

TEACHING HISTORY

DOES HISTORY UNDERMINE FAITH?

James L. Clayton

"All true knowledge is inherently hazardous," Michael Polanyi tells us, "just as all true faith is a leap into the unknown."¹

One of the more enduring hazards in the search for true knowledge is the perennial tension between faith and reason, faith and science, and more recently, faith and history. In Galileo's age this tension expressed itself dramatically in Galileo's preference for scientific evidence as opposed to the authority of contemporary interpretations of Biblical scripture in solving physical problems. This preference, as we all know, got him into considerable trouble at that time, and caused the Catholic authorities even greater difficulty for centuries thereafter. In our own time and in our own community, this age-old controversy continues, only now the tension is not so much between faith and science as between faith and history.

The most recent and spirited exchange on the alleged conflict between faith and history as it relates to Mormonism occurred at the 1981 meeting of the Western History Association in San Antonio, Texas. Professor Louis Midgley, a political scientist at BYU, read a draft of the first chapter of his manuscript entitled "No Middle Ground" in which he declared that LDS historians should not attempt to be detached or objective but should be "defenders of the faith." Professor Midgley maintains, for example, that one must accept Joseph Smith as totally prophetic or reject him as totally fraudulent. To explain any of Joseph's revelations or teachings as "products of culture is an act of treason," he believes. It is not the traditional science vs. religion conflict that Professor Midgley fears, but the "New

Presented to the B. H. Roberts Society on February 25, 1982.

Mormon History" vs. contemporary religious orthodoxy that inflames him. He fears that many Mormon historians are undermining faith in their writings, and is deeply suspicious of the entire LDS intellectual community, which he believes "has always been only partly at home in the Restored Gospel."² Others, including persons in high Church positions, have expressed similar concerns about the alleged dangers of historical inquiry.

I

Without singling out any individual, I should like to discuss what to me are the major concerns of those who fear that the study of Mormon history can undermine faith, or more precisely the orthodox expressions of that faith, including the assumptions and beliefs that generate this concern. Time does not allow analysis in depth on every issue, neither is it possible to differentiate precisely among the various authors of these fears. Nevertheless, many ideas are common to those concerned about the alleged destructive powers of objective historical inquiry, among Mormons and non-Mormons alike.

Fundamental to all of these concerns is the assumption that there is a great cosmic battle in process between God and Satan, good and evil, right and wrong. Scripture of course gives much support to this view. Accordingly, it is often suggested that truly committed historians, and more especially those who are entrusted with the teaching of religion and its revealed traditions, must never be neutral in such a battle. They should become "advocates" for the faith and "belligerents" in the cause.³ This is not to say that the end justifies the means, but that religious history should be one-sided rather than neutral, immediately and directly faith-promoting rather than objective, and concerned with short term consequences for orthodoxy more than long term accumulations of wisdom.

Deliberately taking a one-sided approach to history violates, in my judgment, the very essence of the historical craft, which emphasizes honesty, objectivity, and a willingness to tell the truth. Being fair to all sides, being suspicious of religious cant, partisan polemic, and propaganda are values that are at the very heart of historical craftsmanship. I am not suggesting that historians should not have a point of view or that historians can ever achieve total objectivity. I am saying that the goal of any good historian is to get as close an approximation of what actually happened as is humanly possible, even if that approximation does violence to his or her own most cherished religious values, and that understanding not advocacy is the sine qua non of good historical scholarship.⁴

① { A good historian should have not only the ability but also the willingness to tell the truth, to place that truth in its own setting, and to suspend judgment where the record is not clear. History has no general laws or absolute truths of its own, no truths per se, although historians do use general laws from other disciplines. Abstract concepts are of limited usefulness, and the significance of the infinite variety of human experiences in different ages and cultures depends on the assumptions one begins with. Subservience to a particular religion is therefore incompatible with honest inquiry, whether by historians or anyone else.⁵

② { Deliberately taking a one-sided, short-term, faith-promoting approach to history is as indefensible as deliberately taking a one-sided, faith-destroying approach to history. It tells only the "good" side, only that which promotes faith according to the writer's belief of what is good for us to know. Many of us find our faith strengthened more by having all of the relevant facts than just the "smiling aspects of life" set before us. As Louis Gothschalk has pointed out, few think any less of Judaism because

Moses killed a man; or of Catholicism because Augustine was a sinner in his youth; or of Protestantism because Calvin had Servetus burned at the stake. Nor do very many think much less of Mormonism, I would add, because Joseph Smith once had a bar in his house or because Brigham Young erected a distillery.⁶ Indeed, scripture is replete with accounts of the shortcomings of even the greatest of God's prophets. Should history be less honest?

3 Taking a one-sided approach to history undermines the credibility of teachers with their students and diminishes respect for the doctrine of free agency. Adult students easily recognize when they are being spoon-fed, resent it, and discount these often crude attempts at manipulation accordingly. Many see this approach as a form of censorship to prevent the spread of new ideas. Some resist such censorship openly. Others turn to non- and anti-religious sources to "get the real story." A deliberately one-sided approach to religious history withholds important truths from the membership and thereby lessens their ability to be "agents unto themselves" (D and C 29:39) and restricts their opportunity to work out their own salvation. It treats adults as if they were children and contradicts the principle that we are to seek knowledge in all things that we may be prepared in all things (D and C 88:78-80).

Selecting only those topics and historians that are comfortable in order to lead the membership more easily into the promised land is, to put it bluntly, intellectually and morally irresponsible from the historians' point of view. This is because history has no meaning per se, no divine messages, and any meaning in the ultimate sense that can be derived from history depends entirely upon the meaning people bring to it. The old Augustinian tradition declared that any meaning to be found in history had to come from religion. Today the lessons of history are as numerous as

those who study it. Limiting our insights to those historians who merely strengthen our prejudices limits our ability to learn and therefore to progress.

Historians cannot be divided into those who fight for God and those who battle for the Devil. All historians, both those inside and those outside the faith, are limited in their ability to reconstruct the past. Each seeks understanding according to his or her abilities and none has a corner on the truth. Being deliberately one-sided undermines our credibility with nonbelievers, tarnishes the good name of those who engage in such practices, invites counter attacks, and diminishes the possibility of fruitful dialogue with other Christians facing similar problems.⁷

II

Some people believe that disturbing historical facts are to be taught "selectively," only to those "who are worthy," or not discussed at all. This selective approach assumes that knowledge can be hidden from those unworthy to possess it. It assumes that worthiness for higher historical exposure can be determined somehow, as if "X" years in the church entitles one to "Y" units of advanced church history. I suspect that trying to decide what historical information should be repressed or trying to determine who should be excluded from access to the archives will be very difficult if not impossible tasks for those who seriously try to follow such practices. Who, for example, will decide what is faithful or unfaithful history? Who will author the "Index to Forbidden History Books"? Leaving such decisions up to each individual teacher or scholar would, I suspect, lead to much inconsistency, considerable confusion, and perhaps some hilarity.

The basic problem of teaching only what is uplifting is that this

approach leaves people unprepared to face the realities of life. It is like building a house without a roof. The rain will fall whether we like it or not. We should be prepared when it does. Religious instructors need to strengthen the ability of the religious membership to face the underside of life, not to hide from it. The better historians of Mormonism have always done this, particularly B. H. Roberts. I need only cite his years of struggle with what he called "problems in the Book of Mormon," and his 400 page manuscript⁸ on that topic to illustrate his willingness to face difficult tasks forthrightly.

We cannot escape the challenges of our past by ignoring them or by dealing with them selectively. Such a policy encourages ignorance and rewards sloth. Why not face the problems early on, head on, and all out like Roberts did? Knowledge was his defense, and it was a very noble one. Should ours be any less noble?

A deliberately biased approach to religious history by its very nature places the study and writing of that history in the same category as hardsell salesmanship and media publicity--it promises much and delivers little. In effect, religious instructors are being told to become publicity agents of the faith rather than objective and scholarly advocates of the truth. This approach invariably places penalties on expressed doubt and chills scholarly inquiry. Where this occurs writers and teachers begin to ask "Is this safe?" or "Will this information offend the Brethren?" rather than "Is this true?" or "Will this information enlarge our understanding?"

Whenever preserving testimonies takes precedence over advancing the truth both the mind and the soul are diminished. The mind because access to the archives becomes limited and key documents are locked up in safes;⁹ the soul because packaging the message takes on greater importance than the

message itself. When this happens "image" replaces "inquiry" as the fundamental goal of the historical enterprise and salesmanship is preferred to knowledge. Selling the gospel in this fashion downgrades our most cherished values to the same level as toothpaste, soap powders, and deodorants. It turns our missionaries into corporate sales-reps and our scholars into house agents. It cheapens the gospel and inflates the influence of those best able to manipulate the media.

Constant recourse to the belief that there is a cosmic war going on and that we should therefore be belligerent and one-sided in defense of our religion encourages a siege mentality with little room for any middle ground. It invites denunciations of those who respect objectivity more than orthodoxy and discourages scholarship generally. It turns colleagues into combatants and differences of interpretation into questions of loyalty. Does not the membership have some obligation to prepare themselves to receive all truth, including uncomfortable truth, as scripture suggests?¹⁰ Should the messenger carry the blame for the supposedly "bad" news he or she sometimes brings? After all, historians did not create the past; they are merely trying to understand it.

III

It is sometimes asserted that faith is greater than reason and that the whisperings of the spirit are more precious than the empirical perceptions of the intellect. Such comparative rankings, I believe, are lacking in seasoned judgment. The spirit and intellect have fundamentally different roles and for that reason should not be pitted against each other like two football teams.

Allow me to explain why ranking spiritual insights above intellectual insights, or vice versa, is an unfruitful exercise. The intellect is

paramount in the material world where problems are most easily approached by critical, empirical analysis, where data and methods of verification are at hand, and where replication in scientific experiments is possible. The essence of this approach is inductive, relative, and tentative.

The intellect deals more in questions than answers and helps us to be tolerant of diversity and discord--both of which are important aspects of all human life. As Bacon said, the intellect "hangs us with weights" to keep us from "leaping and flying about." Using empirical methods assists us in moving beyond the simplistic and sterile categories of hero vs. villain, defense vs. attack, and member vs. nonmember so prominent in nineteenth century Mormon history. It allows us considerably greater freedom and accuracy in dealing with the more secular aspects of our past, and it encourages a healthy corporate introspection. Equally important, it warns us against the tendency, all too common in our culture, that if only we feel deeply enough about something then it surely must be true.

The great achievement of the intellect is the massive body of reliable knowledge commanding near universal agreement in the scientific and secular world. It is the result of centuries of arduous effort and magnificent insights. It is the main driving force of our universities and the intellectual foundation of our great corporations. It is our guarantee against dogmatism and the ravages of our nonrational and unreasoning selves.

The spirit, on the other hand, is our contact with God and the sacred. It serves us equally well but in a radically different way. If the intellect supplies us with weights, the spirit gives us wings--to soar above our mundane selves, to extend our reach, to inspire. It helps to establish ultimate values, moral unity, and diminishes the twin evils of

secular man—narcissism and normlessness.¹¹ The spirit gives us a meaningful place in the universe, roots us in a power larger than self, and makes possible the full development of the human personality. It ties us religiously with both past and future generations. Without the spirit we are, as T. S. Eliot so well said, "hollow" men living in a "waste land."

The spiritual achievements of our civilization are equal to the intellectual. Our moral codes—the very cement of society—are religiously based and nurtured. The concept of sin for many if not most is the very ingredient that makes these moral concepts work, for without the ideal of an eventual, divine reckoning for our misdeeds, few among us would control our unsocial impulses so effectively. Religious belief gives life dignity and meaning. Those who have not tasted its delights, those who only know what can be proved empirically, should likewise refrain from denigrating spiritual values.

The spirit gives us certitude, but it cannot be examined empirically. The intellect reminds us to question—even that which seems certain. The intellect and the spirit are our two eyes. Either used alone is lacking in depth perception. Together, they serve us well—both spiritually and intellectually.

IV

The alleged conflict between the intellect and the spirit is usually most intense on or near university campuses, at least that has been my experience. Here the secular persuasion holds sway and students are often exposed for the first time to intellectual rigor. Not infrequently their faith is challenged, more I think by what they read than by any deliberate attempt by their instructors to undermine belief. The university is a great testing ground for the faithful,¹² and those who successfully meet

the challenge are the better for it. Particularly challenging are courses in history, and perhaps none more so than those that deal with the intellectual tradition of Western Civilization. Such courses chronicle the rise of secular philosophy and the privatization of religious belief. No one can take them without being challenged--and enlarged.

Students, like all of God's other creations, are made stronger by exposure to the elements. Hot-house plants may be more beautiful than plants in their natural setting, but they are also more fragile. Membership in the Kingdom, we are told, is for those who succeed in this probationary period and for those who can endure to the end. Can one truly endure without being tested? Of course some may fall by the wayside, but we are promised that God does not tempt people beyond their capacity to resist (1 Cor. 10:13). Still, is it not better that some are allowed through their own deficiencies to fail rather than attempting to rig the system in order to achieve maximum commitment?

An effective way for students to survive the "shocks" of learning the underside of Mormon history is to examine carefully the underside of secular history as well. Once the weaknesses of the opponents of faith are as equally well perceived as are the weakness of the proponents of faith, once the ugly, brash, superficial, and restless trends of modernity are fully understood, the choice between informed committment and inactivity is not all that troublesome.¹³ Once the limitations of the intellect are fully understood, the limitations of the spirit do not loom so large. The key, I think, is to read deeply in both the secular and the religious tradition. Read T. S. Eliot as a corrective for David Hume, William James along with Bertrand Russell, Solzhenitsyn and Sidney Hook, Fawn Brodie and B. H. Roberts. One ought to be familiar with both David Hume's skepticism

and T. S. Eliot's religious conversion, with Bertrand Russell's preference for science and Solzhenitzyn's preference for the "supreme, complete entity," with Fawn Brodie's relatively rapid exodus from the Church and B. H. Robert's long and arduous struggle to stay in.

My view on this point is summed up beautifully in the imagined conversation between Pope Benedict XIV and Voltaire at the end of Will and Ariel Durant's book, The Age of Voltaire.¹⁴ The Pope tells Voltaire it was his "brilliance" that led him astray, that he had an insufficient appreciation for the importance of religion in helping people bear the burdens of life, that only through belief does life acquire a meaning and a dignity that can ennoble our existence. Voltaire told the Pope that the church is capable of being wrong, oppressive, and an impediment to the advancement of understanding. Voltaire focused on reason; the Pope on love. The whole man needs both. But the Pope also admits that many absurdities have crept into his church, largely because the people cried out for them. The Pope does not try to make the historical record perfect; neither does he try to hide it. What he does is to point out that the mature mind goes through three stages: belief, unbelief, and then on to understanding.

V

Having expressed my concern with those who would restrict the study of history out of fear that such study might undermine faith, allow me to offer my own answer to the question, "Does history undermine faith?"

I believe that the study of history seldom directly threatens fundamental religious beliefs because history and religion seldom meet. A competent historian in or outside the Church may believe in God, believe that He created the universe, and believe that there is life after death.

But that historian cannot prove historically that any of these beliefs are true, and certainly cannot apply these beliefs to his or her scholarly work because there is no historically acceptable evidence for God, divine intervention, or life after death. Historians have no way to discern the hand of God or to measure the validity of inspiration because historians have no tools to deal with the supernatural. They can neither confirm nor disconfirm mystical experiences. If history cannot touch the wellsprings of religion, neither can it corrupt them.

Moving from the divine origins of religious faith to the observable consequences of religious action, brings our topic within the jurisdiction of the historian. Religion fills a powerful human need for many if not most people, and helps humanity bear the burdens of life. Religion also helps to check superstition and can be a useful antidote to the despair of modern times. Theology may also be part of the necessary cement that ennobles our existence and makes moral principles effective guides of social decency. Secular historians generally recognize these consequences of faith, even when they themselves think religious creeds are based on little more than "consolatory myths." Historians occasionally speak out against religious intolerance, persecution, and ecclesiastical domination, but these are the excesses, not the essence of religion, and when historians are so occupied, they may be engaging more in advocacy than objectivity.

Where historians and advocates of a particular religion do clash is when the historian perceives that the advocate is not being loyal to historical as opposed to religious truth, where the religious advocate does not have a high degree of intellectual honesty or lacks a sense of balance, proportion, and common sense.¹⁵ This kind of conflict can occur when someone suggests that we should see the hand of God operating in every

aspect of our lives.¹⁶ Any serious attempt to see God's hand in every single act, every shift in policy, or in every ecclesiastical pronouncement contradicts, it seems to me, the more balanced statement that even a prophet is not always a prophet. Mistakes have been made by our religious leaders and are freely admitted as such. As almost everyone knows, Joseph Smith admitted he was wrong to try to sell the copyright for the Book of Mormon in Canada.¹⁷ Erastus Snow and John Taylor thought Brigham Young's united order an unwise experiment.¹⁸ Orson Pratt and Brigham Young had sharp and public differences that lasted for years.¹⁹ Brigham Young and others modified and sometimes distorted Joseph Smith's history, and so on.²⁰ To require our teachers to say all of this was inspired, to try to make consistent that which is inconsistent, is to create rather than diminish doubt, and to undermine respect for both historical and religious inquiry.

Nor does religion operate in a cultural vacuum. Some changes in religious doctrine are influenced by governmental action, as for example the Supreme Court's 1879 decision which sustained congressional legislation outlawing the practice of polygamy, and its 1890 decision disincorporating the Church for refusing to honor the law of the land. Surely that tribunal had some influence on President Woodruff's 1890 decision which, incidentally, directly contradicted President Taylor's 1886 revelation on the same topic.²¹ To say, as is sometimes said, that the Manifesto was simply a direct revelation from God and not in some essential way influenced by the events of that day is simply to raise other, harder questions. Such as, why did God wait until 1890 to cease the practice? Why not 1879 when the Supreme Court sustained congressional laws prohibiting polygamy? Or, if the timing was just right, why then did half of the Quorum of the Twelve take additional wives after the Manifesto was issued?²² A more historically accurate presentation of this "theological dysfunction" would give attention to the

painful and not always honest interaction between public authorities and church officials which took at least a generation to resolve.

Many statements by Church leaders were made in the heat of battle and some of their statements were demonstrably wrong, e.g., Brigham Young declared that the Civil War would not free the slaves²³ and that a temple would be built in Missouri in his generation,²⁴ Heber C. Kimball "prophesied" that Brigham Young would become President of the United States,²⁵ and so on. There are several false statements like this in our history, but again such zealotry is not the essence but the excesses of Mormonism. Once we recognize that no person is infallible, that there is a secular as well as a sacred side to religious history, history and religion are much more easily reconciled and can coexist comfortably together.

The statement that God directs everything in every moment implies that everything is of equal importance. It equates every minor personal eccentricity with the Divine Will, every contemporary church policy with ultimate, enduring truth. Asserting that God directs his leaders in all things contradicts the fundamental doctrine of "moral agency" given to all men that they may be held "accountable" (D and C 101:78). It assumes that the leaders agree among themselves, which is not always the case either now or in earlier times.²⁶ It implies that the Church leadership is infallible and that any criticism of policy or of errant church leaders is heresy. This approach implies that the mantle of church authority shields our leaders from all criticism by the membership, that no one no matter how knowledgeable in a given topic should be allowed to criticize the Brethren. It makes it nearly impossible to learn from our past mistakes and makes needed changes arduous and slow.

It is really quite striking how much heat can be generated when some historian offers a common sense explanation, based for example on the

diaries of the time, for a religious belief of avowedly peripheral importance. Whether there was one or many trees in Salt Lake Valley when the pioneers arrived, whether the persecutors of Joseph Smith met ignominious deaths, whether the Word of Wisdom was influenced by the temperance movement, whether the united order could be described as a "communal" system--these are only a few of the clashes between historians and others that have occurred over the years in this community. If one's religious faith is based on the paucity of trees in the valley, or whether God took vengeance on some of the leading citizens of Illinois because of what they did to Joseph Smith, I suppose one could say that history (with its more mundane explanations) does undermine that sort of faith. A better question is why one should place any faith in those kinds of things in the first place.

Even if history threatens the dogmatic and literal-minded occasionally, and even if history exposes some of the peripheral excesses of religion, I believe that history also records over the centuries the basic human expression of and desire for religion as an enduring and fundamental characteristic of all human endeavor. Religion has played a very large role in the history of civilization and it has been historians who have told us this. It is seen as important in every age in shaping the lives of all kinds of people, whether primitive or modern. Secular historians certainly take religion seriously, most treat its precepts respectfully, and many I suspect are religious themselves. Wherever love, hope, and wisdom are considered important, religion will be given its just due by historians in fostering these important human attributes. So long as people cry out for ways to lighten their burdens, so long as despair is a part of the human condition, religion will find its supporters and many historians will attempt to measure objectively its secular impact.

VI

Carlyle once said the great historian will "first recognize what is true . . . then discern what is false."²⁷ This seems especially good advice for those studying religious history. To recognize the enormous power of faith, the enduring value of spirituality, the personally enhancing power of ritual and tradition is, in my judgment, the beginning of wisdom and the first step toward real sophistication in dealing with religious history. The second and equally necessary step toward enduring wisdom is to move from faith to the rational detection of myth, religious cant, sentimentality, deliberate distortion, and religious propaganda. Failure to take the first step, to remain forever a skeptic, to constantly fear being duped by men of the cloth will guarantee a critical mind perhaps, but such an attitude will also fall short of full appreciation for the very real powers of spiritual commitment. Failure to take the second step into the abyss of doubt, to recognize that skepticism is as important an historical tool as is belief, is to remain naive, credulous, and also lacking in understanding of the evils of dogmatism. To deal with any kind of history intelligently both belief and skepticism are necessary, perhaps in equal measure. Together and in balance they lead to truth in so far as truth can be determined. Without this balance no historical account will endure.

To ignore those things disadvantageous to the Christian cause, B. H. Roberts writes in the preface to his A Comprehensive History of the Church . . . , and to dwell upon only those things which glorify religion is special pleading, not history. To omit events in the past that were clearly reprehensible, or not to admit that all church leaders at times manifested errors of judgment, is not to write good history, he continued. In a little known speech in 1905 to the Mutual Improvement Association Roberts declared

It is well nigh as dangerous to claim too much for the inspiration of God in the affairs of men as it is to claim too little. By the first men are led into superstition, and into blasphemously accrediting their own imperfect actions, their blunders, and possibly even their sins to God; and by the second they are apt to altogether eliminate the influence of God from human affairs; I pause in doubt as to which extreme would be the worse.²⁸

Roberts went on to say that

[T]he Lord evidently proposes that man shall act here largely upon his own intelligence, exercise his own agency, and develop the powers, intelligent and moral, that are within him. That is why men are here in this earth-probation. While I believe the Lord will help men at need, I think it improper to assign every word and every act of theirs to an inspiration from the Lord; for if that were true, we would have to acknowledge ourselves as being wholly taken possession of by the Lord, and not permitted to go to the right or to the left, but as he guided us. Needless to say that in that event there would be no error in judgment, no blunders made. Where would human agency or human intelligence exist in the one case or be developed in the other under such circumstances? They would not exist. Hence I think it is a reasonable conclusion to say that constant, never-varying inspiration is not a factor in the administration of the affairs even of the Church; not even good men, no, not though they be prophets or other high officials of the Church, are at all times and in all things inspired of God. It is only occasionally and at need that God comes to their aid.²⁹

What is needed today is not a new medievalism, a new clash between "God and the professors," a new search for heretics in historical garb, but a reaffirmation of the joint usefulness and continuing interdependency of faith and reason. Placing religion and history at odds with each other puts us at war with ourselves; raising one to a position of predominance over the other diminishes the value of each. Seen as two quite different but nevertheless complimentary ways to deeper understanding allows each to make its own unique contribution and insures both spiritual and intellectual repose.

True knowledge is indeed hazardous just as true faith does indeed require a leap into the unknown, but I think both are well worth striving for. Together and in balance they provide a temperate alternative to the

excesses of religious dogmatism and secular narcissism in a community where polarized thinking is a major hazard of our times.

FOOTNOTES

1. See his "Faith and Reason" in The Journal of Religion, XLI (October, 1961), p. 244.
2. See Midgley's "A Critique of Mormon Historians: The Question of Faith and History," paper presented to the Western History Association, October 14-17, 1981, San Antonio, Texas, available from the author. Citations are to pp. 28 and 38 of the paper and p. 13 of Professor Midgley's rejoinder to his critics.
3. Both the "New Left" and the "New Christian Right" take this position and are less effective than they might be if they were less combative.
4. On this central issue see especially Harvey Wish, ed., American Historians, A Selection (New York: Oxford University Press, 1962), particularly Samuel E. Morison's "Faith of a Historian," p. 378; Edward Hallett Carr, What is History (New York: Random House, 1961), Chap. I; and Hans Meyerhoff, The Philosophy of History in Our Time (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1959), especially the introduction on "history and philosophy."
5. Herbert Butterfield, as quoted in C. T. McIntire, ed., Herbert Butterfield, Writings on Christianity and History (New York: Oxford, 1979), says something is historically true if Catholics, Protestants, and Marxists can agree on it (p. xlvi).
6. On Joseph's and Brigham's activities regarding alcohol see The Saint's Herald, Jan. 22, 1835, p. 110; and Journal of Discourses, vol. 10, p. 206.
7. Anyone who doubts the seriousness of these problems should read Bryan Wilson, Contemporary Transformations of Religion (New York: Oxford, 1976). One solution is offered by Donald E. Miller, The Case for Liberal Christianity (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1981).
8. Now available in the Special Collections of the Marriott Library at the University of Utah, and soon to be published, with appropriate introductions, by the University of Illinois Press.
9. One of several key documents now locked up is the journal of George Q. Cannon which even the Church's own historians cannot see.

FOOTNOTES

10. John 16:13
11. On which see Christopher Lasch, The Culture of Narcissism (New York: W. W. Norton, 1978).
12. Both for students and for professors. Indeed, the better the school the greater the challenge, or so it seems according to a substantial body of literature. See, for example, "Secularization and Scholarship Among American Professors," Sociological Analysis, vol. 37 (Spring, 1976), p. 63.
13. A good source on this perspective is James Oliver and Christina Scott, eds., Religion and World History, A Selection from the Works of Christopher Dawson (Garden City, N.J.: Doubleday, 1975).
14. (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1965), p. 787.
15. One of the better studies on the need to keep separate religion and history is Charles Frankel's The Case for Modern Man (Boston: Beacon Press, 1955).
16. For an extended analysis by an outstanding scholar who sees God's hand "in every event," see C. T. McIntire, ed., Herbert Butterfield, Writings on Christianity and History (New York: Oxford, 1979).
17. B. H. Roberts, A Comprehensive History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 6 vols. (Provo: BYU Press, 1965), vol. 1, pp. 162-163. For other human characteristics see B.Y.U. Studies, vol. 21 (Spring, 1981), p. 175.
18. Leonard Arrington et al., Building the City of God (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1976), pp. 285 ff.
19. See Dialogue, vol. 13 (Summer 1980), p. 2.
20. B.Y.U. Studies, vol. 11 (Summer, 1971), pp. 457 ff.
21. Gilbert Fulton, The Most Holy Principle, 4 vols. (Salt Lake City: Gems, 1975), vol. 4, p. 34.

FOOTNOTES

22. See Victor Jorgensen, "The Taylor-Cowley affair and the Watershed of Mormon History," Utah Historical Quarterly, vol. 48 (Winter, 1980), p. 4.
23. Journal of Discourses, vol. 10, p. 250.
24. Times and Seasons, vol. 6, p. 956.
25. Journal of Discourses, vol. 5, p. 219.
26. Disagreements among the Brethren have been deep and lasting on the nature of God, polygamy, the united order, the gathering, several political issues, and among others, on the uses of history.
27. From Lecture XI, On Heroes, Hero-Worship, and the Heroic in History as cited in Fritz Stern, ed., The Varieties of History (New York: Meridian, 1958), p. 107.
28. B. H. Roberts, Defense of the Faith and the Saints, 2 vols. (Salt Lake City: Deseret News, 1907), vol. 1, p. 527.
29. Ibid; pp. 524-525.