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Power in Washington: Congress
Versus the White House*

Stan A. Taylor**

I would like to preface my remarks to you with three personal affirmations which I hope are not inappropriate.

First, I am very grateful for the restored Gospel of Jesus Christ and its power of salvation and exaltation. I find deep personal satisfaction and consolation in my testimony of our Savior. I also find immense and continual professional benefit from that knowledge. I feel it is appropriate to testify that, as a social scientist, I find that every social problem which I analyze has as its root, at some place, to one degree or another, the failure of man to abide by the teachings of our Lord. I have come to feel that, at least in my own field and especially among Mormon scholars, one ignores sacred teachings at the peril of making his scholarship sterile and superficial.

Second, I want to express my deep respect and appreciation for this great university. Only one who has taught at non-Church institutions can appreciate the warm collegiality which exists between students and faculty who share such central beliefs about man and God. When I announced that I was going to leave a college in Boston where I had been Chairman of the Government Department, and go to Brigham Young University, one of my fellow teachers there was very concerned about my future. He approached me one day and asked if I thought I could be happy at a church university where I would not have sufficient academic freedom to teach what

*A Forum address delivered at Brigham Young University, 17 July 1973.
**A former administrative assistant to Congressman Gunn McKay, Stan A. Taylor is currently coordinator of the International Relations program at Brigham Young University, where he is an associate professor of political science.
I wanted to teach. I have since told him that I personally have never enjoyed that freedom more than at Brigham Young.

I have taught or lectured at four other schools and was never free to show how insightful the Holy Scripture could be. After enjoying this freedom for three years here, I now find it difficult to conceive how I would explore fully the role of government, for example, without benefit of the 134th Section of the Doctrine and Covenants. It is perhaps paradoxical and even pitiable that Professor James Wilson of Harvard recently said, "the list of subjects which cannot be publicly discussed in a free and open forum [at Harvard] has grown steadily, and now includes the war in Vietnam, public policy toward the urban ghettos, the relationship between race and heredity, and the role of American corporations in certain overseas regimes." [James Q. Wilson, "Liberalism versus Liberal Education," Commentary, June 1972.] I am grateful for this university where I feel free to discuss all things in the light of the Gospel.

Third, let me affirm my respect for the constitutional principles on which this nation, and other nations are based. I take with considerable seriousness the scriptural descriptions of these principles. I believe, as stated in the Doctrine and Covenants, that "Government is instituted of God for the benefit of man." (134:1) There are many people and groups today who try to convince us that government is a necessary evil. It is not. The absence of government is anarchy and there is no liberty therein.

It is the nature of constitutional government about which I want to talk today.

At base, any government is constitutional which, by either law or tradition or both, limits the power of the government and specifies certain procedures for the government in the exercise of its power. In effect, then, constitutional government exists when there is a proscription of power and a prescription of procedures. Note that a government can be constitutional without a written constitution and a government can have a written constitution and still not be constitutional in this sense. It is constitutional government when power is proscribed and when government procedures are prescribed. This leads to my central thesis, which is that over the last twenty or thirty
years in America, virtually all federal power has drifted into the Executive Office, which in itself is now separate from the Executive Branch and, in fact, constitutes a fourth branch of government.

I personally believe this development to be contrary to the intent of the framers of the Constitution. It was not an historical accident that Article I of the Constitution created the Legislative Branch. That it was listed and dealt with first in the Constitution is evidence of the intent of the framers to avoid the excesses of executive misrule with which they were familiar in the Europe of their time. They created, deliberately and consciously, a Legislative Branch which was to have all lawmaking authority, and an Executive Branch whose prescription was to "faithfully execute" the laws passed by Congress.

Now, I do not claim that the framers gave all power to the Legislative Branch, merely a sort of primacy of power. We all know that the two other branches were created to share government power in a specified way. But it is instructive to note that Article II, which establishes the Executive Branch, is very penurious in its allocations of power. Other than the executive's responsibilities in foreign affairs (which he shares with the Senate) and in military matters (as Commander-in-Chief), about all the Constitution says about the executive's power is the prescription that he shall see that the laws of Congress are faithfully executed.

For the last ten or fifteen years in Washington, I submit that there have been four branches of government rather than three, and that the Executive Branch (or what I prefer to call the Executive Office) has amassed overwhelming power into its own hands.

The evidence of this is quite well known and need not be recited here. You may be interested to know, however, that just in terms of size, the Executive Office (the White House) has grown from approximately 300 or so personnel during Truman's presidency to over 6,000 today, with a payroll of approximately $150 million annually.¹ This excludes, of course, the Executive Branch of government—the Cabinet, Departments, Bureaus, etc. It even excludes 13,000 or so C.I.A. per-

sonnel and some who, technically, report directly to the President. It has been said for some time in Washington that the size of the White House is exceeded only by its delusions of grandeur.

This creates a number of problems. First, by growing to such an enormous size, the Executive Office has lost one of the advantages it used to have—maneuverability. It now has a vast bureaucracy of its own separate from the bureaucracy of the Executive departments.

The historian Daniel Boorstin said recently that

there are something like forty persons who bear such titles as counsellor to the President or assistant to the President or something of that sort, [many of whom we now know seldom see the President]. Now this is a relatively new phenomenon: the opportunity for the President to get out of touch with the people who speak in his name.2

I believe there is great danger in exorbitantly large numbers of non-elected officials running the country. The strength of democracy lies in the constant and frequent reaffirmation of mandate that comes from facing the people at election time. This is why I do not like the 22nd Amendment, which limits any president to two terms, and why I oppose the current proposal for a single six-year presidential term. The notion that any political leader, especially a president, once elected, may never have to face the electorate again, is a frightful specter to me.

Second, this has brought about the demise of the Cabinet as it has historically developed. Cabinet officers, of course, head the Executive Branch Departments, and are now no longer a part of what I call the Executive Office. A concomitant loss of morale throughout the bureaucracy naturally has resulted from this. Cabinet appointments are no longer sought after as much as are White House positions. As George Ball once said, "nothing propinques like propinquity," and the Cabinet is no longer close to the President. President Nixon holds virtually no Cabinet meetings, and President Johnson held them only when the press would criticize him for ignoring the Cabinet. In fact, a current joke going around Washington is that the Republicans, looking ahead to the 1976 nomination,

2Congressional Quarterly, 7 July 1973, p. 1795.
are searching for someone totally unknown—maybe even a member of the Cabinet!

Third, the growth in the Executive Office has brought about a vast duplication of efforts overlapping seriously with some of the Cabinet departments. John Ehrlichman used to head a Domestic Affairs Council and staff of approximately 350 persons, and Henry Kissinger still heads a National Security Council and staff of 360, duplicating, between them, many of the upper-level jobs in nearly every Cabinet department.

Fourth, this growth of power is intrinsically dangerous in a democratic society. Such power invested in one man gives evidence of enormous arrogance. It is sad but true that those who try to be a de Gaulle all to often end up as a Napoleon, a sphinx without a riddle—all power, but no authority. I fear that at least the last two administrations, and perhaps even before, have been uncommonly devoted to enhancing the power of the White House by attempting to discredit, destroy, or cripple competing power centers.

Lord Acton has said, as you all know, that power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely. I have never believed that, but I do believe, with the British poet Stephen Spender, who wrote in his remarkable essay on why he left the Communist Party, "that power is saved from corruption [only] if it is humanized with humility. Without humility, power is turned to persecution . . . and public lies."3

Moreover, I interpret as an absence of humility in the White House the development of peerlessness. I feel that no man should be without peers. George Reedy, President Johnson’s Press Secretary, and therefore a man who should know, has noted that "Power breeds isolation. Isolation leads to the capricious use of power [which] in turn . . . breaks down the normal channels of communication between the leader and the people whom he leads. This ultimately means the deterioration of power and with it the capacity to sustain unity in our society."4 No leader, especially the President, should be free of "adversary debate with equals, or their sensitivity deteriorates," yet today’s presidents cannot have that kind

---

of "adversary relationship with other people" because everyone around them is a subordinate. You all remember the fairy tale about the Emperor's New Clothes. It occurs to me that a peerless president without proscribed power can be virtually a naked emperor whom no one's dares correct.

Those who have been cabable of performing this role with President Nixon (Moynihan, Kissinger, Burns, Peterson, Harlow, and others), have effectively been isolated from the President by Haldeman and Ehrlichman and have eventually, with the exception of Kissinger, left the Administration.

I hope no one feels I am being too critical or harsh with President Nixon, with the late President Johnson, or with any other president. I do feel that we may need to be reminded, as Brother Benson reminded us recently in General Conference, quoting President Theodore Roosevelt, that "patriotism means to stand by the country. It does not mean to stand by the President or any other public official save exactly to the degree in which he himself stands by the country . . . . Every man who parrots the cry 'stand by the President' without adding the proviso 'so far as he serves the Republic' is wrong."5

Thus, the power of the Executive Office has grown virtually unchecked at the expense of the Cabinet, but even more seriously, it has grown at the expense of Congress. Many commentators have been telling us for some time that Congress is dead. After working with Congress for the last two years, I can assure you it is not dead—moribund perhaps, but not dead. It is even showing some signs of life now that the Executive Office has fallen on hard times.

And, if the reports of the death of Congress have been a little premature, so also has the identity of the culprit been a little unclear. It is true that there has been some degree of homicide present and that it has most likely emanated from the Executive Office. But there has also been present some degree of suicide. It is true that much of the blame for this development needs to be laid at the feet of Congress, who, failing to process the necessary leadership and procedures to forge a viable national agenda, seem to be all too ready to hand all power to the President.

The House, for example, in the closing days of the 92nd

5As quoted by Ezra Taft Benson, "Civic Standards for the Faithful Saints," The Ensign 2:60 (July 1972).
Congress passed a greatly misunderstood bill called the Debt-Ceiling Bill which would have given to the President one of the few remaining Congressional powers, the power to determine and allocate priorities for the funding of national programs—or, in other words, the power of the purse. The Washington Post editorialized that very morning that the House sat around for 364 days complaining about the growing powers of the President and then on the 365th day passed a bill handing the President the last set of powers they had. Fortunately, that bill was killed in the Senate, which is one of the few examples of the Senate showing better judgment than the House in the 92nd Congress.

The Library of Congress recently completed a survey which indicated that in the last thirty years, Congress has passed 580 emergency delegations of power to the Executive Office, none of which contained a terminal date, and none of which has been rescinded.

There is no question but that Congress is slow and deliberate, many times to the point of seeming inaction. But Congress, for all its faults, is the most democratically elected body we have. As such, it is probably the most representative expression of the majority of Americans. Perhaps part of the value of Congress is, in fact, its deliberateness. If the Founding Fathers had wanted speedy and aggressive legislative activity, they never would have produced the document they did. It is very enlightening, especially after reading criticisms of Congress for its slowness, to read from the records of the Constitutional Convention.

In the legislature, promptitude of decision is oftener an evil than a benefit. The differences of opinion and the jarrings of parties in that department of the government, though they may sometimes obstruct salutary plans, yet often promote deliberations and circumspection, and serve to check excesses in the majority.

Those words of nearly 200 years ago seem very wise today.

I don’t mean to suggest that Congress does not need reform. It does most desperately. During the two years I was with a Congressional office, 1,778 bills dealing with education were introduced. Of these, 758 went to the Education and Labor Committee, while the remaining 1,020 were handled by 18 other committees. The Executive Branch of government
has changed beyond recognition in the last ten years, yet Congress, which was given the responsibility to oversee the Executive Branch, is virtually unchanged in structure and procedures.

Some people have suggested that although the stature of Congress vis-a-vis the Executive has diminished, the scope of its responsibilities has expanded. In other words, they suggest, even though the legislative role of Congress has been weakened relative to the Executive, the kinds of things requiring governmental concern have increased. This, of course, is probably just a charitable way of saying that Congress is doing less and less about more and more things.

In fact, there must be a redress in the balance of power between Congress and Executive. Ideally, I would hope that Congress would put its own house in order and then reassert itself, and that the Executive would recognize that an imbalance of power is not in the best interests of the country and voluntarily give up some of its power. I do not expect this, however. There appears to be more of a commitment in Congress now to have a showdown with the President. Perhaps such a showdown would clarify some Constitutional principles, and thus be a good thing for the country. But I am afraid that it would not. The broad social, economic, and environmental problems of today require a certain degree of harmony and cooperativeness between Congress and the Executive which a showdown will not encourage. Whether the President wins and Congress loses, or vice-versa, the country will probably lose. Neither a victorious Congress and an embittered, obstructionist President, nor a victorious President and a recalcitrant Congress, augers well for the electorate. "As we all know, Congress and the President were meant to do battle. In the end, their capacity to do business at all rests upon a set of mutual restraints and accommodations, because in the last analysis, either branch can do the other in."

Let me conclude by mentioning just briefly two specific developments which in my judgment violate what I identified earlier as the very heart of any constitutional government, that is, the proscription of power and the prescription of procedures.

First, let me mention a specific power which the Constitution does not grant the President; one which I would conclude is therefore proscribed. Some of you may argue that this

---

appears to be a very strict constructionist approach to the Constitution, but I would reply that since this Administration announced itself as strict constructionist, this becomes a reasonable basis for argument. I have reference to what is referred to as executive privilege.

Executive privilege is an unwritten doctrine that Presidents have used to withhold testimony or documents from investigative agencies, particularly congressional committees. It is based on the separation of powers principle underlying the Constitution but is not mentioned in that document or in the statutes. Presidents have assumed the power to invoke executive privilege in order to guard the privacy of their operations from public scrutiny.1

President Nixon has now invoked executive privilege twenty-one times. While the scope of this doctrine was at one time very narrow and applied only to the President himself, former Attorney General Kleindienst, speaking for the Administration, claimed last March that it applies to all members of the Executive Branch, past, present, and future. President Nixon personally said that the "doctrine of executive privilege is well established. It was first invoked by President Washington and it has been recognized and utilized by our Presidents for almost 200 years since that time. This doctrine is rooted in the Constitution...."2

I must disagree with the statement. As nearly as I can determine, the use of the doctrine in this form goes back only to 1954. President Washington never did invoke the privilege. When Congress requested documents from him relating to the disastrous defeat of General St. Clair at the hands of some Indians, Washington discussed the request twice with his Cabinet and ordered all papers to be turned over to Congress. It is further stated by the present Administration that President Washington invoked the privilege a second time in 1796 when he refused to release papers and instructions sent to John Jay in connection with a controversial treaty with England. Again, my personal review of that incident revealed that Washington did indeed refuse the House request, but immediately turned the papers over to the Senate, reasoning that he shared foreign affairs powers with the Senate, but not with the House.

One of the more interesting statements from Congress on executive privilege came in 1948 in response to an order from President Harry Truman forbidding the FBI from giving certain records to the House Un-American Activities Committee. A young California Congressman on that Committee argued that executive privilege was untenable “from a constitutional standpoint” and that to let that doctrine stand would mean a President “could have arbitrarily issued [such an order] in the Teapot Dome Scandal . . . denying the Congress . . . information it needed to conduct an investigation of the Executive Department and the Congress would have no right to question the decision.” That statement may turn out to be prophetic, and was uttered by Congressman Richard M. Nixon of California.9

In sum, I believe that the privilege of the Executive Branch of witholding information unilaterally from Congress and hence from the public, is a power not granted by the Constitution nor implied by any constitutional principles.

The second development to which I referred is the practice of presidential impoundment of congressionally appropriated money. This practice specifically contravenes the prescribed procedures of the Constitution for the passage of laws and for the spending of appropriated funds. The Constitution is clear that all federal expenditures must be made from money appropriated by Congress in the form of legislation, and that the President must “faithfully execute” these laws. Moreover, the Constitution specifically denies the President the right to item veto. It requires that the President must veto a bill with which he disagrees and that if it is passed over his veto it becomes the law of the land. He cannot enforce parts of a bill and not the rest. Yet, this is precisely what impoundment allows the President to do.

As of today, the present administration has impounded $17 billion of duly appropriated money. This is not merely economizing where possible, nor deferring some expenditures to obtain better bargains; this is the wholesale dismantling of congressionally approved programs. I personally think Congress should and would support an overall reduction of all federal expenditures as long as it applied evenly to all federal

programs. But they are not willing, and should not be willing, to abdicate legislative responsibility.

There are undoubtedly some who support the President in impounding money, whatever the program. I believe that if we want greater economy in government we should try to get it by electing congressmen and senators sympathetic to that problem, and not try to get it through encouraging the President to take unconstitutional action. Fiscal crisis can be used to justify presidential action, but no crisis of any kind should require nor justify the President to act unconstitutionally.

Past Presidents have impounded money in some ways. Jefferson impounded some money appropriated by Congress for the construction of gunboats, but apologized for impounding it and spent it in the subsequent year for gunboats which he felt were a better buy than the ones available when the appropriation was made. With the exception of one impoundment by President Grant, I cannot find an example of presidential impoundment made in an area other than weapons procurement or specific defense spending, until the present administration, which has impounded money in the areas of housing, public health, food stamps, veterans' benefits, highway improvement, and water-pollution control. You may be interested to know that eight district court cases in different states during the last year have all decided against this practice, yet it continues.

An Assistant Attorney General in 1969 issued an opinion which said that, "With respect to the suggestion that the President has a constitutional power to decline to spend appropriated funds, we must conclude that the existence of such a broad power is supported by neither reason nor precedent." That Assistant Attorney General was William Rehnquist, who is now one of President Nixon's appointees to the Supreme Court.

Thus, the practices of impoundment and executive privilege, and the separation of the Executive Office from the Executive Branch, have created a new and dangerous center of governmental power in America. The precarious balance of power which was so carefully structured by the Constitution no longer exists. The pendulum is swinging, however, and I only hope that it does not swing so far that we end with unnecessarily

\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}, 5 April 1973, p. S6803.}
weak executives. What has developed is not the result of some global conspiracy nor even the fruits of sinister perversity. But to say that it is the result of folly and not malice does not reduce its seriousness—in fact, it should cause greater concern. Dietrich Bonhoeffer once said,

Folly is a more dangerous enemy to the good than malice. You can protect against malice, you can unmask it or prevent it by force. Malice always contains the seeds of its own destruction, for it always makes men uncomfortable, if nothing worse. There is no defense against folly.11

The present situation is the result of the decisions of many who, over a number of years, have attempted to do what they felt was best for their country. But we are not always sensitive enough to the long range results of short run programs. Regarding the present developments, it is true, as someone has written:

Thus the world we made
Pays back what we paid;
Thus the dark descends
And our means become our ends.

Watergate was not the result of desperation nor even of corruption, but rather of unbridled power, of peerlessness in the Presidency, and of a severe imbalance between Congress and the White House.

I have great faith in this country. I even have great faith in politicians, strange as that may seem to some of you. I find that the overwhelming proportion of Congressmen are dedicated and honest individuals, trying to do what they think is best for the nation. I even take some consolation from the fact that, at least thus far, no elected officials have been involved in Watergate—not necessarily because they are intrinsically more moral or honest, but because they know you don’t win elections by bugging and dirty tricks. In other words, they are afraid of the people. You know, Madison remarked at the Constitutional Convention that the ultimate restraint on power comes from the people as they exercise their electoral responsibilities. I hope and pray we may exercise it wisely.

POSTSCRIPT — 29 OCTOBER 1973

The almost daily recurrence of government crises since this Forum Address was delivered on July 17th has prompted the Editor to invite me to add a brief postscript. It is interesting, if not mind-boggling, merely to catalog these developments: we have learned that the highest government official in our land taped all of his conversations from the Spring of 1971 to July of 1973 without permission of those with whom he was conversing; we have seen the legal disposition of these tapes become a major constitutional question, relating to the issue of executive privilege discussed in the Forum Address, and we do not know at the time of the writing of this postscript whether these tapes will or will not be available in unadulterated form to assist in the prosecution of fundamental criminal justice; we have seen a series of clean cut, square-jawed young men, none of whom were ever elected to a public office, yet who were directing the highest affairs of this nation, give contradictory statements, the truth of which is yet to be found but the moral mentality of which is frightening; we have seen the second highest government official in the nation vehemently deny that he was guilty of any wrongdoing, then later virtually confess to income tax evasion of illegally obtained money, resign from office, and then claim he had never enriched himself at public expense; we have witnessed the dismissal of a Special Prosecutor who was appointed and authorized to pursue an independent investigation of "the Watergate Case and related matters" and about whom it was said he "would not be removed from office except for extraordinary improprieties on his part" (Washington Post, October 21, 1973); and we have most recently seen a veto of a War Powers bill which would have reaffirmed the Constitutional imperative that the President cannot involve the country in a war without Congressional consent.

This list of facts is in itself depressing. The central thesis of the Forum Address was that an excessive amount of power has been accumulated in the Executive Office which has had the effect of isolating the Chief Executive from the people and from Congress. The events subsequent to that address have convinced me that if I erred in my analysis, I erred in not recognizing the full extent of this development. Perhaps the apex of this long trend was reached in a President who ran an election without his party, ran domestic affairs without the House of Representatives, ran foreign policy without the Senate, and ran the country without consensus. In sum, we have witnessed the development of a single center of unprecedented power surrounded by men who have not shared the notion voiced by William Pitt the Elder that "there is something behind the throne greater than the king himself."

Government is a very precious commodity, yet we treat it very lightly. We have erroneously assumed in America that religion and ethics were inextricably intertwined and that since we could not teach (Continued on page 28)
The Church in Japan

Seiji Katanuma*

I have been asked many questions like, "Do the Japanese originally come from Hagoth in the Book of Mormon?" or "Why has the economy of Japan developed so rapidly?" or "What kinds of foods do Japanese people eat?" or "Do the Japanese still wear kimonos?" These questions are so diversified that I sometimes find it difficult to answer them all, but I have answered them as best I can in order to give a good understanding of Japan and her people. However, there is one question which is difficult for me to answer clearly. It is, "Why has the Church in Japan grown so tremendously?" There are many reasons why this question perplexes me. One is that I do not understand what the standard is for judging whether the Church in Japan has grown tremendously or not. And the second reason is that I have been involved in the history of the Church in Japan for sixteen years so that now I have difficulty understanding the total aspect of our Church just the same as a man in the forest cannot see the forest more clearly than another man outside the forest. And the third reason why I am quite at a loss is that, in our traditional modesty, it is not so polite to say so, even though I do feel that the Church is getting stronger than ever before. So my article about "The Church in Japan," is not only the success story of the Church in our country, but is also about how the members in Japan have lived through Japanese history.

On 14 February 1901, the Church called Heber J. Grant to go to Japan. Louis A. Kelsch, Horace S. Ensign, and Alma O. Taylor, age nineteen, were with him. They left the United States on 12 August 1901 aboard the ship *The Empress of*

*Dr. Katanuma received his Ph.D. degree in Japanese language and literature from Hokkaido University at Sappora in 1972, and is currently a lecturer at the Kokkaido National College of Education. He was also Visiting Scholar at Brigham Young University during the Spring and Summer terms of 1973.
India and arrived at the Yokohama port several weeks later. On Sunday morning, 1 September, Elder Heber J. Grant went up to the hill of Ohmori with the three elders and offered a sincere dedicatory prayer for the proclamation of the truth and for the bringing to pass of the purposes of the Lord concerning the gathering of Israel and the establishment of righteousness upon the earth. The first Asian mission was begun in this way.

The first convert baptism was a Shinto priest named Hajime Nakazawa. In Japanese Hajime means "first" or "beginning," so it was appropriate that Hajime became our Hajime no member. Naturally he was excommunicated from the Shinto sect to which he belonged. This sect told him that he would be permitted to return to the sect if he gave up the Church of Christ. However, this man did not rejoin his Shinto sect. According to the diary written by Alma O. Taylor, which is now kept in the Church Historian's Office in Salt Lake City, Brother Nakazawa helped Alma O. Taylor as an interpreter in the early days of their missionary work. They went to Tokyo Bay in a small fishing boat—not for fishing, but for baptizing Nakazawa off Tokyo Bay. Elder Grant baptized him; then they returned to the shore and laid their hands upon him. Similarly, that same day, he was ordained to the Aaronic and Melchizedek priesthoods.

Let us concentrate our focus on the general attitude of the Japanese toward our Church in those days. The young generation had a natural interest in Christianity, and all generations except a small number of nationalistic Japanese were interested in American people. Generally speaking, the Japanese had a good feeling about foreigners because they were in a hurry to import the Western civilization, having a high regard for western countries. Our missionaries were not persecuted. However, Protestant and Anglican churches made up all of Christianity in the Meiji Era of Japan (1868-1913). Not the Mormon Church. Young boys and girls rushed to the churches of these Christian sects. I would like to explain this phenomenon through modern Japanese literature. Famous modern literary men such as Kitamura Tokoku, Kunikida Doppo, Masamune Hakuko, Tokutomi Roka, and Shimazaki Toson were influenced by Christianity. If today's students who study Japanese literature hear their names, they would know that these
men were among the most representative writers of modern Japanese literature, and they cannot talk about modern Japanese literature without mentioning them. They used Christianity to write better literature. However, they never used Christianity to get close to God. Why did they have a strange attitude about Christianity? To explain this point, I would like to show a very interesting example as follows:

1. Yuugure shizukani inorisentote
   Yonowazuraiyori shibashi nogaru
2. Kimiyori hokaniwa kikumononaki
   Kokageni hirefushi tsumi o kuinu
3. Sugikoshi megumi o moitsuzuken
   Iyoyo yukusue no sachiozonegau

1. In the twilight
   I have a beautiful dream
   of release from earthly
   afflictions
   for a while
2. No one can hear us
   but my lover
   I go into the shadows of flowers
   and cry for love
3. I continue to think
   of the dream of love
   and love is sin
   and sin is love

Here we can understand that the hymn was changed into a love poem. The word "prayer" was changed into the word "dream." The word "God" was changed into the words, "my lover." The phrase "the Grace of God" was changed into the Japanese phrase, "the dream of love." In my opinion, this adaptation was not made by Shimazaki Toson¹ for the mere sake of making the words nicer, more aesthetic, but to represent his true understanding of what he thought Christianity to be. This was also representative of many young men in the Meiji Era. Therefore, it can be said that such an adaptation

was a spontaneous result. That is to say, in Christianity they found such new, interesting teachings and customs as being able to sit next to girls and talk to them freely, beautiful teachings of equality and love, and then beautiful music. They thought they could get true insight into the Western spirit through Christianity. They learned many new things from the churches, but I think they seemed to be most fascinated in "Confession," which we do not have in our church. I think the young literary men in the Meiji Era came to get a new style of expression through "Confession." They began to express their own consciousness of sin and lust in their literary works. But they could not reach an understanding of what God truly was. Those who belonged to the younger generation in the Meiji Era did not want to know the true meaning of Christianity and Christ's teachings of salvation, but merely wanted to touch the core of European spirit and culture. They expected these Christian churches to release them from the traditional pressure of Neo-Confucianism, which had strongly bound the relationship between men and women by such specific teachings as: "Boys and girls should not sit down next to each other after they become eight years old." This is the reason why the "Hymn to our Heavenly Father" was changed into a love poem by Shimazaki Tsonon.

This general atmosphere also had effects on our church. To the Japanese people, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints was only a religion of a remote countryside in the United States. However, even some other churches refused us. Alma O. Taylor wrote in his diary details about what other churches felt about our church.

On the other hand, however, it seems to me very interesting that some famous Japanese literary men were helpful to our church. For instance, Goro Takahashi, who was a very famous critic in the Meiji Era, wrote the book, Mormon and Mormonism: A Supplemen of the Origin of the American Indian, in Japanese and it was published on 20 August 1902. Heber J. Grant, speaking at General Conference in Salt Lake City later, said that "This man has written a book that, I believe, will do us a world of good." Alma O. Taylor also mentioned this book:

---

3Heber J. Grant in Conference Report of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 5 April 1902.
On the whole, it is quite reliable—when he has stated "Mormon" doctrine he has kept pretty close to some of our good writers. We are not responsible for any of his opinions or the comparisons which he draws. We do not give or sell his book as a "Mormon product," but present it as the writing of a "Non-Mormon" who writes from the standpoint of what the "Mormons" say of themselves and not what their enemies say of them.4

I would like to explain about the very famous modern novelist, Soseki Natsume. Alma O. Taylor contacted him and asked his help in correcting the first translation of the Book of Mormon. He was unable to give time to the correction of the translation of the Book of Mormon. He suggested Hiroharu Ikuta, a recent graduate of the philosophy department of Tokyo Imperial University. Ikuta later became a very famous critic with Ikuta Choko as his pen name, and he revised and corrected some of the manuscript. How wonderful to know that our Heavenly Father directed the most excellent literary men in the Meiji Era to work for our church!

To my regret, I have to touch on the unhappy days of our church in Japan, especially the period following the time when the Anti-Japanese Immigrant Bill5 was established in the United States. Anti-American feeling was increased in Japan, and spontaneously the Japanese people became less congenial to the American people in Japan. Consequently, the Japan mission had to be closed in 1924. I would like to inform you in detail about the history of the times when the Japan mission was closed. On 19 February 1924, the prime minister, Kiyoura Keigo, invited the representatives of Shintoism, Buddhism, and Christianity, and asked them to establish the spiritual foundation of the Japanese, and to instruct the members of each religious sect to be patriotic to Japan. That was, however, a very dangerous sign to democracy in those days in Japan, since the meaning of establishing the foundation of Japanese was to establish militarism, and the meaning of "Patriotic to Japan" was to support "the Imperialism" in Japan. In the next year, the Japanese government passed the Bill of Mandatory Daily Military Education, and this new law became effective in all schools in Japan. On 28 May 1926, the Ministry

5This bill was established in 1924.
The Church in Japan

of Education proclaimed unilaterally the Law of Religions which prohibited free missionary work in Christianity, and made Shintoism the core of nationalism in Japan. During these first twenty-three years (1901-1924) of our missionary work in Japan, we had only 176 convert baptisms. And then Japan rushed into the dark age of the Showa militarism.

During World War II, how did the members in Japan hold their faith? I want to discuss this. There are quite a few members who succeeded in passing through the critical days for those who had faith in God since the Meiji Era. One of these members, Nara Fujiya, is unforgettable. He made efforts to keep contact with members, and published the bulletin called "Shuro" (name of a kind of plant) in a very humble, mimeographed printing. This bulletin was sent to the members in Japan monthly. The members' addresses, to whom "Shuro" was sent are now kept at the library of the Japan East Mission in Sapporo, but the list shows only seventy-two members' addresses, so the other 104 members were lost in those days. The publication of "Shuro," however, had to be discontinued soon because Brother Nara, like all other Japanese, old and young, had to spend all of his time for the military purposes of Japan.

Another member, Sister Kumagai, who was also one of the few early Japanese converts in Sapporo, once told me, as I was writing a drama about the historical events of the Japan Mission, how members in Sapporo held Sunday School at Sister Kumagai's home. A few people attended every Sunday to study the Gospel, singing hymns, and giving sincere prayer. However, the young men who attended there gradually disappeared one by one. Some of them went to work at factories, and some went to the battlefield. I heard from Sister Kumagai that policemen often came to her house when she was playing the hymns, because the hymn itself was the song of an enemy country. It might be hard for you to imagine, but we Japanese people could not use any English words during the World War II. So instead of the word "ereveita" for "elevator," we had to say "Johgeshokoki," which means, "the machine for going up and down." We had to use the Japanese language even when we played baseball. We used to say "auto," for

*The list is two pages long, and on the cover there is a title "Matsujitsu Seito Jesu Kirisuto Kyokai Jushoroku."*
"out," but now "out" was "shini," which meant "dead." But the dead man who slid to second base always stood up again.

It is sad but true that most of the Japanese members lost their faith in our Heavenly Father through the severe, miserable times of the war, and only a few members were keeping the torch of the Gospel held high. I cannot help saying thanks to those who have kept their faith, because the new mission started with such wonderful members who were always obedient to the Gospel.

The first step in the new missionary work was to seek good meeting places in Tokyo, because during the war, Tokyo was completely burned out. From the Sunday School records of those days, which were written in detail by Brother Nara, we can find some names of American soldiers who made efforts to find meeting places for the members in the Tokyo area. Some of these names were Komatsu and Horiuchi; Brother Komatsu later became a mission president and then a regional representative. Another man, Horiuchi, became a mission president of the Japan East Mission, too. Sister Kumagai once told me about the time two missionaries arrived in Sapporo. She worked at the Hokkaido Newspaper at that time, so she phoned the copyreader and said, "Here is some good news! The missionaries of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints have come to Japan again!" It was surely great news for Japan.

One of the first missionaries who came to Sapporo was Paul C. Andrus. He became a mission president of the Northern Far East Mission, including Japan, Korea, Taiwan, and other Asian countries, and is now a regional representative of the Twelve. In the earlier time of the new missionary work, the church meetings were held in Tokyo only. Before long, missionaries worked in Takasaki, Nagoya, Ohsaka, Yokohama, Sendai, Sapporo, Niigata, Kofu, and Kanazawa. In the Tokyo area they worked in Ikebukuro, Koenji, Shibuya, and Minami-isenzoku. These thirteen branches were, of course, not enough for the Japanese. Later the Church opened fourteen more new branches. So we soon had twenty-seven branches in Japan. For the next ten years, however, there were no other new branches added to the proselyting areas in Japan. That was

7These records are now in the possession of Brother Nara, with a copy kept in the library of the Japan East Mission at Sapporo.
until about 1965. Now we have two stakes and five different missions, including 107 braches in Japan. So if you take a train in Japan, you can find our church in every city where the express train stops.

That is to summarize the recent growth in Japan since 1968. The mission has doubled twice, from one to five. Two stakes have been organized. More than half a million Japanese visited our pavilion at EXPO '70. Seminaries have recently started. Missionaries have increased from less than two hundred to over eight hundred. Branches have gone from 27 to 107, and convert baptisms have gone from a couple of hundred, to over 3,000 per year.

Although these statistics are exciting, we must be realistic in our appraisal of them. As in all parts of the world when baptism numbers begin to boom, unfortunately, inactive and dropout numbers also begin to boom. Therefore, in order to keep the Church growing, and to keep more people active, and to be able to reach all of the Japanese with the message of the Gospel, we must look very seriously at present-day Japanese society. I feel Japan is now at a major turning point in her history. We have had so many fruitful results and uncountable blessings from our Heavenly Father in preaching the Gospel. To develop our church more, we have, of course, many problems to overcome, as we have had in the past. One of the problems which has been on my mind is quite a new problem which we Japanese members have never had in the past Church history of Japan.

In recent days, there appears a notable sign of change which we can recognize by general social phenomena in Japan. Part of this social phenomena seems to be a rushing to the past, to traditional Japan. After World War II, we adopted a western-style democracy, and progressed very rapidly economically. Because of this rapid economic progress, many are beginning to feel that we have sold out our Japanese uniqueness in the process. So, lately, there has been a reaction against post-war democracy in Japan, and a new interest in traditional Japan. It is not that we are trying to return completely to pre-war Japan, but rather that we are trying for a new Japanese (rather than Western) blend of traditionalism and modernization. Thus, we are heading somewhere we have never been before.
As a political phenomenon, I would like to explain that now the Japanese people are facing the problem of which party they should choose, the Liberal Democratic Party, or the Socialist or Communist Party. It seems quite strange to me that even the Japanese Communist Party must be not internationalistic, but nationalistic. This party insists that they will establish a proper Japanese Communist country, without any interferences of foreign Communist countries, and this party is making an effort to alter Communist terminology to fit into the Japanese mentality. In the meantime, two ministers of the present ruling Tanaka Cabinet caused some trouble by strongly emphasizing their opinion that Emperor Hirohito is the essence of Japan and her people and culture. This bothered many, since it was reminiscent of pre-war, militaristic Japan, and present-day Democrats say the people themselves, not the Emperor, are the core of Japan.

As a cultural phenomenon in Japan, many traditional arts, like NO-Play, Kabuki, and Calligraphy, are being favored by the younger generation for a change. And many religious books are now booming in Japan. Are the Japanese becoming more religious? Are they going to switch their minds from the economic animal to the religious animal? Why are there such phenomena in Japan? Does it have a special meaning to our church? I would like to explain why these changes might be as dangerous to our church as the changes which took place before the war. We need more information in order to understand the real meaning of this problem. These changes are coming from the desire that the Japanese people have to find their own identity and traditions. They are longing for their own identity. Consequently, this enthusiastic desire means that we must deny the days of post-World War II. What were the days of post-World War II? In those days we borrowed many things from the United States of America, just as the Japanese had borrowed many things from Europe one hundred years ago, and had borrowed much Chinese culture 1200 years ago. We borrowed American democracy, jazz music, movies, literature, and so on. We also borrowed even the life style of America. To the Japanese people, the United States was the idealistic and dreamlike country they saw represented in a lot of Hollywood movies. When we were hungry, the Americans in the movies ate big dinners. When we walked on rough
roads, they drove Cadillacs. When we lived in humble houses, they lived in big houses with swimming pools. When we were in a crisis because of the political confrontation between the Government party and the opposite parties, they were discussing difficult political matters humorously and democratically in the movies. However, the Japanese people—especially the young men—are becoming aware of the fact that all these things which seemed to us so good were just in the movies made in Hollywood. As they became aware of the fact that America was fallible in such things as the Vietnam War, and the Negro problem, and some inequality, they became disillusioned with all of America. Many young men in Japan are now singing old-fashioned songs such as "My Castle Town," etc. which praise the Japanese-like atmosphere in a town, where there was once a Samurai's castle; at the same time they are enjoying the Beatles' songs, for instance, "Let it Be."

The government of Japan represented by the Liberal Democratic Party now seems to be in a crisis. Probably the election of Tokyo assemblymen held soon will be an important indicator of how the Liberal Democratic Party will do in the future. On the other hand, both the Socialist and Communist parties are getting stronger. From Tokyo to Osaka, the governors of the main prefectures, and the mayors of the main cities are all socialists and communists. Why are so many Japanese people turning against the Liberal Democratic Party? Only the scholars of politics or sociology can give us the true meaning. From my point of view as a scholar of literature, the Liberal Democratic Party has been a typical political party which did the typical function after the war. It has been representative of the days of post-World War II. The decline of this party, in my opinion, is closely connected with the social phenomenon which denies the days of post-World War II, and rushes back to tradition. Of course, this phenomenon, as I already mentioned, did not begin only recently. Several years ago, there were many radical movements in Japan among the students called the "New Left." They had such slogans as, "Deny the democracy of the post-World War era." Especially I want to call your attention to Mishima's Harakiri. Why did he commit suicide by doing Harakiri? There are, of course, many elements to analyze in his Harakiri. However, it can be said that he also thought we should turn from the post-war
democracy to traditionalism. He thought that democracy had destroyed the traditional virtues of the Japanese people.

I think we Japanese members need to think more about this new situation which we have never had before. Our church, is, of course, not an American church. It is the Church of Jesus Christ, who is God of all people on this planet. I have already pointed out that the Japanese people in recent days are denying America itself, and in a way returning to their traditions. If most of the Japanese people look at our church as an American church, can it stand the changes of time? I dare say, this is not the problem of "If," but the problem of "Reality." As far as I know, many Japanese intellectual men already take our church as an American church, that is, the question is not if the Japanese look upon us as an American church, but since they now do look upon us as an American church, what can we do?

I will give my definite conclusion about these matters. I think one of the most important ideas in overcoming this problem is to have a formula like: "Internationalization of the Church necessitates nationalization of the Church." It does not mean that the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints becomes a Japanese people's church. It means that our church in Japan becomes the church for the Japanese. What methods can we take for this purpose? How can we do that? In the first place, I think we Japanese members should pay attention to our brethren's need, desire, and hope to go back to their traditional things, and their reason for wanting to do so. These brothers are not nameless existences called the Japanese, but are our neighbors themselves. And it is necessary for us to reconsider ourselves, whether or not we preach the virtues of America when we preach Mormonism to our neighbors. As part of the beautiful traditions of Japan, as well as of China, Korea, and other Asian countries, we think much of our family and ancestors. Since these are the same virtues our church continuously teaches us, we need only an efficient way to approach the Japanese on these subjects. Do we try to understand the Buddhists and Shintoists with the same respect we ask of them? Or do we have a strange isolationism in terms of thinking ourselves the chosen people in Japan? I myself was a Buddhist. I do not think my knowledge and experience as a Buddhist became obstacles in my joining our church. I
had done Zazen⁸ for a week before I began studying our church, from early morning till night. I learned through this experience to concentrate by myself on one thing and to understand the importance of thinking by myself in the silent world. And I also understood what the spiritual world was. Because of the deep meditation and spiritual insight I gained from Zazen I was better able to understand our scriptures. I could identify with Nephi when he said, "I was led by the spirit not knowing beforehand the things which I should do." (1 Nephi 4:6).

I gained an affinity for many other scriptures also, and could better understand how Jesus and the prophets thought. For instance, when the Pharisees brought the adulterous woman to Jesus and tempted him to condemn her, the Bible says:

But Jesus stooped down and with his finger wrote on the ground, as though he heard them not. (John 6:6)

From my Zazen experience, I could feel what Jesus was thinking at this time. In these ways traditional thought can sometimes aid us in understanding God’s teachings.

What role can the Japanese members play in the new situation of society in Japan? If the Church's teaching methods, textbooks, and image are not changed in Japan, will it not retard the Lord's work there in relationship to the rapidly changing social scene? I think if we ignore a consideration of this new situation, that is, how can we make Japanese people recognize that our church is not an American church but their own church, then our church in Japan will meet somewhat troublesome trials. Of course I do not forget the exhortation which our Lord spoke:

My son, despise not thou the chastening of the Lord, nor faint when thou art rebuked of him: For whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth. (Hebrews 12:5-6)

We know, of course, we will be chastened and tried for our religion, but we would rather be persecuted for our true doctrine and faith than for a false American image.

We members in Japan have, as I have mentioned already, many problems which are sobering and challenging. There will never be any other men to take these problems in Japan

⁸To sit in Zen meditation.
except the Japanese people. So I want to emphasize as my conclusion that we have to pay attention to the transculturalization of curricular materials, because the scriptures urge the Church to speak to men "after the manner of their language, that they might come to understanding." (Doctrine & Covenants 1:24) We have never had such an opportunity to think over the connotations between our tradition and our church. That is the newest and most pressing problem. And "the works, and the designs, and the purposes of God cannot be frustrated, neither can they come to naught." (Doctrine & Covenants 3:1)

I think for our Japanese members, as well as you in every nation, as James E. Talmage once said, "that there is room and place for every truth within the Gospel of Jesus Christ, thus far learned by man, or yet to be made known."9

---

9Passage taken from Elder James E. Talmage’s monument in the Salt Lake City Cemetery.
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religion in public schools, we therefore could not teach ethics. Perhaps we need to reassess that assumption and work towards the development of courses on social and political ethics for all levels of education. We have taught in our public schools what is "right" and "left" in American politics, but not what is right and wrong. To teach accountable citizenship at all levels of education may be more important in the long run, than teaching specific skills. Any skill, whether carpentry, nuclear physics, or administration, is merely a tool which can be used for good or evil, to build or to destroy. What good is a mandate without virtue or the right to vote without wisdom?
Andrew Jenson,
Latter-day Saint Historian

LOUIS REINWAND*

Andrew Jenson was born on 11 December 1850 in Torslev, Hjørring Amt, Denmark, to Christian and Kiersten (Andersen) Jensen. His parents became converts to the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in 1854, and he himself was baptized a member of that church in 1859 at the age of eight. His parents were very poor, and though his father was a farmer and craftsman the family remained in a condition of poverty. After building several homes near Andrew’s birthplace, Christian was forced through need and an injury to one of his feet to take up clock repairing as a full-time occupation. For this purpose he moved to Saebj in 1863, and after one year sent for his family.

*Louis Reinwand, who completed his Master’s Degree in history at Brigham Young University in May 1971, has served as a research assistant for Church Historian, Leonard Arrington. After completing most of the research for this paper, the writer learned of the preparation of a Master of Arts thesis at Brigham Young University by Keith W. Perkins, entitled “A Study of the Contributions of Andrew Jensen to the Writing and Preservation of LDS Church History.” He recommends this splendid thesis as a more thorough examination of the subject of this essay. The quotations he has taken from the thesis are with Mr. Perkins’ permission.

With respect to the change in surname spelling from Jensen to Jenson, Andrew wrote: “When I came here [to Utah] at 15 years of age not having done much as a boy I was influenced to change my Danish name Andreas to its equivalent in English, namely Andrew. And in making this change I thought I might as well introduce the o in Jenson instead of the e as the Icelanders, the English and Scotch spell it to this day.” (Jenson to Richard R. Lyman, 22 February 1938, Jenson Papers at Historical Department, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City, Utah [hereafter referred to as HDC]).
The family's meager condition required that the two oldest boys, Jens and Andrew, fare for themselves at an early age. Andrew was ten and Jens twelve when they assumed their first herding jobs. An illness required Andrew's return the second summer, and because his father was away much of the time there was ample work for Andrew at home for the next two years. After his father moved his mother and younger brother (Joseph) to Saeby in 1864, the older boys were on their own.

The Jensen boys were ridiculed and treated harshly by the local schoolmaster on account of their new religion, so for a time they were tutored at home by their parents and by the Mormon missionaries. Eventually, though, Andrew and Jens attended the common school where Andrew, excelling in his studies, completed his required state education one year before his brother. Encouraged to stay another year for Jens' benefit, Andrew received an education that was superior to that of his peers.

Rather than work as a farm hand, Andrew began a peddling career. Within five months he had earned eighty dollars while his brother Jens, working for a local farmer, could earn only six dollars. This income enabled Andrew to immigrate to America in 1866 with his parents and his younger brother Joseph. Andrew promised to help his brother Jens emigrate to America with any money he might earn in "Zion."

After arriving in the Salt Lake Valley in October 1866, the family headed south, Andrew's father going to Sanpete Valley while the two boys and their mother stopped in Pleasant Grove. They were soon reunited in Ephraim, and Andrew worked there until March of 1867 taking care of stock. Their residency in Sanpete was short-lived, for Black Hawk, the Indian chief, had resumed hostilities against the Mormons. Because of this and because of an operation which led to the amputation of Andrew's father's injured foot, the family moved back to Pleasant Grove. During this year and the next Andrew worked as a laborer—plowing, making adobe brick, herding, building a home, and helping to dig the Provo Bench Canal.

*Andrew Jenson, *Autobiography of Andrew Jenson* (Salt Lake City, 1938), pp. 1-8. Unless otherwise noted, all the biographical information found in this essay may be found in the *Autobiography.*
Although he preferred "study to hard manual labor," Andrew was "compelled through circumstances to assist in earning a living for the family." Earning a living did not mean staying at home, and at age eighteen, after seeing his mother settled and provided for, he set out for Echo Canyon to work with Mormon railroad crews. His journal contains one of the finest first-hand accounts of the grading and meeting of the transcontinental railroads. His thorough descriptions emphasize the heavy work, the bitter winter cold, and the raw humor of the railroad camps. Andrew experienced his share of pain and hard work as a "gandy dancer," at one point suffering a mule kick that broke his jaw.¹

Andrew's apprenticeship in the Wasatch mountains was rough and lonely. Though he made it home on occasion to help with the harvest or the construction of a new home, he always seemed eager to return to the railroad for the high wages which were offered. By 1869 Andrew was able to send money to allow Jens to immigrate from Denmark. When the two brothers met near the railroad camp where Andrew was working, their greatest thrill was that each had remained loyal to the standards of the Church. Together they returned to Pleasant Grove, where their mother, since her separation from Christian, had been living alone with Joseph.

Jens began to farm immediately; accustomed to farm work, he was a success where Andrew had failed. Andrew, his responsibilities to Jens discharged, set out once again to work as a grader on the "highway of nations."² But most of the railroad contracts were near completion and so he was soon out of work. Andrew's boss, greatly impressed with him, offered him a free pass to Omaha, Nebraska. But with the gullibility of one so young, Andrew got off in Cheyenne, Wyoming, with an associate who inveigled out of him both his ticket and his money. Andrew managed to obtain employment in a local railroad shop and turntable, however, and soon earned enough money to press on to Omaha.

In Nebraska, Andrew found that the only available work was on local farms. Determined not to work for the low

¹Aubio*graphy, pp. 28-29.
²The Mormon contracts to do the grading for the Pacific Railroad are described in Leonard Arrington, Great Basin Kingdom: An Economic History of the Latter-day Saints, 1830-1900 (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1958) pp. 258-269.
³Andrew Jenson, Diary, 20 June 1868, MSS., HDC.
wages being paid, he began to sell pictures, just as he had in Denmark, adding maps of the United States to his collection of wares. He met with little success, and when a chance came to return to Utah, he took it.

On his return trip, made during the summer of 1871, Andrew served as herdsman on a cattle drive. He referred to himself during this period as a cowboy, and in a sense that is what he was. His diary and autobiography provide excellent descriptions of the life of a nineteenth-century cattle drover. Upon his return to Utah, Andrew worked on a grading crew for the Bingham Canyon and Camp Floyd Railroad, which was constructed in 1872-1873 from the Utah Southern Railroad track near Sandy to Bingham. Then he was offered the chance to work as a grocery clerk in American Fork Canyon at a branch store constructed especially for miners and railroaders in the area. Jenson’s rough treatment at the hands of a group of intoxicated and unruly miners who knocked the tent-store down and stole some merchandise upset him; after working on for another week he returned home.

Several days later, Andrew obtained employment helping to grade eight miles of roadbed for the American Fork Railroad from the Utah Southern Railroad track to mines in American Fork Canyon. When this job was completed, he and a friend formed a partnership to fish in Utah Lake. Meeting with little success in this enterprise, he made a trip to Richfield to see his brother and help him with his farm labors. During the winter months he sold lithograph pictures. Jenson was now twenty-two years old, and began “to look upon life in a more serious way than before.” He “had herded sheep and cattle, worked on railroads, in mines, in smelters and on farms.” He had also “been a store clerk, fisherman and salesman.”6 Now was the time to begin a career, to change his life, to concern himself with his future.

ANDREW’S FIRST HISTORICAL LABORS

In 1873 Andrew became an American citizen. Next, he received a call to serve on a mission to his native land of Denmark. Ordained a Seventy, he was given a cordial send-off by his family and friends, and embarked on an experience that would give new meaning and direction to his labor.

---

6Autobiography, p. 65.
Andrew encountered the usual frustrations of the Mormon missionary. At one time, after being insulted at a small meeting in Säby, he "squared up" to the accuser "with clenched fists, the spirit of my cowboy life asserting itself, ready to strike him." Nevertheless, he adjusted to the work and was "eminently successful in most instances." Advanced to a position of leadership, he began to travel about the mission. He preached in meetinghouses and public parks, and was moderately successful in converting persons with his honest and open speech.

In 1875, after his return to Utah, Andrew resumed work on a spur line into Cottonwood Canyon—presumably the narrow gauge tramway constructed from Fairfield Flat to Alta, in Little Cottonwood Canyon, during 1875-1876. After his mission, however, such labor was repugnant to his growing sensibilities. He organized and published a manuscript newspaper, "The Rising Star," for the young people of Pleasant Grove. Andrew's diary entries suggest that he often wandered into the nearby hills to meditate and think about the future. While pondering alternative courses of action, he hit upon a bold plan—he would translate the "History of Joseph Smith" (which had appeared serially in the Latter-day Saints' Millennial Star) into the Danish-Norwegian language.

Andrew began work immediately, pausing only long enough to send letters outlining his intentions to the General Authorities of the Church. He was granted permission to begin the work, but was told that he would have to submit the translation to Apostle Erastus Snow for final approval. He was also told that he must expect no remuneration from the Church—he would have to cover his own expenses.

Jenson's potential reading audience, of course, was limited to the non-English reading Scandinavians in the territory (and in Scandinavia), which meant that he had to contact them personally in order to inform them of his projected work. Since it was financially impossible for him to publish the work all at once, and because of the low incomes of his reading audience, Jenson had to serialize it, distributing it to his

\[1\] Autobiography, p. 69.


\[3\] Autobiography, p. 93. Andrew had begun some writing of the history while on his mission.
subscribers on a weekly basis. Only after the total printing was completed—a period which might extend over several months of weekly mailings—could he at last bind a few of the remaining copies into single volumes. This pattern of finance characterized all of his early publishing work. Later he was able to publish some works in a single printing, but he still underwrote the cost himself. Only late in his life did the Church advance Jenson money to aid with the publication of his books.

Andrew attacked his publication problems with vigor and enthusiasm. Traveling through the various settlements, he conversed with the Scandinavian Saints and often spoke at their weekday and Sunday meetings. There was some adverse comment about these subscription drives, of course, and some thought Andrew a little "pushy" in peddling his own works. His son, Harold H. Jenson, has written the following about this tendency to censure his father’s promotional activities:

Only one criticism can be made of father’s determination, and that is his over-ambition to accomplish what he thought was for the best good of all. Those who are best acquainted with him know that his activities are not based on selfish motives. He never made money on his books, and anyone who has had anything to do with printing and publishing will realize the hard task he has had to raise the necessary funds to pay for printing and binding. His solicitations sometimes may have been misconstrued by some, but his books will live on to benefit future generations and to be appreciated by those who as subscribers contributed a little towards making the publication of them possible.10

In 1877, while traveling through southern Utah on similar business Andrew seized the opportunity to meet Brigham Young. During the same period he was also in close contact with Apostle Erastus Snow, who, besides correcting his translations and making suggestions where necessary, gave Andrew friendship and encouragement.

In canvassing the state for subscriptions, mailing the newly printed *Joseph Smith's Levnetslob* (History of Joseph Smith), and working on the Scandinavian newspaper, *Bikuben* (Beehive), Andrew was involved in a labor of love. He enjoyed a certain status and received a modest income, which enabled him to build a home in Pleasant Grove. His skills in writing

---

10 *Autobiography*, p. 671; also *ibid.*, p. 394.
English and Danish were vastly improved when he was called on a second gospel mission to Denmark in 1879. There he studied from distinguished teachers and assisted with the writing and translation of English articles for the Danish Church paper, Skandinavien's Stjerne (Scandinavia's Star), and edited a monthly periodical for young people called Ungdommens Raadgiver (Counselor of Youth). He was named president of the Copenhagen branch and eventually assistant to the president of the mission. He compiled a reference to the Bible and with President Niels Wilhelmsen, retranslated the Book of Mormon. When President Wilhelmsen died suddenly, Andrew was given temporary charge of the mission.

Andrew's autobiographical notations reveal his concern that Scandinavian converts be accorded greater recognition in Utah. At one point, he mentions that Frederik Samuelsen, a member of the Danish Rigdag (Parliament), who had converted to Mormonism and who had made great efforts to help the cause of the Church in Denmark, was so badly treated in Utah because of language difficulties that he was "broken hearted for the quiet life he was forced to lead." Jenson undertook a one-man crusade to portray Scandinavian immigrants to advantage. The modern researcher will be struck with the heavy sprinkling of Scandinavians in his Biographical Encyclopedia.

Upon the completion of his second mission Andrew busied himself with a new periodical for the Scandinavians which he titled Morgenstjernen (Morning Star). He had never been satisfied with Bikuben, even when he had assisted in its publication. He tried to make his new magazine better, basing its emphasis on history. When Jenson's enthusiastic drive for subscriptions to Morgenstjernen made inroads on Bikuben, the complaints of his rivals reached the ears of Church leaders, who called both editors into the Church offices in Salt Lake City. Jenson was told that one Scandinavian paper was enough and that he should support Bikuben. Still, Church leaders were impressed with Jenson's abilities as a writer and his-

11Andrew says of this call: "... the authorities of the Church desired that I should obtain a better knowledge of the Danish language, so that I might be used by the Church in the future as a writer and translator." Autobiography, p. 110.
torian. They therefore asked him to continue publishing materials similar to those in the *Morgenstjernen*, but these must be done in English. His *Morgenstjernen* was retitled *The Historical Record*. During this period Andrew also kept busy writing and publishing parts of his *Biographical Encyclopedia and Church Chronology*. In addition, he translated the Pearl of Great Price into Scandinavian.

Andrew's wife, Mary, whom he married in 1875, became sick in 1886, with little chance of recovery. He was deeply concerned about her and the future of his four children (Andrew A., Parley P., Mary Minerva, and Eleonore E.). Andrew's solution, with the knowledge and consent of Mary, was to take a second wife—a young Britisher named Emma Howell. Mary died shortly thereafter (3 January 1887), but her children were not left without a mother. Three additional children were born to Emma: Alfred H., who died in infancy, Harold H., and Eva H. In 1888, Andrew entered into a third marriage, this time with Emma's sister, Bertha, bringing her and her mother to live in his home. The Church was now in the midst of the Anti-Polygamy Raid, and to enter plurality was illegal under the Edmunds Act. Consequently, Jenson traveled alone toward Manti, and met Bertha in a clandestine manner on the way. After the marriage he drove his team into Salt Lake City with his new bride. No children were born to Andrew and Bertha, but they adopted one child, Leo Rulon.

Andrew believed that his children should make their own way as early as possible. Away from home much of the time, his income was modest indeed. His family received $50 a month in tithing orders from 1888 to 1891, after which it was raised to $100 per month. Two of his children, Eva and Harold, worked with Andrew in the Church Historian's Office; his oldest son, Andrew, remained a sheepherder throughout his life. Clearly, Jenson's family also sacrificed for the cause of Church history.

In 1888 Andrew obtained permission from the First Presidency to make a trip to the east to visit former *Mormon*

---

13Jenson wrote of this episode: "On the 'divide' between Fountain Green and Salt Creek Canyon we met some deputy marshals who were searching for polygamists. Had they known what Bertha and I knew they could have made a 'haul' right there and then." *Autobiography*, p. 148.

sites and to gather historical information. Setting aside work on the first volume of his *Biographical Encyclopedia*, he traveled with Edward Stevenson and Joseph S. Black to Missouri, Illinois, Ohio, New York, and other places of historic interest to the Latter-day Saints. Upon their return, Jenson published a detailed report to the Saints on the status of their former homes; he also spoke to capacity crowds in Salt Lake City and other Utah towns.

**ASSISTANT CHURCH HISTORIAN**

This trip established Andrew Jenson as a collector and organizer of Church historical materials. He moved into this area with relish, having tired of his arduous editing and publishing ventures. Apostle Erastus Snow continued to be Jenson's advocate in these labors. After Elder Snow's death, Apostle Franklin D. Richards who was Church Historian, became his advocate, followed by President Joseph F. Smith, to whose daughter Harold Jenson was married and who was one of Andrew's neighbors. Jenson was also on a friendly basis with Anthon H. Lund, Charles Penrose, Francis M. Lyman, and Anthony W. Ivins.15

In 1889 Erastus Snow hinted to Jenson that he (Andrew) might be called by the Church to serve as Assistant Historian. Being somewhat self-assertive, Jenson wrote a letter to the First Presidency in which he offered his services to the Church at no cost. This offer was forthrightly rejected, as was a similar offer in 1886. These offers were probably designed to secure official sponsorship of his historical labors and publications.

In 1891, however, Jenson was set apart as a historian. He had been traveling for the Church, and because the Historian's Office was in need of his skills, it was decided to give him this status. All along, of course, he had been working full time as a Mormon writer and historian, and although he had been receiving fifty dollars a month from the Church since 1888, most of his income had been from the sale of his books and articles. With his energies now being directed primarily toward the collection of historical data, it was imperative that the Church provide some further financial support. Later,

---

15 *Autobiography*, pp. 131, 132, 147, 522, 634.
in 1898, he was sustained and set apart as Assistant Church Historian.

The officials of the Church liked the work Jenson had done on the history of the Scandinavian Mission, a project on which he had worked during the mission's jubilee while he was in Denmark on his second mission. The authorities wanted him to prepare similar histories of all the wards, stakes, and missions. This assignment gave him further opportunities to travel. Throughout the remainder of his life, no matter where he went, he always took time to glean pertinent materials from the Church's local records.

The 1890s were exciting years for Jenson. Traveling through the West and the nation, working with bishops, stake presidents, and mission presidents and staying in their homes, he was treated very much like a General Authority. Almost invariably, he was given an opportunity to speak in local wards, and was often called upon to speak in stake conferences. In 1895, the Church called Jenson to visit the foreign missions to gather historical data. Starting from Utah in May 1895, he first made his way through the Pacific Islands. After visiting New Zealand and Australia, he made a leisurely tour of Southeast Asia. By July 1896 he was in the Near East, where he spent many days visiting the Holy Land. After traveling through Italy into France, he crossed the channel to England. There he met Emma, who had come to travel with him. After visiting Emma's birthplace and relatives in England, and after taking her through Denmark and Sweden, Andrew sent her back to Utah while he continued his travels. He went to the Church's missions in Germany, the Netherlands, England, Ireland, and Scotland. Although he took time to do some sightseeing and deliver sermons on Church history, he collected historical information in all the places he visited. In June 1897, after twenty-five months and 60,000 miles, he finally returned home, followed by a multitude of boxes containing records and other historical materials obtained on his journey.

Back in Salt Lake City, Jenson was given the responsibility of managing the floundering Bikuben. Jenson's administrative skills and tireless energy were soon in evidence. The paper regained its footing and never again had to rely on the Church for funding. Jenson's diary comment on this new calling was, "I would rather have gone on another foreign mission
than receive this appointment, but, being called by the highest authority in the Church, I accepted the task."\textsuperscript{16}

For a period events seemed to turn against Andrew. At the October conference in 1900, he was not sustained as an Assistant Church Historian. He was also told the new Historian's Office would probably not be built for some time. Stake leaders criticized the vigor with which he sought to dispose of copies of \textit{Church Chronology}. He began making plans to organize the Andrew Jenson History Company, and apparently contemplated leaving the Church Historian's Office. He became so depressed that he took a "lonely" walk into the mountains, where he engaged in "secret prayer and meditations." The result of his experience was the receipt of a personal revelation in which the Lord chided him for being "too ambitious" and caring "too much for the opinion of men." "My son, be of good cheer," he was told; "be patient yet a little while."\textsuperscript{17}

During the next few years Jenson, now about fifty years of age, reached the height of his career as a historian. He turned the ownership of his \textit{Church Chronology} over to the Church, and was engaged in preparing the \textit{Scandinavian Jubilee Album}. Of more importance was the revision of the Book of Mormon translation he had done while on his second mission, this time in collaboration with Apostle Anthon H. Lund. When the revision was completed he took it to Europe for printing. Then he went to England to meet his wife Bertha, whom he treated to the same whirlwind tour of Europe that he had previously given her sister Emma.

After his return home, he quickly resumed his literary and historical labors. In 1904, he was on the move again—this time as a witness in the Smoot trial in Washington, D.C. He then proceeded overseas to Sweden, where he helped dedicate the new Swedish mission home, a building for which he had helped raise money. He also arranged for the printing of a second edition of \textit{Joseph Smith's Levensløb}. His return trip was dedicated to the collection of historical materials in Germany, England, and in the eastern United States.

Two years later, in 1909, Jenson once again left Utah for Denmark, to serve as president of the Scandinavian Mission.

\textsuperscript{16}\textit{Autobiography}, p. 391.

\textsuperscript{17}This paragraph is based primarily on quotations from Jenson's diary and accompanying discussion in Perkins, pp. 58-60.
The mission was made enjoyable by the visits of several General Authorities and of his wife Emma and daughter Eva, with whom he did considerable sightseeing. Much of Jenson’s energy on this mission was directed toward establishing the Mormons’ legal rights. He also became involved in a series of debates with anti-Mormons who were seeking to nullify the missionaries’ efforts. His participation in these heated debates eventually resulted in a libel suit brought against him by the anti-Mormon speaker, Hans Freece. Finally released from his mission in 1912, but with the lawsuit still pending, Jenson left for home. He lost the lawsuit, and because he had already departed some Church property was seized to pay the fine.\textsuperscript{16} Unaware of this development at the time, Jenson was on his second round-the-world tour which took him across Russia to Japan and then home.

The years 1912 to 1920 were spent primarily in the American West. Jenson worked on his histories, published a second and third volume of the Biographical Encyclopedia, and made a series of short trips to Idaho, southern Utah, the Grand Canyon, and California. His life was occasionally spiced by such events as the organization of a round-the-world club, the removal of the Historian’s Office to the new Church Office Building, his son Harold’s mission call, and his own celebrated birthday parties.

In 1921 Anthon H. Lund, Church Historian and member of the First Presidency, died. Although tradition dictated that the next Church Historian be chosen from the ranks of the Quorum of the Twelve, many persons regarded Jenson as the prime candidate for the position. President Lund was “the Scandinavian Apostle,” and various persons suggested that Andrew might be a logical person to fill the vacancy in the Quorum of the Twelve as well as the office of Church Historian. That he might be chosen to fill both positions may have also occurred to Brother Jenson, who wrote in his diary:

He [President Lund] and I had labored together these many years and had been so intimate and bound together in loving friendship. I wonder what effect Bro. Lund’s death will have upon my own career and usefulness in the Church in the future? . . . Peculiar reflections passed through my mind regarding the contemplation of my life’s career, and

\textsuperscript{16}Autobiography, pp. 480-482, 489; Salt Lake Tribune, 8 September 1912.
before I knew of it I was reasoning and talking with myself and at last prayed in a subdued voice laying my case before the Lord in humility and asking him to guide me aright and give me strength to bear whatsoever might be coming into my life.  

When he was selected for neither position, Jenson suffered some anguish of spirit:

I ask myself if I have done anything wrong whereby the Lord should be displeased with me, or why with my increased ability and diligence I should lose out instead of gaining with my brethren in the Priesthood. Yet, here I am, sidetracked...after a lifelong struggle, during which I have given my best to Church work and have reserved nothing...Is it wrong in the sight of the Lord for a man to expect reward of recognizance for real merit? Is there no such thing as appreciation when a man puts his whole soul into a work which is aimed at doing good and to benefit the cause of God and mankind generally? I left the library in a solemn mood.

Much later he wrote, "I am driving no stakes, laying no plans and having no expectations, so I look for no disappointments."

Fearful that the Church would let the Church Historian's Office atrophy, Andrew found the very possibility heart-breaking. In a letter dated 12 July 1921, Jenson asked the First Presidency if his life and devotion had been in vain, and if so would they confirm this so that he could change his course and find a new profession to which he could direct his labors. Their reply, which is unavailable, seems to have given him mild encouragement in his historical labors.

In 1923, Jenson set out on a tour of South America. It was an extensive trip, requiring the better part of the year, and was regarded by Jenson as his first vacation from historical labors. His observations and recommendations probably

---

9Diary, 3 March 1921. Apparently, Jenson was once considered to fill a vacancy in the Council of Seven Presidents of the Seventy. Perkins, pp. 29-30.
10Diary, 23 March 1921; see also Autobiography, p. 541. Jenson's innermost thoughts, as exemplified in this diary notation, were seldom evident to those around him. His family were not aware of any strong feelings he may have had at the time about church position. President Anthon H. Lund assured him that he was "honored in the Church and it is not positions but works that will count." Diary of Anthon H. Lund, 22 October 1912, MSS., HDC.

12Diary, 12 July 1912; Autobiography, pp. 542-543.
contributed to the ultimate establishment of missions among the people of South America.

JENSON'S HISTORICAL LABORS: LAST PHASE

Under the impression that President Heber J. Grant desired to curb (or perhaps not expand) the activities of the Historian's Office, Jenson reduced his history compiling activities. This was partly a matter of necessity because of the shortage of help. His mammoth Journal History was cut short, covering the period 1830 to about 1900 instead of the first century of Church history as he had earlier planned. Since the manuscript histories of the stakes and missions were almost completed for the first century, he was given permission to make one last historical trip through the stakes in 1930 to bring this labor to a conclusion.

Aside from the 1930 jaunt, Jenson's travels in the 1920's and '30s were mostly for his own pleasure. In the years from 1926 until his death on 18 November 1941, he visited Canada twice, Alaska, Denmark, Hawaii, many of the western states, and traveled extensively in Utah, visiting as many of the Mormon historical sites as possible. The old Scandinavian had a special interest in driving and hiking along the pioneer trails. He even traveled the entire length of the Mormon Battalion Trail.

His scholarly and publishing activity continued. In 1927 he published the History of the Scandinavian Mission and in 1936, by request of the First Presidency, he published a fourth volume of the Biographical Encyclopedia. He also decided to edit his diaries for publication as an autobiography, which was published in 1938. Three years later, his Encyclopedic History of the Church appeared.

In 1930 Jenson gave his private library to the Church on the condition that it be placed in a separate room. His gift was accepted and he surrounded himself at the Church Historian's Office with his private collection. Junius F. Wells, Assistant Church Historian, installed a large sign in gold print—THE ANDREW JENSON LIBRARY—a life-size photograph of Jenson, and a world map which had the routes of his many trips traced upon it. Jenson's collection of books

Diary, October 1921.
and pamphlets is still retained as a separate entity in the Church Historian's Library and Archives. Subsequent to the donation of his personal library to the Church, Jenson gathered another collection for the Andrew Jenson Memorial Building, which he constructed behind his Seventeenth-Ward home in 1932.24

Jenson need not have feared that his historical efforts would be overlooked, for during the 1930s he received considerable recognition. He was invited by the Salt Lake Tribune to submit a series of articles on the Mormons' western movement and the settlement of Utah. He wrote extensively for the Deseret News. In 1934 he was asked by United Airlines to fly over the route he had walked as an emigrant boy. And in 1935 Governor Henry H. Blood asked Jenson to accompany a pioneer covered wagon to Denmark, to present it as a gift to Rebild National Park, near Aalborg. The search for a suitable wagon and the trip to his homeland with his wife Bertha and daughter Eva, who represented the Daughters of Utah Pioneers, were a thrill and an honor—a fitting conclusion for his long and industrious life.

APPRAISAL OF ANDREW JENSON, HISTORIAN

What judgment can we make of Andrew Jenson—Latter-day Saint, traveler, writer, historian? He arrived in America a poor, uneducated boy who, because of his broken English, was faced with seemingly insurmountable obstacles. Yet he aspired to greater things, and in his lifetime accomplished much. He traveled more than 300,000 miles in direct service of his Church, and logged an incredible 1,000,000 miles in his lifetime—this done by train, ship, wagon, and on foot. He traveled twice around the world, crossed the Pacific Ocean four times, and the Atlantic Ocean thirteen times. He visited every continent except Antarctica, and nearly every nation. He visited every Latter-day Saint mission except the one in South Africa.

Jenson served ten missions for the Church, seven on special assignment. Among his three full-time missions was a three-

---

24Jenson expressed the reasons for constructing the Memorial Hall as follows: "I desire the Building to become permanent and represent the life works of Andrew Jenson, hoping that future generations will be benefited by it and cause my name to be held in honorable remembrance on the part of descendants and the general public and especially to the Latter-day Saints." Diary, 4 September 1941, as cited in Perkins, p. 133.
year term as president of the Scandinavian Mission. During those years as mission president (1909-1912) he gave 1,000 speeches and saw his missionaries convert 1,300 persons.

Jenson's career is noteworthy not only for his service to the Church in collecting historical data and serving missions, but also for the number of speeches he delivered. The exact number is unknown, but a rough calculation suggests that he delivered more than 6,000 addresses during a forty-two year period.

Andrew Jenson was a public as well as a religious man. He served as a member of the State Constitutional Convention in 1887. He was also a school trustee and a Justice of the Peace. His public life included his service as President of the Utah State Historical Society (1917-1921), a member of the Old Folks Central Committee (1883-1941), a member of the executive committee of the Utah Pioneer Trails and Landmarks Association, and a founder and lifetime member of the board of the Genealogical Society of Utah (1894-1941).

Jenson made his greatest contributions through his writing and collecting ability. Besides his translations and Danish newspaper articles, he published twenty-two articles in The Improvement Era, a long series of articles for the Salt Lake Tribune, and some two thousand historical articles in the Deseret News. He indexed the Deseret Weekly, and subsequently, all of his own works. He collected the stake and mission histories of the Church for the first 100 years and compiled an immense chronological day-by-day account of the Church's history which became known as the Journal History. These two manuscript collections comprised 850 volumes at the time of his death. He collected several thousand biographies of Church officials and others, publishing some of them in four volumes as the Biographical Encyclopedia.

In his Biographical Encyclopedia and the Journal History, Jenson exhibited an unusual interest in the common man—the ordinary pioneer. He inserted information about the Eng-

---

The compilation of the Journal History began in January 1896 when Charles W. Penrose was appointed by the First Presidency to write a daily journal of current events. Duplicates of typewritten minutes kept by George F. Gibbs, secretary of the First Presidency, were to be incorporated into the Journal. (Diary of Charles Penrose, 10 January 1896, MSS., HDC). Later, Andrew Jenson was placed in charge of compiling a daily journal for the Church in the nineteenth century and Joseph Fielding Smith, Jr., for the Church in the twentieth century. See Anthon H. Lund, Conference Report, October 1917, p. 12.
lish miner, the New York farmer, and the Scandinavian craftsman alongside information about the highest Church or government official. His works celebrate the dreams, goals, activities, and accomplishments of the ordinary members of the Church. Latter-day Saint history was far more to him than the notable movements of the general and local authorities. In his unremitting effort to help the different nationalities retain pride in their national culture, Jenson played a vital role in keeping alive the ideal of a universal Church. He was the first to insist that Mormon history include Germans, Britons, Scandinavians, Tongans, Tahitians, and other national and cultural groups, and that Latter-day Saint history should be written in various languages for the benefit of those to whom English was not the native tongue. Jenson was the only person in the Church of his day to translate its history into a foreign language.

Andrew Jenson was acquainted with all of the Church presidents except Joseph Smith. He knew all of the Church Historians and Assistant Church Historians from George A. Smith onward. He worked for four different historians (Willford Woodruff, Franklin D. Richards, Anthon H. Lund, and Joseph Fielding Smith), and served forty-four years as Assistant Church Historian. This span of years (he lived to be 91) gave him an unbelievable scope and understanding of Latter-day Saint history, enabling him to provide the basis for a continuous and comprehensive narrative of the Church's history up to 1900. Of the twenty-five persons who have served as Church Historians and Assistant Church Historians since 1830, none has made a greater contribution in the collection of primary materials, the organization of them for research purposes, the indexing and cataloguing of materials, and the preparation of volumes of narrative and documentary history.\textsuperscript{26}

Andrew Jenson was not of course a great interpretive historian; he was not concerned with the issues and problems of

\textsuperscript{26}The only possible rival was B. H. Roberts, who edited the six volumes of Joseph Smith, \textit{History of the Church} . . . (Salt Lake City, 1902-1912), and who wrote \textit{A Comprehensive History of the Church} . . . Century I 6 vols. (Salt Lake City, 1930), and other historical works. See an appreciation and appraisal of his work in Davis Bitton, "B. H. Roberts as Historian," \textit{Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought}, III (Winter 1968), 25-44. Professor Bitton suggests that Roberts was a historian, whereas Jenson was essentially a compiler. Letter to the writers, 14 July 1971.
Latter-day Saint historiography. His primary goal was to produce a factual basis for an accurate narrative history of the Church. His guideline was "to present facts in truth and simplicity. Accuracy as to dates and figures [persons] will be a predominant feature."27

In pursuing this goal Jenson was honest and open. Whether faith-promoting or faith-questioning, whether significant or trivial, Jenson assembled everything—all the materials he could find bearing upon the history of the Church, its leaders and members. The fact that historical materials regarded by some as adverse to the Church still exist is a tribute to Jenson’s objectivity. He realized that time would provide historians with larger perspective, thus enabling them to intelligently interpret the Church’s first one hundred years. Indeed, without Andrew Jenson’s carefully-written narratives, prodigious compilations, and time-saving indexes, no modern Mormon historian could produce the monographs and interpretive histories which are now being turned out with increasing frequency.

While we might deplore that Jenson did not receive an education equivalent to his intellect—an education that might have permitted him to produce interpretive history—the monumental scope of his documentary compilations cannot be denied. Without the Journal History, Encyclopedic History, and Biographical Encyclopedia, historians today would find their task incomparably more difficult.

Andrew Jenson’s contributions to Latter-day Saint historical literature seem almost incredible, especially in the light of his background. From railroad construction worker to missionary, from translator-editor to traveler-compiler-historian—at each stage in his career Jenson exhibited a rare dedication and resourcefulness. His limitless energy and ambition—his capacity to endure, even to enjoy, the drudgery of historical research and writing—made it possible for this otherwise unpromising convert-immigrant to become one of the foremost historians of the Latter-day Saints.

27Statement with respect to The Historical Record in Deseret Evening News, 12 November 1885. Jenson continually emphasized to church officers and organizations the importance of keeping full and accurate records. To this end, he prepared forms to be used by stakes, wards, and missions which required accurate historical notations and summaries.
The Uses of the Mind in Religion*

LOWELL L. BENNION**

Since you have distinguished yourselves as thinkers and scholars and, by your very presence at Brigham Young University bear witness of your commitment to religious faith, I thought it not inappropriate to talk with you this evening about the uses of the mind in our relationship to the restored gospel.

Living in these latter days we are the recipients of many legacies from East and West, but the two which have been most influential in Western Culture are doubtless the faith and morality of the Judeo-Christian tradition, and the rational and aesthetic emphasis of the Greeks. These traditions are not wholly distinct. There is considerable rationality in the Law and the Prophets and Jesus' words even as there is notable ethical reflection in Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle, but there is a difference in emphasis.

Both the religious and rational footings of our civilization are beyond price. For me nothing in all the ethical thinking of mankind quite equals the combined ethic and morality of the Hebrew prophets and Jesus. The prophets taught justice and mercy in human relations and tied these principles to the ethical character of a living God. Scholars call this ethical monotheism. Jesus, respecting his prophetic forbears, stressed the worth of the individual, and taught men to walk with humility, to act with love, and to trust in the Father. Both Jesus

*An address given at the Phi Kappa Phi Banquet on Brigham Young University Campus, 12 April 1973.

**Dr. Bennion is a professor of sociology at the University of Utah, and director of the Community Services Council for Salt Lake City. He has published widely in the fields of sociology and religion, and received the Distinguished Alumnus Award from the University of Utah in 1972.
and the prophets exemplified moral courage as they attacked the superficialities and hypocrisies of their day. Greek philosophy delighted in man’s capacity to create order out of mystery and chaos. They began to think about nature, how men think, and the rules of logical thought. They inquired into aesthetics and ethics, and the nature of society. They were not afraid—as were the Jews—to create works of art in sculpture and architecture, in addition to drama and literature. They laid the foundations not only for philosophy, but also for history, the natural and social sciences, medicine, and the arts. Most of all, they discovered and nurtured faith in man’s capacity to think and to create.

I do not understand how a person who has come to know these two traditions in any substantial manner, can turn his back on either one. I confess my profound respect for each of them and try in my own life to effect a marriage between them—a marriage that has all the tension, adjustments, frustration, joys, and ecstasy one finds in a marriage between man and woman. Even as I prefer marriage to living alone, so do I prefer to live in a world of both faith and rationality rather than in a world of either alone.

It is not my intent this evening to try to reconcile faith and reason—a task that has been tried over and over again. Rather, my purpose is to indicate the value of thinking within the gospel. Rationality not only has its place in fighting cancer and in getting man to the moon; it also has a place within the gospel. A quotation from Pascal triggered afresh my own interest in this theme. It reads:

If one subjects everything to reason our religion will lose its mystery and its supernatural character. If one offends the principles of reason our religion will be absurd and ridiculous . . . . There are two equally dangerous extremes—to shut out reason and to let nothing else in.5

In the spirit of this quotation, let me hasten to make clear that religion is more than reason. Thinkers for centuries have noted that life and the meaning of things are greater than reason and objective study. Religion’s first and unique mission is to transcend knowledge and to help man find meaning in

this uncertain existence. If all were known, religion would disappear or change its meaning drastically. Religion enables us to take "the leap of faith," to rise above our contingency, to triumph over our tragic predicament as mortals conscious of our ultimate powerlessness. I am not suggesting that reason should displace faith, however, because man must transcend reason in order to face the future and his total existence.

Religion transcends reason also in the area of human values. I don't know how one can choose purely objectivity among competing values. Our choice among value positions rests ultimately, I believe, on feeling, on intuition, on our total experience—not on the cold analysis of empirical evidence. I respect the inspiration of the prophets and of the religious sages of mankind in this field. Micah's words have the ring of truth: "... what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God," (Micah 6:8), but I would not like to have to prove them to be true.

THINKING WITHOUT THE GOSPEL

It is often said that the gospel—in contrast to the thinking and philosophies of men—is eternal, unchanging truth. No thinking person, including the scientist himself, would dispute the fact that all human efforts to know the truth are tentative, unfinished, and changing. A glance at textbooks over the years is evidence of this. The hard won, laboriously acquired knowledge of the greatest of the scientists will be superceded one day by a larger, truer vision. Even the great artist is rarely satisfied with any of his creations. None fully expresses his felt impressions.

But the gospel—it is said by way of contrast—is divine, revealed of God, taught by the Christ, recorded in holy writ, and hence unchanging, eternal truth. From my limited experience, I believe the gospel of Jesus Christ is eternal, universally valid, and true in the lives of men and Deity. But my understanding of the gospel, and dare I suggest yours too, is not eternal truth and ought not be unchanging truth.

In the mind of God and Christ, the gospel is known in its full beauty and actuality, but in your life and mine, the truths of the gospel are only partially known and are relative to our capacity, humility, and experience. Faith, repentence,
love, God, atonement, are but words in a book, symbols of attitudes and realities that we comprehend only in part. This we sometimes forget, but the prophets profess it in moments of profound humility and insight.

Isaiah said for the Lord: "For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts." (Isaiah 55:8-9)

"Woe is me!" said Isaiah when he was called to the ministry, "for I am undone; because I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips; for mine eyes have seen the King, the Lord of hosts" (Isaiah 6:5).

The apostle Paul, who was not lacking in testimony and assurance, said in his sublime eulogy on love:

For we know in part, and we prophesy in part. But when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away. . . . For now we see through a glass darkly. . . . (I Cor. 13:9-10, 12)

Some of that same spirit of humility is found in Latter-day scripture. Moses had a remarkable vision of God and some of his unending creations. The prophet's fascinating response to that overawing presence was: "Now . . . I know that man is nothing, which thing I never had supposed." (Moses 1:2) Satan took advantage of Moses' humbled position and said to him, "Moses, son of man, worship me." (Moses 1:12) To illustrate how relative man's view of the situation is, Moses recovered his perspective and answered,

Who art thou? For behold, I am of God, in the similitude of His only Begotten; and where is thy glory that I should worship thee? (Moses 1:13)

For a long time, I have been grateful for and impressed by the Prophet Joseph's description of his remarkable vision of the Father and the Son wherein he said, "I saw two personages, whose brightness and glory defy all description." Revelation, itself, is not a one-way communication, but a teaching process dependent on the learner as well as on the teacher. It is so described in the preface to the Doctrine and Covenants: "Behold, I am God and have spoken it; these commandments
are of me . . . .” This is the divine part of revelation. That which follows reveals the human limitations on the divine word to man:

... and were given unto my servants in their weakness, after the manner of their language, that they might come to an understanding.

And inasmuch as they erred it might be made known; and inasmuch as they sought wisdom, they might be instructed; and inasmuch as they were humble they might be made strong, and blessed from on high, and receive knowledge from time to time. (Doctrine and Covenants 1:24-28)

Perhaps I have belabored this point, but I feel that many of us are too complacent. Because of the remarkable events and teachings associated with the Restoration, we assume to know all about God and His ways. When we act on that assumption, we reduce him to our image, and we lose our hunger and thirst for his truth and his righteousness. Jesus said, "And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.” (John 17:3) To know them we must come to think as they think, feel as the feel, create as they create, love as they love. We must, as Christ did, receive grace for grace. This is an eternal quest.

I have tried to distinguish between the eternal truths of the gospel and our limited, human understanding of them. I like the way Yvor Winter puts in his In Defense of Reason:

The absolutist believes in the existence of absolute truths and values. Unless he is very foolish, he does not believe that he personally has free access to these absolutes and that his judgments are final; but he does believe that such absolutes exist and that it is the duty of every man and of every society to endeavor as far as may be to approximate them. The relativist, on the other hand, believes that there are no absolute truths, that the judgment of every man is right for himself.²

The gospel of Jesus Christ contains eternal truths, but our knowledge of them is relative to our humility, study, capacity, and experience.

If we recognize our limited understanding of the gospel,

our next step is to study it earnestly, searchingly, and prayerfully. May I suggest too, that the object of our major study ought to be simple, fundamental principles of the gospel. Too often, these are taken for granted or passed over superficially, while we occupy ourselves with "things which lead not to edification" or we "elaborate on the things the Lord has only touched on lightly."

What we need to understand more fully are the attributes of God—the meaning of integrity, creativity, intelligence, and love; the teachings of Christ which he reiterated again and again—humility, meekness, love, trust in God. We need to grow within our understanding of each gospel principle.

A child in Primary is taught: "We believe in being honest . . . ." But honesty is one thing to a child, quite another to a thoughtful adult. The former thinks of honesty in terms of not lying and not stealing. The adult includes these in his conception of honesty, but he learns the difficult role of being honest in human relationships and in being true to his own deepest convictions. He struggles between keeping his own integrity and his concern for the feelings of others and their well-being. Honesty must sometimes vie with mercy in the mind of the sensitive adult.

One of the rewards and joys of gospel teaching is what one learns from his students either directly or by the questions they raise. I remember a freshman in a large Book of Mormon class, who, when the class was asked how the covenant of baptism differs from a marriage contract, replied: "In a marriage contract, either party may fail, but in the baptismal covenant, only man can fail. God will not!" This was a new and beautiful insight to the teacher.

The restored gospel is a religion of action. It is not an end in itself, but was designed to bring about growth and fulfillment in man. To do so it must penetrate the inner life of the individual and the social systems of society. To accomplish this goal, religion must be more than feeling, more even than faith and good will. The life of man, living in society, needs to be understood. There are factual and rational aspects to the economic, political, and social life of man. To have any impact on these, we must understand both the nature of society and gospel principles. This is a rationale, as well as a question, of value. For example, roughly twenty percent
of our population in America live in poverty. They cannot succeed in our competitive, "free" society. The gospel teaches us to love those who have least, and that it is more blessed to give than to receive. How do we give love to the poor in ways that will build the freedom and respect of the individual? I submit to you that we have not begun to learn—on a large scale—how to live the principle of love in a modern complex society. I think this could well be the subject matter of a priesthood or Sunday School course of a study of a year, or a decade, and it would tax the mind as well as the heart to the limit. It calls for thinking to make the gospel viable in human relations.

One further example may illustrate the same point. We speak of free agency in sermon after sermon and in class after class. It is a beautiful and fundamental principle of the gospel, but too seldom do we recognize that we are not free. Every man has free agency—a desire and capacity to be free—but none of us are completely free. We fail to make the distinction between free agency and freedom. Some are not free to resist overeating, to communicate honestly with husband or wife, to forsake greed or lust, to acknowledge one's weakness or sin, to follow one's convictions of the right. Freedom is won with knowledge, with understanding, with wisdom, sometimes with love, and with cooperation from others. Here is another "commonly spoken principle" of the gospel a class could profitably study for a year or a decade.

I would like to suggest one more use of the mind in religion. Someone has said that there is nothing so lost as an isolated fact. In every field of study, facts are related to each other by hypotheses, by theories, by conceptual schemes.

This same learning process applies to the restored gospel. One needs to see it whole. It contains a basic framework of theology and an integrated ethical pattern for living. But the scriptures were not written by systematic theologians or moral philosophers—thank goodness—but have come to us as spontaneous records, quite miscellaneous in form, containing the experience, inspiration, and words of men as they have struggled with God and His people.

Without destroying the freshness and reality of the scriptures, we need to look into them to find these fundamental, oft-repeated, and established truths which give the scriptures
their great meaning and value. This is an intellectual and imaginative exercise as well as a spiritual search.

Not only does the gospel as a whole seem to hang together, at it were, but within it are several groups of beautifully integrated ideas. I can mention but two or three this evening.

Jesus and the prophets portray God the Father as a person of integrity and impartiality, love and mercy, and as a Father whose purpose it is to bring the abundant and eternal life to man. If we keep this character of God in mind, we shall not interpret his relationship to men in ways which contradict these divine attributes, even though isolated passages of scripture might give us license to do so. We will not believe him to be jealous, revengeful, and wrathful as we know these qualities of character in human experience.

The restored gospel teaches us also that the elements, some laws, the intelligence of man along with his capacity for freedom, are coeternal with God. If we believe and understand this, we shall not ascribe the limitations of nature and human nature to Him. Rather we shall be inclined to help Him overcome evil and to realize the ideal.

The Beatitudes are another example of a beautiful, logical framework within the gospel. I commend to your reading a book by Henry Churchill King, called The Ethics of Jesus, in which he describes the Beatitudes as Jesus’ map of life. He shows how each builds on and presupposes those that have gone before. Dr. King gives new insight into the meaning of “blessed are they that mourn,” whom he calls “the penitent,” and of “blessed are the meek,” which he equates with self-control at its highest. The Book of Mormon, with the phrase, “who come unto me,” inserted in the Beatitudes, adds additional meaning to this map of life.

Finally, I am impressed by the remarkably intimate relationship of the first principles and ordinances of the gospel. Faith in Christ leads to, inspires, and gives direction to repentance. Baptism bears witness to a new beginning and of a bond with Christ and with each other. And, in the words of Mormon, “because of meekness and lowliness of heart,” which follows from faith in Christ and repentance, “cometh the visitation of the Holy Ghost, which Comforter filleth with
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hope and perfect love." (Moroni 8:26) This whole process of becoming a disciple of Christ is renewed in the sacramental covenant.

CONCLUSION

One has every reason to be intellectually eager and alert as he relates to the gospel of Jesus Christ and seeks to apply its principles to the demands and privileges of living.

I must admit that the thoughtful way is not in the short run the easy way. It is less troublesome to be as sheep led or herded without thought, and with little sense of personal responsibility. Thinking is always critical. It means analyzing, taking apart, and synthesizing, or seeing things in new relationships. Thinking means questioning, even doubting, and trusting that the gospel can stand the test of thought. Thinking means carrying one's own lantern, living one's own testimony.

God himself does not seem to object to our questioning even Him and His ways. Abraham persuaded the Lord to save Sodom if He could find ten righteous souls. Jacob wrestled with his heavenly antagonist until he got his way. And most impressive of all, Job challenged God's justice and compassion and stood by his own integrity through an extended debate. He learned that he had "darkened counsel by words without knowledge," but God did not condemn him for his honest thinking, whereas his complacent friends—Eliphaz, Bildad, and Zophar—who upheld the traditional, limited Hebrew view of the reason for suffering, received a judgment from God, for they had not spoken of Him "the thing that is right."

The gospel of Jesus Christ was restored in response to a youth's search for truth. Throughout our history prophets have asked questions and reasoned freely about truths of the gospel. I trust that you will bring your best thinking as well as your deepest feelings to bear on the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, and I hope that you will love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind.
Topsfield, Massachusetts:
Ancestral Home of the
Prophet Joseph Smith

DONALD Q. CANNON*

Much has been written concerning the ancestors of the Prophet Joseph Smith. Almost every biographical or historical account refers to his forebears. Those writers unsympathetic to the Church have branded his ancestors as irresponsible, even demented, people, while writers friendly to the Church have consistently described the Smiths in terms of the steadfast qualities, such as honesty and sobriety, generally associated with early America.

Although the Smith family has received ample attention, almost nothing has been written concerning the place where they resided. Five generations of the Smith family lived in Topsfield, Massachusetts, before Joseph Smith, Jr. was born, and yet we know very little about this significant town. Does not the place have something to tell us concerning the Smith family and indeed the Prophet himself? Physical and social environment as well as home and family help mold the lives of men and women.

Visiting Topsfield today, one discovers a well-kept, quiet New England village. The normal visual manifestations of the New England town such as the white frame meetinghouse, the common, and colonial homes meet the eye as soon as one enters Topsfield. Here, only a few miles from the frenetic pace of Boston, one finds the solace and peace associated with the small New England town. Indeed, at least once a

*Dr. Cannon, associate professor of Church history and doctrine at Brigham Young University, has taught history at the University of Maine, has published previously in the Improvement Era and BYU Studies, and is currently preparing an American history textbook for Harper & Row.
year, the residents of Topsfield gather together in the schoolhouse and hold a town meeting. In such meetings the people choose their officials and conduct the major business of the town, much as they have done since colonial times.¹

Situated on the North Shore of Massachusetts about twenty miles north of Boston and ten miles southeast of Lawrence, Topsfield is a so-called bedroom city of some 5,000 people. In its role as a bedroom suburb for Greater Boston, Topsfield has grown rapidly since World War II, from 1,412 in 1950 to 5,225 in 1970. Comprising a land area of 12.80 square miles the town has a population density of 408 persons per square mile. The town is 99.8% white, predominantly Republican, and has a median annual income of $8,745. Economically, it is a progressive rural community with a modest amount of small-scale manufacturing.²

Topsfield, located at the center of Essex County, is noted for its rolling hills. These rounded elevations, thrown up by a retreating sheet of ice in the glacial period, form a kind of barrier around the edge of the town. They bear such names as Great Hill, Town Hill, and Witch Hill. Much of the land in the town consists of a thin coating of sand and gravel which covers a layer of bed-rock. Almost everywhere in the valley where the town is located, one can drill and secure water. The Ipswich River runs through the southerly and easterly portion of the township, and into it flow the important tributary brooks Pye, Howlett, Mile, Fish, and Nichols. In the rich meadow land along the banks of the river are found large deposits of peat. Topsfield is heavily wooded and boulders of all sizes and shapes abound. On the outskirts of the village are excellent farmlands, especially along the river banks.³

Topsfield has a rich architectural heritage. In close proximity to the common, or village green (as some Topsfield residents refer to it) are several excellent examples of colonial architecture. Best known of all colonial homes in Topsfield is the Parson Capen House. Guides to Topsfield and Essex County, architectural studies of New England and many other published works refer to the Parson Capen House as an architectural treasure. Reverend Joseph Capen, Minister of the church in Topsfield, built the house in the summer of 1683. Patterned after the frame homes the colonists knew in England, the house has a framework of heavy oak timbers mortised and tenoned together. The exterior walls are covered with clapboards and there is a second story overhang in the garrison style. Acquired by the Topsfield Historical Society in 1913, it has been carefully restored and is open to the public during the summer.

In this quaint village the spirit of colonial America lives on in the twentieth century. This spirit was best described by one speaker during the 250th anniversary of the town:

"Let Topsfield continue as it is—a place of agricultural industry and modest manufacturing interests; an increasingly residential community; nature’s retreat for weary bodies and tired brains; a home of virtue and a source of life for the nation. . . ."

But what of Topsfield’s past? What kind of a town was it when ancestors of Joseph Smith walked its streets? Was it a typical New England town or did it have a unique history?

Concerning the question of typicality, recent historical studies show that the traditional notion of the typical New England town is largely incorrect. Historical research of the past decade demonstrates that each town must be considered as a separate and distinct entity, not a part of a related whole. In his Puritan Village, Sumner Chilton Powell explains that not just Englishmen, but various types of Englishmen came to New England. Consequently, he claims that they created many
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Reverend Joseph Capen built this house in the late seventeenth century. Framed with oak timbers and covered with clapboard, it is a valuable example of the more substantial architecture of the period.

The Congregational Meetinghouse, a center for religious as well as community activities in early Topsfield.
distinct towns, each with its own origin, its own character, and each different from the towns in Old England.\footnote{Summer Chilton Powell, \textit{Puritan Village:} (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, 1965, pp. xv, 178-179.)} Kenneth Lockridge explains in his study of Dedham, Massachusetts, that the New England town has been a myth—one of the great American myths. He seeks to discredit that myth by describing Dedham's own true history as a record of change—a transition from a static rural community to a thriving commercial and manufacturing center. While suggesting that other New England towns changed also, Lockridge maintains that each alteration was unique. No two towns experienced quite the same transformation.\footnote{Kenneth A. Lockridge, \textit{A New England Town: The First Hundred Years: Dedham, Massachusetts,} 1636-1736 (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1970), pp. xi, 91-93, 172-174.} Finally, Rhys Isaac cautions: "there are grave difficulties in the construction of a picture of the larger society from the study of the microcosm. It would be misleading to proceed by the simple multiplication of a supposedly typical example."

Any examination of Topsfield during the colonial period, then, must proceed on the assumption that this town experienced a unique historical development, one which may or may not have been like the experience of any other New England town.

Captain John Smith and other English explorers had described the North Shore and the Ipswich River long before the establishment of permanent settlements in New England. In fact, the Pilgrims of Plymouth Colony had heard of Ipswich and thought of settling there. The earliest settlements in the area occurred not at Topsfield, but at the mouth of the Ipswich River where the town of Ipswich is now located. Ipswich, or Agawam, as it was then known, was settled by John Winthrop, Jr., in 1633. Agawam took its name from the most prominent local Indian tribe, the Agawams.\footnote{Rhys Isaac, "Order and Growth, Authority and Meaning in Colonial New England," \textit{The American Historical Review}, vol. 76, no. 3 (June 1971), p. 736.}

Soon after settling Agawam (Ipswich), settlers began to move upriver; they came to a place known as she-ne-we-medy, "the pleasant place of the flowing waters." This area, dubbed
"New Meadows" because of the extensive meadowland along the river, became the nucleus of Topsfield. The earliest settlers moved into the Topsfield area about 1641. While extant records do not show who settled there first, most of the early townspeople were prominent men in Massachusetts Bay. The earliest records contain such names as Dorman, Bradstreet, Endicott, Gould, Curtis, Bixby, and Redington.10

These people had participated in a great English folk migration during the first half of the seventeenth century. Because of economic dislocation, political turmoil, religious persecutions, and general insecurity, they joined others who had left their native land to create a new nation across the stormy Atlantic. They came from all parts of England and from many different walks of life. Enticed by promotional literature and motivated by the hope of improving their lot in the New World, "these ordinary men and women had together performed the most daring act of modern history when they succeeded in planting a new nation where none before had stood."11

Some of those who settled at New Meadows, later Topsfield, came from Essex County, England, so naturally they used place names from English Essex to designate their new settlements in Massachusetts Bay. Samuel Symonds, who owned five hundred acres at New Meadows had come from Topsfield, a small parish in Essex County, England. His ancestral home had been named after Topp, a Saxon Chieftan who crossed the North Sea from the Friesian Islands about 550 A.D. Seeking to honor and perhaps remember his home in England, Symonds, an assistant in the Massachusetts General Court, changed the name New Meadows to Topsfield in October 1648. Eventually the residents of the village simplified and shortened the English spelling to Topsfield.12

According to George Francis Dow, the foremost authority on Topsfield history, "farming was the chief occupation of the first settlers here and has continued to be through all the
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years." Most of the early settlers had been farmers in England so they farmed in New England, too. The unusually rich farmlands along the river had attracted settlers from Ipswich, and they set about the task of making the land productive. Corn, the main crop all along the Atlantic seaboard in the colonial period, became the major crop of Topsfield farmers as well. Native to the New World, and introduced to the settlers by the Indians, corn had many purposes: food for man, fodder for animals, and bedding for the home.14

Corn grinding, a logical outgrowth of the production of corn, became an important economic enterprise. At first, Topsfield farmers carried their corn to Ipswich. In the 1660s, however, two grist mills were erected in Topsfield, one by Francis Peabody and another by the Howlett family.15

One rather unusual agricultural enterprise capitalized on one of the major natural resources of the Massachusetts marsh-lands. The salt marshes of Essex County yielded sizeable quantities of salt grass, supposedly more desirable for feeding horses and cattle than hay grown in fresh water meadows. Described by Captain John Smith, this salt grass or hay attracted the attention of these farmers from England because they had cut such hay in their homeland. Harvesting salt grass was hard work, but these ambitious Yankees harvested about six hundred tons of salt grass annually during the colonial era. Often, neighbors from adjacent farms would share the arduous task, the men working in the marsh, while the women prepared their food. Topsfield's farmers used salt hay not only for feed, but also for thatch for their crude dwellings, and to protect early vegetables in the fields.16

Topsfield farms also produced flax and wool, used in spinning and weaving cloth. Most textile manufacturing, however, was done on a domestic rather than a commercial scale, the home serving as the center of the early textile industry. Hides from domestic and wild animals were processed in Tops-

13Dow, History of Topsfield, p. 354.
field tanneries and much of the leather was used in shoe manufacturing. Indeed, shoe manufacturing became the largest industry in the town, reaching its zenith in the early nineteenth century. Some Topsfield residents worked in Topsfield shoe factories, while other commuted to work in factories in Danvers and other nearby communities.

Many of the trades and crafts commonly found in England also appeared in early Topsfield. Edmund Bridges, the first blacksmith, set up his shop in 1661. For Topsfield residents his work was indispensable. He not only shod horses, but manufactured household tools and farm implements as well. Town records dating back as early as 1654 carry the names of carpenters and cabinetmakers. By the eighteenth century a carpenters union had been formed. Topsfield's first cooper, Isaac Estey, began making barrels in 1661. Asael Smith, grandfather of the Prophet, worked for a time as a cooper in Topsfield. Not unlike their counterparts in many other towns in colonial America, the residents of Topsfield searched earnestly and doggedly for precious metals, hoping perhaps to rival the wealth of the Spanish colonies in the New World. In 1648, Governor Endicott, who owned property in Topsfield, employed Richard Leader, the man in charge of the famed Saugus Iron Works, to mine copper on his land. Although Leader had "skill in mynes and tryall of metalls," the copper mining venture failed. In 1770 William Buntin, an English promoter, reopened the copper mines, and managed to extract some copper ore, but the mine failed to produce enough to make the operation pay.

Topsfield had no distinct class of men practicing medicine—no doctors in the modern sense—in colonial days. Men of other callings practiced medicine as a sideline. A schoolmaster, for example, might also work as a doctor. Indeed, practicing the adage, "everyman his own doctor," each family met most of its own medical needs. Almost every household had its own herb garden, and every wife and mother could apply quaint household remedies to ease pain and comfort the sick. In addition to dispensing wormwood, dandelion, parsley,
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sage, and mint, some Topsfield mothers reduced fever by binding two salt water herring to the soles of the patient’s feet. In keeping with medical theory of the day, bleeding and leeches were also employed. By 1740 some of these customs began to diminish as Topsfield’s first full-time, trained physician, Richard Dexter, began his practice.20

In colonial Topsfield, poverty and wealth existed side by side. Although all houses conformed basically to English styles, they ranged from crude huts to elaborate mansion-like dwellings. Looking inside the house, with assistance from Essex County probate records, one discovers, in general, modest furniture and possessions. The kitchen, often referred to as the hall in the seventeenth century, was the center of the household. Culinary activities centered, in turn, around the huge fireplace with its pots and kettles suspended from pot chains. In front of the fireplace stood plain tables, chairs and cupboards. Here, the average family dined simply on corn meal, boiled meat and vegetables. Residents of colonial Topsfield often used sand to clean their floors, both in the kitchen and elsewhere. The so-called “better” families had rugs and carpets and consequently employed other cleaning materials. The work in these more prosperous homes was performed not only by the family, but by servants as well. Some of the latter were indentured servants, having to work a certain number of years in order to pay for their passage to America. Once their term of service ended, they received “freedom dues,” clothing, tools, and land, to get them started on their own.21

Religion played a major role in the lives of the people who resided in Topsfield prior to the Revolution. From the time of the earliest settlements provisions were made for the public worship of God. In the colonial period, Topsfield’s major church was, of course, the Congregational church. Although Topsfield did not erect its first meetinghouse until 1643, one William Knight had preached the word of God as early as 1641. He did not remain permanently, and in 1655 the Rev-
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erend William Perkins of Gloucester arrived in Topsfield and made arrangements for the erection of a meetinghouse. Upon completion of the meetinghouse and with the establishment of the first regular church, the townspeople replaced Reverend Perkins, maintaining that he was too old. His replacement, the Reverend Thomas Gilbert of Charleston, was ordained on 4 November 1663. Reverend Gilbert remained until 1671 when he was tried for intemperance, having become intoxicated at the table of the Lord's Supper. His replacement, Jeremiah Hobart, arranged for the construction of a stone wall to protect the meetinghouse during King Philip's War. In 1681 Parson Capen, the owner of the famed house bearing his name, arrived in Topsfield, and thus began the most auspicious period in the history of the Congregational church of Topsfield. The Reverend Joseph Capen served for more than three decades as minister, and under his leadership church membership increased and the quality of religious life improved.22

A close examination of the records and history of the Congregational church in Topsfield reveals considerable strife and friction among its members. The members of the congregation quarreled frequently with the ministers over such matters as proper conduct, salaries, church membership, and seating arrangements. The rapid turnover in ministerial personnel is evidence of this friction. The seating of townsfolk in the meetinghouse, for example, was a matter of no little consequence. On 20 May 1760, a special committee of twelve men was appointed to seat the people according to their "best skill and judgment." Some of the pews in the new meetinghouse had been previously sold to the wealthier members of the community, but the committee had to wrestle with the problem of seating the remainder of the congregation. Those who could not purchase a pew were seated by the committee, the men and women being segregated.23

The sermons preached in colonial Topsfield remind one of Puritan sermons preached elsewhere in New England. Abundantly studded with scriptural citations, each sermon was designed to communicate one central message. In organization, it

22Historical Manual of the Congregational Church of Topsfield, Massachusetts, 1663-1907 (Topsfield, Mass.: Published by the Church, 1907), pp. 5-15; Dow History of Topsfield, pp. 246-264, 271-280.
resembled a legal brief, including the reasons for its consideration, and other legalistic formulations. Sermons of that day filled two or three hours and provided ample food for thought.  

It is difficult for most twentieth-century Americans to imagine the intense concern with spiritual matters demonstrated by the people of seventeenth-century Topsfield, Massachusetts. Religion filled much of their lives, indeed gave direction to them. That they took religion seriously is demonstrated by the recording of numerous public confessions before the entire congregation. Thus, Jacob Towne and his wife confessed before their fellow church members that they had known each other carnally before they were married.  

The Congregational church and the town maintained a cemetery from the earliest period of settlement. While the exact location of the earliest burial ground is not known, it was probably adjacent to the earliest meetinghouse. The oldest cemetery still in use, Pine Grove Cemetery, contains tombstones with legible inscriptions running back as far as 1717. In this cemetery are such notables as the Reverend Joseph Capen (1659-1728), the Reverend John Emerson (1707-1774), Major Joseph Gould (1763-1803), and the ancestors of Joseph Smith.  

Residents of colonial Topsfield carefully looked after their educational as well as their spiritual needs. Initially, the burden of education fell upon individual families. Indeed, during most of the colonial era, even public school classes convened in private homes. The townspeople did not erect a schoolhouse until late in the colonial period. Beginning in 1694 the town of Topsfield hired one man each year to serve as schoolmaster. Until a public building was erected the schoolmaster boarded with families near the houses where school was held. Much of the record of early education in Topsfield contains information about struggles to obtain money and buildings—a struggle between various factions in the town. Clearly, educa-
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tion was a part of the democratic process—not something imposed by a ruling caste.27

Travel was an ordeal in colonial Topsfield. Descriptions of the early roadways within the town and of those connecting Topsfield with other towns paint a picture of primitive, inadequate roads, often no more than widened Indian trails. Maintenance of public highways required teamwork and every able-bodied male citizen had to report for road work periodically to provide such maintenance. In keeping with New England custom, the road leading to a certain town bore the name of that town; thus, Salem Street led to Salem and Boxford Street to Boxford.28

In colonial America roads existed for the conduct of commerce, but most important, they existed for the benefit of the postal system. Originally, the Salem post office handled mail for Topsfield and many other Essex County communities. Eventually, however, Topsfield got its own postmaster. The Topsfield Postmaster, like the postmaster in many parts of colonial America, was a “Jack of all trades.” This busy man not only handled the mail but also took care of all freight business for Topsfield and taught penmanship.29

The town of Topsfield concerned itself not only with communication and transportations, but also with caring for the poor and needy within its borders. Although few of the early settlers of Topsfield were wealthy, few were poor. Most managed to care for themselves. The first poor person to receive aid was Luke Wakeling. In 1663 the town bought a cow for Luke and his family. Harking back to an English tradition, Topsfield officials often solved problems of poverty by “warning” undesirables out of town. People who had moved from other towns and would not support themselves were forced to leave; thus Evan Morris, described as a “shiftless, indolent fellow,” had to leave Topsfield. Topsfield preferred to have its legitimate poor earn their way; consequently, people receiving poor relief would perform tasks such as digging graves in return for the assistance they received. Occasionally, people boarded destitute persons in their homes and received a reimbursement for expenses from the town officials. Although
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town meetings frequently discussed the construction of an almshouse, Topsfield did not build one until 1822.\textsuperscript{30}

In seventeenth-century Topsfield another social problem of major concern was witchcraft. Although overshadowed by its neighbors, Salem Village and Salem, Topsfield also figured prominently in the famous witchcraft episode of the 1690s. As one study expressed it, "Topsfield's connection with the witchcraft delusion in Salem Village (now Danvers) is of much importance historically and has a greater claim upon the notice of the historian of that period than generally has been conceded."\textsuperscript{31}

Topsfield's involvement in the witchcraft episode in Salem Village centered on disputes over boundaries and ownership of land. One of the most persistent disputes may have arisen from a clerical error made by the Massachusetts General Court as early as 1639. This first came into the open in 1668 when Topsfield divided up some common land on the south bank of the Ipswich River near the property of Thomas Putnam of Salem Village. Described as strong-willed men, eager for controversy, the Putnams easily became the center of conflict. Arrests followed accusations, and executions followed trials in this period of frenzy and distrust. Many of the characters of the famous Salem witch trials were actually residents of Topsfield. Anne Putnam, Rebecca Nurse, Mary Easty, and Sarah Wilds, all of Topsfield, became principal participants in the trials and executions in Salem. Indeed, Mary Easty was hanged on Gallows Hill in Salem on 22 September 1692. Ultimately, the people of Topsfield and other villages came to their senses and the witchcraft delusion ended. In Topsfield, and elsewhere, pardons were granted to those convicted on insufficient evidence and reparations were paid to the unfortunate relatives of the condemned.\textsuperscript{32}

The only town government, which dealt with such problems as witchcraft, was the town meeting so often associated with co-

\textsuperscript{30}Dow, History of Topsfield, pp. 343-353.

\textsuperscript{31}Mrs. Abbie Peterson Towne and Miss Marietta Clark, "Topsfield in the Witchcraft Delusion," Topsfield Historical Collections, 13:23 (1908).

\textsuperscript{32}Towne and Clark, "Topsfield in the Witchcraft Delusion," pp. 23-38; George F. Dow, "Witchcraft Records Pertaining to Topsfield," Topsfield Historical Collections, 13:39-143 (1908). Dow, History of Topsfield, pp. 320-342; See also Essex County Court Records, Essex Institute Manuscript Collections, Essex Institute, Salem, Massachusetts.
lonial New England. Originally scheduled for the first Tuesday in March, annual town meetings in Topsfield convened as early as 1664. Settled in the late 1630s and officially incorporated in 1650, Topsfield obviously had some form of government prior to 1664. Unfortunately, many early records were destroyed by fire; consequently 1664 is the earliest year for which records exist. Initially, only the "freemen"—those involved in the original settlement and incorporation—could vote. Later, all "commoners" could vote. According to Topsfield's standards and definition a commoner was an Englishman of orthodox religion, who owned a specified amount of real or personal property. Thus, Topsfield imposed religious and property qualifications for voting. In this sense, Topsfield differed little from many other New England towns.\textsuperscript{33}

Town meetings could not be convened without adequate warning and notice, including the posting of a notice on the meetinghouse door. According to records of the town meetings, matters that came within the purview of the town government included land grants, boundaries, taxes, highways, bridges, provision for the poor, care of common lands, and public morals. Officials elected in early town meetings included town clerks, selectmen, constables, and jurymen for trials held in Ipswich. In the period between town meetings these town officials had the responsibility of conducting the affairs of government. They knew, however, that the town meeting would hold them accountable for their actions. From the earliest times, town meetings convened in the meetinghouse. Occasionally, however, during periods of repair and renovation on the meetinghouse, the townsfolk gathered at a local inn. A town hall was not constructed until after the Civil War.\textsuperscript{34}

During the frequent intercolonial wars of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, Topsfield’s town fathers had the responsibility of defending the town against attack and providing soldiers for offensive operations against the foe. The earliest residents of Topsfield maintained membership in the militia of Ipswich, the first independent militia in Topsfield being established in 1662. All able bodied men between 16 and 45 years of age had to belong to the militia company, attend training sessions, and fight, if called up.\textsuperscript{35}

\textsuperscript{33}Dow, History of Topsfield, pp. 73-80.
\textsuperscript{34}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{35}Ibid., pp. 124-127.
Topsfield did call upon its militia for defense several times during the first century and a half of its existence. The first Topsfield militia members to engage in a general conflict were those who participated in King Philip’s War (1675-77). While only incidentally engaged in that Indian uprising, Topsfield’s military forces made a substantial contribution to the series of intercolonial wars against the French and their Indian allies. Official military records indicate that Topsfield residents fought in King William’s War (1689-97), Queen Anne’s War (1702-13), King George’s War (1740-48), and the French and Indian War (1754-63). Indeed, Topsfield men participated in the capture of Louisbourg, “the Gibralter of the North,” during King George’s War. The capture of that supposedly impregnable Canadian fortress on Cape Breton Island ranks as one of the outstanding military achievements of the American colonists during the long series of wars against the French.

Although participating in all of the intercolonial wars, Topsfield made its greatest military contribution during the American Revolution. Relying upon more than a century of experience, Topsfield’s Minute Men played an important role in many of the battles of the War of Independence. Thus, Topsfield men saw action at Lexington and Concord, at the Battle of Bunker Hill, in the New York Campaign of 1776, and at the Battle of Trenton. It was during this struggle against Great Britain that one of Joseph Smith’s most illustrious ancestors, Samuel Smith II, distinguished himself.

By the time the American Revolution drew to a close, Topsfield had become a thriving New England town. Travelers and visitors extolled its progress and praised its natural beauty. Thus, the Reverend William Bentley of Salem described Topsfield as “one of the most pleasing towns in our neighborhood.”

Having considered the social and physical environment of

---

37Dow, History of Topsfield, pp. 167-197; Brigham H. Roberts, A Comprehensive History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 6 vols. (Salt Lake City, Utah: Deseret News Press, 1930), 1:3-4. (Hereafter referred to as CHC.)
early Topsfield, it remains to examine the role played by the Smith family in the community. Since this story has been told elsewhere,\textsuperscript{39} only a brief sketch is necessary within the context of this study.

The five generations of the Smith family who resided in Topsfield before the birth of the Prophet included Robert Smith, Samuel Smith (I), Samuel Smith (II), Asael Smith, and Joseph Smith, Sr. For almost two centuries the Smiths were regarded as solid members of the community. In a recent study, Richard Lloyd Anderson has described the ancestors of the Prophet as possessing "moral responsibility, unselfishness, personal tenacity, intellectual awareness, and intelligent sincerity."\textsuperscript{40}

Histories of the Church, biographies of the Smiths, and Topsfield historical records agree on at least three characteristics which the Smiths of Topsfield shared: patriotism, religiosity, and socio-economic success. While all five generations of Joseph Smith's ancestors demonstrated patriotic virtues, Samuel Smith (II) and Asael Smith seemed best to exemplify love of country. Samuel Smith served in the General Court, the state legislature, on committees of correspondence prior to the Revolution, and held a number of local offices. Known as "Captain Samuel Smith," he distinguished himself in the Topsfield militia. While his father, Samuel (II), served as an officer in the Revolution, Asael enlisted as a soldier and saw military action in New York. In an address written on 10 April 1799, Asael Smith urged his family to be loyal to the United States and impressed upon them his own sense of patriotism and conviction that the Constitution was inspired. Clearly, the ancestors of the Prophet Joseph Smith were as patriotic as any of the founding fathers.\textsuperscript{41}

The ancestors of the Prophet loved God as well as country. Church records and historical accounts provide substantial evidence to prove that all five generations of Smiths who resided

\textsuperscript{39}The general histories of the Church as well as most biographical studies of Joseph Smith and his ancestors deal with this matter. See especially Richard Lloyd Anderson, \textit{Joseph Smith's New England Heritage} (Salt Lake City, Utah: Deseret Book Company, 1971).

\textsuperscript{40}Anderson, \textit{Joseph Smith's New England Heritage}, p. 159.

\textsuperscript{41}Ibid., pp. 82-92; \textit{CHC}, 1:2-5; Joseph F. Smith, Jr., "Asaehel Smith of Topsfield, With Some Account of the Smith Family," \textit{Topsfield Historical Collections}, 8:87-101 (1902). Note: Joseph Smith, Jr. is now commonly referred to as Joseph Fielding Smith; Dow, \textit{History of Topsfield}, p. 167.
in Topsfield were sincerely religious. While Robert, Samuel (I), and Samuel (II) affiliated with the Congregational Church, Asael advocated the beliefs of the Universalist Church. Throughout his life Asael Smith endeavored to teach his children and grandchildren the basic tenets of Christianity. A man of practiced integrity and uncompromising honesty, Asael Smith emulated the life of Jesus Christ in whom he so firmly believed. It was this kind of faith that Asael Smith bequeathed his son Joseph Smith, Sr., and his grandson Joseph Smith, Jr.42

Recognized for their patriotism and religiousness, the ancestors of Joseph Smith also gained recognition for their socio-economic achievements. Their contemporaries referred to them as pillars of the community and their property holdings demonstrate their relative affluence. The most impressive property acquired by the Smiths was the farm where the well-known Smith-Dorman house was located. Situated on Pye Brook, this property was the site of a grist mill operated by Francis Peabody as early as 1665. In 1690 Thomas Dorman built a house there. Sometime after 1755, Samuel Smith acquired the house and land and conveyed it to his son Asael on 24 March 1786. Joseph Smith, Sr., was born in this house 12 July 1771. The birthplace of the Prophet's father was a two-story colonial style farm house measuring forty by twenty feet. Asael Smith sold the property to Nathaniel Perkins Averill in 1791 for 270 pounds.43

While many know that Joseph Smith's ancestors lived in Topsfield, few realize that some of Brigham Young's ancestors also resided there. Through his mother, Abigail Howe, Brigham Young was related to Francis Peabody, an ancestor of Joseph Smith, who lived in a house about a quarter of a mile from the Smith home.44

And what of Joseph Smith and Brigham Young: did they

43Sidney Perley, History of Boxford, Essex County, Massachusetts (Boxford, Mass.: Published by the author, 1880), pp. 35-34; John H. Towne, "Francis Peabody's Gristmill," Toppfield Historical Collections, 1:39-45 (1895); Sidney Perley, "Toppfield Houses and Lands," Toppfield Historical Collections, 29:87-88 (1928). The house in which the Smiths resided was taken down in about 1875. The present house had been built in the meantime, during the nineteenth century. The property is presently owned by Levi C. Wade, Jr. There are no markers or signs to indicate the historical significance of the property.
44Toppfield Historical Collections, 50:120 (1935).
ever visit Topsfield? Although no direct evidence exists to substantiate such a visit by either man, it is a well-documented fact that they visited nearby Salem, Massachusetts. Following his leg operation in Lebanon, New Hampshire, Joseph Smith, then only eight years of age, went to the home of his uncle Jesse Smith, in Salem, Massachusetts, to recuperate.\(^\text{46}\) Many years later, in 1836, after he and the Church had moved from New York to Ohio, Joseph Smith again visited Salem. One scholar believes that the purpose of this second visit was to find buried treasure supposedly hidden in Salem.\(^\text{46}\) Certainly the Church was in dire need of financial assistance and thus one motive for the journey to Salem might have been to find the treasure reputedly located there. Section 3 of the Doctrine and Covenants, a revelation received by Joseph Smith on 6 August 1836, at Salem, does make reference to treasure located there, but the wording makes the meaning difficult and obscure. Joseph Smith’s own account in his *Journal History* and in the *History of the Church* fails to mention anything about treasure or treasure hunting and dwells on the missionary activity in which they engaged. His account reads in part: “We... arrived in Salem, Massachusetts, early in August, where we hired a house, and occupied the same during the month, teaching people from house to house, and preaching publicly, as opportunity presented; visiting occasionally, sections of the surrounding country, rich in the history of the Pilgrim Fathers of New England. ...”\(^\text{47}\) From the evidence available, one might conclude that the purpose of Joseph Smith’s second journey to Salem was both to enrich the Church and to do missionary work. Apparently, however, any alleged attempt to locate buried or hidden treasure was unsuccessful. From his statement concerning visits to “sections of the surrounding country” one might conclude that the Prophet also visited Topsfield, his ancestral home. At any rate, his second trip to Salem was a most interesting and unusual event.


\(^\text{49}\)Joseph Smith, *History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints*, ed. B. H. Roberts, 7 vols. (Salt Lake City, Utah: Deseret News Press, 1965), 2:464 (hereafter referred to as *HC*). The same words are also found in the *Journal History of the Church* located at the Church Historian’s Office in Salt Lake City, Utah (hereafter referred to as *JH*).
Like his predecessor, Joseph Smith, Brigham Young was also in Salem and may have visited Topsfield, as well. While Joseph Smith was there on his second trip, Brigham Young arrived in the company of Lyman E. Johnson. During the spring of the next year, 1837, Brigham Young returned to Salem for the purpose of calling on members of the Church and transacting business. Thus, Brigham Young and Joseph Smith both sojourned in Salem and possibly in Topsfield, Massachusetts.

The name of Joseph Smith may or may not be familiar to residents of Topsfield today. It depends upon whom one asks. Newer residents, those who live in Topsfield as a "bedroom city" and commute to work in Boston, generally have not heard of the Prophet Joseph Smith. On the other hand, the old Yankee members of the community, those whose roots run far back into Topsfield's past, generally know of the founder of Mormonism. In separate interviews, the town librarian and the curator of the Topsfield Historical Society confirmed the fact that the older members of the community are aware that Topsfield is the ancestral home of Joseph Smith.

Physical evidence of the Prophet's ancestors is scant. The home which some of his forebears occupied is no longer there. Not even a marker exists to identify the old Smith property. In the Pine Grove Cemetery, Topsfield's oldest surviving burial ground, one finds a single marker or monument to the Smith family erected by George Albert Smith in 1873. In the library, of course, there are historical and genealogical records of the five generations of Smiths who lived in this picturesque New England village during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

Despite the lack of physical evidence or historical artifacts, the knowledge that Topsfield is the ancestral home of the Prophet is part of the lives of those who are descendants of Topsfield's founders. For Wallace Kneeland, superintendent of Topsfield cemeteries, Joseph Smith is a part of his experience. Mr. Kneeland enjoys chatting with members of the

---

"HC, 2:466.
"IH (14 March 1857).
"Interviews with Mrs. Margaret J. Mayo, librarian of the town of Topsfield, 1 April 1971 and 16 October 1972. Interviews with Miss June Tilton, curator of the Topsfield Historical Society, 14 July 1970 and 2 September 1971. Miss Tilton is related to Joseph Smith through the Gould family of Topsfield. She has an excellent family history and genealogy in her possession."
The Smith family marker in Topsfield Pine Grove Cemetery. The monument was erected in 1873 by George Albert Smith.
Church who visit Topsfield today, either to pay homage to the Prophet's ancestors or to engage in genealogical research. Reminiscing about earlier visitors, Kneeland recalled that some Mormons came to Topsfield during the early part of the twentieth century and visited the site of the old Smith farm. He said that they carried off bits and pieces from the remains of the old house as souvenirs and also held religious services near the well on the former Smith property.51 Wallace Kneeland, June Tilton and other descendants of the original founding families are proud that their town is the ancestral home of the Prophet Joseph Smith.

51 Interview with Wallace Kneeland, superintendent of Topsfield cemeteries, 2 September 1971.
Personal Faith and Public Policy:
Some Timely Observations on the
League of Nations Controversy in Utah*

James B. Allen**

For nearly twenty years as a teacher either in the seminaries and institutes of the Church or at Brigham Young University, I have frequently been called upon to counsel with young students as well as adults on various matters. For many the problem of making political decisions is one which seems to cause a great deal of frustration. Constantly I have been asked the question, where does the Church stand on this or that political issue? Repeatedly I have been confronted with statements to the effect that this or that person has said that Latter-day Saints must, if they understand the Gospel, take such and such a stand on such and such an issue. I have been touched by students who become confused and frustrated when they hear leaders and teachers whom they respect cite the scriptures and quote the prophets on opposite sides of the same questions. What role, they seem to be asking, does my faith have in helping me make political decisions? Is it a sign that I don’t understand the Gospel if my attitude on some public policy is different from that of a Church leader, or leaders? For most of us here, such questions are probably elementary, for we have solved them long ago. For me, the constant contact with students who still have such questions has led me to search the history of the Church for precedents and

*The following paper was presented by James B. Allen as the presidential address of the Mormon History Association at its seventh annual meeting in Salt Lake City, Utah on 5 April 1973.

**James B. Allen, professor of history at Brigham Young University, also serves as Assistant Church Historian and is a past president of the Mormon History Association.
insights which, in proper perspective, can help young people achieve a personal balance in their quest for a solution to the problem of personal faith and public policy.¹

The League of Nations controversy in Utah presents just such an opportunity. All the questions are raised: American isolationism or world cooperation? Should the Church take a stand on political issues? Should a Church official speak to problems of national policy? Can he turn to the scriptures for support of his position? Where does the lay member find himself when he disagrees with his ecclesiastical leaders on political issues?

Actually a study of this old controversy does not answer any of these questions. But it does demonstrate with one intensely moving incident of fifty-four years ago that men of devout loyalty to the Church, who understand and live the basic principles of the gospel, and who are men of sincere good will toward each other, can and often do disagree on public policy, even to the extent of relating their views on that policy to their religious views. And yet at the same time, they display no public animosity, hostility, or lack of genuine respect toward those with whom they disagree, and see no reason to question the faith or integrity of their opponents. One might even infer from this and similar incidents that part of the strength of Mormonism is its ability to attract and hold tough-minded men of different political persuasion, all involved in the building of the Kingdom. Imaginative, strong-willed, successful leaders are seldom if ever like-minded on every topic, and, a sign of true greatness in such men is that they can disagree, even in public, on some issues and yet do it in such a spirit that their unity on matters that genuinely affect the faith is not inhibited.

Let’s review the political drama of 1919, letting the chips fall where they may as I try to tell as accurately as possible what happened as Church members at all levels wrestled with the perplexities of relating personal faith to public policy.

The drama of that year included many sub-plots and characters, all tightly interwoven. Yet we must at the outset separate at least some of them in order to fully appreciate the com-

¹Similar concerns led me to write an earlier article on Mormon attitudes toward presidential elections. See "The American Presidency and the Mormons," The Ensign (October 1962).
plexity of the story and the impact one element could have upon the other.

In the background, but nevertheless clearly visible throughout the controversy, was Woodrow Wilson, Democratic President of the United States, whose idealistic plans for permanent world peace had actually set the stage for the impending drama in Utah. At the end of the Great World War, Wilson went personally to the peace conference in Paris and was able, through much persuasion and compromise, to make his proposed League of Nations an integral part of the peace treaty. At home, however, the battle for ratification of the treaty in the Senate became intensely partisan. Most Republican Senators tended to favor American entry into the League only if certain reservations or amendments were agreed to which they believed were necessary to protect American sovereignty. Leader of this group was Henry Cabot Lodge of Massachusetts. Other Republicans were known as “irreconcilables” because they refused to endorse the League under any circumstances whatsoever. The Democrats, on the other hand, generally supported Wilson, although some of them would have agreed to the Lodge reservations if it were necessary to save the League at all. Wilson became irreconcilable in his own way by refusing to accept any major reservations, and in a direct challenge to the powerful Republican leadership in the Senate, he took his case directly to the American people. The controversy set off a series of debates throughout the country, but hardly any of them more intense, partisan, or emotional than that which took place in Utah. In the end, Wilson’s own followers defeated the League when, after the Senate accepted the Lodge reservations, Wilson instructed them to vote against it.2

The main events in the present plot took place among the Latter-day Saints in Utah, with a few dramatic scenes in Washington, D.C. There were many characters in the drama; the line-up was indeed impressive. Some who played the most active roles were these:

Senator Reed Smoot, the Mormon Apostle who had won nation-wide publicity in 1904-1906 when a long and bitter investigation was carried out by the Senate before it would ac-

---

cept him as a colleague in that august body, but who now was gaining wide respect not only within the Republican Party but among all his Senate colleagues. A man of unquestioned integrity, he displayed an intense nationalism that led him to question anything, including the League of Nations, that would tend to undermine the total independence of America. From the tone of some of his statements, it would appear that Smoot was almost an irreconcilable, but after much soul-searching he joined forces with Senator Lodge as a "reservationist," and refused to endorse the League of Nations without the proposed amendments.

Although Smoot made no speeches in the Senate on the League and was not known in public as a leader of the reservationists, he often met privately with Lodge and others to help plan strategy to be followed by the reservationist Senators. As a confidante of Lodge, he even acted on one occasion as a go-between when Lodge wanted someone to attempt to persuade former President William Howard Taft that the League, which Taft supported, would never be ratified without the reservations. Smoot's intense concern with the League is seen in the fact that throughout the debates of 1919 and early 1920 he regularly recorded in his diary candid comments on what was happening. In addition, he assiduously collected all the speeches made in the Senate on the treaty and the League and had them bound into a book that "contained over 3000 pages, about 2100 words to the page making a book of about 6,300,000 words."5

Complicating Smoot's role was the fact that he would stand for re-election in 1920 and he realized that generally the people of Utah supported the League of Nations. After repeated warnings from friend and foe alike as to the political implications of his stand, he boldly made his feelings known in the faith that by the time of the election the people of Utah would

5For the best political analysis of Reed Smoot, see Milton R. Merrill, "Reed Smoot, Apostle in Politics," Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1950. See especially the sections on "Reed Smoot—American," and "The League of Nations." Unfortunately, at the time Merrill wrote his dissertation the Smoot diaries were not available to him. Additional insight into Smoot's role in the League controversy has been gained as a result of examining the diaries.

6Reed Smoot Diaries. Handwritten manuscript, Brigham Young University Library, 1 October 1919. See also entries for 6 August, 31 August, 6 November, and 18 November.

7Ibid., 3 February 1920. On this date "movie men" (apparently news-men) took pictures of Smoot with the book.
either have been persuaded to his view or the issue would no longer be important. In this he was correct.

Charles W. Nibley, Presiding Bishop of the Mormon Church. Nibley was a close friend of Smoot and was even more intensely opposed to the League than was the Senator. He was, in fact, an "irreconcilable" in attitude. He corresponded frequently with Smoot, met with him in Washington to plan anti-League strategy, and generally became one of the most outspoken voices in Utah against the League. In addition, Bishop Nibley was avidly working for the re-election of Smoot, and used the means at his disposal to achieve that end.7

B. H. Roberts, a member of the First Council of the Seventy, and a member of the Democratic Party. He was as much convinced that the Democratic Party came closest to reflecting the will of God as Smoot was that Republicanism, Americanism, and Mormonism were almost inseparable. Roberts had not been as fortunate as Smoot in his quest for a seat in Congress. After being elected to the House of Representatives in 1898, he was refused his seat by that body because he had been a practicing polygamist. In 1919 Roberts became the most active proponent of the League of Nations among the leadership of the Church.

8Ibid., 28 September 1919.

The intensity of Nibley's efforts to keep Smoot in the Senate is illustrated by two interesting incidents. In 1906 Nibley had some reservations about whether Smoot should continue in the Senate. When he expressed these feelings to Joseph F. Smith, the President of the Church brought his fist down emphatically and replied: "If I have ever had the inspiration of the Spirit of the Lord given to me forcefully and clearly it has been on this one point concerning Reed Smoot, and that is, instead of his being retired, he should be continued in the United States Senate." This settled the matter for Nibley, who recalled in 1918: "I withdrew my opposition and from that hour to this . . . I have loyally and faithfully supported Senator Smoot." Charles W. Nibley, Reminiscences (Salt Lake City: Published by His Family, 1934), pp. 125-126. In 1920 Nibley was still loyal and faithful to Smoot. On 26 February he wrote to the President of the Uintah Stake, Don B. Colton, with regard to becoming Republican party chairman in Utah. Wrote Nibley, in part: "Dear Brother Colton: Confirming my conversation with you of this evening over the phone, I am very glad to know that you are willing to accept the job.

President Grant said that they had made a rule a long while ago that stake presidents should as a rule keep out of politics as much as possible, but in this case he was willing, he said, to let you go ahead and do anything you could to try and re-elect Senator Smoot . . . .

"I will do everything I can to back you up with men and means. We must win. There is no such word as fail this time." Charles W. Nibley to Don B. Colton, 26 February 1920. Charles W. Nibley papers, Church Archives, Box 6.
Joseph Fielding Smith, son of the late President of the Church, Joseph F. Smith, and himself a member of the Quorum of the Twelve, who would become the President of the Church in 1970. Other than Reed Smoot, Elder Smith and David O. McKay were the only Apostles who stood in opposition to the League. Elder Smith apparently drew especially close to Smoot during this emotional controversy as he encouraged him through the mails, kept him informed of what was going on among the leadership of the Church, and warned him of possible consequences of a strong, unswerving stand.

George F. Richards, member of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles who, at the time of the debate, returned from England where he had been presiding over the European Mission. Probably as a result of that mission he was especially conscious of the ravages of war and sympathetic to the yearnings of the European people for the final end of such destruction. Equally convinced with Smoot that God guided the destiny of America, he nevertheless interpreted the direction of that guidance differently. He declared on July 27 in a quarterly conference of the Pioneer Stake:

You know something of the history of our forefathers, how they fought for their liberty, and how the constitution of the United States was framed. The Lord has told us by direct revelation that He had a hand in that matter; that He raised up the men who framed the constitution of the United States; that He inspired them; and we believe firmly that the Lord led the Pilgrim fathers to this land.

I believe that the president of the United States was raised up of the Lord. I believe that the Lord has been with him. He is regarded in Europe as one of the greatest men—a man with one of the greatest minds in the world—Woodrow Wilson . . . . It may be possible that amendments [to the League covenants] may be necessary. Scarcely any great movement has been so perfect in its inception that no amendments were necessary later, and I believe that the league of nations is inspired of God.

Reed Smoot, it would be safe to say, had a hard time believing that Woodrow Wilson was inspired to do anything.

---

8Joseph Fielding Smith, Jr., to Reed Smoot, 13 September 1919, as quoted in Merrill, Reed Smoot," p. 321.
9Smith even warned Smoot that many of the brethren were inclined to censure him for his use of Mormon scriptures in opposition to the League.
10Salt Lake Tribune, 28 July 1919. A major portion of Richards' address was devoted to the League.
In fact, as the controversy heated up in November, and as more was said about the League being the product of inspiration, he wrote in an impassioned letter to George H. Brimhall:

I cannot help feeling that we have made a mistake in thinking that President Wilson has been directed and inspired of God. . . . I think that if the Lord had anything to do with the League of Nations, it was during the last election, when the Senate of the United States was changed from Democratic to Republican.11

Heber J. Grant, who had become President of the Church in 1918, had served the Democratic party faithfully in all his early political activities and in this debate was fully and openly on the side of Wilson and the League of Nations.

J. Reuben Clark, Jr., a prominent international lawyer, former member of the judge advocate general’s office in the United States Army, and author of an important reference work on the German peace treaty that was being used by the United State Senate. As B. H. Roberts became a sort of traveling spokesman in favor of the League, Clark played the same role in opposition. Highly respected as a scholar, Clark was probably better informed on all matters related to the League, as well as the history of American international relations, than any of the other characters in the drama of 1919.12

C. N. Lund, Jr., faithful Mormon, editor of a newspaper in Mt. Pleasant, Utah, and emotionally committed to the League of Nations. He set off a chain reaction of letters and discussions when he wrote to Senator Smoot not only complaining of his stand on the League of Nations, but also questioning how Smoot could refuse to believe that the League was inspired. Reflecting the spirit of what was going on throughout Utah, Lund wrote:

Last Sunday evening I attended a meeting, one of many Church meetings that I have attended where the league has been favorably discussed. The elder who prayed asked God to give the president and the senators sufficient wisdom to adopt this plan as one of the greatest steps forward in the

---

11Reed Smoot to George H. Brimhall, 17 November 1919. George H. Brimhall papers, Brigham Young University Library.

great upward march of mankind, and as a literal carrying out of the doctrines of the Savior of the world. . . . Similar prayers and sermons have been spoken in many a church throughout the length and breadth of the whole United States. I feel justified that the head of our own church, the apostles and leaders and the lay members, almost as a unit, are for this great proposition.

Lund reminded the Senator that, as a high churchman, he believed that God had inspired Christopher Columbus, the Mayflower pilgrims, the writers of the Declaration of Independence, the framers of the Constitution, and Abraham Lincoln. He then went on to inquire:

Now, let me ask, believing so, why you do not see the hand of Providence in this mighty effort in our own day and time, to bring about peace to a war-weary world? Why can you not see that the same God who inspired Washington and Jefferson and Lincoln does also inspire Woodrow Wilson . . . in this the greatest step ever contemplated by the human race?23

Smoot sent a long reply to Lund in which some of the over-riding themes of our plot were beautifully developed. Smoot’s letter, though obviously filled with an emotional attachment to his principles, was exemplary in its lack of emotional wandering, in its solid reasoning, and in the spirit of good will with which the Senator replied to his critic. And it was this spirit of good will which many Church leaders expressed, in spite of their differences, that is the real message of the story we are attempting to unfold.24

Smoot wrote in part:

Dear Friend Lund:

. . . I want you to know that I appreciate your letter, as I do letters from any of my constituents, expressing their views on public questions.

I think I understand the spirit and meaning of your letter, and why it was written. Your surroundings, and no doubt your first impression that the League of Nations would insure

23The letter was originally written on 15 July 1919, but apparently Lund misplaced his copy. He rewrote it for the sake of publication on 22 August, and it appeared in the Salt Lake Tribune, 24 August 1919.

24The writer recognizes, of course, that there was also some ill-will displayed among prominent people. But if even a few Church leaders on opposite sides of the question were able to maintain both the image and reality of brotherhood toward those with whom they disagreed, the point of this discussion will have been made.
the future peace of the world, have convinced you that the League is all that was first claimed for it, and as a friend, you concluded that I was letting political bias warp my better judgment. I hope to be able to convince you otherwise.

Then, after a long explanation of the problems in the League covenant, Smoot came to the question about the Church and inspiration:

You ask me if I want to disappoint the Church and the State in my stand on this question. Certainly, I do not, but I have taken an oath of office to defend the Constitution of the United States. I have prayed as much over this question as any member of the Church, and I think I have studied it with more care than any member of the Church. The responsibility of my vote is upon me. If my vote is cast wrongly, I am the one that in the future will be condemned, not the members of the Church at home.

Yes, I do believe that the framers of the Constitution were inspired of God. I do believe that America, this land of ours, was reserved by God for the establishment of truth and liberty thereon, but I am not prepared to admit that President Wilson has been inspired of God in effecting the Covenant of the League of Nations, either in its original or its present form....

And after another long section on the implication of the League, he continued:

You testify to me that, if my stand on the League is not all that it should be before God and man, I will be badly repudiated at the polls. I want you to know that I am doing what I believe is my duty to my Church, to my Country, and to my God. I would not do otherwise if it cost me every vote in the State of Utah.

I am just as sure as I live that, when the present form of the Covenant is explained to the people, they will support me in standing for and demanding the reservations as I have already outlined. I believe in the Americanism of the Utah people, and will be content to abide by their decision in this matter.

I appreciate your friendship, your good will and your counsel, but in this matter, I am following the dictates of my conscience and the best inspiration I can get from my Heavenly Father.

Do not hesitate to write me upon any public question, for I am always glad to hear the views of my constituents, and I am never afraid to let them know just where I stand.15

15Reed Smoot to C. N. Lund, Jr., 11 August 1919. Copy filed with Brimhall papers.
The faculty of Brigham Young University, of which there were fewer than sixty that year. Most of them, as well as several faculty wives, signed petitions asking Senator Smoot to change his position on the League.

The Studentbody of Brigham Young University, and especially the young editor of the student yearbook, Nels Anderson, later a distinguished sociologist, who stood squarely for the League without reservations.

George H. Brimhall, President of Brigham Young University and a close personal friend of Reed Smoot. Brimhall favored the League of Nations, and was frank to admit to the senator that he had told a newsman, "I am for the league of nations, first, last, and all the time, and I have implicit confidence in the United States Senate." But in the controversy he turned out to be sort of middleman between the university community on one hand and Smoot on the other. It was a frustrating position to be in, but he played his role well.

On 15 October 1919, the studentbody of Brigham Young University sent a resolution to the Senate urging immediate ratification of the League of Nations, without reservation or amendments. Smoot, an alumnus of BYU and now a member of its board of trustees, quickly acknowledged the resolution, but took the occasion to write a lengthy letter expressing to the students all his reasons for opposing the League in its present form. Said he, in the spirit of good will in which he conducted nearly all his replies to such petitions,

You must know that it would give me great pleasure to comply with the first request ever made of me as a United States Senator by the studentbody of my Alma Mater, but I am compelled, under my oath of office, and as one who is jealous of America's nationality and who fears the future of our Government in that internationality which is the League's highest aim, to advise you that, unless reservations are made to the League of Nations Covenant that will preserve to the American people the Independence and sovereignty of their Government, I will be compelled to vote against the Treaty. I am a nationalist, not an internationalist, and I cannot vote to submerge our nationality with a supernationality, which would be the result if the League of Nations in its present form were ratified.17

16George H. Brimhall to Reed Smoot, 7 November 1919. Brimhall Papers.
17Reed Smoot to BYU Studentbody, 22 October 1919, in White and Blue, 5 November 1919.
The students at BYU were not reluctant to debate the issue, even though it meant arguing with an apostle of the Church. Smoot had not attempted to use his apostleship to promote his political ends, but the fact remained that he was a Church leader as well as a member of the board of trustees, and some people might have felt that students should be highly circumspect in the nature of their opposition to him. Student reaction, while not by any means disrespectful, was pointed. On November 11 an editorial appeared in the student newspaper which expressed disappointment at the nature of Senator Smoot’s reply, especially in his personal criticism of Wilson. To be more precise, the editorial accused Smoot of distorting the facts, although the students tended toward a little historical distortion themselves when they said, “We are inclined to accept Oscar Strauss’ [a Republican, by the way] prophetic picture of the progress of the ages. A few days ago in New York he declared, ‘There are and have been four great land marks in human history. The Ten Commandments, Magna Carta, the Constitution of the United States and the League of Nations.’” The editorial ended with a heartfelt plea in behalf of student veterans:

Let us say that many of us who are supporting the resolution are not mere idealists; some of us have been in the camps and ‘over there’ in the thickest of the fight. We felt ourselves fighting to end the war and to help secure the ultimate peace of the world. Nor did we feel less loyal to our country because of this larger vision.19

At the same time, the BYU faculty expressed similar concerns, and likewise petitioned Senator Smoot to support the League. It was an overwhelming show of solidarity on the issue when over fifty of them signed a letter on October 30 which declared “We feel that objections raised against the League of Nations furnish no substantial reasons for amendment or qualifications requiring reconsideration by the peace conference or any of its associated members.20 Such a statement was a direct challenge to Smoot’s oft-stated position that he would endorse the League only with the major reservations being proposed.

18One student who participated actively in public debates, and who favored the League, Ernest L. Wilkinson, later became president of the university and was well known for his political conservatism.
19White and Blue, 1 November 1919.
20Provo Post, 7 November 1919.
At least two members of the faculty wrote in support of Smoot's position, but the generally overwhelming opposition of the faculty, their wives and the student body, together with the fact that the chairman of the board (President Heber J. Grant) shared their views, led the harassed senator to confide in his diary that if his position brought any embarrassment to the President of the university he would resign as member of the board of trustees.  

In this troubled spirit the senator wrote a magnanimous letter to President Brimhall:

I have received petitions from the faculty of the University, from the student body of the University, and from the wives of the teachers of the University, asking me to vote for the League of Nations without amendments or reservations. This I cannot do, and I have thought that perhaps my position in this regard is very embarrassing to you and may be resented by the school.

It might be that it will be best for me, under the circumstances, to resign as one of the Directors of the University. I assure you that I will gladly do so if it will advance the interests of the University in any way. I never want it said that my position on any question reflects in any way upon that great institution of learning. Kindly let me know your views on this matter, as I will withhold action until I hear from you.

I want you to know that to do so would cause me regret, but I love the institution well enough to make almost any sacrifice for its betterment.  

Such an offer could only have been a bombshell to Brimhall, who was struggling valiantly to keep the debate above personalities, and who, in spite of their political differences, maintained a very close relationship with Senator Smoot. In one of the most touching letters written throughout our drama, Brimhall wrote his good friend as follows:

I am well and regretfully aware of the undue pressure that has been put upon you, and have been severely criticized and soundly abused for not "doing my bit" to bend you into a reversal of your convictions as to what is best for our country and the cause of human "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Our petitioners do not know you as I do; for if they ever did know it, they have forgotten that you faced a world with

---

21Smoot diaries, 13 November 1919.
22Reed Smoot to George H. Brimhall, 12 November 1919. Brimhall papers.
a few friends and won out; and when I say a few friends, I mean that in comparison with your enemies your friends in number were few indeed, but among your friends was He, who with one man is always a majority. The trial of today is just another test of Faith, Hope and Charity which belong on both sides of every issue, and those to whom much of these three qualities has been given, from them much is expected.

One of the weaknesses of a democracy is the imperialism of the majority. This was exemplified in the cry at the court of Pilate, and yet democracy, the youngest of earth governments, will grow, make its own mistakes, learn by what it suffers, and wield the sceptre of power as a gift from God.

I cannot entertain the thought of you resigning from the Board of Trustees of our beloved Alma Mater. The institution cannot afford it. Your head, and your heart, and your hand have guided, comforted, and carried the school in days of almost helplessness.

If standing up for you, or refusing to ask you to reverse yourself works against me I shall enjoy the working.

I am quite sure that both faculty and student body would register a vote against your severing your official connection with the school; and you could not get a single vote from either the Presidency of the school or the Board to sanction your retirement, and the secretary of both of these organizations, granted the opportunity, would register a No.

Needless to say, Smoot did not resign, and the general good will between himself and the student body remained, in spite of a few embarrassing incidents connected with the exuberance of the youthful editors of the school publications.

---

23Brimhall is obviously referring to the controversy in the Senate over the seating of Reed Smoot.

24George H. Brimhall to Reed Smoot, 20 November 1919. Brimhall papers.

25In reply to Brimhall’s touching letter, Smoot wrote, in part: “At the time I wrote you in relation to my resignation as one of the trustees of the Brigham Young University, I had no resentment in my heart. I did it because I thought that it was better for the institution to have the faculty a unit with the teachers of the institution and the student body itself. Before taking any steps, however, I felt that it was my duty to write to the man who had given the best that was in him, and nearly his life besides, endeavoring to make the institution what I believe God intended it to be. I shall take no further action in the matter, but hope to have a heart-to-heart talk with you about the future of the institution as soon as I return to Utah.” Smoot to Brimhall, 28 November 1919, Brimhall papers.

26On one occasion a rather snide remark was included in the joke column, for which the student editor quickly apologized (White and Blue, 19 November 1919, and 26 November 1919). On another occasion Nels Anderson, editor of the yearbook, was giving a lantern slide lecture. After showing a slide of Smoot and Senator Lodge, he said that these were not the only opponents of
These, then, were some of the major characters in the drama taking place within the Church in 1919. There were also several themes that made up the complicated plot, three of which I should like to mention. One was the deep reverence for America and its institutions which was felt among both factions in the controversy. The belief that God had inspired the founding fathers and was guiding the destiny of the country was a basic assumption on both sides. They only disagreed on whether such an institution as the League could also be inspired. Next, and certainly a more complex problem, was the ideal of unity in the faith, and, in connection with it, the question of whether or not the scriptures and the teachings of the prophets could form a doctrinal basis for opposition to or support of such political issues. Finally, the spirit of good will in political debate, as opposed to bitter personal attacks on one's opponent, forms a conflict theme that is just as important as the issue of the League itself.

But time flies and we have hardly finished the prologue to our drama. This has been deliberate, for the real value of studying such an incident in history is not always in recounting the sequence of events. The value might lie, rather, as in this case, with the insight into what these events meant, and could still mean, in the lives of people, and I hope that some positive thoughts on this will have been stimulated by what I have said and will yet say in this discussion.

Briefly, the major plot would run something like this:

_Latter part of 1918 and early 1919:_ Woodrow Wilson

the League of Nations, and flashed on the screen a picture of some monkeys. This brought a flurry of giggles from the audience and was eventually reported, probably with some distortion, to Senator Smoot. Brimhall was dismayed at what he considered an inappropriate embarrassment to a member of the board of trustees. The incident soon brought an exchange of letters between Smoot, Anderson, and Brimhall that are in themselves an interesting study in differing human perspectives. Anderson understood that he was being asked to apologize to Smoot. He wrote to Smoot expressing dismay at such a prospect, for he felt he had nothing to apologize for. This was, to him, only in the category of the same kind of political joke that Smoot himself would laugh at, and he claimed nothing but respect toward the senator. Smoot replied that he was not seeking an apology, but hoped that Anderson would see that there was a difference between a political joke against an individual, and something that would seem to be pointed toward an officer of the institution. In a letter to Brimhall, Smoot declared, "Poor Brother Anderson cannot see the difference between ridiculing an individual as such and doing so before the studentbody of an institution in which the person ridiculed is an officer. I hope someday that he may." See Brimhall to Smoot, 11 December 1919; Smoot to Brimhall, 29 January 1920; Smoot to Anderson, 29 January 1920. Brimhall papers. Some of these letters contain copies of still others.
goes to Europe, returns with the treaty. The League of Nations is discussed widely throughout the nation. Smoot, from the beginning, mistrusts Wilson, his motives, and his plans.27

February 22 and 23, 1919: As part of the effort to promote the League, the Mountain Congress of the League to Enforce Peace holds a convention in Salt Lake City. Former U.S. President William Howard Taft attends, as does President Heber J. Grant and other prominent Church leaders. A resolution is passed by the 9,000 delegates from Utah, Idaho, and Wyoming, with only one dissenting vote, declaring that the League of Nations is the means of guaranteeing that peace, liberty, and justice will be established and maintained. Among the members of the platform committee that drew up the resolution is George Albert Smith, a member of the Quorum of the Twelve. President Heber J. Grant conducts some of the activities of the convention.28

March 4, 1919: Reed Smoot makes his first public stand on the League by signing the so-called "Round Robin" sponsored by Senator Lodge. Three days later he dictates a form letter to send to those whom he knew would deluge him with mail criticizing the Lodge resolution. By the end of the month debates are being carried on regularly throughout Utah, and B. H. Roberts is becoming a major spokesman in favor of the League.

April 10, 1919: Deseret News editorial signed by the First Presidency calls for support of "peace day" and wide discussion of League of Nations.

27As noted earlier, Smoot made constant reference in his diary to the League controversy. The following are representative of his attitude. December 21, 1918: "Lodge made a great speech on the present world situation and terms of peace. It no doubt will have weight with members of the Peace Conference of foreign countries. It punctured some of Wilson's idealisms." March 1, 1919: "Senate took recess to allow the Republicans to hold a conference to agree upon a legislative program. At the conference it was decided by a vote of 15 to 14 not to prevent the passage of the Bond Bill. Some very pointed remarks against Wilson were made and the 14 in favor of preventing any further legislation with a view of forcing an extra session of Congress charged (and it was well understood by all) that Wilson's statement that he would not call an extra session until he returned from the Peace Conference was in order that the people should not be informed of what was going on at the Conference. The Senate is the only place left that information can be gotten to the people and for this reason Wilson does not intend to call an extra session of Congress if he can help it." August 7, 1919, after noting the President's call for a joint session of Congress to discuss the high cost of living: "This is a clever political move and done to draw attention from the growing opposition to the League of Nations."

28Salt Lake Tribune, 22 and 23 February 1919.
April-May, 1919: Discussions held widely in Utah. Some bitterness is evoked as religion gets involved in the discussions. Both sides seem to feel that the doctrines of the Church support their own points-of-view.

July 15, 1919: C. N. Lund writes his significant letter to Reed Smoot. Result: The Lund letter and Smoot's reply are both eventually published and become the basis for further discussion in Utah.

July 20, 1919: The religious implications of the debate over the League become even more pointed as Apostle Anthony W. Ivins speaks out in favor of the League at the Weber Stake Conference in Ogden. "Those of you," he proclaims, "who do not want any more war, any more bloodshed, any more destruction, any more devastation in the world make that fact known to your representatives in Congress, that they will not dare to oppose the League or the covenant." At the close of his address, the eighty-four year old President of the Stake, L. W. Shurtliff, declares himself in hearty accord with all Elder Ivins has said, and calls for a sustaining vote for peace. All hands are raised. When he offers a chance for a vote in opposition to the League, no hands are raised. After the conference, the anti-League Salt Lake Herald attacks Apostle Ivins for his stand, which occasions a defense of Elder Ivins by the Tribune on 16 August.29

July 27, 1919: George F. Richards, member of the Council of the Twelve, addresses the quarterly conference of the Pioneer Stake and declares his belief that President Woodrow Wilson was "raised up of the Lord" and that the League of Nations was inspired.

August 11, 1919: As the tempo of the debate increases in Utah, Senator Smoot sends his twenty page reply to Lund.

August 24, 1919: The Salt Lake Tribune publishes the Lund-Smoot Correspondence. On the same day, a reporter visits Reed Smoot in Washington, D.C. and Smoot amplifies his reference in the Lund letter to Mormon scriptures. Mormon scripture, he argues, shows that world peace is impossible,

29Salt Lake Tribune, 22 July 1919, and 16 August 1919; Deseret News, 22 July 1919. There are many exchanges of letters that may be followed in the Salt Lake Tribune, Deseret News, and Salt Lake Herald, showing the bitter intensity of the fight. Only a few representative examples are given here.

30Cancelled.
and this is evidence that the League of Nations will fail. In addition, he says,

I believe this land, now called America, was held in reserve by God for ages, with a view of establishing upon it truth and liberty, and from this land truth and liberty would be carried to the farther ends of the world.

As I have said before, I prefer that America should Americanize Europe and not that Europe should Europeanize America.

If this country enters the League of Nations and mixes up with other nations, they will control and America will not be able to carry out its destiny.\(^{31}\)

These arguments reflect the general religious arguments used by Mormon opponents to the League.

August 26, 1919: Presiding Bishop Charles W. Nibley expresses alarm to Smoot that other Church leaders are active in Stake Conferences urging support of the League.\(^{32}\)

August 27, 1919: Smoot records in his diary that the Church newspaper, the Deseret News, has refused to print his reply to Lund, even after Bishop Nibley had offered to pay for it as an advertisement.

August 28, 1919: After considerable prayer and agonizing soul-searching, Joseph Fielding Smith writes a twelve page letter to President Grant about his deep concern over the issue. Two major problems trouble him: (1) that the brethren are in disagreement, which he feels they should not be, and (2) that it would be wrong for America to join the League of Nations. In a touching and eloquent plea he says, in part:

It appears that I am not in full harmony with the majority of my brethren. This is a solemn matter with me for I do not want to be out of harmony. I have but one desire and that is to support my brethren in defense of the truth and live in such a manner that I may at all times be in possession of the Spirit of the Lord. I have prayed about this matter and have lain awake nights thinking about it, and the more I reflect the more the position which I have taken appears to me to be correct. Under such conditions I know of no one to whom I can go, only to you, and I do so in the hope, and I believe the confidence, that I will not be misunderstood and that you will appreciate the position I am in.

\(^{31}\)Salt Lake Tribune, 25 August 1919.

\(^{32}\)Charles W. Nibley to Reed Smoot, 26 August 1919, in Merrill, "Reed Smoot," p. 315.
He then argues, on the basis of scripture as well as the utterances of former Church leaders, that peace is impossible in the last days, thus making membership in the League really "not a matter of politics, nor party affiliation, but of crying 'Peace, peace, when there is not peace.'"33

September 1, 1919: By this time there is widespread national publicity on the fact that Senator Smoot has used Mormon scripture to oppose the League of Nations.34

September 2, 1919: J. Reuben Clark, Jr., speaks to a capacity crowd in the Salt Lake Tabernacle, and gives an eloquent, well-studied argument against the League of Nations. In addition to the regular political arguments used by so many national speakers, he declares: "I belong to that great class of American citizens who see in the present situation such a departure from the traditional attitude of our government toward other nations and toward world politics as to constitute this one of the most critical moments in our history.

"Taught from my infancy that this constitution of ours was inspired; that the free institutions which it created and perpetuated were God given, I am one of those who scan every proposal to change or alter either with a critical eye."35 B. H. Roberts attends this meeting, and announces he will reply next week.

September 6, 1919: The Deseret News endorses the League of Nations, and criticizes those who say that it is impossible to avoid war. We have an obligation at least to try, reasons the News.

September 8, 1919: B. H. Roberts speaks in the Salt Lake Tabernacle, replying one by one to the arguments of Clark. In addition, Roberts uses Mormon Scripture in support of the League.36

September 13, 1919: Joseph Fielding Smith writes to Smoot warning him that some of the brethren are unhappy with his

---

33Joseph Fielding Smith to Heber J. Grant, 28 August 1919. Joseph Fielding Smith papers, Church archives.

34A copy of a national news service broadside, apparently distributed throughout the country, is on file in the Reed Smoot papers, Church archives. It is dated 1 September 1919, San Francisco. The scriptures quoted include I Nephi 13:19; II Nephi 10:11-12; Ether 1:22; Ether 2:12; and Doctrine and Covenants 87:1-6.

35Complete text of this address is found in the Deseret News, 6 September 1919.

36Deseret News, 13 September 1919. Roberts quoted, among other scriptures, II Nephi 12 as a chapter forgotten by the opponents of the League.
continued public stance against the League and have even suggested some form of censure. He says that only he and Elder McKay are with Smoot, and suggests that Smoot be more guarded in his actions. Nearly all agree, he writes, that "the standard works of the Church in no wise should be used in opposition to the proposed League, such a statement not to be a reflection on you if it can be made without."  

September 21, 1919: A severe blow to Smoot comes when President Heber J. Grant delivers the nearest thing to an official public rebuke. Speaking in a quarterly conference of the Salt Lake Stake, President Grant declares in unequivocal terms: "An illustrated hand-bill has been circulated and has been widely republished in newspapers under the heading: 'Mormon Bible Prophecies Become Issue in Opposition to the League of Nations.' The position of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints is that the standard works of the Church are not opposed to the League of Nations." Grant also endorses, in the strongest terms, the League of Nations, although he makes it clear that it is on the basis of his own opinion rather than scripture. Later, Grant considers his address important enough that he has it bound with the official report of the following October conference of the Church.  

September 23, 1919: President Woodrow Wilson receives a tumultuous welcome in Salt Lake City as he arrives to speak for the League. President Heber J. Grant is on the reception committee. A few days later, Wilson stricken ill, returns to Washington, and spends the rest of his days as an invalid.  

September 29, 1919: Bishop Nibley is in Washington, D.C., discussing politics with Smoot. The two decide that Smoot should write President Grant in reply to his conference address, and that Nibley will deliver the reply personally to the President of the Church.  

October 3, 4, 5, 1919: The general conference of the Church in Salt Lake City turns into a veritable flood of endorse-
ments of the League of Nations, from Orson F. Whitney's opening prayer onward. Smoot, still in Washington, anticipates such a meeting and writes in his diary: "October Conference opened today at Salt Lake. I expect we will have more League of Nations propaganda."

October 4, 1919: An interesting entry in Smoot's diary reveals both his loyalty to the President of the Church and his dismay at the Church leader's support of the League:

I received a telegram from Pres. H.J. Grant in which he quotes a statement made by him at the morning session referring to the sickness of Pres. Wilson as well as the prayer offered by Elder Orson F. Whitney and requesting that I with Senator King convey same to President Wilson. I immediately dictated a letter to the President conveying the information contained in Grant's telegram. Went to King's office, read it to him and we both signed it and I had a messenger deliver it to the White House. Sen. King and I both thought it was not in very good taste. It was a great endorsement of the League of Nations.

October-November, 1919: Although they have been active in the drama to this point, the Brigham Young University faculty and student body now play more prominent roles and find themselves in conflict with a man who is not only an apostle and senator, but also on their board of trustees.

November, 1919: The United States Senate votes on the League of Nations and rejects it.

November, 1919 to early 1920: Attitudes in Utah begin to change, partly as expected by Smoot, and there is no longer so much concern over the League.

"Orson F. Whitney prayed for Woodrow Wilson, "Thy servant who so recently addressed us from this stand with whose remarks and sentiments and the truths that he uttered our hearts so powerfully impressed and illuminated." George F. Richards again declared his belief in the inspiration of the League, and Richard R. Lyman even identified Reed Smoot by name, saying "I have hesitated to do this because my views do not agree with those of my life long friend, the Honorable Reed Smoot, whom I have admired since childhood. But I know this broad-minded statesman well enough to realize that he will have greater respect for me if I speak than he could have if, with my convictions, I were to remain silent." Other leaders also endorsed the League. When Smoot heard of the prayer, in particular, he was dismayed and wrote in his diary: "Eastern papers reported the action of the Conference at Salt Lake in praying for the President. I know the statement of Pres. Grant and prayer by Elder Whitney will have a great effect upon the people attending conference. I had no objection to a prayer being offered for Wilson but I thought it very unwise to endorse his views on the League of Nations in the prayer or President Grant's statement." Smoot diaries, 6 October 1919.
March, 1920: In another vote on the League of Nations, the reservations sought by Smoot and the Republicans pass. The treaty with reservations is then voted on, and defeated by the Democrats who, under Wilson's instructions, are demanding all or nothing. Smoot votes for the League with reservations, and the Deseret News, which earlier endorsed the League without reservations, commends him for his vote and criticizes Wilson's unbending stance. Writes the rather bemused Smoot in his diary: "a new thing for the News."

And the curtain falls.

But the epilogue to our drama carries the real message, as far as my theme is concerned, and it ought to go something like this:

The debate over the League of Nations was now all but finished, even though as much as eight years later both B. H. Roberts and Reed Smoot were giving further speeches suggesting the same things they had espoused in the hectic year covered by our play. But the real story lies elsewhere. There was never an official statement regarding the question of whether or not the Church should take a stand, although Grant's instructions that Mormon scriptures should not be used to oppose the League must also have implied that neither could they be used in its support. Throughout the controversy, when bitterness seemed to be raging in the newspaper comments, and the sources suggest that some Mormons at lower levels were allowing the issue to embitter them, questioning each other's faith, tearing down each other, and bringing to bear the scriptures to put down their brothers in argument, the spirit of most leaders of the Church was far above such attacks on personality. In the October Conference of 1920, President Grant recalled what had happened the year before and expressed regret at the bitterness the League controversy had caused. Much of his sermon was devoted to a plea for the spirit of forgiveness to characterize the Latter-day Saints. While he was not speaking directly of the League controversy, the principle certainly applied in context. He referred to the advice which, as a young apostle, he had received from President John Taylor:

My boy, never forget that when you are in the line of your duty your heart will be full of love and forgiveness, even for the repentant sinner, and that when you get out of
that straight line of duty and have the determination that what you think is justice and what you think is equity and right should prevail, you oftentimes are anything but happy. You can know the difference between the Spirit of the Lord and the spirit of the adversary, when you find that you are happy and contended, that you love your fellows, that you are anxious for their welfare; and you can tell that you do not have that spirit when you are full of animosity and feel that you would like to mow somebody down.\textsuperscript{41}

And so the Church went on. Perhaps at no time in its history had there been such divergence of opinion among its leaders, but it seemed to have had little effect upon their working together in harmony to build the Kingdom. Does this answer the question as to whether they should have been unified? Perhaps not, but at least it demonstrates that, in this instance, those who really wanted to follow the example of their leaders would not avoid debate or the expression of personal opinion, but would refuse to let that opinion stand in the way of good will based on genuine respect for the right and responsibility of each man to think and speak for himself on such issues. For those who still doubt that such conciliation is possible, let it be remembered that President Grant soon found himself to be a great admirer and friend of Reed Smoot, his opponent in the League controversy; that another opponent, Bishop Charles W. Nibley, was called to be his second counselor in the Presidency of the Church in 1925; that a third opponent, J. Reuben Clark, became a counselor in 1933; and that still another opponent, David O. McKay, became a counselor in 1934. In this case there is a moral in history.

\textsuperscript{41}Conference Report, October 1920, p. 7.
The Historians Corner

Edited by James B. Allen

"Turning Over Stones"—The Value of Primary Sources

The three items in this issue of The Historians Corner are all different subject matter, but their presentation as a group is connected with one central theme: the importance of going to original sources in our continual quest for historical knowledge.

A prominent historian once remarked that the historian's experience is something like that of an outdoorsman who loves hiking in the mountains but instead of just looking at the scenery, he turns over the stones. All sorts of new and interesting things suddenly emerge from under them. And so it is that as we ply through the little-used diaries, letters, and other papers of the past, a little time spent in examination, turning them over so to speak, often results in some unexpected and even exciting finds. What's more, these new discoveries are often more than just interesting curiosities, for sometimes even a small one adds important depth to our understanding of some past event.

Three cases in point. For many years Mormon scholars have been aware of the political Kingdom of God concept which characterized the thinking and planning of Mormon leaders over 100 years ago, but who has ever supposed that they went so far as to design a flag, or flags, for it? Michael Quinn has discovered three possible flags, and in the process, added a new phase to our knowledge of the Kingdom. In his description of the Stephen Post collection, Max Evans points out for us a rich field of research where many new stones may be turned. And David Williams, while doing research completely unconnected with Mormon history, discovered the
original of an interesting letter which throws important light on the background of anti-Mormon sentiment in the 1850s.

THE STEPHEN POST COLLECTION

Max J. Evans*

The Historical Department of the Church has received a collection of the papers of Stephen Post, an early member of the Church and a member and leader of a variety of schismatic groups. Post was born in New York state in 1810. He joined the Church in 1835 and moved to Kirtland, where he became a member of the second quorum of Seventy. Beginning almost immediately to engage in missionary work, he defended the Church and answered its critics. In 1837 it was said that "His defence [sic] of Mormonism [sic] we suppose is the best which can be made." His first mission for the Church sent him to Michigan in 1839. His second call, beginning in 1844, was to Pennsylvania and New York.

Included in the collection are twelve volumes of journals, kept from the day of his baptism until his death in 1879. Most of the journal entries give an account of Post's missionary travels and his religious activities. Post was in Pennsylvania when the Prophet Joseph Smith was killed. The following is his account of learning of the martyrdom:

July Sun 7th [1844] . . . The Country is now filled with reports about the Mormon war[.]. The general belief is that Joseph Smith is killed[.] the reports are rather contradictory & so I do not make up my mind on them, one thing is certain there has been a great excitement at Nauvoo . . . .

[July] 28 . . . I have now received confirmatory news by the "Nauvoo Neighbor" of the disturbance there[.] Joseph & Hyrum Smiths [sic] were murdered in Carthage Jail June 27 P.M. . . .

After the Prophet's death, Post continued his mission in the East, and apparently moved his family there. Although he was aware of the move West under the leadership of Brig-

*Brother Evans is supervisor of the processing section of the Church archives.

1The Christian Palladium, 1 August 1837, p. 110.
ham Young, Post remained in the East and refrained from aligning himself with any of those who claimed a right to the Presidency. In 1846, however, this entry appears in his journal:

[July] 14 . . . I received today four no’s of the Voree Herald[.]. I read them after I returned before I slept & the result is that I find much good evidence that James J Strang is appointed by the will of God to preside over his church as successor to Joseph Smith.

Post followed the Strangite movement until the mid 1850s. During a conference on Beaver Island in 1850 Strang was crowned a king in Zion. This is Post’s account:

July 8[1850] This day is one long to be remembered[.]. The grand feature of this day has been the crowning of a king in Zion & the electing of a grand council of 8 for the setting up of the kingdom of God on the earth[.]. The scene was solemn & impressive[.]. King James was hailed as king in Zion by one unanimous voice of the whole congregation[.]. The day long looked for by prophets was declared at length to have arrived[.]

After becoming disillusioned with Strang, another attempt at reorganization was made; a meeting was held in Kirtland in October 1855:

Sun 7 Met in the temple 1/2 past 10 oclock [sic] [.]. Brother Martin Harris was elected president of the Conference Stephen Post secretary . . . It was not deemed expedient to organize but to pass some stringent resolutions & recommend another conference to meet next april[sic] [.].

P.M. Bros. Wm Smith & Daniels spoke during which I wrote some resolutions . . . The following resolutions were received unanimously[.]

1st Resolved That the members of this conference have full confidence in the raising up and calling of Joseph Smith Jr. as translator, seer, & prophet, to lay the foundation of the church of Jesus Christ and move the cause of Zion for good in this generation . . .

The following year, 11 April 1856, Post found “Kirtland apparently a land barren of faith as people without a shephard [sic] [.].” Post's activities were also curtailed somewhat; for the following year-and-a-half only seven entries were made in his journal. But by 1857 he became a follower of another of those who claimed the right of the presidency: Sidney Rigdon.
Oct 25 [1857] I preached at Br Soules in Erie[,] preached P.M. on the order of the church & set forth the revelations shewing the appt. of S Rigdon as president of the church.

In Sept Wm Smith got up a revelation appointing me a printer to the church &c. he is now trying to organize as president in Kirtland Ohio[.]

In March 1856 S Rigdon sent me a rev. calling me to assist in sending forth the word of the Lord &c[.]

Included in the collection, in addition to the journals, are revelations sent to Post from Rigdon as his home in Friendship, New York. After Post moved a branch of the church to Attica, Marion County, Iowa in 1864, Rigdon continued to direct the church by the mails. Consequently the collection has what is probably one of the largest single collections of Sidney Rigdon's letters. More than 200 bear his signature. Other letters (some 200 more) are from Post's children, from Post to his wife, and to and from members and leaders of Rigdon's church, the Strangite Church, and the Reorganized Church. Included are letters to and from Joseph Smith, III. Other papers are certificates and receipts, revelations copied into bound volumes (arranged by sections, like the Doctrine and Covenants), and published works. Most of the published material come from other schismatic-Mormon groups, and includes pamphlets written by Post. Many of the published works are annotated.

The collection tells much about Rigdon and his religious beliefs. For example, Rigdon's church had apostles and a prophet. It had, in addition, female quorums of priesthood. Rigdon was a prophet and president of his church, and at one time, Post, his wife, Jane, and Rigdon's wife Phebe served as assistant presidents.

In 1876 Rigdon received a revelation which told Post to move his branch of the church from Iowa to Canada. In May, Post established a settlement at West Lynn, Manitoba. Two months later Sidney Rigdon died. Post held Rigdon's few followers together until his death in 1879. He was "the last important champion of Rigdon, and the wasting away of Rigdonite Mormonism really begins with Post's death . . . ."4

Fortunately, the Post family preserved and maintained the papers of Stephen Post. They came to the Historian's Office

from Stephen Post’s grandson, Edward O. Post of Winnipeg, Manitoba. Two missionaries in the Minnesota-Manitoba Mission, Elder K. Van Duren of Salt Lake City, Utah, and Elder David E. Rowe of Fairbanks, Alaska, first contacted Mr. Post, and learning of the collection, notified the Historian’s Office. Elder Van Duren and Elder Rowe, in connection with Mission President Carl M. King, procured the papers for the Historian’s Office. The collection, which comprises about 2 1/2 cubic feet of papers, arrived in Salt Lake City in two shipments, in July and October 1971. This collection will most certainly add to our knowledge of one of the many nineteenth-century religious groups that followed the Prophet Joseph Smith.

PRESIDENT BUCHANAN RECEIVES A PROPOSAL FOR AN ANTI-MORMON CRUSADE, 1857

David A. Williams*

The author of the letter which is reproduced herein, Robert Tyler, was a son of John Tyler, tenth president of the United States. The Tyler family’s American roots stretched back to the mid-seventeenth century when its first representatives settled in Virginia. President Tyler, first vice-president to succeed to the Presidency following the death of William H. Harrison in 1841, like his father attended William and Mary and sent his son there also. Educated in the classic manner, Robert subsequently studied law under the direction of Professor Beverly Tucker. He acted as private secretary to his father during his years in the White House, but thereafter his career was dominated by the law and his political interests.

Philadelphia became Robert Tyler’s home toward the end of his father’s term and it was there that he became a very active member of the Democratic Party, and a well-known friend and political ally of James Buchanan. The association between these two men, evidenced by numerous letters exchanged by them, began in the late 1840s and persisted through the Civil War, when Robert Tyler served in the Treasury Department of the Confederate Government. In an earlier

*Dr. Williams is a professor of history at California State College at Long Beach.
and happier time, he supported Buchanan for president (un-
successfully in 1852, but successfully in 1856). During Bu-
chanan's administration, Robert Tyler was consulted on many
matters. As the long-time champion of Buchanan, he had ready
access to the President, and as the chairman of the Democratic
executive committee of Pennsylvania, he was a major figure
in party councils.

This letter, for which no reply has been discovered, is a
significant document in presenting the private views of a
well-known advisor to Buchanan. In clear detail it spells out
the political gain that would emerge if the public mind were
turned from "Bleeding Kansas," which was tearing the coun-
try and the Democratic Party asunder, to crusade against the
Mormons. The degree to which it influenced the thinking of
the administration and its decision to launch the military op-
eration known as the Mormon War is not precisely known,
but it demands more attention than it usually receives from
those who interpret this episode. Even in the best treatment
of the subject to date, Norman Furniss, The Mormon Conflict
(Yale University Press, 1960) it is somewhat slighted. In the
book from which Furniss obtained the letter, Philip G. Au-
champaugh, Robert Tyler, Southern Rights Champion (Hin-
man Stein, Duluth, Minnesota, 1934) it is poorly handled. As
it stands, it represents a blatant attempt to pander to prejudice
in an effort to realize political gain. The fact that it could
be seriously advanced by a son of a former president of the
United States to the incumbent President in and of itself,
makes it a significant document in the political history of Mor-
monism in America.

My dear sir:

The public mind is becoming greatly excited on the sub-
ject of Mormonism. The Popular Idea is rapidly maturing that
Mormonism (already felt slightly in our large Northern cities)
should be put down and utterly extirpated.

I believe that we can supercede the Negro-Mania with the
almost universal excitements of an Anti-Mormon Crusade. Cer-
tainly it is a subject which concerns all the Religious Bodies &
reaches every man's fireside with a peculiar interest. Should
you, with your accustomed grip, seize this question with a strong
fearless & resolute hand, the Country I am sure will rally to you with an earnest enthusiasm & the pipings of Abolitionism will hardly be heard amidst the thunders of the storm we shall raise. Were I President I would put down & cast out this hideous imposture, equally at War with Conscience, Reason & Philosophy, at all hazards. I would take the ground that the case was anomalous & altogether exceptional—without the limits of ordinary Constitutional treatment—& that the principles of the Democratic Party in regard to Territories consequently had no application. The eyes & hearts of the Nation may be made to find so much interest in Utah as to forget Kansas.

I see (by telegraph) that Mr. Forney has purchased one fourth of the Pennslyvanian & is coming here as Editor. I am heartily glad of this provided he will come here to serve your cause faithfully & to conduct his Editorial office with strict impartiality to all. In this event he will be most welcome & will succeed—otherwise he will be certain to fail in a manner deplorable to yourself & injurious to the Party. I send an article from the Herald. Pray put not the slightest faith in Bennett, a greater or mischievous knave does not live!

His Excly ever your friend
James Buchanan Ro: Tyler


THE FLAG OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD

D. Michael Quinn*

The "Kingdom of God" in Mormon thought and practice during the nineteenth century exceeded the confines of religion alone. The Kingdom of God was regarded by Joseph Smith,

*D. Michael Quinn is a graduate of Brigham Young University who is currently a candidate for the master's degree in history at the University of Utah. He is also an Historical Associate with the Historical Department of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

"The best general studies of this question are James R. Clark, "The Kingdom of God, the Council of Fifty and the State of Deseret," Utah Historical Quarterly 26:131-148 (April 1958); Hyrum L. Andrus, Joseph Smith and World Government (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Co., 1958); and Klaus J. Hansen, Quest for Empire: The Political Kingdom of God and the Council of
Brigham Young, and John Taylor, presidents of the Church, as more than the ecclesiastical church. The Kingdom of God was at once millenarian and contemporary, spiritual and temporal. One characteristic which has been overlooked in scholarly analyses of the Council of Fifty and Mormon Kingdom of God is the existence of an external symbol of that political kingdom—a banner or flag.

Joseph Smith suggested the possibility of creating an ensign for the Kingdom of God as early as 22 June 1844: "I also gave orders that a standard be prepared for the nations." According to LDS Church Historian George A. Smith, Joseph Smith’s concept for an ensign was amplified in a vision Brigham Young had after the Prophet’s death.

While they were fasting and praying daily on the subject [the migration west] President Young had a vision of Joseph Smith, who showed him the mountain that we now call Ensign Peak, immediately north of Salt Lake City, and there was an ensign fell upon that peak, and Joseph said, "Build under the point where the colors fall and you will prosper and have peace."

Although George A. Smith’s account was separated from the occurrence by more than twenty years, John D. Lee recorded in his diary a sermon given by Brigham Young on 13 January 1846, in which there are more details about this flag:

Pres B Young said that the saying of the Prophets would never be verified unless the House of the Lord be reared in the Tops of the Mountains & the Proud Banner of Liberty wave over the valleys that are within the Mountains & I know where the spot is & I know how to make this Flag. Jos sent the colours and Said where the colours settled there would be the spot.4

Therefore, even prior to the departure of the Saints from


Journal of Discourses, 26 vols. (Liverpool, England: F. D. Richards, 1854-1886), 13:85 (discourse delivered 20 June 1896). Italics added. At the time of this discourse Elder Smith was First Counselor to President Brigham Young.

John D. Lee, Diary, 13 January 1846, typescript, Church Archives, Historical Department of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City, Utah. Hereinafter cited as Church Archives.
Nauvoo, Illinois, Brigham Young contemplated making a special flag for the mountain haven of the Saints.

By the time Brigham Young led the first pioneer company toward the Great Basin in the Spring of 1847, he had aligned this flag with the political Kingdom of God. On 29 May 1847, President Young preached a sermon on this subject to the pioneer company.

President Young then spoke of those who was not in the Church—as there were some present—that they would be protected in their rights but they must not introduce wicked men in the camp for it would not be suffered. He then spoke of the standard and ensign that would be reared in Zion to govern the Kingdom of God and the nations of the earth. For every nation would bow the knee and every tongue confess that JESUS was the Christ and this will be the standard: The Kingdom of God and his Laws and Judgment in

———[a shorthand entry which completes the full name of the Council of Fifty: The Kingdom of God and His Laws with the Keys and Powers thereof and Judgment in the Hands of His Servants]. And on the standard would be a flag of every nation under heaven.5

In response to this allusion to a flag of the kingdom, Wilford Woodruff drew a sketch of a flag in the margin of his journal (Fig. 1).

The flag Wilford Woodruff drew was not the one suggested by Brigham Young’s words, i.e., a simple composite of the flags of the nations of the earth. The flag he sketched in his journal was distinctively Mormon in several characteristics: the emblems of the sun, moon, and star (which had already been used as motifs in the Nauvoo Temple), the twelve scallops along the edges of the flag’s extremity (perhaps symbolizing the twelve tribes of Israel or the twelve apostles), and the three ascending lines in the lower left-hand corner of the flag (perhaps symbolizing the Godhead or the Presidency of the Church). The significance of other details of the sketch is obscure. The flag may have been merely Wilford Woodruff’s imaginative representation of what the flag of the Kingdom of God might look like. In May 1847, it appears that the flag of the Kingdom of God was still an indefinite visual concept in the minds of the leaders of that kingdom.

5Wilford Woodruff Journal, 29 May 1847; holograph, Church Archives. Spelling and punctuation corrected.
On 26 July 1847, Brigham Young, Heber C. Kimball, Wilford Woodruff, George A. Smith, Willard Richards, Ezra T. Benson, Albert Carrington, and William Clayton ascended a peak at the north end of the Salt Lake Valley which they named Ensign Peak. Many later commentators on this incident have asserted that these men raised the flag of the United States on the peak at this time. Historian Brigham H. Roberts dismissed that assertion as fiction in his official history of the LDS Church. However, a flag of the United States was actually raised in the Salt Lake Valley sometime in 1847, but not on Ensign Peak. Erastus Snow clarified the matter by stating, "In 1847 the standard of the American nation was planted *on this Temple block. I assisted in planting it..." Despite authoritative denials of the Ensign Peak story, the tradition of the American flag on Ensign Peak persisted, and on 26 July 1934, a monument was erected there commemorating the alleged raising of Old Glory.

Debunking the myth of the flag on Ensign Peak leaves us with a question concerning the naming of the peak. If no U.S. flag was raised, could a flag of the Kingdom of God (or anything representing it) have been raised on that prominence on the day it was named by Brigham Young and the exploring party? The earlier vision of Brigham Young concerning the peak included a flag of some kind, and B. H. Roberts indicated that the significance of Ensign Peak concerned the political Kingdom of God, rather than loyalty to the United States.

"The Ensign" that these Latter-day Saint Pioneers had in mind, and of which they had frequently spoke *en route*, was something larger and greater than any national flag whatsoever; and what it was meant to represent was greater than any earthly kingdom’s interest, and I speak not slightly of earthly kingdoms either; but this “Ensign” in the minds of the “Mormon” Pioneers concerned not one nation, but all nations; not one epoch or age, but all epochs and all ages; not nationality but humanity, is its scope and concern. It was the sign and ensign of the *Empire of Christ*; it was a prophecy

---


of the time to come when the kingdoms of this world would become "the Kingdom of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall reign forever and forever."

In 1910, William C. A. Smoot, one of the last survivors of the first pioneer company, gave his personal account of the flag raising on Ensign Peak:

Brigham Young, Heber C. Kimball and his associates went up on the hill and toward Ensign Peak which was the name they gave it, as Kimball said: "We will someday hoist an ensign here." . . . While they were up there looking around they went through some motions that we could not see from where we were, nor know what they meant. They formed a circle, seven or eight or ten of them. But I could not tell what they were doing. Finally they came down in the evening . . . . They hoisted a sort of flag on Ensign Peak. Not a flag, but a handkerchief belonging to Heber C. Kimball, one of those yellow bandana kind. This explained the actions of the party when they first went up on the peak and which we could not understand.9

Smoot's account was viciously attacked in an editorial of the Salt Lake Herald Republican on 23 March 1910, to which Smoot subsequently replied:

And what I said about the appearance of the valley when we arrived here in July, 1847, and also about the hoisting of the bandana handkerchief on Ensign peak, is as true as that God Almighty lives. At the time I felt pride in the very thought of hoisting an ensign to the world, for such it was represented to be when they unfurled the handkerchief to the breeze at that time. I took it to be emblematic of what should be done later; and that it was a bandanna handkerchief, and not the Stars and Stripes, I know for a fact.10

Smoot's account implies that the raising of the makeshift ensign on the peak was a spontaneous affair, which would account for the absence of reference to a flag raising in the diaries of the men involved. The naming of the peak and Smoot's understanding of the handkerchief incident indicated that an official ensign might be hoisted on Ensign Peak at some future time.

9Roberts, Comprehensive History, 3:275. Italics in the original.
9Salt Lake Tribune, 18 March 1910, p. 2. William C. A. Smoot had been a bishop from 1866 to 1877 after which time he had become disaffected from the Church. His remarks quoted here were a part of a speech he gave at the annual banquet of the American Party in 1910.
The details of that occurrence are not presently extant, but it is very possible that after July 1847, a flag of the Kingdom of God was raised on Ensign Peak. This seems to be the implication of the familiar Mormon hymn, "High On the Mountain Top," written on 19 February 1853, by Joel Hills Johnson. Johnson's reference to a flag of the Kingdom of God is implied in the first lines of the hymn: "High on a mountain top a banner is unfurled. Ye nations now look up, it waves to all the world." That a flag of the Kingdom of God had been raised in Salt Lake City by 1853 is also implied by Brigham Young's comment during the same year about reports that the Saints "had hoisted the flag of our independence."  

Although the raising of a theocratic flag on Ensign Peak can only be inferred, there is direct evidence that a flag of the Kingdom of God was subsequently designed and displayed. The Saints apparently gave public display to a flag of the Kingdom of God as early as 1859, even though the Utah Expeditionary Force remained in Utah as an uncomfortable reminder of the "Utah War." A non-Mormon emigrant to California, William Henry Knight, attended the July Fourth celebration in the Salt Lake Valley. In a letter to his mother on 7 July 1859, Knight wrote, "The Mormons were celebrating the day with a flag of their own, firing cannon and marching about to Yankee music." Knight's allusion seems to indicate that it was a flag other than Old Glory, but his lack of description leaves us uninformed as to the appearance of the Flag of the Kingdom.

Twenty years later, another non-Mormon, Don Maguire, observed the Flag of the Kingdom in public display during the funeral of Brigham Young in 1877. Maguire not only described the flag in his personal journal, but also associated this flag with Ensign Peak:

Kindly note, gentle reader, that Utah history states that the flag known as the Stars and Stripes was placed on Ensign Peak about the twenty-ninth [sic] day of July 1847. The so-called flag of the Stars and Stripes placed there on that occasion was a flag having in its upper left hand corner a blue field with a circle of twelve stars and in the center

---

11 Johnson was a brother of Benjamin F. Johnson, a member of the original Council of Fifty organized in March 1844, by Joseph Smith.
12Journal of Discourses 1:188 (discourse delivered 9 June 1853).
a large white star. The stripes on that flag, instead of being red and white stripes, were blue and white stripes, and it was to be the flag denoting Mormon sovereignty over an area that they had now taken possession of . . . for good and sufficient reasons the so-called flag of Stars and Stripes raised on Ensign Peak above Salt Lake City in July 1847 was never again seen in public until the day of Brigham Young’s funeral when it hung from a second story window of Heber C. Kimball’s residence. That flag was exposed to public view on that morning September 1877 and it may be supposed that between the hours of eleven o’clock and two o’clock of the same day it was carefully folded and laid away in the redwood casket containing the mortal remains of Brigham Young, there to rest with him unto the morning of the Resurrection.¹⁴

Wilford Woodruff’s version of the Flag of the Kingdom may have been imaginative, but Maguire described a tangible reality. The colors of the Flag of the Kingdom were blue and white. These were the colors of the flags used in the Iowa settlements of the Saints to announce meetings: the white flag for the entire camp and the blue flag for captains of companies (most of whom were members of the Council of Fifty).¹⁵ The stars in the blue field suggest a symbolism consistent with the theory of the Kingdom of God: the twelve tribes of Israel (or possibly the twelve apostles) surrounding Christ, as King of the Kingdom of God. Maguire did not indicate how many stripes were in the flag, but in view of the prominence of the number twelve in Mormonism, the artist’s conception of the flag in this article (Fig. 2) shows only twelve stripes.¹⁶


¹⁵A published version of this flag, showing thirteen stripes, is found in Norman C. Pierce, The 3½ Years (Salt Lake City: [n.p.] 1965), p. 211. As early as 1855 a variation of the American flag appeared in the Church publication, The Mormon, published in New York City by John Taylor between 1855 and 1857. The masthead of the publication showed two flags, each having the stars arranged in a circular fashion, though scattered. The flag on the right had the word “Utah” as the center for the star configuration. The flag on the left showed one large five-pointed star in the center of the field, with twenty-four stars surrounding it in a haphazard fashion. Since there were thirty-one states in the Union in 1855, the other seven stars were apparently concealed in the folds of the flag design, or were obscured by the wing of an eagle which partly covered the flag.
Fig. 2. The flag of the Kingdom of God was publicly flown from a window at Brigham Young's funeral on September 1877. This figure is drawn from a description in Journal of Don Maguire.

Fig. 3. Another version of the flag of the Kingdom of God was flown from the Salt Lake Temple construction on 6 April 1880. This figure is drawn from a description in the journal of John D. T. McAlister.
Three years following the funeral of Brigham Young, a somewhat different flag of the Kingdom of God was publicly displayed in Salt Lake. On 6 April 1880, the LDS Church celebrated the Golden Jubilee of its organization. On that date John D. McAllister, president of the St. George Stake of the Church, described the flag as follows:

Fifty years today since the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints was organized. Flags and Banners unfurled. On the Temple was a white one with Blue field, a circle of Twelve Stars and three in the Center, in the form of a triangle, all representing the First Presidency & the Twelve, Truth and peace, Fidelity.17

In this flag of the Kingdom of God (Fig. 3) there were no stripes, and in place of one larger star there was a triangle of three large stars surrounded by the twelve smaller stars. The symbolism in this flag seems to relate more directly to the organization of the Church, as was indicated in McAllister's interpretation. However, the star motif and the colors of blue and white seem to be a direct derivation from the Flag of the Kingdom displayed in 1877.

Although the political Kingdom of God in Mormonism never attained its millenarian fulfillment, it was regarded as a precursor of things to come. The provisional ensigns of the nineteenth century indicate the seriousness with which the Latter-day Saints accepted the call to establish a literal Kingdom of God in the tops of the mountains.

17John D. T. McAllister, Diary, 6 April 1880; Church Archives. Punctuation added.
Book Reviews


(Reviewed by Dr. Hugh Nibley, professor of history and religion at Brigham Young University.)

Almost a quarter of a century ago this investigator wrote a study of life in the Arabian desert in ancient times. It first appeared in the pages of the Improvement Era under the title of "Lehi in the Desert," and drew almost exclusively on the writings of European visitors to those arid regions during the past 200 years and the works of Medieval and modern Arabic writers. Some years later in a study called "Qumran and the Companions of the Cave," he again explored the subject, this time with extensive flights into the early Arabic writers. (Rev. de Qum. 5 [1965], pp. 177-198). Since the ways of the Beduins are notoriously unchanging, the idea was that the Arabic report of how things were out there would apply in ancient as well as in Medieval and modern times, and thereby supply us with a "control" over Nephi's history of his family's travels and tribulations in those same deserts early in the 6th century B.C. The main reason for using Arabic sources was, of course, that there were no other specialized studies in the field. But just as the articles began to appear, the first copies of the Dead Sea Scrolls began to be available—and that changed everything. We no longer had to ask the Arabs how the Jews may have behaved in the desert in ancient times, since we now had first-hand reports of how they actually did. Those reports have steadily increased in volume, and Prof. Yadin's book now carries the Book of Mormon student far beyond the former speculations.

The reaction to these marvelous discoveries by their finders is convincing confirmation of the Book of Mormon thesis that these new findings were meant to be. The Israeli scholars are understandably moved by the one thing that makes these docu-
ments of supreme importance for them: the fact that they belong to their own ancestors. "... we found that our emotions were a mixture of tension and awe," writes Prof. Yadin, "yet astonishment and pride at being part of the reborn State of Israel after a Diaspora of 1,800 years." (p. 253) Compare this with Nephi's moving lines: "And it shall be as if the fruit of thy loins had cried out unto them from the dust; for I know their faith. And they shall cry from the dust... even after many generations have gone by them. ... (2 Nephi 3: 19f) Their own people after all those years! How often has it happened that ancient documents—2000 years old—have been dug up in their own homeland by the very descendants of the men who wrote those documents and, what is still more marvelous, who could still read them on the spot? We know of no other such instance in the history of scholarship. Nephi continues: "For those who shall be destroyed shall speak unto them out of the ground, and their speech shall be low out of the dust, and their voice shall be as one that hath a familiar spirit; for the Lord God will give unto him power, that he may whisper concerning them, even as it were out of the ground; and their speech shall whisper out of the dust." (2 Nephi 26: 16ff) All this talk about dust. Well, anyone who visits the sites or reads Yadin's books soon finds himself deep in dust. Every text discussed in Dr. Yadin's new book was found by the searchers deliberately buried under the floor of a very dusty cave. They have not survived accidentally, as most other ancient writings have, but were hidden away on purpose; nor were they simply left behind or misplaced or forgotten by people who moved on and lived out their lives elsewhere—the people who left these records died soon after they buried them and died on the spot the victims of a savage religious war. "... For those who shall be destroyed shall speak unto them out of the ground. ..." (2 Nephi 26:16) What do these records contain? Accounts of contemporary affairs in private letters, legal documents, military and civil correspondence, or, in the words of the Book of Mormon, "For thus saith the Lord God: They shall write the things which shall be done among them. ... Wherefore, as those who have been destroyed have been destroyed speedily. ..." (2 Nephi 26: 17-18) Not only all their letters and legal papers, but their household effects and their bones were left behind in the caves,
for the simple reason that they did not have time to escape. As to their destroyers, "Nothing remains here today of the Romans save a heap of stones on the face of the desert," writes Yadin, "but here the descendants of the besieged were returning to salvage their ancestors' precious belongings." (p. 235) Again the Book of Mormon: "... and the multitude of their terrible ones shall be as chaff that passeth away..." (2 Nephi 26:18)

The future of the Book of Mormon is fittingly the subject of prophecy by the first man and the last one to write it. Moroni ends and seals up the book with the prophecy that when its words shall be "like as one crying from the dead, yea, even as one speaking out of the dust" (Moroni 10:27), then shall the invitation go forth to the Jews: "Awake, and arise from the dust, O Jerusalem... enlarge thy borders forever, that thou mayest no more be confounded..." (Moroni 31) Which is exactly what they are doing today.

In reading Prof. Yadin's account of the findings of the ancient artifacts and documents in a cave in the Nahal Hever cliffs, we seem to shift back and forth between the refugees and the fighters under Bar Kochba, or, in Book of Mormon terms, between Lehi, the refugee in the desert, and Moroni, the hero, fighting against fearful odds to save his people.

First consider Lehi, warned by dreams and portents of the imminent fall of Jerusalem to the Babylonians, fleeing by night with his family to the south desert with the intention of founding some sort of community there. His sons, sent back to the city to obtain valuable family documents, hid in nearby caves as the sized up the situation and laid their plans. The caves in which the Bar Kochba documents were found were places of hiding, and the people who wrote and owned them had brought them from home, for they too were refugees from the approaching armies of a mighty world-conquering power determined to hold Palestine and to subdue the Jews for that purpose.

In Lehi's day we find many well-to-do Jews putting their trust in Egypt and finally fleeing thither when things got too hot in Jerusalem. The same sort of thing meets us in the letters of a rich lady named Babata, found in the Cave of Letters; she was all ready to flee to Egypt, where she had property, but unfortunately she did not make it. (p. 248) Lehi
burned his bridges behind him, and did not expect to return to Jerusalem, but to find a "promised land" in the desert; nothing was farther from his mind than crossing the ocean—Nephi was simply staggered when he was commanded to build a ship, and his brothers laughed their heads off at his presumption. On the other hand, it is never hinted that there was anything strange about Lehi's taking to the wastelands, or even proposing that he should found a colony with his son Nephi as its ruler, because that sort of thing was being done all the time. Lehi's story takes place 700 years before Bar Kochba's day, and yet the two tales present astonishing points of resemblance which, we believe, are more than purely coincidental, for the same cave that yielded the Bar Kochba materials also brought forth evidence of much earlier occupations. The diggers working under Bar-Adon in a neighboring cave in the Nahal Mishmar discovered a treasure of 429 metal objects, some of them quite beautiful, and as the things were brought to light the workers spontaneously "burst into a very well-known Hebrew song of the Temple," for the beautiful bronze objects strongly suggested Temple Vessels to their minds. (p. 218) Yet those objects were found by Carbon-14 dating to be no less than 5000 years old! The most plausible explanation of how they got to the cave is that people fleeing from the advances of the first Kings of Egypt into Palestine brought and hid them there (p. 211)—in all probability they were sacred vessels, but what, and whose? Even without an inkling of the answer, it is clear that the practice of people fleeing to these caves with their sacred and profane treasure is far older than Lehi's day. The same caves also yielded objects from the Iron Age of the 8th and 7th centuries B.C., i.e., from Lehi's own time, making it "quite clear," according to Yadin, "that these remote caves . . . served as places of refuge for people who were forced by circumstances to flee the rulers of the land." (p. 30) We are also reminded of how Lehi's sons were impressed by the "precious steel" of a sword, that being a time when the stuff was available (iron could not be smelted without a carbon mixture which made it steel) but was still very costly. (1 Nephi 5:9, 16:18)

The most welcome aspect of the new findings is that the families who fled from the town to the desert took along collections of writings with them—legal documents, correspon-
ience, family records, scripture—quite in the manner of Lehi. Unfortunately the modern Beduins of the region, knowing the monetary value of the ancient scrolls, had thoroughly sacked nearly all the caves before the scholars could get to them; but the scraps of writing dropped by them in their hasty departure happen to be passages of scripture which peculiarly fitted the situation of the people in their desert hiding places. Though this may be a coincidence, it does remind us that Nephi in the desert made it a point to read to his people just those scriptures which applied to their present situation: "And I did read many things unto them which were written in the book of Moses; but that I might more fully persuade them to believe . . . I did liken all scriptures unto us, that it might be for our profit and learning." (1 Nephi 19:23) This practice of applying ancient stories and prophecies to their own peculiar condition was found to be a special practice of the religious community at Qumran, who compared themselves to Israel driven into the wilderness and sorely afflicted by Gentile armies in ages past. This is exactly what Nephi did to hearten his people wandering in the sands, and it was the Book of Mormon that first pointed up the practice.

As might be expected, the most interesting and important documents of all to their discoverers were the personal letters, including an autograph of Bar Kochba himself. These take us not into the world of Lehi so much as into that of the great Book of Mormon general, Moroni. Thus we find that Bar Kochba’s people reissued Roman coins with a new stamp upon them bearing slogans of liberty resembling those on the trumpets of the armies in the Battle Scroll. Such devices are, "Year 1, Redemption of Israel," "Year 2, Freedom of Israel," or simply "Freedom of Jerusalem." These slogans were to inspire the people to resistance, inscription money having long been used in the ancient world, especially by the Romans, as a convenient means of spreading government propaganda. Compare this with Moroni’s standards: "In memory of our God, our religion, and freedom, and our peace, our wives, and our children." (Alma 46:12) " . . . And he took the pole, which had on the end thereof his rent coat (and he called it the Title of Liberty). . . ." (Alma 46:13) It has been objected that such talk of Liberty smacks suspiciously of nineteenth-century America rather than ancient Israel, but the
constant recurrence of the word Liberty (Kherut) in the Dead Sea Scrolls, to say nothing of the Bar Kochba coins, shows that it is entirely in order in Moroni's world. But what has that world of circa 70 B.C. in the Western Hemisphere to do with Bar Kochba's world of 131-132 A.D. in Palestine? Surprisingly, a great deal. Not only have the new discoveries shown the Jews to be phenomenally conservative in their ways, but the Book of Mormon itself accounts for Moroni's familiarity with old-world customs. The Title of Liberty which he inscribed on his own cloak was suggested to him, according to his own report, by an ancient tradition which the people had brought with them to the New World: "... let us preserve our liberty as a remnant of Joseph; yea, let us remember the words of Jacob [when] ... he saw that a part of the remnant of the coat of Joseph was preserved. ..." (Alma 46:24-27)

He then goes on to tell a story of how the garment of Joseph was preserved in two parts, which the aged Jacob recognized on his deathbed, weeping for the part one which was defiled, and rejoicing over the other which was miraculously preserved. This was a story that went back to the Old Country which the people were enjoined to remember—it is not in the Bible, and I have not found reference to it in any Jewish source; and though my resources are far from unlimited, still they go immeasurably beyond what Joseph Smith possessed and yet he knew this story, which I have found preserved in the pages of Tha'labi, who got it from an old Jewish informant somewhere in Persia in the tenth century. The point is, that Moroni bases his military practices on the customs of the Jews in the homeland.

The story of Moroni's war of liberation with its Liberty slogans is taken from the Book of Alma in the Book of Mormon, and this provides us with another tangible link to the Old World, namely, the name of Alma, which deserves a momentary digression. The more exotic proper names of the Book of Mormon have been matched up extensively and sometimes quite convincingly with real Egyptian and Semitic names (which is what they claim to be). Such an odd monicker as Paanchi (who ever heard of a double "a" in English?) not only turned up in the Egyptian records a generation after the Book of Mormon came out, but turns out to be a rather prominent and important name in the bargain. And such a very
un-Egyptian, un-Oriental, indeed un-anything name as "Her-
mounts," was applied by the Book of Mormon Nephites to a region on the extremity of the land where wild animals abounded, a territory whose description perfectly matches that part of the world to which the Egyptians gave the name of Hermonthis. But strangely enough, the name in the Book of Mormon that has brought the most derision on that book, and caused the greatest embarrassment to the Latter-day Saints, especially among those holders of the priesthood who have borne it among the children of men, is the simple and unpre-
tentious Alma. Roman priests have found in this obviously Latin and obviously feminine name (who does not know that Alma Mater means fostering mother?) gratifying evidence of the ignorance and naivete of the youthful Joseph Smith—how could he have been simple enough to let such a thing get by? At least his more sophisticated followers should have known better! It is therefore gratifying to announce that at the extreme end of the "Cave of Letters," on the north side of the Nahal Hever, between three and four o'clock of the afternoon of 15 March 1961, Professor Yadin put his hand into a crevice in the floor of the cave and lifted out a goat-skin bag containing a woman's materials for mending her family's clothes on their sad and enforced vacation; and stuffed away under the stuff, at the very bottom of the bag, was a bundle of papyrus rolls wrapped in a cloth. These were the Bar-
Kochba Letters, and among them was a deed to some land near En-Gedi (the nearest town to the cave) owned by four men, one of whom signed himself, or rather dictated his name since he was illiterate, as "Alma the son of Judah." The deed is reproduced in color on p. 177 of the book, and there at the end of the fourth line from the top, as large as life is A-l-m-a
ben Yehudah, which Prof. Yadin sensibly renders "Alma" with no reservations. And speaking of names, it is interesting that the Jews who reissued Roman coins as Bar Kochba coins with their pious patriotic inscriptions gave the coins new names and denominations (p. 176), with the same freedom with which Alma says his people invented new names and denomi-
nations of money. (Alma 11)

Bar-Kochba's war, like Moroni's, was a holy war, a "Messen-
anic war," with fanatical concern for the temple. (p. 27) In the struggle for liberation, the hero found his hands full deal-
ing with all kinds of people and problems. For one thing, he found that "some of the wealthier citizens" of a city were "evaders of national duties" in his day, as their ancestors had been in the days of Nehemiah. (p. 125, Nehemiah 3:5) Specifically, they were "disregarding the mobilization orders of Bar Kochba," who became exceeding angry and issued dire threats against them, including even the death penalty. Compare this with Moroni in a like situation: "And it came to pass that whomever of the Amalickiahites that would not enter into a covenant to support the cause of freedom . . . he caused to be put to death; and there were but few who denied the covenant of freedom." (Alma 46:35) And who were the Amalickiahites? A coalition of those who "because of their exceeding great riches" opposed government controls (Alma 45:24), those who considered themselves the aristocracy "who professed the blood of nobility" (Alma 51:18ff), the "king men" led by "the lower judges of the land . . . seeking for power" (Alma 46:4), local judges, official and other upper crust bound together by family ties as "kindreds," whose boast was that they had "acquired much riches by the hand of their industry" (Alma 10:4, 3 Nephi 6:27 etc.); and "many in the church who believed . . . Amaliciah" and "dissented from the church." (Alma 46:7) These were no pacifists or draft-evaders, but were armed to the teeth, "those men of Pachus and those kingsmen, whosoever would not take up arms in defence of their country, but would fight against it. . . ." (Alma 62:9-11) These Alma put to death. Bar Kochba had to deal with just such characters and he did it in the same way. To the "brothers" (for so he calls them, as Moroni does all to whom he writes) in the city of En-Gedi he personally wrote a letter in Hebrew that survives to this day: "To Masabala and to Yehonathan; bar Be'ayan, peace. In comfort you sit eating and drinking from the property of the House of Israel, and care nothing for your brothers." Thus Yadin (p. 133): we have italicized certain words to point up the parallels to Moroni's letter from the field: "To Pahoran, in the city of Zarahemla . . . and also to all those who have been chosen by this people to govern and manage the affairs of this war." (Alma 60:1) " . . . Can you think to sit upon your thrones in a state of thoughtless stupor, while your enemies are spreading the work of death around you? Yea while they are murdering
thousands of your brethren?” (Alma 60:7) To such people Moroni issues a dire threat: “And I will come unto you . . . behold I will stir up insurrection among you, even until those who have desires to usurp power and authority shall become extinct.” (Alma 60:27) If this sounds shockingly severe, the provocation was as terrible: Moroni, like Bar Kochba, was holding on by the skin of his teeth: “Whatever we may think of Bar Kochba’s harsh tone,” writes Yadin, “it is quite clear that Yehonathan (an important leader) was not the most loyal of subordinates,” and there were others like him in high office, especially as things grew worse. (p. 134) But if the secret of Moroni’s success was his essential gentleness—he always called a halt to the fighting the instant the enemy, whom he called his “brethren,” showed the least inclination to parley—it has often been said that Bar Kochba’s undoing was the lack of such a redeeming quality. “His brutality, according to some sources, was manifested in the way he killed the revered Rabbi Eleazar of Modi’in . . . who Bar Kochba suspected of betraying the secrets of Bethar (a city under attack) to the Romans. . . . This cruel act, according to the same sources, caused Bar-Kochba’s death, and the fall of Bethar. . . .” (p. 26)

When another leader, Galgoula, was called to task for holding out supplies, including a cow, he wrote to his superiors to explain: “Were it not for the Gentiles [the Romans] who are near us, I would have gone up and satisfied you concerning this lest you say that it is out of contempt that I did not go to you.” (p. 136) Moroni ran into just such a misunderstanding, when he accused Pahoran of withholding supplies, to which Pahron replied just as Galgoula did. “It is those who have sought to take away the judgment-seat from me that have been the cause of this great iniquity; . . . they have withheld our provisions, and have daunted our freemen that they have not come unto you . . . in your epistle you have censured me, but it mattereth not; I am not angry, but do rejoice in the greatness of your heart.” (Alma 61:4, 9)

If the Book of Mormon were a product of our own day, such striking parallels (and there are many others) would be not only a suspicious but a damning circumstance. As it is, one is still forced to ask for an explanation for a phenomenon which can hardly be mere coincidence. The explanation is to be found in the nature and genius of the Jewish people, whose
internal and external history has a way of falling into almost rigid patterns. The kind of squabbles that go on among themselves are typically and thoroughly Jewish and you will find them everywhere; the same temperament or culture places them at odds with the "outside world" in a particular way so that the atrocities committed against them seem to fall into the same mold whether in the first or fifteenth or twentieth centuries and whether in Spain, Germany or Russia. This is the familiar theme of the prophets—rebellion, punishment, repentance, the same old cycle round and round. Just as the Six-weeks war of 1948 broke out, the Battle Scroll of the Dead Sea Scrolls came to light—it read like a series of editorials to inspire twentieth-century Jews to deeds of heroism, and as such it was joyfully received. The Battle Scroll, now edited by Prof. Yadin, shows to what an amazing degree even in such a technical and dating operation as warfare, the ancient image fits the modern situation.

Since the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, it has become plain that one of the constants of Jewish history in ancient times was the small band of pious souls who would leave Jerusalem, which they deemed doomed and corrupted, to go out into the desert to form their own community there and to attempt to carry on in the manner of Israel in the wilderness under Moses. Lehi is a classic example of such an operation, and the tradition was carried over right into the New World, Lehi's descendants forming such groups of pious sectaries from time to time. The most notable of these was Alma's colony, and we are told how it came about. Alma, as a young priest, serving under a corrupt king, became a secret disciple of the prophet Abinadi, who was a master of the old Jewish lore, and a caustic wit; he was a walking Bible, and after he was put to death, Alma hid out in a cave and wrote from memory, and probably from notes, all he could recall of Abinadi's teachings. Then he went out into a desert place to a spot called the Waters of Mormon, and there set up his community, organized in companies of 50 with visiting inspectors, engaging in pious activities, self-supporting and industrious. He initiated members by baptism in the Waters of Mormon. Even down to details his organization resembles very closely the sectaries of the Dead Sea. Yadin points out in his book the presence at Qumran of "numerous cisterns and..."
ritual baths" (p. 189), the ritual nature of which was stoutly denied by Jewish and Christian scholars alike as being an altogether unlikely circumstance.

Of the thirty-five private letters of the wealthy woman Babata, mentioned above, twenty-three "belonged to the type commonly known as 'double deeds' or 'tied deeds,'" the use of which "is a very old and known practice in the ancient world," though until this, no actual examples had ever been found from ancient times. (p. 229) It was an arrangement by which a legal agreement was written twice on the same piece of papyrus or parchment; the first time very small at one end of the paper which was then rolled into a tight cylinder, sewn closed, and signed over with the participants' signatures; the rest of the sheet, the greater part of it, then received the same writing in bolder letters; it was not sealed, so that it could be freely consulted while the other copy of the text, though on the same sheet, remained tightly sealed until the time came to settle the contract; then it was unrolled and compared with the other writing, and if the two were exactly the same all would be in order. The purpose, of course, was "to safeguard the original deed from falsification, while at the same time to enable its holder to use the lower exterior half for daily reference as required." (p. 230) This is simply an elaboration of the old tally-stick technique which we have discussed at length elsewhere. Very early, strips of parchment or cloth were attached to the sticks and wrapped around them, since there was not room enough on a stick for writing a lengthy contract. This was the origin of the Jewish scroll wrapped around a staff resembling a scepter. The original tally-stick was a staff on which the contract and names of the contracting parties were written; the staff was then split down the middle and one half, the "stock," was kept by one of the parties, while the other, "the bill," was held by the other. When the time came to settle the contract the two parties would bring their sticks together in the presence of the king, and if they matched perfectly, it was plain that neither party had attempted to tinker with the document, and the two would then be bound with a string in the king's hand and laid away in the archives. The Bar-Kochba cave has now produced twenty-three examples of this technique, and this is another score for the Book of Mormon, which claims to be that very
"stick of Ephraim" which in the last days would be joined to the "stick of Judah" so that the two would come together "and they shall be one stick in my hand." (Ezekiel 37:19) The word of the Lord assures us that it is "Moroni whom I have sent unto you to reveal the Book of Mormon, containing the fulness of my everlasting gospel, to whom I have committed the keys of the records of the stick of Ephraim." (Doctrine and Covenants 27:5) There are many "sticks" but no more significant joining of sticks than that now taking place between the Jewish and the Nephite records:

And it shall come to pass that the Jews shall have the words of the Nephites, and the Nephites shall have the words of the Jews; and the Nephites and the Jews shall have the words of the lost tribes of Israel. . . . And it shall come to pass that my people, which are of the house of Israel, shall be gathered home unto the lands of their possessions; and my word also shall be gathered in one. And I will show unto them that fight against my word and against the house of Israel, that I am God, and that I covenanted with Abraham that I would remember his seed forever—2 Nephi 29:13-14.


(Reviewed by George L. Strebel, who received his doctorate in history from the University of California at Berkeley, and currently teaches at the Logan LDS Institute of Religion.)

This publication of the Folklore Society of Utah presents a variety of accounts about life in the Mormon West. Nine of the accounts deal with local situations which probably are limited in their application to the communities where they happened. In most cases they find echoes of similarity in other communities, but not a re-enactment of the same experience. Three of the contributions deal with village histories, each of which present interesting details of folklore of those villages, but again, such materials are mainly contributive to the folklore of the Mormon culture as a whole.

Although it is an interesting and significant account, Karl Young's "Red Magic" has little if anything to do with Mor-
mon folklore. It is representative of a great store of folklore of the southwest Indians of which Professor Young has an almost unlimited supply at his disposal.

The article by Helen Z. Papanikolas, "Greek Folklore of Carbon County," is an interesting account of a cultural pattern which has been superimposed on a western and predominantly Mormon environment, and suggests some interesting conflicts and adaptations which such a mixture of cultures has produced. Utah, with its cosmopolitan background, could be the source of many comparable studies.

These accounts present approaches to a very necessary ingredient in Utah pioneer experience. Life at best was hard and often depressing to those who lived through it. To make their existence bearable and to divert their minds from the pressures of reality, pioneers often engaged in many types of practical jokes and humor. This relief often partook of the rough, crude characteristics of pioneer life itself. Such activities are reflected either directly as in Brooks' "Pranks and Pranksters," and Larson's "Ithamar Sprague and His Big Shoes," or to an indirect almost ludicrous situation of a savage Indian with his hair tangled in a spinning wheel.

Robertson's "The Gray Ghost of the Desert" is a sample of the many tales of animals and birds as individuals and as species which were noted and recorded among the pioneers. These stories arose from their interest in and their observation of their new homeland.

Despite a keen interest in the arts in their own communities, Utah shared with other western communities an interest in the itinerant theatrical groups which toured frontier towns to bring entertainment to the communities. These troupes were often attractive simply because they presented new personalities and new faces in the settlements. Dean Farnsworth's "Barber on the Boards," recounts such experiences in addition to preserving a delightful bit of family history.

Because pioneer life was so difficult and uncertain, especially for the women, they were probably more dependent upon and sensitive to a spiritual strength which was necessary to maintain them in their difficult pioneering activity. These experiences are explored in "Woman-heart is Many Voiced," by Claire Noall and "A Strange Gift" by Rosabel Ashton.

Two features significant and peculiar to Mormon society
are explored in “Prisoners for Conscience Sake,” by William Mulder, a discussion of the polygamy struggle in Utah. “Wine-making in Utah’s Dixie,” by Olive W. Burt, discusses some of the problems associated with this seemingly contradictory activity in a Mormon community. These accounts open some interesting facets of Mormon history.

Two folk heroes, Orin Porter Rockwell and Samuel Brannan, are presented respectively by Gustive O. Larson and Thomas E. Cheney. These two men have been popularized by much having been written about them. These two summaries of their lives with special reference to some folk myths about them make interesting and significant reading.

Seven articles are included in this work which deal with folklore more directly. “How to Grow a Legend,” by Frank Robertson, and “Why Mormons were Said to Wear Horns,” by Karl Young, give some interesting insights into the development of folklore itself. Five articles are devoted to an examination of general topics which present a culture-wide investigation of folklore such as “The Cycle of Life,” “The Common Cold and Utah Folk Medicine,” and “Unsung Craftsmen.” All deal with the everyday life of people in Utah. “Ditties of Death in Deseret,” by Olive Burt, and “Tales of the Supernatural,” by J. H. Adamson, deal with more esoteric, but none the less interesting, facets of Utah history.

This book presents a prelude to more work to be done in the fields of folklore and historical narrative. Each of the areas, either as presented in the book or as suggested in this review, could be expanded into collections of their own, many of them of book length. The presentation of this material, while not historical in all aspects, presents important insights and understandings for a study of the history of the Mormon movement in the West.
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