a sacrifice or, as Mormons maintain, a simple memorial meal and thanksgiving? There are even some interesting suggestions now being made about the question of the Real Presence. These issues are, it is true, mostly of concern to Europeans, so it is not surprising that they are overlooked in Spectrum. Likewise, there is little said about the new self-image of the Church as a pilgrim church, the wayfaring people of God. Nor is anything said about the new interest among Catholic theologians of the first rank in the question of postapostolic revelation and prophecy. Some are arguing that the people of God (i.e., true Israel, God’s covenant people) must have prophets to lead them on their journey through this world and that, in order to be the people of God, Christians must also be a genuinely prophetic community. Developments such as these are not touched on in
**Spectrum.** However, the book does offer a nontechnical introduction to some interesting currents in Catholic thought, as our short survey of Daniel Callahan’s opinions on God has perhaps shown.


(Reviewed by Roy W. Doxey, professor of scripture at Brigham Young University. Professor Doxey has probably written more on the Doctrine and Covenants than any other man in this dispensation. He has published *Doctrine and Covenants and the Future* (1957), *The Doctrine and Covenants Speakers* (1964), *The Latter-Day Prophets and the Doctrine and Covenants*, 4 vols. (1963-65), and *Zion in the Last Days* (1969, as well as other Church books.)

In his foreword, the editor says that this book represents lectures given at the University of Southern California during the period April to June 1936 by Elder Widstoe, deceased member of the Council of the Twelve of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. The editor admits that these lectures were “not completed or ‘polished’ in his [Elder Widstoe] own inimitable manner for publication.” The original material consisted of two parts: “(1) An extensive outline, and (2) the transcript of his university lectures as actually delivered (with the aid of additional notes) from the extensive outline.” The editor undertook to “edit and organize the transcript of these lectures into chapter divisions.” Credit for the “arduous statistical and analytical labor recorded in these pages, the hard work,” goes to Elder Widstoe, and to him “belongs full regard for whatever of value is here portrayed from his life-long endeavor to understand, and portray with simplicity, the message of the Doctrine and Covenants. In his absence, I assume and bear full responsibility for the book as it now appears. It is not a Church publication. It does not carry any official approval.”

For any one who is looking for a “capsule” treatment of a great book of scripture, this book answers the need. Of value to the beginning student of this standard work is the author’s division of *The Message of the Doctrine and Covenants* into
seven parts. This allows the reader to "fit everything into one or the other of these divisions" (pp. 18-19). The book is written in a simple, straightforward style, characteristically the style of a teacher in the classroom. The informal nature of the lecture is evident throughout, with such statements as: "Martin Harris was 'some pumpkin'" (p. 36). "Have you ever thought of that boy twenty-five years of age talking in such a way to a man nearly twice his age? Martin was a prosperous man in the community. The young upstart Joseph had nothing. Yet he was laying down the law to this man" (p. 39). "There is the deceiver who goes about and says, 'This man doesn't know any better. I have some worthless real estate here, and I will just fool him.' He is a deceiver. The hypocrite is slightly different. He is also a deceiver but he powders his face, curls his hair and trims his whiskers and tries to make himself appear what he is not" (p. 52).

In a classroom situation and without a written script, a teacher may make statements which he would not ordinarily use for publication, not, perhaps, because they do not represent his understanding, but because they represent only the thought at the moment. If the lecturer had "polished" the material for eventual publication, it might have been different. For example, on Page 86, reference is made to the doctrine of opposite existences with this comment: "President B. H. Roberts brought out this doctrine in his writings"—but with no reference to the source of a discussion of the doctrine as taught by President Roberts. Another example is about an eyewitness account of Joseph Smith and Sidney Rigdon receiving the "Vision," Section 76, with this statement:

The story goes—I do not know how correct it is—that there were people present at time the revelation was given, and that as the revelation came to the two brethren, idea upon idea, vision upon vision, the two men spoke to each other and said, "Did you understand it this way?" Was this what you heard or saw?" I think it is a correct story. You will find it in some of the records of the Church. Men have testified that they heard such remarks made (p. 169).

The informal classroom style of "writing" is also indicated in this confession: "I have not had a great deal of interest, not as much as I should have, in the hereafter. I am so enamored with this life that I haven't had time to think of the hereafter.
I am perfectly content to let the hereafter take care of itself, if I live right here” (pp. 165-166).

The total view of the Doctrine and Covenants is well presented, but unfortunately, it is an acknowledged hurried view. “We have hurried over the commandments relative to daily living. It would be well to study these matters in our homes in greater detail” (p. 140). Elder Widtsoe provides the reader with ample references for further study: “The Godhead is discussed. The separate members are clearly set forth [two references] as the Father [five references are given], the Son [four references] and the Holy Ghost [three references] (p. 121).” “Duties of parents are found in . . . [four references are given] (p. 81).”

Knowing Elder Widtsoe’s stature as a student of the scriptures and his calling in the Church, I feel today’s student of the Doctrine and Covenants would benefit greatly if Elder Widtsoe had had time to do as he suggests on Page 30:

Without digging under, it is quite a waste of time to be dealing with the Book of Doctrine and Covenants and any other such book. By “digging under,” I mean that we must take every word and sentence, every idea, and weight them, so to speak, against our best understanding.

Elder Widtsoe, as an inspired, scholarly, contributor to the literature of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, is known throughout the Church. His many contributions to the periodicals of the Church, as well as his numerous books, have been received with enthusiasm. If he had had the opportunity to put this material on the Doctrine and Covenants in publishable form, it would then no doubt be equal to his other books.


(Reviewed by Ivan J. Barrett, associate professor of religion at Brigham Young University. Professor Barrett is the author of Joseph Smith and the Restoration (1967), as well as numerous Church pamphlets.)

On Christopher Layton’s seventy-seventh birthday, which he commemorated in Safford, Arizona, he was visited by many
friends and members of his family. President Andrew Kimball, of the St. Joseph Stake, suggested that a committee of the Layton family be appointed to gather their father's genealogy and write a history of his life. This suggestion was immediately acted upon, a committee was appointed, and Christopher Layton began dictating his life story. This autobiography was designed to be passed on from generation to generation and to be preserved as a family memorial.

Christopher Layton reveals himself as a common man who achieved great success as a business man, a Church man and particularly as a family man, being a father of sixty children and a husband to ten wives. The courage, perseverance, and faith of the man during trials, sorrow, despair, persecutions and rebuff inspires the reader and marks Layton as one of the great men in pioneer Mormonism.

Compared with biographies in general it is outstanding. Andrew Jenson read the manuscript before the autobiography was printed and used much of it in his biography of Layton in his first volume of LDS Biographical Encyclopedia. He declared Layton's story "will show that Christopher Layton was one of the most remarkable men that ever figured in the history of the Mormon Church." James H. McClintock, Arizona historian, in Mormon Settlement in Arizona commented: "The narrative is one of the best at hand in the way of literary preparation, though with frank statement that President Layton himself had all too little education for the accomplishment of such a task (p. 24)." It appears that Christopher Layton did not learn to write until some years after joining the Church for when he signed the payroll as a member of the Mormon Battalion he placed an "X" where his signature should have been. Despite this handicap he proved himself the equal, if not superior, to his peers in judgment, wisdom, and foresight. He had the almost uncanny talent to prosper and succeed materially where others failed.

In 1965, the newly formed Christopher Layton Family Organization decided to prepare a new edition of his autobiography. This new edition was edited by Myron W. McIntyre and Noel Barton. Some alterations were made in the new edition: the births of children lacking in the original publication were supplied with maps and pictures added to enrich and inform the readers of people and places with which they might not be
Christopher Layton was a diamond in the rough, an Englishman by birth, born in Bedfordshire, March 8, 1821. His first practical experience was at the age of seven when he kept crows off the wheat fields for 36c a week. In 1843 he crossed the ocean with his wife; both had been baptized into the Mormon Church the year before. At Nauvoo they met the Prophet Joseph Smith who shook Brother Layton's hand. He said, “God bless you,” so fervently that the words “sank deep into our hearts giving us a feeling of peace such as we never had before.” From here on to his final days, the life of Christopher Layton was full of dedication to the Church, loyalty to its leaders, activity in the settlement of the western Zion, and service to his fellow church men.

Christopher Layton joined the Mormon Battalion and walked to California. He takes his account of the Battalion march from Daniel Tyler's *Concise History of the Mormon Battalion*. His service in the Battalion is significant in his life yet the space allotted in the autobiography is disproportionate as it covers almost one third of his entire life story and deals with one year's activity. He was only a private in the Mormon Battalion, but his military service spread over nearly a quarter of a century. In 1868 he was commissioned lieutenant colonel. A reputation Layton developed for being practical and plain spoken was brought into focus when Colonel Philip St. George Cooke ordered him to cross a swollen river to take a message to Captain Jefferson Hunt on the other side. Layton tried to get his mule to swim the raging stream but it refused. The colonel yelled for him to cross over. Layton readily sensed that to cross the river would cost him his and the mule's life so he turned his mule and rode off, saying as he went, “Colonel, I'll see you in hell before I drown myself and mule in that river.” The colonel stared at him for a moment and muttered, “What is that man's name?” An attendant replied, “Christopher Layton, sir.” “Well, he is a saucy fellow.”

After his discharge from the Battalion in California, Layton worked as a ranch foreman. He bought a band of horses at $1.50 a head and sold each one for $100. With this small fortune he sailed for England and brought his family and friends to
America. He engaged passage for all of them. While in England he married Sarah Martin. After a delay of more than a year in St. Louis, he led a large company of Saints across the plains and mountains to Salt Lake Valley. For the next thirty years Christopher Layton pioneered in Carson Valley, Nevada, where he built for himself a large herd of cattle which brought from President Brigham Young the comment: "Brother Layton, you have more stock than the whole Church." Christopher's reply reveals his selfless devotion to the Church and its leaders: "Brother Young, they are all at your disposal."

When it was known that the government was sending an army to Utah, the outlying settlements were abandoned, and Christopher Layton was called to Utah to the headquarters of the Church. He settled himself in Davis County and established Kaysville. Here he pioneered dry farming and introduced alfalfa which proved to be an epoch-making experiment. It cannot be estimated the value which this forage plant has given the intermountain area. While living at Kaysville he served as bishop and counselor in the stake presidency. Christopher Layton was a natural pioneer and colonizer who developed during his lifetime the rare attribute of an empire builder. In Kaysville he became a man of wealth and affluence and considered himself settled for life when the call came from the First Presidency to take charge of the settlements in southern Arizona and preside over the Saint Joseph Stake, named in honor of the Prophet Joseph Smith. He was not a young man then, but he tackled the assignment with the courage, vitality, and energy of a young man.

He presided over the St. Joseph Stake for fifteen years when he was released because of poor health. He was then ordained a patriarch. In June 1898 he was taken to Utah in a special railroad car and underwent an operation which proved unsuccessful. He died August 7, 1898.

Christopher Layton, Colonizer, Statesman, Leader is a book to be read. It is stimulating and strengthening, uplifting and assuring in this age of doubt and uncertainty. It reveals the motives and forces that shaped an eventful life and could well shape the lives of all those who follow them.
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