

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF
MORMON STUDIES

Volume 3

Spring 2010

PUBLICATION DETAILS

EDITOR

David M. Morris

EDITORIAL BOARD

Zachary R. Jones

Kim B. Östman

The *International Journal of Mormon Studies* is a European based internationally focused, peer-reviewed online and printed scholarly journal, which is committed to the promotion of interdisciplinary scholarship by publishing articles and reviews of current work in the field of Mormon studies. With high quality international contributors, the journal explores Mormon studies and its related subjects. In addition, *IJMS* provides those who submit manuscripts for publication with useful, timely feedback by making the review process constructive. To submit a manuscript or review, including book reviews please email them for consideration in the first instance to submissions@ijmsonline.org.

International Journal of Mormon Studies (Print) ISSN 1757-5532
International Journal of Mormon Studies (Online) ISSN 1757-5540

Published in the United Kingdom.

©2010 *International Journal of Mormon Studies*

All rights reserved.

<http://www.ijmsonline.org>

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MORMON STUDIES

Volume 3, Spring 2010

Contents

Publication Details	ii
Editorial	
<i>David M. Morris</i>	v
Father, Jesus and Lucifer in Pre-Mortal Council	
<i>Douglas J. Davies</i>	1
Meaning and Authority in Mormon Ritual	
<i>Walter E. A. van Beek</i>	17
The Religious “Other”: Reflecting upon Mormon Perceptions	
<i>Mauro Properzi</i>	41
The Rise of the Nazi Dictatorship and its Relationship with the Mormon Church in Germany, 1933-1939	
<i>Steve Carter</i>	56
Religious Freedom in Belgium: A Limited Study of Challenges as experienced by LDS Children and Youth in Flemish Classrooms from the 1970’s until Today	
<i>Ingrid Sherlock-Taselaar</i>	90
Utah and All These Cherries: Mormonism in Fallaci’s <i>Un cappello pieno di ciliege</i>	
<i>Massimo Introvigne</i>	102
Oriana Fallaci, the Mormons and Me: A Personal Recollection	
<i>Michael W. Homer</i>	107

Poles Apart? A Look at Mormon Doctrine in Light of Historic Christianity <i>Johnnie Glad</i>	113
Are Jesus and Satan Brothers? A Short Exploration in Mormon Christology <i>John Walsh</i>	128
Review – <i>People Of Paradox: A History Of Mormon Culture</i> <i>Carter Charles</i>	139
Review – <i>The Mission Of Mormonism In Norway, 1851–1920</i> <i>Christian Euvrard</i>	145
Review – <i>Mormony v Rossii: put' dlinnoi v stoletie</i> <i>Jeffrey Hardy</i>	155
Review – <i>German Saints at War</i> <i>Zachary Ray Jones</i>	160
Review – <i>Massacre at Mountain Meadows</i> <i>Ingrid Sherlock-Taselaar</i>	165
Review – <i>Joseph Smith, Jr.: Reappraisals After Two Centuries</i> <i>Chrystal Vanel</i>	173
Article Contributors	179

EDITORIAL

David M. Morris

Editor

Once again, it is with great pleasure that we publish another issue of the *International Journal of Mormon Studies* (IJMS). This issue brings together a combination of scholars from different parts of the world and academic disciplines. Drawn from Mormon and non-Mormon perspectives, the articles found herein provide interesting insights to Mormonism globally, encouraging further attention and examination. Following on from the successful *European Mormon Studies Association* (EMSA) conference in Torino, Italy (2009), we have published here many of those papers that were presented during that conference. We are grateful for the submissions and support.

Like all aspects of modern life, and the worldwide recession, financial constraints have not left a journal as this and organisations such as EMSA untouched, and we are particularly grateful to those who have supported us financially, who no doubt would prefer that we do not mention them by name. We are, nevertheless, grateful. As editor I am particularly indebted for the efforts of Kim Östman and Zachary Jones who not only bring a professional and academic eye to this journal, but also selflessly give of their time and talents. We also extend our appreciation to those who blind peer reviewed the articles and took time to review publications that have an international flavour. We hope as an editorial board that you will enjoy the contents of this issue.

FATHER, JESUS AND LUCIFER IN PRE-MORTAL COUNCIL¹

Douglas J. Davies

How does one establishment deal with another establishment? Does it concede rank to others or assert rank over them? Much depends, of course, on the nature of the 'establishment' concerned, as to whether it exists at the apex of the power-base of a society or merely as a subsidiary institution, and much depends on the stage of development of institutions as they relate to each other as, just now, in the relationship between nation states within the European Union. In England, currently, the very 'establishment' of Parliament, for example, has been seriously depleted in popular opinion because of the disclosure of expenses of members of Parliament, and this following shortly after the depletion of the popular status of bankers and financiers following the global 2008-2009 credit-crunch. Or, again, the Roman Catholic Church has, for example, suffered as an 'establishment' within Ireland and the USA following issues of sexual wrongdoings on the part of some priests. Other issues surround the relationship between religious institutions as 'establishments' and their wider social environments as with the Church of England, as part of the English 'establishment', which seems to be perilously poised around a variety of issues concerning sexuality, gender, ordination, and religious authority. Much could also be said about medical 'establishments' and popular concerns over euthanasia and assisted suicide. In all these cases the issue of context is of paramount importance.

So, Mormonism in Britain for example, despite having been a religious group in Britain for a hundred and seventy or so years, can hardly be regarded even as a player in the field of religious 'establishments', an assertion that needs to be understood against a cultural background in which the Church of England's formal status as the established church in England is now even questioned while Roman Catholic identity still stands uncertainly. In today's world the churches play off each other and also against other religions, especially Islam, in terms of social relevance and potential political usefulness, reminding us that

¹ Plenary Paper at *European Mormon Studies Association (EMSA) 2009 Conference*, Turin. I thank EMSA for their invitation to deliver this paper, also The Huntington Library, California, for a Fellowship, and The British Academy for valuable research support.

political power in the formal as well as informal sense remains a dominant factor in notions of 'establishment'. Behind all such establishment-attitudes towards others and of others towards establishments lie sets of values that help constitute what sociologist Max Weber described as an 'orientation to the world', the way a group's ideas and actions, doctrines and ethics, interplayed in the face of social realities.²

Apostasy, betrayal and obedience

In this paper I highlight just one cluster of ideas and their related actions that influenced Mormonism's orientation to the world in the nineteenth century and which still retains a degree of significance today, viz., apostasy, betrayal, and obedient activity. Here much could, and probably should, be said describing Mormonism's rise from sectarian status to an American sub-culture and established church in some American contexts and to its status in some other countries as a questionable sect or even a 'cult' in the popular sense of that word. Its status in all those contexts influences its relationship to associated 'establishments' and theirs to it. Consideration could also be given to how bureaucratic USA-Mormonism with its sense of assured American status seeks to operate in other countries where its endemic establishment status is low or non-existent.

In this paper, however, I focus only on the topic of apostasy as an element within nineteenth-century Mormonism's orientation to the world, approaching it through the doctrinal narrative-myths of the Council in Heaven and of group-experience on earth. I do not mean to argue that doctrine creates ethics in a linear, simple, cause-effect fashion, but I do think they are important as mutually creative forces. Moreover, I think that doctrinal ideas flourish or die depending upon the way they reflect people's real-life situations; and to speak of such human experience is to emphasise the importance of the emotional dimension of life and its place in scholarly studies of religion.³

The Heavenly Prelude

In Mormon thought the important role of abstract 'principles' is often encountered in the personified forms of 'relations' between peo-

² Max Weber, *The Sociology of Religion* (London: Methuen, [1922] 1963), p. 149.

³ E.g. John Corrigan, (ed.) *Religion and Emotion, Approaches and Interpretation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 2008.

ple.⁴ This was so in early Mormonism in the image of the opposition between Jesus and Lucifer in the Latter-day Saint (LDS) version of a pre-mortal Council in Heaven that became the basis for an analysis of the notions of betrayal and apostasy, concepts that helped frame the issue of evil in LDS thought. This perspective influenced earlier Mormonism's attitude towards 'Gentile' political-religious power-centres depicted as Evil Babylon set against holy Zion. Apostasy, indeed the Great Apostasy, deemed to have existed from the Christian sub-apostolic period combined with a degree of LDS millenarian Adventism to engender a negative view of worldly powers, including those of Great Britain and its Empire. The opposition over the plan of salvation that emerged between Jesus and Lucifer in heaven became the basis for discussing the idea of evil on earth, not least in cases of betrayal and apostasy. And here I deploy both these terms because I see a strong family resemblance between them, with betrayal applying to interpersonal relationships and apostasy to the relationship of an individual with an institution. Although apostasy does, primarily, refer to the dynamics of 'establishment' it also raises its head more personally in cases where a spy is often referred to as one who 'betrays his country'. There the institutional and personal overlap. In the well-known religious context of Jesus, however, we speak of him as betrayed by individuals, indeed by his friends and disciples. In terms of the history and sociology of religion, however, there was no apostasy because he had no church organization as such.⁵

I appreciate, of course, that an LDS reading of Jesus and his disciples as a church would see this differently on the basis of faith that Jesus had founded a church amongst his followers. Again, from a sociological perspective, Joseph Smith was in a different position from Jesus, for he had founded a church and could be both betrayed as an individual by other individuals known to him and could also encounter apostasy in those who renounced his church.

Mormonism's own theological reflection on apostasy on earth seems to begin with the idea of Satan as the persecutor of Christ's church. In the *Doctrine and Covenants* for example, the motif of Babylon is invoked within Joseph's enhanced interpretation of the biblical parable of the

⁴ Douglas J. Davies, *An Introduction to Mormonism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), p. 6.

⁵ But see, for example, Dietrich Bonhoeffer ([1949] 1955:47-54) for a Protestant reflection on the guilt of apostasy within the faithful believer.

sower, the wheat and the tares.⁶ Interestingly, the Index to the *Book of Mormon* and the *Doctrine and Covenants* applies the word apostasy to numerous contexts in which the word does not itself occur but which depict all sorts of disobedient spiritual hard-heartedness, perhaps the classic case being 2 Nephi 28 with its wide-spread account of the devil. Its editorial chapter-synopsis uses the word Apostasy despite its textual absence, thus indicating the word's status as a dominant verbal symbol within the LDS worldview of a Great Apostasy upon earth.

Satan, himself, appears at various points to oppose God's obedient servants as, for example, just after Moses receives his encounter with God, in which he not only beheld the divine glory but was, himself, 'transfigured before him':⁷ Satan appears and tempts him. This reflects the biblical text of Jesus' temptations after his baptism but with the major exception that after a discourse in which he ponders his own abilities to discern the evil Satan, Moses commands Satan to 'depart hence' at which point there ensues a distinctive form of spiritual conflict. Satan cries with a loud voice and 'ranted upon the earth', claiming that he is the Only Begotten and that he should be worshipped. Amidst this onslaught Moses comes to 'fear exceedingly' and sees the 'bitterness of hell'. The battle of good and evil is well and truly joined but Moses calls upon God and receives strength to command Satan's departure. Now Satan begins to tremble and Moses, strengthened still further, invokes the name of the true 'Only Begotten' and commands Satan to depart, which he does.⁸

This encounter of good and evil by an LDS Moses reflects Joseph's account of his own engagement with evil told in the First Vision when he is overcome by a power 'of astonishing influence' that prevented him from speaking, when a 'thick darkness gathered around him' and he felt as though he 'were doomed to sudden destruction' at the hands not of some 'imaginary' entity but of 'the power of some actual being from the unseen world' possessing a power Joseph had 'never felt before in any being'.⁹ An 1835 account has Joseph referring to his

⁶ *Doctrine and Covenants*, (Salt Lake City, Utah: Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1981), Section 86:3.

⁷ *Pearl of Great Price*, (Salt Lake City, Utah: Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1981), Moses 1:11.

⁸ Moses 1:21-23. The 'Only Begotten' in this context would seem to refer to the still awaited Christ.

⁹ *Joseph Smith History* 1:15-16.

tongue feeling swollen in his mouth preventing speech and also to a noise as of someone walking behind him.¹⁰

My inclination in this paper is to see the source of that evil power inhering both in the rebellious narcissism of Lucifer in the pre-mortal council's deliberations over the plan of salvation and also in his subsequent fall as Satan. This origin of Satan, grounded in his disobedient agency, provides one clear focus on the issue of evil in LDS thought. Here I specifically avoid the phrase 'the problem of evil' because LDS argumentation does not follow the paths of theodicy much frequented by many other Christian traditions that have practically conventionalised the phrase. This argument is not, I think, irrelevant to the very nature of the Mormon 'establishment', of how it related historically to dissidents of various kinds and to other 'establishments'. As we will see, this orientation to the world was even applied by LDS to America itself following Joseph's death, interpreted as a murderous lynching.

As a complementary comment on my theme let me recall that, at the first EMSA conference in England I suggested that the Plan of Salvation occupied a position in LDS thought which mirrored the role of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity in historical Christianity. At the second conference in Finland I developed that further by bringing this Heavenly Council alongside the two narratives of Christ in Gethsemane and of Joseph Smith's First Vision to argue that, together, these formed the core theological charter for LDS theology. Now I emphasise the point that Lucifer-Satan-Evil appears in all three of these paradigmatic scenes of Mormonism, interpreting that appearance, its intentions and actions in terms of apostasy, and seeing that act as a key idiom of evil within LDS thought. To put this suggestion at its sharpest we might say that the problem of evil in Mormonism is the problem of apostasy. Theologically, this made the ethical concern over persons and their choices, not least their 'activity' within the institutional establishment that is set against Satan, of prime importance. Lucifer, whose name originally denotes being a 'light-bearer', a bright 'son of the morning' then, became Satan, the personified image of evil, the prime apostate.¹¹ As an important aside, here, I note that in my previous conference papers I did not dwell upon any ritual expression of these Heavenly Council motifs, nor will I

¹⁰ Milton V. Backman Jr., *Joseph Smith's First Vision*, 2nd ed. (Salt Lake City, Utah: Bookcraft, 1980), p. 159. Cf. Scot Facer Proctor and Maurine Jensen Proctor, *The Revised and Enhanced History of Joseph Smith by his Mother* (Salt Lake City, Utah: Bookcraft, 1996), p. 105.

¹¹ Isaiah 14:12.

do so today, but rather consider public texts that reveal paradigmatic scenes that interplay and depend upon each other in the matrix-building process of LDS theology.

Case Study

As we move to consider some basic contexts of apostasy I reiterate the previous mention of emotions, for I wish to stress that evil is felt, experienced and encountered, it seldom remains only as a theological abstraction. The emotional root of fear, in particular, as well as driving that sense of despair that brings fear to bear on the very hope of survival often underlies a sense of evil. With this personal arena in mind I recall last year's conference where I cited Heber C. Kimball, shortly after landing on his crucial first mission to England in 1837–38, reporting attacks from Satan's evil forces. Kimball, and here we should recall him as one claimed as 'the first Latter-day Saint in Europe', encountered the devil and his forces very early after his arrival.¹² While it would be too great a stretch of rhetoric to identify these demonic forces as the European 'Establishment' there is some point in interpreting such a reported encounter in terms of 'spiritual politics'. Kimball's emotions were stirred by evil in the form of devilish possession. Later, back in the USA, Joseph explained to him that it was precisely because he was announcing the gospel in this new place that he was so attacked.

Certainly, it is important to note in this perceived onslaught that it was in the name of Jesus that the Apostle opposed Satan and evil spirits. Theologically speaking this echoed the charter narrative of the Heavenly Council in which Jesus and Lucifer play major roles. Once they had taken their separate paths it was inevitable that opposition would ensue between them, an opposition that took the LDS notion that there is an inevitable opposition in all things into a sharply personal, interpersonal, direction that would include the apostate arena.¹³ To mention this notion, indeed this principle of opposition, is to highlight the importance of chapter two in the second Book of Nephi in which these themes of good, evil, and agency are enunciated, where there is reference to that 'angel of God' who 'had fallen from heaven' to 'become a devil'.¹⁴ In that

¹² Edward L. Kimball, 'Heber C. Kimball', in *Encyclopedia of Mormonism*, (Ed.) Daniel H. Ludlow (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1992), p. 782.

¹³ *Book of Mormon* (Salt Lake City, Utah: Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1981), 2 Nephi 2:11.

¹⁴ 2 Nephi 2:17.

chapter an opposition is also set up between the emotions of joy and misery. Misery as the lot of the fallen angel, indeed it was to be 'misery for ever' that pressed him to seek 'the misery of all mankind'.¹⁵ By an important contrast, the 'fall' of Adam and Eve—grounded in their agency, the capacity given them by God to act for themselves—still left them with their agency intact such that they are 'free to choose liberty and eternal life through the great Mediator of all men, or to choose captivity and death, according to ... the power of the devil'. But as that well-known chapter indicates, the one key outcome of Adam's fall was that people 'might have joy'. Here, then, the idiom of fall and salvation is played out in terms of opposition of goal, of freedom of choice amongst the fallen, all contextualized in the emotions of destiny: of misery and joy. Tellingly, the Garden of Eden is depicted as a place of 'innocence', a state devoid both of 'joy' and of 'misery', a condition in which they also did 'no good'. Eden is emotionless! Theologically speaking, it is interesting to see at that point of an eternally enduring impending Eden, devoid of good action, of joy and of misery, the verse: 'But behold all things have been done in the wisdom of him who knoweth all things' (v. 24). In one sense it is a text that describes nothing, leaving agency with Adam and Eve, yet it indicates a grand narrative sustained by wisdom and knowledge. This, of course, is but one creative development of the ancient and developing Jewish-Christian tradition of fallen angels and their engagement with humanity.¹⁶

The Temptations of Joseph

Joseph Smith, in turn, is also caught up in this grand narrative in ways that, similarly, include experience of evil. Several texts tell of his encounters as when Oliver Cowdery describes a 'Remarkable Vision' that combines experiences dated September 21 and 22, 1823, involving the angelic visitor coming first to Joseph's own room and subsequently confronting him en route to find the hidden plates at Cumorah. Pub-

¹⁵ 2 Nephi 2:18.

¹⁶ See Richard Godber, *The Devil's Dominion, Magic and Religion in Early New England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992); Henry Ansgar Kelly, *Satan, A Biography* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006); Blake T. Ostler *Exploring Mormon Thought: of God and Gods*, vol. 3. (Salt Lake City, Utah: Greg Kofford Books, 2008); Annette Yoshiko Reed, *Fallen Angels and the History of Judaism and Christianity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

lished in successive numbers of *The Latter-day Saints' Millennial Star*,¹⁷ this told how Joseph was prevented by an angel from gaining the plates because his thoughts were focused more on his own potential for gain than on the divine purpose. When in the presence of divine glory Joseph beholds 'the prince of darkness, surrounded by his innumerable train of associates' with the outcome of being able, ever after, to know the opposition of 'the two powers', the forces of good and evil.¹⁸ These accounts give a combined sense of coterminous temptation, warning, and spiritual education. Cowdery's official *Millennial Star* account furnishes an unvarnished description of Joseph's wilfulness in seeking gain and in forgetting the high commission received from the angelic messenger. He writes, 'do not understand me to attach blame to our brother: he was young and his mind easily turned from correct principles'. This was, indeed, a period of spiritual education, 'of solemn instruction from the heavenly messenger': Cowdery describes how Joseph received a 'shock ... upon his system, by an invisible power, which deprived him, in a measure, of his natural strength'.¹⁹ As Joseph gives himself to prayer the darkness is dispelled. Here, the traditional Protestant motifs of obedience to God, of sinful selfishness, and of forgiveness are combined with motifs of darkness and light to emphasize the duality of the 'two powers' of good and evil. What is, perhaps, significant here is the way an entire mode of discourse has developed around the motifs of divine and satanic influence.

These episodes resemble Christ's wilderness temptations whose Synoptic Gospel accounts²⁰ begin with Mark's dramatic two verses on the Spirit driving Jesus into the wilderness with the wild beasts following his baptism at the hands of John the Baptist, on how he was tempted over forty days by Satan, and on how 'the angels ministered to him'.²¹ Luke includes dialogues between Jesus and the Devil in temptations to quell

¹⁷ *The Latter-day Saints' Millennial Star* (hereafter *Millennial Star*), vol. 1, no. 6, p. 150. Also *ibid.*, vol. 1, no. 7, p. 175.

¹⁸ Oliver Cowdery, *Letters by Oliver Cowdery to W. W. Phelps on the Origin of the Book of Mormon and the Rise of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints* (Liverpool: Thomas Ward and John Cairns, 1844), p. 41.

¹⁹ *Millennial Star*, vol. 1, no. 7, p. 175-76.

²⁰ Unlike the Synoptic Gospels of Matthew, Mark and Luke, John stresses John the Baptist as herald of Jesus and the descent of the Holy Spirit upon Jesus as the Lamb of God and the Son of God. He does not actually say that Jesus was baptized nor give any account of any wilderness temptations (John 1:19-35).

²¹ Mark 1:12-13.

hunger, gain fame and test God's protective power, after which the devil 'departed from him until an opportune time'.²² Matthew much resembles Luke.²³ While there is an obvious difference between these temptations, in which Jesus does not but Joseph does sin in some way by experiencing 'temptation to fame and fortune' there remains a similarity in their depiction of a personalized encounter of good and evil. Someone chosen by God is presented with choices. Jesus remained untouched while Joseph stumbles but without ultimately falling, for he 'looked to the Lord in prayer and as he prayed darkness began to disperse from his mind and his soul was lit up as it was the evening before', when the angel also visited him, 'and he was filled by the Holy Spirit'.²⁴

USA Apostasy

To these person-focused contexts we might add the public world, especially Mormonism's early experience of the 'establishment' in the sense of USA Federal law as a frame for Joseph's death interpreted as a kind of sacrifice or, more especially as a martyrdom. Here I use this motif of Joseph's martyr-sacrifice as its own example of apostasy, albeit using that word in an expanded and particular sense of what I will call 'cultural apostasy'. For, from the contemporary LDS perspective, it is possible to see the American social context of the mid-late 1840s as a kind of cultural apostasy – in the sense of a renunciation of responsibility on the part of proper authority. The killing of Joseph whilst in legal custody was understood as an abdication of justice. The failure of civil society to give early Mormons their legal due and the protection of the State under the law is well expressed, for example, in one of Eliza Snow's poems as she opposes the celebration of American Independence, and here we will not ignore the emotional indexes of her discourse.

Shall we commemorate the day
Whose genial influence has pass'd o'er?
Shall we our hearts' best tribute pay
Where heart and feeling are no more?

Shall we commemorate the day,
With freedom's ensign waving high,

²² Luke 4:1–13.

²³ Matthew 4:1–11.

²⁴ Oliver Cowdery's account of the event is given in *Millennial Star*, vol. 1, no. 7, p. 176.

Whose blood–stained banner’s furled away,
Whose rights and freedoms have gone by?

It is heart–rending mockery!
I’d sooner laugh midst writhing pain,
Than chant the song of liberty
Beneath oppression’s galling chain!

Columbia’s glory is a theme
That with our life’s warm pulses grew;
But ah! She’s flown–and like a dream
The ghost is fluttering in our view!

Eliza, a plural wife of Joseph, and now his earthly widow, speaks of freedom’s dying groans, a death knell as protection faints, justice cowers, and the country’s victor–wreath fades. Her final recourse is to God and certainly not to Federal authorities:

Better implore His aid divine,
Whose arm can make his people free,
Than decorate the hollow shrine
Of our departed liberty!

In what was regularly described as ‘mobocracy’, we are presented with the wider sense of betrayal of liberty, of a kind of ‘cultural apostasy’. And that negative evaluation was accentuated whenever Joseph’s death was invoked as martyrdom. Joseph’s killing was, however, advantageous to Mormons, enabling them to identify it with Jesus’ death and within a total picture of LDS destiny. Had Joseph died naturally or through one of the frequent fevers of his day that link with Christ could not have been forged as Eliza Snow expressed the outcome.²⁵

For never since the Son of God was slain
Has blood so nobly flow’d from human vein.

Shades of our patriotic fathers! Can it be,
Beneath your blood–stained flag of liberty.
The firm supporters of our country’s cause
Are butchered while submissive to her laws.

²⁵ 'On the Assassination of General Joseph Smith and Hyrum Smith Presidents of the Church', *Millennial Star*, vol. 5, no. 4, p. 53.

We mourn thy Prophet from whose lips have flow'd
 The words of life thy Spirit hath bestowed.
 A depth of thought, no human art could reach
 From time to time, roll'd in sublimest speech
 From the celestial fountain, through his mind,
 To purify and elevate mankind.

The parallel between Jesus as the Son of God and Joseph the Prophet is firm. Their deaths manifest a 'paradigmatic death', both crucifixion and martyrdom involving the shedding of blood and virtually guaranteeing a degree of exchange of attributes between each event for subsequent believers.²⁶ Later Mormon comment would note how Joseph 'like his master, Jesus' had 'sealed his testimony with his blood' and was 'instrumental in the hand of God in opening the door of salvation again to fallen man'.²⁷

Indeed, retaining the Kimball connection we find David C. Kimball, an early President of the Seventies, describing Joseph as one who, 'gave himself a sacrifice for the people he dearly loved—he would die rather than they should be slain—he gave his life for theirs'. For Kimball, Joseph knew that in leaving for Carthage 'he had seen Nauvoo for the last time' and 'gave the text from which his funeral sermon was to be preached'. Kimball adds: 'Here then was love'.²⁸ In other words his sacrifice stood full contrary to betrayal or apostasy.

Betrayal and Apostasy

Betrayal was described by Joachim Wach as 'the sinister act of the disciple'.²⁹ In LDS terms it also embraces the cardinal sin of 'rebellion against legitimate authority'.³⁰ That quotation from the *Millennial*

²⁶ Christopher Justice, *Dying the Good Death, The Pilgrimage to Die in India's Holy City* (Albany, New York: State University of New York Press, 1997), p. 235; Applying T. N. Madan's usage to Vinoba Bhave's death, a disciple of Mahatma Gandhi. T. N. Madan, 'Dying with Dignity', *Social Science and Medicine*, vol. 35, no. 4 (1992), p. 425–32.

²⁷ Elder Septimus Sears, *Millennial Star*, vol. 26, no. 34, p. 553.

²⁸ Cf. 1 Nephi 11:8–9, 21–22. Love extolled and typified in a white tree.

²⁹ Joachim Wach, 'Master and Disciple: Two Religio-Sociological Studies'. Reprinted by University of Chicago Press, *The Journal of Religion*, vol. XLII, no. 1 (January 1962), p. 5. Sociologist of religion taking jealousy as a key motivating emotion in betrayal.

³⁰ *Millennial Star*, vol. 18, no. 15, p. 227.

Star of 1856 is telling in that it combines the features of betrayal and apostasy that I tried to separate in my introduction. For early Mormonism was both a deeply interpersonal and an institution–membership based body. The rise of a Mormon sub–culture, especially in Utah, has made some of these issues much more complex as Terryl Givens shows in his splendid study *People of Paradox*. There he rehearses a 1993 statement of the First Presidency and Quorum of the Twelve on apostasy, which repeatedly stresses public opposition to the church or its leaders and errant teaching or lifestyle practice such as plural marriage.³¹

Returning to the similarities between Jesus and Joseph in death, however, it is but a short step to their similarity in betrayal. For, without an analysis of this betrayal–apostasy theme much of the Plan of Salvation, and several crucial aspects of early Mormon history, would remain unintelligible. For such an analysis it might be useful to construct a ‘betrayal–apostasy’ scale devised on the basis degrees of obedience–disobedience. This could begin with perfect obedience and move to what we might call repentable disobedience before reaching unrepentable disobedience. Jesus displayed perfect obedience to his heavenly father in heaven and on earth but was betrayed on earth by his disciples. Joseph Smith, we may assume, was obedient to the father in the pre–mortal realm prior to his mortal life as a ‘choice’ spirit–child of God. Nevertheless, he engaged in repentable disobedience as various accounts of his life surrounding the obtaining of the metal plates of revelation showed. Lucifer–Satan, however, engaged in that unrepentable form of disobedience in heaven and furthers it in his influence on earth.

Just how disobedience, betrayal and apostasy differ would require greater exploration than I give it here, but one clear element involves the degree to which others are involved. Apostasy, though an act against an institution, will also involve an abandonment of associates and friends. In this sense all apostasy will involve betrayal but not all betrayal involves apostasy. It is betrayal that is foremost in the gospel accounts of the treatment of Jesus, but it is apostasy that frames how Joseph and the claims and practices of his Church were treated. This is, in fact, an important issue that could be explored further when comparing and contrasting early Mormonism with early Christianity. Apostasy, embedded in that ‘orientation to the world’ of Weber cited earlier in

³¹ See, Terryl L. Givens, *People of Paradox, A History of Mormon Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), p. 236 for First Presidency Statement on Apostasy of October 1993.

this paper, occupies a serious place in nineteenth-century Mormonism, it is even stronger than the issue of betrayal in biblical texts.³² When Willard Richards and John Taylor write to British Saints from Nauvoo on July 9th, 1844, they say that ‘for some months past we have been troubled with the wicked proceedings of certain apostates in our midst who have striven to overthrow the Church’.³³ Their wickedness has not succeeded, indeed ‘their designs have been frustrated by wise and judicious management on the part of the prophet and the Saints’. To have a reference to the Prophet is quite telling here, since he was already dead, but it serves a double role of marking the importance of church organization established prior to his death, and to a sense of his ongoing influence over the thought of the Apostles.

Apostasy was deeply significant because the organization itself was believed to have been of divine origin now miraculously restored after the long period of Christian history inaugurated by an Apostasy following shortly upon the death of Jesus and of his original apostles. Apostasy and Restoration were partner concepts. Much of Christian history had thus been a history of apostasy, albeit allowing for some good people being influenced by the Spirit of God in other denominations, and doing as much good as was feasible in the absence of the Holy Priesthood and its ordinances from the earth. Recognition of the Restoration and of Joseph as its mediating prophet was all the more important because of this. Accordingly, to betray him and apostatise from his movement was doubly vile, replaying the ‘Great Apostasy’ of earlier Christianity and, I suggest, the opposition in that heavenly council.

This orientation to the world also helps explain the importance of the *Book of Mormon* and of the *Doctrine and Covenants* being given formal recognition through ‘testimony’, as with the ‘Testimony of The Twelve Apostles to the truth of the Book of Doctrine and Covenants’ as found in today’s edition.³⁴ For testimony is the opposite of betrayal and apostasy. It depends, above all else, on the trustworthiness and reliability of those concerned, and this is all the more important in the kind of society in which Joseph Smith lived within which formal education or status conferred by family or wealth was far from widespread, leaving the issue of an individual’s worth down to matters of character. This is often

³² Douglas J. Davies, *Private Passions* (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2000); Douglas J. Davies, *The Mormon Culture of Salvation* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000).

³³ *Millennial Star*, vol. 5, no. 4, p. 77.

³⁴ *Doctrine and Covenants*, ‘Explanatory Introduction’.

the case in traditional modes of society where a person and many aspects of their life are known to many. In the more mobile world of early Mormonism there was no guarantee that everyone would be so known but, whenever possible, local church leaders often sought dependable sources to vouch for individuals. This is one reason why so many formal and legal statements were made on the character of Joseph Smith and, contrariwise, why issues of his reliability, claims of his engaging in gold-digging and superstitious forms of treasure-seeking were rife. Character mattered when the medium of a message emerged from an individual's narrative and not from formal educational processes. In other words much institutional capital was invested in a person's trustworthiness. And this is why defectors were defined as apostates, having begun as witnesses to the truth they subsequently denied it and, in so doing, stood as examples of moral evil for a system so dependent upon true witnesses. They resembled Satan, described in the *Doctrine and Covenants* as 'the great persecutor of the church ... the whore of Babylon'³⁵ who, in Joseph's interpretation of the biblical parable of the wheat and the tares is the enemy who sows weeds in a field planted with wheat.³⁶ And Lucifer-Satan is the worst of apostates whose motivation was and remains fired by rebellion—indeed, 'the very basis of Lucifer's power is rebellion'.³⁷

Traitors deeply pervaded early Mormonism with Reed Peck,³⁸ for example, telling how Sidney Rigdon inveighed against such a traitor group in the church, citing 'the Cowderies, Whitmers, Lyman Johnson and some others', and reckoning that a secret meeting was called in Far West by two of the prophet's 'greatest courtiers, Carter and Huntington' that wished to 'kill these men that they would not be capable of injuring the Church'. This was opposed by one of the Apostles. Peck tells how Rigdon preached strongly from Matthew 5 on 'the salt of the earth' and 'undertook to prove that when men embrace the gospel and afterwards lose their faith' it becomes a 'duty ... to trample them under their feet'. Rigdon informs the congregation that there are people trying to 'destroy the presidency, laying plans to take their lives' and exhorts them to rise

³⁵ *Doctrine and Covenants*, Section 86.

³⁶ Matthew 13:24-30.

³⁷ *Millennial Star*, vol. 18, no. 15, p. 225.

³⁸ Reed Peck, *Memoir of Reed Peck*, Huntington Library (mss HM 54458), (1839), pp. 22-27; Also in, *Peepstone Joe and the Peck Manuscript*, (New York: Cake, 1899). Peck describes an engagement with a person who told him that 'if Joseph Smith should tell him to cut my throat he would do it without hesitation' (1839:31).

'and rid the county of such a nuisance'. Joseph Smith is then said to have offset this call to violence saying that he did not want the brethren 'to act unlawfully but he will tell them one thing. Judas was a traitor and instead of hanging himself was hung by Peter (who also killed Ananias and Saphira):³⁹ with this hint the subject was dropped for the day. Peck describes how the culprits fled, leaving their wives and families behind for a time. Westergren refers to this 'Salt Sermon' of June 19th, 1838, as well as a sermon on the 4th of July, 1838, by Rigdon, as forcing Oliver Cowdery, John Whitmer, W. W. Phelps and others to 'flee Far West for the town of Richmond in Clay County' in reaction to this 'new, rigid structure of church discipline, completely contrary to the spirit of the restored gospel'. He also saw Rigdon's influence as helping to 'precipitate the Mormon War in Missouri in 1838-39.⁴⁰ Less controversial, and at quite a different level of intensity, missionaries in Germany could add to their report of 'false brethren' who had sought and effected their imprisonment in Hamburg their sense that 'perils amongst false brethren are of the most grievous kind of trials'.⁴¹ Indeed, recalling how 'false brethren' had 'betrayed our Saviour' they could see how a similar pattern of 'falsity and deceit' had beset Joseph and Hyrum and that people 'professing to be brethren, have brought most of the evils upon the Saints'.

Conclusion

Such issues of apostasy and betrayal, as well as martyrdom and sacrifice, helped forge Joseph Smith's complex identity, ever mindful of the matrix of similarity with the life of Christ and his early experience of a devilish onslaught.⁴² This onslaught is interestingly absent in some contemporary church materials, including the 2004 CD presentation of

³⁹ Reed Peck (1839:57); Tells how Smith 'talks of dissenters and cited ... the case of Judas. Saying that Peter told him in a conversation a few days ago that he himself hung Judas for betraying Christ' (p. 55). In an exchange with John Corrill who opposed some of Joseph's ideas, Smith said he would prevent Corrill from entering heaven and 'stand at the entrance myself' and use 'fisty cuff in doing'.

⁴⁰ Bruce N. Westergren, ed., *From Historian to Dissident: The Book of John Whitmer* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1995), pp. x, 22.

⁴¹ *Millennial Star*, vol. 16, no. 35, pp. 552-53.

⁴² David Catchpole, *Resurrection People* (Macon, Georgia: Smyth & Helwys, 2002), p. 141. Israel's resurrection beliefs originated in the context of God's vindication of the Maccabean martyrs two centuries before the time of Christ as 'a homegrown response to the human tragedy of martyrdom'.

The Restoration in which everything is light and nothing darkness, everything joyous and nothing negative let alone perilous. This itself might indicate a lack of sense of opposition to the Church amongst key leaders and may indicate a degree of success reflected in growth and the often noted size of today's institution. In the absence of an embattled mentality the need for negative symbols decreases.

Nevertheless, the apostasy syndrome did deeply affect the nineteenth-century church's orientation to the world and its establishments as a concluding example will demonstrate. I take it from Parley Pratt's letter to Queen Victoria, written from Manchester in England in May 1841. This reminds the Queen, whose Empire was already rather extensive, of the biblical figure of Daniel and his prophetic image of the kingdoms of the world likened to a great statue in which her empire is but 'one of the toes'.⁴³ Pratt informs her that 'the Lord God of Israel hath sent his angel with this message' that people may prepare to meet his coming kingdom. Pratt signs his letter, 'Your majesty's humble Servant and Loyal Subject', but she is left in no doubt that Christ's millennial coming will soon change the political nature of the world and her Empire within it.⁴⁴ This gives an accurate impression of the theological ethos of Mormonism in what turned out to be the last years of Joseph's life. Today, LDS approaches are less prophetic and more bureaucratic, operating more on the basis of contacts between major corporations with Elders as Chief Executive Officers than as denouncers of evil empires. Nevertheless, such changes in emphasis upon Lucifer-Satan that have occurred in the orientation to world establishments at large still do not mean that the apostasy syndrome is irrelevant within the Mormon establishment itself as leaders relate to segments of the membership, not that these symbols do not remain available as part of Mormonism's pool of potential orientations to the world, whether institutionally or personally.

⁴³ Daniel 2:31-35.

⁴⁴ Letter to Queen Victoria from Parley P. Pratt, 1841, pp. 2, 4, 8.

MEANING AND AUTHORITY IN MORMON RITUAL

Walter E.A. van Beek

*Doctrine without ritual is void,
Ritual without doctrine is blind.*

Introduction

The description of any religion usually starts with what people believe, plus a founding story explaining its origins and some of the core elements of its creed. This also holds for Mormonism. Latter-day Saints (LDS) missionaries spread out over the world with a story, a tale about hierophanies and an exegetical discourse on what these new revelations are trying to teach humankind. Throughout, their approach is doctrinal. In this article I want to go against the current and to approach Mormonism through ritual to add another perspective on characteristic processes and paradoxes. Looking first at what people do in a religion and then what they think while doing has clear advantages. A reason for zooming in on Mormon ritual is one of relative neglect.

In LDS studies the relationship between history and the content of belief has been explored at large and, as far as ritual is concerned, good studies are available on the history of temple endowment.¹ However little has been done from the angle of Ritual Studies, and the relationship between ritual and cognitive content in particular needs attention. Here, I want to follow up on John Sorenson's early exploration of 'Ritual as Theology'² in which he states that 'ultimate questions about God and man may not be found in formal theology', but could be approached through ritual. This offers a good starting point as long as one talks about questions and not answers, as I explain later. Ritual is

¹ David Buerger, *The Mysteries of Godliness: A History of Mormon Temple Worship* (San Francisco, Smith Associates, 1994). For an impression of publications on temple ritual, see James B. Allen, Ronald W. Walker & David J. Whittaker *Studies in Mormon History 1830–1997* (Urbana/Chicago: University of Illinois Press 2000). Characteristically, the topical guide of this massive bibliography has no lemma "ritual." For a study on a non-Deseret temple, see Walter E.A. van Beek, 'Hierarchies of Holiness: The Mormon Temple in Zoetermeer, the Netherlands', in *Holy Ground: Reinventing Ritual Space in Modern Western Culture*, ed. by P. Post and A. Molendijk (Leuven: Peeters, 2010), pp. 255–299.

² John Sorenson, 'Ritual as Theology', *Sunstone*, May–June 1981, 11–14.

much more important in LDS practice than is generally assumed. It is surprising that Mormonism is relatively rich in ritual, even if the discourse is on truth and doctrine, and not ritual. In fact, the term ritual is eschewed: 'We do not have ritual, we have ordinances'.³ In a similar vein, the Roman Catholic Church has no ritual either: it has sacraments and liturgy. Ritual is seemingly what the rest of humanity has, and 'ours' is special. Yet, sacraments, liturgies and ordinances definitely belong to the general category of ritual and, as such, are comparable to other rituals elsewhere, both within and outside Christianity.

The second reason is that in the scholarly study of religion in the last decennia, ritual has come to the fore⁴ and now offers a productive vista on Mormon rituals as well. Present theorizing focuses on ritual much more than on belief or myth, and ritual studies has become a flourishing sub-discipline of its own. Ritual is what all religions share and ritual is the most empirical expression of religion but we also immediately recognize ritual when we see it, even a foreign one. It is impossible for anthropologists arriving in a foreign culture to view belief or taste doctrine, but one can see and recognize ritual surprisingly easily.

A field experience: In my Dogon research station in Mali, I hosted a film team that included an Iroquois Indian. At a certain moment he started his own ritual of burning tobacco in the four cardinal directions. The Dogon who were present, my assistant, my host and my cook, immediately wanted to join in, bared their breasts and called out: 'Here, blow here'. They had instantly recognized the act as a ritual and

³ Sorenson, 'Ritual', p. 13.

⁴ For instance, Catherine Bell, *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992) and *Ritual, Perspectives and Dimensions* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997); Ronald L. Grimes, *Deeply into the Bones: Re-inventing Rites of Passage* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000); *Ritual and Religious Belief: A Reader*, ed. by G. Harvey (London: Equinox, 2005); *Theorizing Rituals: Issues, Topics, Approaches, Concepts*, ed. by J. Snoeck & M. Stausberg (Leiden: Brill 2003); Roy A. Rappaport, *Ritual and Religion in the Making of Humanity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999); Jonathan Z. Smith, *To Take Place: Toward Theory in Ritual* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987) and *Relating Religion: Essays in the Study of Religion* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004); D. Brown, *God and the Enchantment of Place: Reclaiming Human Experience* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004). K. Knott, *The Location of Religion: A Spatial Analysis* (London: Tavistock, 2005); *Holy Ground: Reinventing Ritual Space in Modern Western Culture*, ed. by P. Post and A. Molendijk (Leuven: Peeters, 2010).

wanted to participate even though they knew nothing about the Iroquois religion, the history of the League or any doctrine but there was a ritual and they wanted to take part in it.

Not only is ritual easy to recognize, it also constitutes one of the most peculiar and contradictory types of human behaviour, engaging as it does in acts that are recognizably strange, have an unclear goal and meaning, and seem to have to direct effect. From the outside, ritual is strange and unusual behaviour but from the inside, for the participant, it is highly relevant, even crucial. The study of ritual encapsulates a constant search for meaning of acts which in themselves are more or less devoid of meaning.

It is this fundamental exegetic paradox of ritual that has generated a spate of publications over the last few decades from various angles: from practice theory to symbolism, from a performance approach to an evolutionary paradigm. Throughout, the notion that analyzing what people do, first, and what they think, later, has proved productive.⁵ My general angle is a cognitive one, in particular the Modes of Religiosity Theory as put forward by Harvey Whitehouse,⁶ an approach that not only uses ritual as its main entry point but also unites in one theory the whole array of religions with scripture (such as Christianity, Islam and Buddhism) and the traditional religions based upon oral transmission (like those in African that I have been studying for many years). The Modes Theory uses the varieties of ritual as the major key to understanding the different basic forms religions can take. Rituals are always clearly present in religions but differ in two significant ways, which field and experimental research has shown to be linked.

One way is in their frequency.⁷ Some rituals are frequently performed (like the sacrament in LDS)m sometimes even daily (prayer), others are performed less often, maybe once a year (Christmas) or even less, like initiation rituals in African religions that can be performed at ten-yearly intervals, or perhaps only once in a life time. The second way is the intensity of the rites. Frequent rituals tend to be low in passion,

⁵ Bell, *Ritual, Perspectives and Dimensions*, p. 89.

⁶ The crucial synopsis of the theory is Harvey Whitehouse, *Modes of Religiosity: A Cognitive Theory of Religious Transmission* (Oxford: Altamira Press, 2004), followed by many edited volumes in the same series "Cognitive Science of Religion."

⁷ Here Whitehouse bases himself on, among others, R.N. McCauley and E.T. Lawson, *Bringing Ritual to Mind: Psychological Foundations of Cultural Forms* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

i.e. do not evoke intense collective emotions (again, like the sacrament) but instead moments of introspection and quiet solitude and not of high energy interchange. On the other hand, rarely performed rituals are usually intense, with the type of emotional excitement Durkheim called 'effervescence'. The Dogon mask dance, for instance, that is organized each twelve years as a boys' initiation ceremony is a captivating spectacle full of intense participation that involves extensive preparations before the village puts on the huge show and hosts numerous guests. Weddings form an obvious example from our culture, as do royal coronations. This distinction between frequent + low excitement and infrequent + high excitement levels leads to two clusters of religious processes, two modes of religiosity called imagistic and doctrinal. The first (and oldest) mode of religion, the imagistic, combines low frequency with high-intensity rituals. The other, the doctrinal mode, capitalizes on frequent rituals and explicit learning that requires exegetic authority. In itself, this could be seen as the classic distinction between a traditional religion and a typical church-based one but that is neither the aim nor the case, as I will show in the Mormon example.

Rituals are important because they are crucial in the major challenge in any religion, namely that concepts and practices have to be remembered. Religious concepts tend to be either 'cognitively optimal' or 'cognitively costly'. The first are concepts that can easily be learned, are hard to forget and difficult even to unlearn. These are usually minimally counter-intuitive concepts, to use Pascal Boyer's term.⁸ Concepts of the supernatural often closely resemble 'normal'⁹ concepts of persons or things but are different in one crucial detail, which makes them, in Lévi-Straussian terms, 'easy to think'. An example is the notion of a ghost: a human in all respects but with no tangible body. Cognitively costly concepts are more complicated and have to be explained, taught and commented on, such as the 'Trinity', 'predestination', 'atonement',

⁸ P. Boyer, *Religion Explained: The Human Instincts that Fashion Gods, Spirits, and Ancestors* (London: Vintage Books, 2002); 'Cognitive Templates for Religious Concepts: Cross-cultural Evidence for Recall of Counter-intuitive Representations', *Cognitive Science*, 25, 535-564. His work has strongly influenced many other scholars, S. Atran, *In Gods We Trust: The Evolutionary Landscape of Religion* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002); S.E. Guthrie, *Faces in the Clouds. A New Theory of Religion* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993); and D. Sperber, *Explaining Culture: A Naturalistic Approach* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1996).

⁹ Boyer describes a minimal violation of a basic ontological category. See Boyer, *Religion Explained*, pp. 90-101.

'Nirwana', 'plan of salvation' or 'restoration', all of which are quite complex. These concepts are embedded in stories of the past, hierophanies and revelations and form the nucleus of reflection and systematic exegesis, continuously defined and redefined by complex reasoning and thoughtful speculation. They require a large cognitive investment, and are hence considered cognitively costly. These two opposites seem to be the focal points in religions, two 'attractor positions' to which religious concepts appear to gravitate. Religions focus on either of the two, and the mix is usually skewed. Why should this be so?

The theory highlights the causal connections between the collection of ritual features and the transmission of the religion and is not a typology but a logical pathway in which the features are connected and co-generated, in short, a dynamic interaction. Aspects of the imagistic and doctrinal processes are found in any religion, but given the logic connections between the ritual, concepts and organizations there tends to be a clustering either at the imagistic or the doctrinal point of gravity. Each religious tradition in its viable forms is then the result of the interplay of both modes, and shows dynamics of both. Mormonism in its own way can also be seen as a skewed interplay of both modes so we now turn to the characteristics of LDS rituals to highlight some of the paradoxes and puzzles of Mormonism.¹⁰

If we distinguish both frequent and infrequent rituals in Mormonism, we end up with a long list: Sorenson listed 47 'patently religious' rituals (e.g. sacraments, endowments), 39 semi-religious (e.g. home teaching) and 3 social rituals (e.g. wedding receptions). Mormonism is definitely rich in both frequent and rare rituals. How do these impinge on exegesis? I use two crucial rituals here: the sacraments and the endowment.

The Meaning of Frequent Ritual: Ritual Exegesis, Authority and Doctrine

The Modes Theory predicts that high-frequency rituals, which are usually low in excitement or intensity, tend to generate exegetic reflection controlled by the ecclesiastical authorities and to be combined with cognitively costly theological concepts. This is the fundamental 'attractor position' of a doctrinal mode and the prediction is easily borne out in part of Mormon ritual practice. If we take the weekly sacrament, the ritual is highly orchestrated and perfumed in silence and follows a

¹⁰ Following the lead of Terryl L. Givens, *People of Paradox: A History of Mormon Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

very strict procedure known by all, in which each ritual participant partakes in private. This simple liturgy, just a blessing and the serving of bread and water, is central in Mormon ritual practice and is continuously commented upon and explained in an exegesis that includes other rituals, such as baptisms and the conferring of the Holy Ghost. General Authorities, lesson manuals and journal articles centre on the meaning of this ritual, using complicated conceptual themes. One is the series of sin, repentance and atonement, i.e. of the forgiveness of sins through Jesus Christ's vicarious suffering and redemption, while another is the cluster of notions cantering around the concept of the covenant.

Through the ritual, Mormon salvation is defined as a contract in which the priesthood is a facilitator of a bilateral covenant, both individual and collective, and the notion of election is present as a chosen people (where only members can partake) plus the agency of the individual who has his own responsibility for keeping the terms of the contract.¹¹ All this is thought to be present in a simple, frequently performed ritual of the taking of bread and water, if properly explained of course. A ritual such as the sacrament, through its frequency and its manifold exegesis, serves as a way of defining membership and informing processes of inclusion as well as exclusion. In its performance, the sacrament also underscores the status quo within the ward and the various ranks in the priesthood, with the gender inequalities that pertain to it.

Some infrequent rituals are drawn into these exegetic exercises. Baptism, though infrequent for those undergoing it, joins in its explication with the salvation theology of the sacrament. As Whitehouse correctly argues, these kinds of rites of passage are relatively frequent for those in charge, who are the ones who reflect and theologize.¹² Any child "born in the church" is from early childhood taught the importance of baptism, and meticulously prepared before the ritual, while afterwards it is discussed at length. It is a ritual which calls for exegesis and offers leeway for a layered explanation. Depending on the age of the person to be baptized, different aspects are adopted according to the comprehension of the person who is entering the fold. Thus exegesis moves from the washing away of sins to the signing of a covenant and finally participation in the death and resurrection of Christ. Rituals have the capacity to encapsulate exegesis at various levels and in different directions for

¹¹ Douglas J. Davies, *The Mormon Culture of Salvation; Force, Grace and Glory* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000).

¹² Whitehouse, *Modes of Religiosity*, p. 118.

the simple reason that they have no intrinsic meaning in themselves, and constitute an open invitation for exegetical reflection.¹³

A frequent ritual like the sacrament has a familiar liturgy and is easily remembered by all participants, even at a less conscious level.¹⁴ Church leaders are instructed to watch for the right actions and to correct those who stray from the correct liturgy. In fact this seldom happens but horror tales of candle use during the sacrament – after WW II – are still present in Europe.¹⁵ My point is not so much what these changes after a long period of isolation actually were, but it is the emotion of indignation itself that is relevant: changing a ritual on local initiative is unthinkable. Frequent rituals have to be performed in the right way as everybody will notice any deviation from the ritual, and straying from a ritual is considered bad. So the prayer formula in the sacrament is constantly monitored, the bishop nodding to the priests that it has been done correctly and that they can proceed. In addition, small sub-cultural rules become part of the liturgy and then a deacon that helps to serve the sacrament in another ward may inadvertently make mistakes. Some deacons in testimony meeting speak of the only proper way to serve, with their left hand behind, on their back. When I showed a few Dutch deacons a picture of a Utah deacon serving the sacrament in his ward, they were shocked: ‘He has his left hand in his pocket’ [an impolite gesture in the Netherlands] and then asked the typical question: ‘Was he really worthy [of his position]?’ Frequent ritual lives in the detail and an incorrectly performed ritual evokes a moral judgment.

Throughout, the LDS Church clearly exhibits its major processes in the doctrinal mode: rituals are repeated, knowledge is verbalized to a high degree, teaching is supremely important, and doctrine is developed and kept within the bounds of orthodoxy that are set by a clear and very visible leadership. Authority is highly developed and aims at guarding the limits of orthodoxy and orthopraxy, and is in full view throughout the ecclesiastical organization. Missionizing, another feature of the doctrinal mode, is extensive, occupies a large part of the internal discourse, and is even part of orthopraxy (for boys, at least). Roles and

¹³ Walter E.A. van Beek, *De rite is rond. Betekenis en boodschap van het ongewone*, Inaugural lecture, Tilburg University, 2007.

¹⁴ Whitehouse refers here to “episodic memory,” remembering the sequence of action. See Whitehouse, *Modes of Religiosity*, p. 103.

¹⁵ The fact that these tales circulate in the form of horror stories – “look how far these people strayed” – is revealing in itself. After all, why candles form a serious infringement of the ritual is hard to explain.

positions within the community are narrowly defined and bolstered by orthodoxy and authority.

An important difference with Whitehouse's model are the professionals. While other Christians usually rely on professionals, both for local leadership and as the formulators of orthodoxy,¹⁶ Mormonism knows neither. Its local leadership is made up of volunteers, but neither is the full-time leadership a professional one, i.e. in religious matters. There is no academic theological discourse in Mormonism, in fact the founders of the Church have taken a step back from the notion of theology, and today the word itself is hardly used.¹⁷ Authority in Mormonism is tied to the organizational structure and not to specific knowledge about ritual or doctrine. Orthodoxy in Mormonism is guarded by an ecclesiastical structure that is not based on religious expertise. Experts in fact do not differ in knowledge or access to information from the rank and file. On the contrary, they accrue their religious authority from the position they occupy, a clear instance of Weber's positional charisma.¹⁸ Authority in this fashion is so important that an orthodox exegesis of personal revelation bolsters institutional charisma, a discourse that mentions revelation-for-all but as some of the religious equals are more equal than others, some inspirations will be more relevant than others. Mormons talk about the 'burning in the bosom', but the most important question is not whether the bosom is burning but whose bosom is burning. In short, authority in Mormonism leads to revelation, not the reverse. The theology first celestialized spiritual experiences and tamed them: the spiritual process of revelation has been domesticated, with the credibility of 'revelation' or 'inspiration' depending less on content than on institutional position.

¹⁶ Whitehouse also mentions large anonymous communities in the doctrinal mode but these are kept small in the LDS Church. They are not anonymous at all and are the result of a conscious policy plus the lay ecclesiastical structure.

¹⁷ Brigham Young University does not have a Department of Theology but a Department of Religion.

¹⁸ A charismatic source of authority and visions was important in the early phase of the Church but has been relinquished almost completely, D. Michael Quinn, *The Mormon Hierarchy, Extensions of Power* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1997), p. 4. Or, in the words of Terryl Givens: "From the standpoint of church government, Joseph learned quickly, a church full of prophets was a holy bedlam," (*People of Paradox*, p. 10).

This situation of a lay authority explains another puzzle in Mormonism regarding the question of creed. On the one hand, Joseph Smith once said that:

Latter-day Saints have no creed, but are ready to believe all true principles that exist, as they are made manifest from time to time.¹⁹

On the other hand, he himself delivered a host of new teachings, thus establishing a distinctive and constantly evolving body of doctrine (the word, after all, means ‘teaching’) that was later ratified and is now fixed in the present-day LDS Church.²⁰ In recent history, the influence of the famous Correlation Committee has been crucial in streamlining all teaching in church manuals and publications, taking care to harmonize all contradictory statements.²¹ Scholars studying the Church are often at pains to pinpoint LDS doctrines²² as there is no authoritative creed or definitive formulation of belief. The Articles of Faith are often considered to be just that but they contain a hint of creedal content and crucial items are absent.²³ Yet the Saints themselves feel that they know precisely what the doctrine is and internally there seems to be no uncertainty about content. How is this possible? Following Joseph, the first obvious answer would be that the body of teachings is still open and developing, but this no longer holds true. The last revelation was in 1978, after an interval of 61 years, which itself had come 71 years after the previous one. But the doctrine of continuous revelation could offer a reason for not striving for a formalized creed. Although the present Saints consider their body of doctrine to be more or less complete, concept of ‘closed

¹⁹ Joseph Smith, “In Reply to Mr. Butterfield,” cited in Givens, *People of Paradox*, p. 28.

²⁰ Ludlow, *Encyclopedia*, p. 393 ff.

²¹ This committee, whose task was in fact more one of coordination than correlation, was the child of Harold B. Lee, as an influential apostle and later president. It was the means by which the top leadership assumed control over all other organizations within the Church, especially publications and teaching. See D. Michael Quinn, *The Mormon Hierarchy: Extensions of Power* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1997), p. 105.

²² Douglas Davies, *An Introduction to Mormonism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

²³ For instance, the Plan of Salvation or anything pertaining to the temple.

revelations' is counter-doctrinal and anyway members do not feel the need for an authoritative formulation.

The key to this puzzle resides in the Mormon concept of authority. It is one of defining doctrinal mode dynamics mentioned by Whitehouse, and as authority is positional in the LDS Church and not based on specific expertise. All authorities have more or less the same power base, namely their position. Of course the prophet has a special position,²⁴ but he is a *primus inter pares*, whatever the discourse within the Church, and always comes from the ranks of the other General Authorities: he is the 'ancient one' with the longest track record and is best known as such. With positional authority as the deciding factor in the construction and exposition of doctrine, the Brethren²⁵ are understandably reticent about arguing among themselves as deference to authority is the one and only power base, and disunity would erode theirs. So they never contradict one another, living or dead, at least not in public.²⁶ The public discourse is one of unanimous harmony, which keeps the authority structure intact, quite a challenge for a large body of assertive men. As for doctrine, they cannot contradict directly any saying of any General Authority in the present or in the past, which makes for an array of never refuted theological discourse.

A special case is the Adam God doctrine proposed by Brigham Young,²⁷ which generated a lot of debate at the time. This was one doctrine which found no acceptance with Young's peers, and it never caught on, a situation he even complained about.²⁸ Eventually that particular doctrine was sent to Coventry, even to the point that present-day General Authorities deny a prophet of God ever propounded it.

²⁴ And with a built-in tension between the First Presidency and the Council of the Twelve Apostles. See Quinn, *Extensions of Power*, pp. 21–60.

²⁵ The colloquial Mormon expression for the First Presidency plus the Council of the Twelve.

²⁶ Quinn analyzes at length the quandary or "twin charges" of the apostles: the stand for their convictions and inspiration on the one hand, and to preserve unanimity in their decisions. Quinn, *Extensions of Power*, pp. 11–15.

²⁷ David J. Buerger, 'The Adam-God Doctrine', *Dialogue*, 15 (Spring 1982), 14–58.

²⁸ D. Michael Quinn, *The Mormon Hierarchy, Origins of Power* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1994), p. 36.

Thus the doctrinal debate is neither concluded nor refuted, but muted.²⁹ So the very definition of religious authority in Mormonism means that doctrines change by fading away, sometimes helped by the rewriting of history. The present distinction between core and peripheral doctrines on the church website³⁰ may stimulate the decline of secondary discourses. To paraphrase a popular song text: ‘Old doctrines never die, they just fade away’.

Looking back on the development of doctrine in the Church, it is astonishing how much has changed. Some members who try to hold the Church to its 19th century revelations view the changes as problematic³¹ but most go with the flow because of increasing clarity and adaptation to the modern world. Faded discourses form the core of Mauss’s book on racial and racialist discourses³² and thus on ethnic discourses, like the ‘Ephraim discourse. But doctrines that were central in the 19th century have slipped away although some did involve an internal struggle. The case of polygamy is an obvious example of a major church-wrenching change in direction, which was highly disputed and saw significant external pressure. The 1978 change in priesthood attribution came from external but also internal pressure, the discussion starting a long time before the change was implemented as a high-profile addition to the scriptures.³³ However, both changes were essentially welcomed by most of the church membership and met little internal resistance once the right authority was established for the new directive. Most changes have, however, been less visible. The notion of Gathering,³⁴ for instance, has completely gone, whereas it was considered one of

²⁹ What is interesting in this respect is the treatment of the doctrine in the semi-official *Encyclopedia of Mormonism*. The lemma “Adam-God doctrine” just refers to “Teachings of Brigham Young.” In that section, however, it only says: “I could tell you much more about this,” he said, speaking of the role of ADAM, but checked himself, recognizing that the world would probably misinterpret his teaching.” *Encyclopedia of Mormonism*, vol. 4, ed. by Daniel H. Ludlow (New York: MacMillan, 1992), p. 1610.

³⁰ <http://www.lds.org>.

³¹ Menno Feenstra, *Samuel*, Unpublished manuscript.

³² Armand L. Mauss, *All Abraham’s Children: Changing Mormon Conceptions of Race and Lineage* (Urbana/Chicago: University of Illinois Press 2003).

³³ See Quinn, *Extensions of Power*, pp. 143–150.

³⁴ Gathering is the doctrine that all Saints have to move to the center of the Restored Church, first in Kirtland, then in Nauvoo and later in Utah. After that the doctrine died a soft death.

the hallmarks of nineteenth-century Mormonism.³⁵ With the proviso that from the early twentieth century onwards all “international”³⁶ members would be international, the notion of gathering disappeared. One other consequence is that Zion is less talked about. The phrase ‘the building up of Zion’ has completely disappeared from Church parlance, though it is still in the 10th Article of Faith.³⁷ If ‘Zion’ is fading, so is mention of Israel as an LDS model. Recently I talked about the notion of ‘Latter-day Israel’ with a class of young Dutch adults who had all been raised in the Church. They looked at me blankly, not understanding what I was talking about: they had never heard the term before! The declining of the ‘gathering’-‘Zion’-‘Israel’ discourse has a lot to do with the delay of the Second Coming, but also with the internationalization of the Church. These particularistic notions had to move backstage for the Church to internationalize.

However, fading does not imply disappearance or disavowal. The faded discourses remain a font of inspiration, as a treasure trove for those who like to proclaim ‘strong doctrine’, shake up sacrament meetings or want a good topic for a doctrinal book.³⁸ In fact, the Second Coming is among them. If the Church was to be named today, the term ‘latter day’ would probably not be included in the name; talk of the return is not frequently heard. But faded discourses are never out of fashion: when asked whether they believe in any of these discourses, members will always assert that they do, as they form part and parcel of a body of potentially retrievable beliefs.

Another side of the same coin is public denial. Viewing its socially explosive past doctrines, like polygamy, the strategy of publicly

³⁵ As the hymn went: “A Church without a gathering is not the Church for me; /The Savior would not own it, wherever it might be.” Quinn, *Extensions of Power*, pp. 316–317.

³⁶ I.e. members of the International Church, the church outside the USA and Canada.

³⁷ In the hymn book used until the 1980s, 36 of the 220 hymns mentioned Zion but significantly fewer did so after the last “correlation” of the Church hymns.

³⁸ An example is Marvin van Dam’s recent book, *Mine Elect Hear my Voice: The Gathering of Israel* (Salt Lake City: Leatherwood Press, 2006), which mainly consists of scripture quotes without reference to the present or to Mauss’s book. See note 17. Other books that go against the current are often of apocalyptic nature and include: Hoyt W. Brewster, *Behold, I Come Quickly; The Last Days and Beyond* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1994).

denying private facts became the norm for a time, made possible by the fuzziness of doctrines. The denial of Brigham Young involvement in the Adam God theory is a less public fact but Hinckley's denial of the fundamental unity of man and God – as man is God once was, as God is man will be – on national TV was a more public and publicized instance of the same tendency. Outwardly, a doctrine is deniable if the denial is done by those who protect the orthodoxy.

The notion of exegetic control is therefore complex in Mormonism. The exegetic paradox resides in the fact that there is authority, but no authoritative voice. The absence of dispute, ironically, produces flexible doctrine, which results in a strategy of remaining as safe as possible in new statements from any authoritative chair. Those authorities that do engage in systematic exegesis are constantly being scrutinized by their peers. However even if restrained to some extent by their peers when they pursue their exegetical publications, these peers cannot do a lot about it. McConkie's doctrinal encyclopaedia³⁹ is a case in point; drawing criticism from his peers because of his outspoken and personal views on doctrine, although it was eventually published and became influential. One of the goals of the much later and better supervised Encyclopedia of Mormon Doctrine⁴⁰ and which is considered semi-official now was to replace McConkie's volume, but the Encyclopedia did not enjoy the same circulation. And in the end, LDS systematic exegetic reflection is a silent struggle for in-Church exposure with the Mormon press as its arena, among authorities that do not contradict each other.

Infrequent LDS Ritual: Endowment and Orality

Infrequent rituals with their intense participation, the Modes Theory predicts, do not lead to authoritative exegesis, and spontaneous exegetic reflection comes to the fore. In these rituals the major problem is how, in what order and in what way rituals should be performed. This tends to avoid the question of why. This is the core of the imagistic process, and one of the peculiarities in LDS Mormonism is that it situates itself inside the other 'attractor position' to a surprisingly high degree. Consequently, the interplay between its imagistic dynamics and doctrinal mainstream processes offers a peculiar window on LDS ritual. We now turn to endowment, as the other ritual.

³⁹ Bruce R. McConkie, *Mormon Doctrine* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1976).

⁴⁰ See note 15.

The LDS Church defines itself as a temple-building church and, as such, is already a stranger in contemporary Christendom. By introducing temple endowments, Jan Shipps remarked that Joseph Smith had changed Mormonism from being an ecclesiastical church into a mystery religion,⁴¹ a religion into which one has to be initiated during a secret ritual. Initiations are in principle once-in-a-lifetime experiences and the epitome of imagistic high-impact rituals. In religion dominated by imagistic processes, initiation often aims at procreation and is always highly somatic. After all, the ritual has to change the individual, not only adding knowledge but also impacting on the body. In initiation rituals, the boys usually follow the deeds and exploits of the groups' ancestors and cultural heroes and of the 'first' people, and the re-enactment of their deeds and symbolic tests provide the main body of the initiation.

The endowment consists of a typical initiation rite that shares other characteristics like additional knowledge and somatic impact as it prepares the candidates for full spiritual adulthood and their journey through life and life after death. So the Mormon temple experience is a crucial part of a shared humanity, exhibiting characteristics of the imagistic mode. Here I highlight two: the traditional nature of the transmission and the exegetical reflection combined with an experiential definition of learning. Finally, I touch on a major peculiarity in temple rituals: the fact that these high-impact rituals are repeated even under the aegis of eternity.

The Church began with a temple obsession. When Nauvoo was just starting, Joseph Smith was already keen to start work on new temples. On 4 May 1842 he introduced the endowment ceremony for the first time to a select group of nine members and, as in Kirtland, well before the temple was finished. The ritual was taught by example and instruction in the upper room of the Nauvoo store of the prophet, after elaborate preparations.⁴² Smith himself left no record of how the rites were generated nor did he write them down or recorded them to a scribe except for a short statement 'that all these things were always governed by the principle of revelation'.⁴³ However this remark is more a comment by Willard Richards, the editor of the History, than a quote by Smith. There is no text underlying the ceremonies or a direct revelation (which were numerous in the Nauvoo days) or an old text. The endowment is

⁴¹ Jan Shipps, *Mormonism; The Story of a New Religious Tradition* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1985), p. 61.

⁴² Buerger, *Mysteries*, p. 36.

⁴³ *History of the Church*, vol. 5 (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1964), p. 2.

essentially an orally transmitted ritual, complicated and elaborate but oral. Not only does it echo its Masonic inspiration but it also links it with ritual expressions the world over. This has several consequences. One is the notion of change, especially the discourse on change. In Mormonism, the authorities discourage speaking about changes in rituals, and temple workers and presidencies are instructed to state that the temple rituals have always been the same and that no major changes have taken place. Historically this is not correct but there is rhyme and reason in the statement. Many of the changes had to do with gently ousting Masonic influence, which does not have to be at the core of LDS rituals. But there were other changes too and the whole habitus of the temple services has changed dramatically since the first Nauvoo initiation, which lasted for hours and was interlaced with violin music and square dancing,⁴⁴ to the streamlined present-day version on film.

Here a short comparison with other imagistic processes might be helpful. Whenever Africans perform a ritual, they always tell the interested outsider (read ethnographer)⁴⁵ that this has been done ‘since the ancestors’, that this is tradition and has not changed through the ages. The ethnographic and historical reality is different though. Rituals do change and rituals that are not codified, as in African traditional religions, change quite quickly in fact. But while changing a ritual, people retain the discourse on tradition, timelessness and the preservation of the past, ‘since the ancestors’. Thus tradition is not so much a historical referent but an argument of authority: things are seen as old, and thus have authority. The notion of tradition is invoked precisely to give authority to present-day practices.

Temple ritual in Mormonism has exactly this cognitive slot, authority by purportedly ancient roots. There is no written text from which it is generated⁴⁶ and yet it claims a very old heritage. It derives its authen-

⁴⁴ Buerger, *Mysteries*, p. 86.

⁴⁵ I have researched two African traditional religions at length, the Kapsiki in northern Cameroon and the Dogon of Mali. W.E.A. van Beek, *The Dancing Dead: Ritual and Religion among the Kapsiki and Higi of North Cameroon and North-eastern Nigeria* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010); W.E.A. van Beek *Dogon: Africa's People of the Cliffs* (New York: Abrams, 2001).

⁴⁶ The whole procedure was eventually codified, first in 1877, again in 1924 and later in many different languages: Buerger, *Mysteries*, p. 25. Each temple has a temple handbook on its premises for the temple presidencies and the temple staff to consult. This handbook never leaves the temple. For the procedures to

ticity from its supposedly ancient history, a myth of origin that is generated by the very authority that commands and changes rituals.⁴⁷ The temple ritual is effectively a piece of non-written religion, as a classic mystery religion inside a Christian church.

From an anthropological viewpoint, any ritual has to change in order to adapt to new circumstances: rituals have to be dynamic and change over time to generate similar experiences for participants who live in a changing world. Such a ritual, on the other hand, may well function under an ideological umbrella that generates a discourse of 'tradition', as a door into eternity, so the gentle distortion of historical reality – 'the ritual has never changed' – is part and parcel of that adaptation to a changing world. As a consequence, the very changes in temple ritual render it constant, and the official denial of change is part of that process.⁴⁸ Whatever the surface motivation for restraining to speak about change and the actual awareness of the authorities of the many changes through history may be, they show in their denial a deep appreciation of what constitutes ritual, just like the elders in African religions.

Endowment and the Quest for Meaning

The thorniest problem surrounding ritual still remains: its interpretation and meaning. In 1981 Sorenson noted increasing ritual activity and decreasing theology in the Church,⁴⁹ and associated this tendency with the Americanization and internationalization of the Church. I agree with the symptoms but have a different diagnosis. One theoretical difference is that he sees rituals as a language and a text and as a didactic enterprise with a teacher or officiator: 'The mysteries of godliness cannot be expounded through purely linguistic discourse, but only through ritual'. The notion of didactics is, in my view, interesting but slightly misleading. Recent debates on ritual, which have taken off since the 1980s, point in the opposite direction, and the dynamics Sorenson mentioned can be better explained, I think, through the Modes Theory. As with symbols, the building blocks of rituals, studies

implement changes used by the Temple Department, see van Beek, 'Hierarchies of Holiness', p. 287.

⁴⁷ Masonic ritual shares these aspects.

⁴⁸ See for an extensive treatment of the taboo on writing aspects, Kathleen Flake "'Not to be Written": The Mormon Temple Ritual as Oral Canon', *Journal of Ritual Studies*, 9 (1995), 1–21.

⁴⁹ Sorenson, 'Ritual', p. 14.

have demonstrated that the notion of ritual as language is not productive and distorts more than it clarifies. Religious studies have distanced themselves from any 'cryptological' approach.⁵⁰ Ritual and symbolism are not a crypto language, not a code to be cracked, nor is symbolism for that matter (sorry, Dan Brown). The present outlook, which I share, is that ritual is an act that has been made special by changing a portion of a 'normal' act, a change which in principle empties it of its meaning in everyday life.⁵¹ This change emptied normal acts of their intrinsic meaning, creating a semantic void. For instance, a sacrifice is based around a family meal, eating with guests, but the guest (the godhead) is invisible during the sacrificial meal and does not really eat. Such a restricted but basic change generates a series of characteristics of ritual: separation in time and place, specific language and outfit to mention but a few.

This has important consequences for the notion of meaning in ritual. Viewing ritual as a changed natural act means that the act has been emptied of its normal everyday meaning. Thus, a ritual has no intrinsic message to its participants or viewers but does accrue meaning. After all, every participant in a ritual finds it 'meaningful'. Or in the words of Anthony Wallace,⁵² ritual does not contain information (the 'message') but does acquire meaning. So the meaning of a ritual does not stem directly from the act itself but has to be constructed by participants, either lay participants or experts. By virtue of being a recognizable act that has been emptied of its normal meaning, ritual is an invitation for active construction of meaning.

Ritual meaning is constructed at two levels. The first is universal: the rite signals that this is a ritual. Like the Dogon who immediately recognized an Amerindian ritual, one thing is clear to all participants. They are performing a ritual and should behave accordingly: 'participation implies submission to the liturgical order'.⁵³ When in the ritual, one has to follow the rules. This self-referential meaning defines ritual as a special act that creates a special occasion and demands particular atten-

⁵⁰ Roy Rappaport, *Ritual and Religion, in the Making of Humanity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), p. 67 ff.

⁵¹ For an overview, see Van Beek, *De rite is rond*, and Bell, *Ritual, Perspectives and Dimensions*, chapter 5; Rappaport, *Ritual and Religion*, chapter 4; Boyer, *Religion Explained*, chapter 7.

⁵² Anthony F.C. Wallace, *Religion, an Anthropological View* (New York: Random House, 1966).

⁵³ Roy A. Rappaport, *Ritual and Religion in the Making of Humanity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), p. 145.

tion.⁵⁴ The whole habitus of the temple is geared towards making this abundantly clear: it is a sacred – ‘holy’ in LDS parlance – place. The Mormon holy place is designed and dedicated just for rituals, and is built around the ordinances. The famous French anthropologist Lévi-Strauss defined rituals as ‘machines à supprimer le temps’, instruments to suppress time, as life during rituals is portrayed as being untouched by history. Patrons experience the ritual as ‘a time out of time’, ‘a world out of the world’ and if the temple services are defined as ‘work’, ritual is also an act out of time, all of which accrues to the self-referential aspect of ritual.

It is the second level of meaning that is the most discussed: the exegetical or canonical⁵⁵ meaning. In addition to being a ritual, what does it ‘mean’? Frits Staal, a famous Hindologist, explicitly stated that rituals have no meaning at all, that they are inherently without sense.⁵⁶ He is partly right: ritual defines itself as a ritual, and after that it has no proper information of its own, no intrinsic message. However, the exegetical paradox mentioned above is that people all attribute great meaning to rituals, insist on their proper procedure first but also get inspiration from them. The solution to this puzzle is that the semantic void of ritual – as normal behaviour made strange – is an invitation to signification. People fill the empty semantic space of ritual with their own meaning, thus creating their own interpretation, their own exegesis. This is exactly why ritual is often ‘do-it-yourself religion’⁵⁷ anyway. Of course, a ritual does give clues for interpretation, some handles in the form of the symbols used, the language (not always as important as in LDS rituals!) and the ‘normal’ act the ritual is modelled on. However these are always multimodal and open to interpretation, and they appeal to a variety of emotions, cognitions and memory. The whole ritual is not a specific given puzzle but a puzzle the participant has to construct for him/herself first, and then solve.

⁵⁴ Jonathan Smith sees ritual as essentially “drawing attention.” See Smith, *To Take Place*, p. 105.

⁵⁵ The term Rappaport uses.

⁵⁶ F. Staal, ‘The Meaninglessness of Ritual’, *Numen*, 26, no. 1, 2–22; F. Staal, *Rules without Meaning: Ritual, Mantras and the Human Sciences* (Bern: Peter Lang, 1989).

⁵⁷ The apt characterization by Mark Leone of practical LDS theology. See M. Leone, *Roots of Modern Mormonism* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979), p. 188.

From the viewpoint of the Modes Theory, the LDS temple ritual, i.e. its own endowment, seems to be a classic case of an infrequent and complex ritual without exegesis. Its main type is that of an initiation, and its model in the daily world is that of a journey, an aspect it shares with many initiation rituals, but then a journey made 'strange'. Indeed the first experience, as many new patrons testify, is one of strangeness. This is for two reasons. First, it is an encompassing, overwhelming ritual and, as such, presents a virtual world of its own that shouts to participants that it is a ritual and a very special one at that, one full of the unexpected. So the self-referential meaning is evident: this is a ritual, even the ritual. Second, this kind of ritual has become a stranger in our time, as mystery initiations have become rare in a culture of transparency and super-information, leading to a sense of alienation that can go either of two ways. Some people experience it as a weird ritual never to be participated in again but most patrons see it as a not-yet-understood spiritual experience and keep coming back to the temple, gradually starting their own private interpretation. The latter, evidently, is what the leadership hopes for. For the present-day Saints, it is also very different from all other rituals in the Church, and it thus creates a large semantic void: the endowment generates a host of questions. That void has to be filled. But by who? The rites are never explained; temple preparation lessons never touch on the content of the rites themselves nor do they offer tools for interpretation. The party that controls the ritual, the church leadership, does not provide an exegesis and simply does not answer the many questions arising from the strange ritual. Any explanation of the ritual is precluded: 'the Spirit has to furnish'. At least one General Authority is on record as stating that he understands only 5% of the endowment. The very same leadership that avoids standard interpretations also tries to control the discourse on it, and prohibits systematic discussion.

One temple president in Zollikofen, fired by his own studies, started teaching patrons the possible messages imbued in ceremonies during prayer meetings that at that time were still held before actual ceremonies. Though his explanations were appreciated by the visiting members, he was told to stop them shortly before his term was over. And stop he did, though he did finish his term.

There is a conspicuous lack of standard interpretation of ritual; in fact there is no interpretation at all. Anyone with questions about the interpretation of symbolism, according to present instructions, is told to pray for the Spirit who will provide the answers through spiritual inspira-

tion to anyone asking diligently. Whitehouse talks about 'spontaneous exegesis' and that is what is happening here, which inevitably leads to divergent interpretations, but in the LDS case the interchange on these interpretations is blocked. In short, the semantic void of ritual is heightened, which is meant to be used as a stimulus for personal reflection and a personalized relation with the godhead.

Mormon discourse on the temple heightens this exegetic paradox: the temple is continually referred to as a 'house of learning' and when talks in sacrament meetings or stake or general conferences deal with the temple, this aspect is always touched upon. Yet while the temple ritual may have an officiator, it definitely does not have a teacher. Though the temple is surrounded by a discourse on continuous learning,⁵⁸ when asked what one learns, people are at a loss for an answer. That is normal for rituals, as ritual experiences are notoriously difficult to verbalize, but this is perpendicular to the discourse on learning. Some apologists have taken up this challenge and gone into the 'language of symbolism'⁵⁹ but they too shy away from interpretations of the total ritual.⁶⁰ And of course, the strong insistence on secrecy precludes any discussion beyond the temple walls, while patrons have no time for lengthy discussions within the temple itself. Private exegesis has to be in private, never in public, not even with other members, so very little systematic exegesis is produced. Mauss argues that patrons may learn aspects that are unintended, such as the introduction of film that visualizes aspects that are left open in the verbal discourse,⁶¹ which is correct but holds too for the whole ritual as it is highly questionable whether any specific meaning has ever consciously been intended.

⁵⁸ For a thorough analysis of the place of education in Mormonism, see S-H. Trigeaud: *Conversion, éducation et communauté. Une étude socio-anthropologique, transnationale et contemporaine des pratiques et représentations des 'Saints des Derniers Jours' ou 'Mormons'* (Paris: Ph.D. thesis at EHESS, 2008).

⁵⁹ For example, A.L. Gaskill: *The Lost Language of Symbolism. An Essential Guide for Recognizing and Interpreting Symbols of the Gospel* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 2003).

⁶⁰ Symbols are then usually approached as a language, as a cryptology that teaches the inner crowd while shielding the sacred elements from curious outsiders. This view of symbolism is outdated in Religious Studies but the notion of symbol remains more a problem than a productive element in the LDS discourse.

⁶¹ Such as the physical appearance of Adam, Eve and the Godhead: Mauss, 'Culture, Charisma and Change' (1987). The same holds for aspects of the story of the Creation.

Routinization of Imagistic Ritual

One peculiar aspect, which makes the endowment an extremely interesting case, is its repetition. Historically, proxy rituals came after the introduction of the own endowments in Nauvoo but today's proxy rituals for the kindred (and not-so-kindred) dead dominate. So high-impact initiation rituals are repeated and often become the norm, the goal and even the very *raison d'être* of the temple. High-arousal rituals, such as the Dogon one mentioned earlier, are very rarely performed but that does not mean that high-impact rituals cannot be routinized. Pentecostal religions do just that, every week, and the same holds for the LDS endowment. The LDS endowment is strange and captivating when entered into for the first time, sometimes even quite disconcerting,⁶² but due to its quiet liturgy, it is more high impact than high arousal. In fact, a series of changes in the endowment ritual have gradually reduced the corporeal effects of the initiation journey in favour of a more contemplative ritual.⁶³ Still, no LDS ever forgets his/her first endowment. As an experience it is unforgettable, in every sense of the word. The Modes Theory mentions the 'flash bulb' memory, the imprinting of unique experiences, the memory of which never disappears. Hierophanies are an excellent example of these, like the Joseph Smith ones, but intense personal experiences too. The temple ritual seems geared to produce this kind of shock experience.

What is the effect of routinization? Whitehouse mentions that all initiations are undergone once but assisted at many times, first as a youngster, latter as an elder. This helps in establishing the correct and much-needed 'episodic memory', the memory of the sequence of the liturgy, establishing the orthopraxy of the ritual and setting out how the ritual is done. This may pose a problem for rare rituals.

Dogon mask dances are performed every twelve years, which may seem a long time to remember the exact sequence of ritual elements. However, the main aspects to be learnt are the mask dances themselves and these are practised regularly several times a year at every funeral. In this day and age, these dances are performed at tourist shows and cultural festivals too. The sequence of constituent events can be a problem. During the last mask ritual I witnessed, in 2008, a conflict arose between two village halves in Tireli, and one of the issues was precisely about

⁶² Ronald L. Grimes, *Deeply into the Bone: Re-inventing Rites of Passage* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), pp. 163-166.

⁶³ Van Beek, 'Hierarchies of Holiness', p. 289.

what should be done first. The liturgy had become an arena here. This holds even more so for the *sigi*, a Dogon ritual that is performed every 60 years. How can the proper procedures of a ritual that one almost never sees be safeguarded? Young specialists are educated in ritual lore during the ritual itself but they will be at least 75 by the time of the next instalment (and will probably be dead by then). The solution is twofold. One, the liturgy in itself is simple and the relevant points are embedded in the songs and tales people know anyway. The second is to have an intermediate generation, the *sigi* teachers, who are taught by specialists and then teach the next generation.

In the case of the endowment, such a problem arose when Joseph Smith died shortly after demonstrating the ritual to a select few. After his death they had to reconstruct the complex ritual, a combined effort of memory as there was no text.⁶⁴ Gradually the ritual was codified, and has consequently changed over the 150 years since it was first set up. The first result of routinization is thus the homogenization of ritual, the codification, regulation and hierarchical control over the ritual. Ritual control is absolute in the case of temple rituals. The idea that a temple president would be inspired to change the endowment sounds ludicrous to a Mormon, which highlights the absolute control of the hierarchy over this ritual, in fact over all ritual.

Ritual control in the Church is clearer than creedal orthodoxy. Rituals are described in great detail in the General Handbook of Instruction, and each priesthood bearer knows the small booklets of ordinance descriptions that cover how they should be done. For the temple, these instructions are not required as each temple has a direct, 24-hour manned line to the Temple Department at Church Headquarters in Salt Lake City. The process of implementing changes, which comes straight from the top, is tightly supervised and surrounded by elaborate security guarantees.⁶⁵ Ritual control is so central for the Church that even in Africa, where almost all churches eventually give in to the forces of Africanization, the LDS Church has remained remarkably resistant to any indigenization of its ritual: no dancing, no drumming, no adaptation to the continent of our ancestry. Ritual control comes under the heading of 'unity in the church' but the difference between unity and uniformity is not always evident in Mormonism.

⁶⁴ Buerger, *Mysteries*, p. 69 ff.

⁶⁵ Van Beek, 'Hierarchies of Holiness', p. 287.

Routinization of imagistic ritual has a definite effect on the definition of doctrine. In my view, there is one additional factor for the doctrinal 'flattening' Sorenson noted, i.e. the fading of the more distinctive Mormon doctrines in favour of more general Christian theological notions. Given the fact that elaborate ritual is hard to interpret and that interpretative discourses are discouraged, repetition of ritual has two effects. First, a sense of habituation sets in, as the questions of the first experience get dulled through repetitive exposure to the same ritual. The gentle hierophanies of the first endowment will give way to a general discourse on temple holiness and then to pride in knowing the whole procedure by heart, especially at the crucial points in the journey. The thirst for explanation is quenched by liturgical expertise but the need for systematic doctrine as an underpinning of the now frequent ritual will keep coming up, as questions are likely to linger. Most focus on details of the ritual as these embody most of the strangeness, but this disappears with increased familiarity. What remains then is the need for reflection on the more general thrust of the initiation, which results in a kind of exegetical quandary between secrecy and meaning, and between lack of exegesis and the need to address individual experiences. It is this quandary that stimulates the kind of theological discourse that is produced by the General Authorities these days, a discourse that avoids thorny exegetical questions. Clearly, they no longer concentrate on old, faded issues but on the ways an individual could make sense of his own personal situation. Atonement, for one, is a major part of current LDS doctrinal discourse and fits well between the doctrinal development of the frequent ritual of the sacrament and the routinized experience of temple sacredness, between the doctrinal and the imagistic mode.

In this ritual approach, Mormonism shows an interesting interplay between the dynamics of the two modes, imagistic and doctrinal, an apt illustration of the maxim at the start of this article by Immanuel Kant, which I have adapted: 'Doctrine without ritual is void, ritual without doctrine is blind'. At first glance, the Church seems almost a stereotypical case of a doctrinal mode but then the paradoxes step in. Doctrinal definition and control are much more complex, not because of a lack of authority but because of the Mormon definition of intense positional authority. But Mormonism is rich in ritual and some of the rituals are imagistic, as if belonging to a different religion and bearing the hallmarks of the oral traditions that all religions started out with, which also impinges upon exegetical processes. In a tightly controlled

church, the ultimate challenge is thus to 'do it yourself', both in exegesis and daily orthopraxy.

Whatever complex and many-stranded relationship individual Mormons may have with their leadership, and whatever the intensive discourse on doctrinal and truth, experiential dynamics ultimately come to the fore. Several researches have shown that in times of need, people do not relate to doctrine or theology or to the complex and cognitively costly structures devised by the churches but to an immediate relationship with the other world, to a recognition of the closeness of the supernatural. If you truly need religion, forget doctrine. Ultimately, religion is imagistic, as the central feature is just a relationship, just knowing, in Mormon parlance, that you have a Father in Heaven and that He loves you. The rest is silence.

THE RELIGIOUS “OTHER”: REFLECTING UPON MORMON PERCEPTIONS

Mauro Properzi

Abstract: Latter-day Saints do not regularly speak about other religions, but when they do, they often manifest a spectrum of approaches which mirrors Mormonism’s own tension between exceptionalism and universalism. In this essay I aim to reflect about this very tension in the European context and suggest a few factors which may uniquely influence the perceptive dynamics of other religions among Mormons in Europe.

Introduction

The purpose of this exploratory discussion is to suggest some basic theoretical hypotheses about the Latter-day Saints’ (LDS) general perceptive schema of other religious traditions. Specifically, I aim to outline some key theological foundations for the Mormon view of a “religious other” while also underlining a few social and psychological factors in the lives of individual church members which significantly shape this kind of perception. Unsurprisingly the picture that emerges from this intersection of theological and socio-cultural factors is complex at best; thus, generalizations become increasingly tentative particularly when psychological dynamics are introduced into a general picture which is already heterogeneous. Yet, some general identifiable patterns remain visible and the core of my immediate endeavour involves the exploration and description of these very correlative patterns. At the same time, while I do not build the present exposition around ethnographic data gathered systematically among Mormon populations, my reasoned reflections and predictions are potentially testable at a future time and in specific settings. In the meanwhile it is valuable to engage the topic theoretically and to evaluate its strengths and weaknesses even in the absence of accompanying structured observations, interviews, or surveys.

In this context, I am especially concerned with those factors which uniquely affect the European Saints’ perceptions of other religious

groups.¹ Indeed, in addition to absorbing theological precepts from LDS religious literature and practices, which are internationally standardized, the perceptions of European Mormons are influenced by distinct social forces which differ from those of their non-Western or American counterparts. As I have observed in my personal confessional experience in Italy and in the United Kingdom, a social reality characterized by historically dominant religious institutions which presently function within a wider context of established secularism distinctly highlights the correlative dynamics which I am about to explore. Therefore, my objective is first to outline the core theological platform about the “religious other” which is shared by Mormons of all nationalities and then to explore a few of the cultural and social dynamics which are likely to affect the specific interpretation and appropriation of such theological nucleus by European Saints vis-à-vis church members from the United States or from other parts of the world.

Exceptionalism versus Universalism

Most observers of Mormonism are quick to pinpoint the tradition’s exclusive nature as demonstrated by its history, culture, and theology. Indeed, while historical phenomena underlying LDS exceptionalism and *physical* isolation such as the United Order, the Nauvoo legion, and a Prophet with official political responsibilities are only memories of a century gone by, much remains within the tradition which stresses the need for contemporary Mormons to separate *spiritually* from the world. To be sure, such particularism is not unique to the Latter-day Saints since other Christian and non-Christian traditions possess similar strands, which in some cases go even further when advocating exile or separation, monasticism being the most apparent example. Yet, few other groups of significant size convey to a whole people such a sense of uniqueness or calling as do the Latter-day Saints, who are united in their common religious identity by specific covenants, a shared history, and a sense of divine purpose in such degree as to make

¹ I am aware of the fact that the use of the adjective “European” is highly problematic for its generalizing implications. Undoubtedly, Latter-day Saints’ experiences in different European countries are sufficiently distinct to require individual treatment; yet, there remain a few common factors which justify speaking of a European Mormon experience.

Jewish distinctiveness its closest identifiable parallel.² In this context, some have even questioned the degree to which it is appropriate to understand the label “Mormon” as a mere classification of religious affiliation rather than as a term which refers to an ethnic group in its own right.³

However one chooses to catalogue Mormon identity, what is unquestionable is that both LDS theology and sacred history have usually been articulated in such a way as to emphasize Mormon exceptionalism. Indeed, according to the canonized version of Joseph Smith’s First Vision, Mormonism has its *raison d’être* in its theological separation from other traditions, particularly Christian traditions, since the founding Prophet claimed that when God first spoke to him He categorically condemned other existing denominations. In fact, Joseph reported that when he asked about the church which he should join “I was answered that I must join none of them, for they were all wrong; and the Personage who addressed me said that all their creeds were an abomination in his sight; that those professors were all corrupt.” Therefore, Mormonism was born to provide those salvific blessings which could not be offered by any other existing church. In this unique role the movement quickly grew to become, according to the LDS canon, “the only true and living church upon the face of the whole earth, with which I, the Lord, am well pleased.”⁴ Needless to say, declarations of this nature attributed to a divine source have not aided Latter-day Saints in building ecumenical bridges with Christian neighbours of various denominations.

At the same time, while being generally unapologetic about their claims of exclusivity, Mormons also highlight that LDS theology has a universalistic side which ultimately softens what has often been perceived as a highly elitist doctrine. To highlight the most prominent theological examples, salvation in Mormonism is ultimately universal,

² Seth Ward, “Introduction,” in *Covenant and Chosenness in Judaism and Mormonism*, ed. by R. Jospe, T. Madsen & S. Ward (Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2001), pp. 11–12. Also see Armand L. Mauss, *The Angel and the Beehive: The Mormon Struggle with Assimilation* (Urbana, IL: Univ. of Illinois Press, 1994), pp. 64–66 for warnings against facile comparisons of this kind.

³ A well-known proponent of this “ethnic” emphasis was Thomas O’Dea. See Dean L. May, “Mormons,” in *Harvard Encyclopedia of American Ethnic Groups*, ed. by Stephan Thernstrom (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1980), p. 720.

⁴ Joseph Smith – History 1:19; *Doctrine and Covenants* 1:30.

although stratified in various degrees of glory, and God is the Eternal Father of the whole human family, past, present, and future. Indeed, birth on earth indicates the core general righteousness of each individual being since it implicitly confirms that he/she has accepted the divine plan while living in a pre-mortal spiritual realm of existence. Furthermore, LDS doctrine affirms that all people are endowed with the “Light of Christ” which functions as a guiding conscience that leads to truth and light. Even more specifically, as underlined in a First Presidency statement as well as in the *Book of Mormon*, it is recognized that truth was revealed to such thinkers or religious leaders as Plato, Mohammed, or Confucius and to people of all times and nations.⁵ Ultimately, Mormonism recognizes truth as emerging from various sources and the wise Mormon should absorb and acquire these truths even when they originate outside the tradition. In Brigham Young’s straightforward words: “we believe in all good. If you can find a truth in heaven, earth or hell, it belongs to our doctrine. We believe it; it is ours; we claim it.”⁶

Therefore, although not universalistic in the most radical sense of the word, LDS theology cannot be viewed simplistically as only exclusive in its claims. Indeed, when placed on a hypothetical spectrum which measures theological exclusivity some theological aspects of Mormonism are adjacent to the universalistic side of the spectrum while others cluster around its very opposite end. In other words, as articulated by Terry Givens in his masterful analysis of Mormon culture, the paradox underlying the coexistence of exceptionalism and universalism, of provincialism and internationalism, or of election with the responsibility to infinitely expand the core of the chosen, is firmly at the root of the Mormon theological discourse and of its cultural manifestations. This contrast is more evident now than it ever was in the more isolated and conflict-ridden decades of the nineteenth century since the later need to negotiate with the wider culture, as Givens explains, meant the following,

⁵ See “Statement of the First Presidency regarding God’s Love for All Mankind,” 15 February 1978. Also see 2 Nephi 29:12 and Alma 29:8.

⁶ *Journal of Discourses*, 26 vols., reported by G. D. Watt et al. (Liverpool: F.D and S. W. Richards, et al., 1851–1886; reprint, Salt Lake City: n.p., 1974), vol. 13, p. 335. Although it may be noted that quotes of this nature have often been interpreted as referring to Mormon openness to scientific empirical truth rather than to the truth of other religious doctrines, this very distinction between scientific and religious truth is ultimately foreign to LDS ontology and epistemology.

Mormon identity became more indistinct, and more vulnerable to contamination. The larger world was still a corrupt Babylon, but Joseph’s open eclecticism (“we will claim truth as ours wherever we find it”) meant some borrowings were not only allowed, but mandated. Individually and institutionally, Mormons continue to work through the paradox of an existence that is both Eden and exile, that embraces difference even as it yearns for integration.⁷

Such a paradoxical view is clearly apparent in the present attitude about other religions which is found among members of the Church. On the one hand few topics are as prevalent in LDS lessons and sermons as is missionary work, which involves members’ attempts to communicate their beliefs, experiences, and convictions to their friends and neighbours who do not belong to the Church. Ideally, these encounters culminate in conversions and in the acceptance of the “Mormon truth” but in many and probably most cases they do not. In this evangelizing context some of the Saints struggle to carry out an actual dialogue about religion since they rarely hear about the need to learn about their friends’ religious convictions. Thus, their focus often remains limited to teaching rather than to the exchanging of knowledge and experiences. In addition, some members fail to continue to nurture their friendships with those individuals who have rejected their missionary efforts and in such manner implicitly communicate insincerity and inequality in their approach to the relationship. Finally, although direct negative references to other religious traditions are firmly discouraged, it is not uncommon to hear some Saints criticize other churches in private conversations. Even in public sermons and testimonies vaguely positive statements are often followed by an emphasis on the preposition “but,” which usually precedes affirmations like “they do not have the Spirit” or “they do not have the truth as we do.”

On the other hand, the institutional Church and many individual Saints are often involved in ecumenical groups which are engaged in delivering aid to the community at large or in fighting for moral causes commonly shared by different traditions. There is also no need to highlight the well documented Mormon longing for inclusion in the wider Christian family and the sought-for recognition of the religion’s Christian theological foundations. Furthermore, I have heard both General

⁷ Terryl L. Givens, *People of Paradox: a History of Mormon Culture* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2007), p. 59.

Authorities and local members make public statements in support of words uttered by such religious leaders as the Pope or the Dalai Lama. Mormons also borrow unapologetically from the theologies and writings of a variety of important religious figures, including occasionally Mother Theresa, Jonathan Edwards, and most frequently and recognizably C.S. Lewis.⁸ Therefore, in current Mormon exegesis the divine condemnation of other denominations, which appears in the First Vision account, does not represent a wholesale censure of membership in another church to be understood as necessarily evil. Indeed, although personal prejudices are present among the Saints as they are among all humans, it is beyond doubt that Mormonism recognizes the good intentions and the positive contributions of faithful members of all different denominations.

I could explore this contrast much further but for my purposes it is sufficient to underline the general presence of this paradoxical stance. In fact, the contrasting forces of exceptionalism and universalism or of “rejection of” versus “fellowship with” other religious perspectives open up LDS theology to wider forms of interpretations and to influences from a variety of socio-psychological factors which would not be as significant if the theological emphasis were to be monolithic in the direction of Mormon particularism. In other words, the perception of this coexistence of emphases is likely to provide enough mental and emotional room for other non-theological factors to play some role of significance in the Saints’ response to other religions. Instead, if the member’s evaluation of Mormonism’s nature, whether consciously or unconsciously, remains firmly focused on its exclusivity it is highly unlikely that any other factor may shift the existing perception in a more universalistic direction. In this particular instance it seems that other socio-psychological factors could only play a role which would strengthen the existing exclusivist perception unless such factors were to acquire levels of cognitive and emotional impact which would bring the whole perceptive structure into crisis and turmoil. Then, aside from these latter cases, the primary factor that usually determines an individual’s attitude towards other religions is that member’s implicit or explicit stance in relation to the spectrum of exceptionalism versus universalism that I have just described.

⁸ Mary Jane Woodger, “The Words of C.S. Lewis as Used by the Leadership of the LDS Church,” <http://www.crlamppost.org/woodger.htm> (accessed July 27, 2009).

Mormon Perceptions and the European Milieu

In Europe the perception of other religious traditions among Latter-day Saints is similarly shaped by individual understandings of Mormonism's nature in relation to this very spectrum. In fact, in my personal experience I have witnessed manifestations of great appreciation and even of "holy envy," to use Krister Stendahl's words, for different denominations' practices and, although only rarely, for some points of their doctrine.⁹ On the other hand, in Sunday School lessons I have occasionally heard scornful comments about other churches and in several instances I have observed stereotyping of both Christian and non-Christian religions. In this context the only major difference I have noticed between the European and the United States church settings is that some members in Italy and in the UK do not seem very hesitant in explicitly identifying other churches when expressing their criticism of the dominant traditions, namely Catholicism and the Church of England. In any case, my present purpose is not to determine whether members of certain nationalities are more prejudiced than others; instead, I want to outline some factors which emerge from the distinct socio-cultural experiences of European Mormons and which are likely to contribute to their perceptive schemata of other religions.

In the first place, it is widely recognized that exposure to religious diversity is a significant factor in determining attitudes towards a different religious group.¹⁰ Yet, at the institutional level it is rare for members to be involved in group projects with adepts of other religious communities; thus, when interactions occur they mostly take place at the level of individual relationships. In this context, as already indicated, the Saints are likely to be somewhat hindered in their social interactions if they fall into an excessively focused missionary mode which obscures true dialogue and exchange. Yet, it is doubtful that Mormons engage in frequent conversations which include the topic of religious beliefs. In fact, conversations of this nature are likely to be rare in Europe since many people appear to have no interest in religious subjects and most practice no religion at all. Such a difficulty is probably greater in Europe than it is in the U.S. where Church attendance and religious observance is not as stigmatized as it is in many European countries. Therefore, if

⁹ "Holy Envy" is the third of Stendahl's *rules for religious understanding*, as presented at a 1985 press conference in Stockholm where he responded to vocal opposition for the building of the LDS temple.

¹⁰ See Thomas Pettigrew and Linda Tropp, "A Meta-Analytic Test of Intergroup Contact Theory," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90, 751-783.

the Saints' experience of religion is compartmentalized, namely limited to their own personal, family and ward meetings, it is most likely that exceptionalism rather than universalism will exert the strongest pull over their perception of other religious persuasions.

On the other hand, European Saints could benefit from some means of exposure to the theologies of other religions which are unique to their situation. For example, educational curricula of many European countries include the subject of religious education with classes beginning in Elementary school which usually spotlight the dominant religion over other Christian and non-Christian denominations.¹¹ Although these courses are not mandatory, a number of Latter-day Saint parents choose to have their children attend them, thus opening a conduit of non-Mormon religious learning which is not available in the United States until College. Furthermore, the history, architecture, and culture of some countries that exhibit a dominant religion are usually so infused with its unique theology that knowledge about its core tenets are bound to reach the whole population to some degree. Thus, when watching the news in Italy it is common to hear a report about the Pope's latest speech or about his most recent encyclical. Moreover, religious holidays extend well beyond Christmas and Easter to include the Immaculate Conception or the Ascension of Mary, and religious festivals and processions, particularly in the south, often involve a whole community. Then, if European Saints desire clarifications about the religious tenets of the dominant church they may usually turn to some friend or to a member of the extended family who is at least a cultural adept of the dominant tradition. In fact, since most European Mormons are converts of recent decades they are unlikely to be surrounded by family members who are exclusively LDS, thus avoiding the kind of insularity which is present where whole generations have been rooted in the Mormon experience.

The degree to which these factors contribute to Mormons' understanding of the dominant religion or to their emphasis on the universalism of Mormonism is of course open to debate. At the same time, given the fact that the majority of LDS members in Europe are converts, it is to be expected that their prior experiences with a different religious denomination, which is usually the dominant one, should have an effect upon their present attitude toward that same religion. In fact, I

¹¹ In this context Ronan Head's analysis is of particular interest. See Ronan Head, "The Experience of Mormon Children in English School-Based Religious Education and Collective Worship," *International Journal of Mormon Studies*, 2 (2009), 197-205.

have noticed from informal observation that those members who claim to have been distant from the dominant religion prior to their conversion to Mormonism often maintain an adversarial attitude towards it. On the other hand, many who have experienced conversion as a transition from one positive religious experience to what they have embraced as the superior light of Mormonism usually maintain a general positive attitude about the denomination of their previous membership. In this context, I can think of two specific examples, i.e. my father and one of my best friends, whose pre-conversion experiences included regular Mass attendance and pervasive interest in religion. Significantly, when I have heard them speak of Catholicism it is usually appreciation and not criticism which lies at the core of the conversation. Yet, I do not believe that the main reason for such ecumenical attitude is the original perception of their conversion as a mere religious upgrade rather than as a radical change, since I know that they both encountered significant opposition following their decision, particularly from Catholic family members. Instead, at the core of their view lies an understanding of Mormonism where the exceptional is somewhat balanced by the universal. In turn, the positive attitude is facilitated by an earlier experience with the religious “other” that is retained in memory as primarily positive.

Therefore, the Mormon convert’s relation with the dominant religion is far from being explainable only through simplistic dichotomies of positive or negative pre-conversion experiences. Indeed, the convert’s newly acquired identity as a member of the Mormon social group involves present relationships and tensions within a wider society which is usually understood to include if not to be driven by the dominant religion. As Armand Mauss described so well in his *Dialogue* analysis, European Mormons are often quite conscious of their status as a suspicious “American” religious minority that has no government support and which is opposed, stereotyped or at best ignored by the dominant religions of their national realities.¹² Whether Mauss’s claim that Latter-day Saints in America have acquired the status of “model minority” is justified in light of recent data about public perceptions of Mormonism in America, it is at least certain that American Mormons are more of a “model minority” in the US milieu than European Saints are in their

¹² Armand L. Mauss, “Seeking a ‘Second Harvest’: Controlling the Costs of LDS Membership in Europe,” *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought*, 41, no. 4, pp. 1–54.

social environments.¹³ Therefore, what may be viewed as a need for constant defence driven by a feeling of being besieged, which is already well developed in Mormon collective historical memories, is perhaps even more emphasized in those realities where Mormonism exists as a very small minority and where a dominant church is perceived to manifest an antagonistic approach towards smaller independent religious institutions. Thus, in order to protect their religious identity in a society which barely tolerates them, it is likely that many European Mormons feel pushed towards the retrenchment of their peculiarism.

Of course, when focusing on the status of a religious group vis-à-vis the dominant religion we enter the theoretical realm that includes the definition and trajectory of cult, sect, denomination, and church, which several sociologists, like Robertson, Stark, and Wilson, have examined.¹⁴ Although these classifications involve several complexities that cannot be examined in the present context, what is clear is that the Church does not hold the same level of sociological status in every part of the world. Thus, Mormonism is certainly a “church” in the Western part of the United States but in Europe it is still a “sect,” and in some countries it may even be considered a “cult,” as Armand Mauss has reminded us. However, the much longed-for “status” of church also implies some disadvantages. Generally speaking, the more powerful and widespread is the religious institution, the more frequent and intense will be the attacks against it, both from non-believers and from members of other religious persuasions. Indeed, significant attacks against Catholicism often take place in Italy, against Mormonism in Utah, or against Anglicanism in England. This is a common phenomenon which reflects the unequal balance of power between minorities and majorities of all kinds.

Still, there is more to this equation than the perceived arrogance of the powerful “oppressive” church, particularly in all those nations, including those I have just mentioned, where religious freedom is guaranteed by law and where open persecution does not usually occur. Part

¹³ See Gary Lawrence, *How Americans View Mormonism* (Orange, CA: Parameter Foundation, 2008) and Jennifer Dobner “Gay Marriage Fight, ‘Kiss-Ins’ Smack Mormon Image,” http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20090816/ap_on_re_us/us_mormon_church_image (accessed August 26, 2009).

¹⁴ For a review of theories on sectarianism, see Malcolm Hamilton, *The Sociology of Religion: Theoretical and Comparative Perspectives*, 2nd edition (New York, NY: Routledge, 2001), pp. 229–271.

of the reason for the dominant church’s reception of greater criticism and opposition is undoubtedly rooted in its increased visibility within the specific society in which it operates so vastly and so powerfully. True, when power is associated with visibility the effects of the opposition are usually not very damaging, but what about a smaller religious group, as Mormonism is in Europe, where its social power and influence are almost non-existent? Is greater recognition and visibility necessarily going to increase the security of the Saints’ social identity?

The answer to this question is open to some debate when one thinks of the double-edged sword of increased exposure. In this context I remember a comment made by a good Catholic friend who distinguished between the Italian perception of Jehovah’s Witnesses and of Mormons in terms of dislike towards the former and of indifference towards the latter.

In fact, at least while serving my full-time mission in Southern Italy in the 1990s, there seemed to be quite a large number of people who demonstrated greater belligerence towards LDS missionaries when mistakenly identifying them with the Jehovah’s Witnesses. Whether this is still common or not, the point is that people usually avoided and rejected the Witnesses more firmly than they rejected us. This tendency is probably attributable to various factors but I suppose a primary reason to be centred around the more frequent encounters that people had with the Witnesses’ proselytizing efforts. Therefore, in the context of a relationship with a society which is potentially threatening to one’s religious identity some may view relative obscurity as preferable to negative recognition. Clearly, the positive exposure for which the Church’s Public Relations persistently strive remains the ideal that Mormonism aspires to, but which is still far from being a firm reality, especially in Europe.

Yet, as Terryl Givens reminded us, to be liked and admired as a people has its own dangers particularly if it results from excessive accommodations or from a universalism which obliterates the meaning of one’s distinctive religious identity. At present, the Church at large, whether in Europe or in other parts of the world, does not appear to suffer from this particular problem and I do not anticipate it will at any time in the near future. Instead, its challenge is to maintain an ideal level of tension with society at large thus turning conflict into a facilitator of spiritual growth while preventing it from becoming an insurmountable hindrance as was about to occur in late nineteenth-century Utah. In fact, Mormons may understand the need for an “opposition in all things” spoken of in the *Book of Mormon* as including that social resis-

tance from outsiders which often strengthens group identity and commitment, but which may also demolish them if present in excessive amounts. Thus, it is likely that most Mormons will spurn the idea of being “at ease” in the world, a condition associated with apostasy, and will continue instead to identify some forms of spiritual/social threats as necessary in order for the positive and the ideal to be affirmed in the face of the negative and the rejected. In this context, the question remains whether other religious traditions, and especially the dominant religions of Europe, should embody this role of an ever-present threat and opposition.

When examining the statements and attitudes of the highest level of the LDS hierarchy in recent decades the answer is undoubtedly negative. Gone are the days of polemical debates with ministers and pastors, or of public prophetic censure of the Christian creeds which was not uncommon in the earlier days of the Church. Today, when reference is made to other denominations or beliefs, the tone is usually respectful and conciliatory, even while recognizing doctrinal differences and the superiority of the LDS position. Some scriptural statements, such as “the great and abominable church” in the *Book of Mormon*, are often reappraised in Church manuals and commentaries where it is affirmed that the term “church” needs to be interpreted in a much wider sense than the word itself seems to suggest. To be sure, exclusivist claims remain and the outstretched hand is for some not sufficiently extended: Mormonism is still declared to be the one true church even though this statement’s implications for the evaluation of other religions are less rigidly constructed. Indeed, both in Europe and in America there is no sense that the greatest threat to the growth of the Church or to the spiritual well-being of its members originates in other Christian or non-Christian religions. Instead, the danger repeatedly emphasized in authoritative sermons and lessons is primarily the result of hedonistic forces as manifested by sexual immorality, selfishness, violence, the breaking down of the family, or materialism.

In other words, it is the secular world rather than a religious world of whatever other denomination which presently functions as the greatest spiritual danger for the Saints.¹⁵ True, it is this same world that

¹⁵ I am aware of the debate concerning the definition and the existence of “secularization.” See for example Bryan Wilson, ‘Reflections on a many-sided controversy’ in *Religion and Modernization: Sociologists and Historians Debate the Secularization Thesis*, ed. by S. Bruce (Oxford: Clarendon, 1992), pp. 195–210. What matters in the present context is the LDS perception as manifested in the

gives them the right to practice their religion and to believe freely in what they please, but these are benefits that come at a spiritual cost against which Mormons are constantly reminded to fight with all their efforts. Hence, if the non-religious world now represents a more powerful and effective adversary over the religious world of a different denomination, what does this entail for the way in which Mormons perceive other churches, and particularly the dominant ones? Especially in Europe, where secularization is well-rooted in the social fabric of society, are different religious traditions our new allies as Mormonism strives to convey at least a general message on the importance of faith and of Christian values? My hunch is that most European Mormons would agree, particularly if they are sensitive to the moral dangers of Western secular society, which is an almost inevitable condition if the teachings and writings of Mormon leaders are accepted as truthful. At the same time, a sense of fellowship or alliance with believers of other persuasions against the dangers of the modern world does not always emerge because it is hindered by a variety of possible obstacles, some of which have already been mentioned.

In the first place, as is typical of all humans, Mormons want to feel the hand of fellowship extended towards them in return whether officially by other churches or informally by their members. Yet, this probably does not occur as often or as widely as many members wished. For their part, the Saints maintain an ambiguous relationship towards "practicing" members of other faiths if they want to share their commonalities in mutual friendship while continuing to perceive them as potential converts for their missionary efforts. Yet, I suppose that most Mormons would prefer to neglect their missionary responsibilities rather than to risk the potential burning of bridges if perceived as pushy or intolerant of other beliefs. At the least, they would need to restructure their understanding of "missionary work" by placing greater focus on brotherly friendship rather than on the potential result of conversions.

Parenthetically, and in conclusion, I wonder to what extent the attitude toward the dominant religion in a particular European country is also related to the perception of its accommodation to secular culture. In other words, the dominant church may be perceived more as an accomplice of the threatening secular society if its theology has assimilated secular concepts to such a degree that it has become almost indistinguishable, particularly in matters of morality, from the society in which it

writings and sermons of Mormon General Authorities which is transmitted to the general membership.

exists. In this sense Mormons would naturally feel greater affinity toward a church which shares a similar ethical stance, particularly if unpopular, because it would add a dimension of joint status as part of the moral minority. Thus, given the widespread perception among Mormons in the UK that the Church of England has failed to maintain its moral standards in the face of society's pressures it would seem that English Saints have a lesser reason to feel affinity with their dominant church than would, for example, Italian Mormons, who often explicitly praise the Catholic Church for its unpopular positions on such moral issues as abortion or homosexuality. Attempting to measure attitudes of this kind would certainly involve some challenges in terms of control of third variables, but I think it would still be worthwhile to attempt a study of this kind.

Conclusion

In summary, the LDS European perception of other religions, particularly of dominant Christian churches, is shaped by a variety of factors, which include theological, cultural, sociological, and obviously psychological dynamics. In the first place, a primary determining factor for individual attitudes involves the member's understanding of the nature of Mormonism as characterized by both exceptionalism and universalism in balanced tension. In fact, if all members were to think that "when you have the truth there cannot be any dialogue with other religions," as I once heard an Italian LDS leader state, there would probably be no need to analyze other factors. Yet, in many cases various other elements open or close the conduit of interaction with other denominations and their members. These dynamics involve exposure to the "other" theology or to the religious experiences of its adepts, pre-conversion experiences as members of the "other" denomination, perceptions on the quality of one's status as religious minority in a reality dominated by the "other," and sensitivity to the threat of secularism with the associated drive to want to join forces with other individuals of faith.

In this context the European milieu evinces forces which on the one hand may exert pressure in the direction of exceptionalism (such as when Mormonism is perceived as a powerless religious minority rejected and opposed by society), or on the other in the direction of universalism if the threat of the secular world is perceived as particularly significant and if some exposure to the "other" religion has led one to appreciate its commonalities with the LDS worldview. Yet, whether in Europe or America the challenge for every faithful remains the same,

to exploit the accoutrements of that host culture without suffering contamination or loss of mission and identity in the process. The difficulty in “spoiling the Egyptians” has ever been the same: to turn the plundered riches into temple adornments rather than golden calves.¹⁶

¹⁶ Givens, *People of Paradox*, p. 62.

THE RISE OF THE NAZI DICTATORSHIP
AND ITS RELATIONSHIP WITH THE MORMON CHURCH IN
GERMANY, 1933–1939

Steve Carter

On 30 January 1933, Adolf Hitler and the National Socialist party came to power and began to establish a dictatorship in Germany. It was the Nazis' intent to control all facets of life in the Third Reich including the institutional church. The relationship between the regime and the German religious community is complex and controversial. Although Hitler early on assured the churches that Christianity was welcomed in the Reich,¹ the Nazis soon launched a campaign against it. Through a concordat, the German dictator was able to neutralize the Catholic Church. And, aided by the pro-Nazi "German Christians," Hitler went a long way in coordinating the Evangelical Church with party aims. Nazi policy toward the smaller Christian denominations was ad hoc. The Nazis sought to control² and eventually eliminate these religious bodies, yet generally tolerated the ones deemed beneficial to party aims.³ Eventually, many small, non-traditional religions⁴ were banned, while the "Free Churches," primarily Baptists and Methodists, were allowed to function because Hitler thought they could be useful to his purposes.⁵

¹ Ernst Christian Helmreich, *The German Churches Under Hitler: Background, Struggle, and Epilogue* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1979), pp. 128–132.

² The Nazis controlled Germany through their policy of *Gleichschaltung* or coordination/regimentation to Party aims.

³ Christine Elizabeth King, "Strategies for Survival: An Examination of the History of Five Christian Sects in Germany 1933–45," *Journal of Contemporary History* 14 (1979), 211; Christine Elizabeth King, *The Nazi State and the New Religions* (Lewiston, NY: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1982), p. 20.

⁴ Usually the small, non-traditional religions in Germany are referred to as "sects," which carries a pejorative connotation in German.

⁵ King, *The Nazi State and the New Religions*, pp. 19–20; King, "Strategies for Survival," 211. King argues that such considerations were based on the denomination's use as a propaganda tool, its wealth and influence and the amount of trouble that would be caused abroad if the denomination were persecuted.

The relationship between the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints and the Nazi regime was also complex. At no time during the 1930s was the Mormon Church banned in the Reich; however, it was not completely welcomed either. To be sure, Mormons were affected by Nazi anti-religious policies. This paper will review and analyze the relationship and interaction between the LDS Church and the Third Reich. I argue that Nazi harassment of the Mormons was sporadic and based primarily on the whims of local party officials rather than any formalized national policy. In the end, the Nazi course of action regarding the Latter-day Saints was similar to the regime's policy toward the Free Churches; the Party tolerated Mormons because it believed the LDS could be useful.

The Rise of Hitler and the Formulation of LDS Policy

Prior to World War I the spread of Mormonism in Germany had been slow. During the 1920s, however, the denomination enjoyed impressive growth throughout the country. In 1930 Mormonism claimed over 12,000 followers in Germany; by 1938 this number had passed 13,000.⁶ This represented the largest pocket of Latter-day Saints outside the United States. Because of such success, Mormon leaders in the USA were optimistic about the Church in Germany well into the 1930s.⁷

By the middle of 1933, the Nazi regime had busied itself consolidating power in Germany including implementing its policies toward the Catholics and Protestants. At this point, the Nazis began to investigate the smaller denominations including the Mormons.⁸

That summer, both LDS mission presidents—Francis Salzner of the Swiss-German mission and Oliver Budge of the German-Austrian mission—were confronted by Nazi authorities and asked to issue concise written statements regarding Mormon attitudes toward the Hitler re-

⁶ See Table 10 in Jeffrey L. Anderson, "Mormons and Germany, 1914-1933: A History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in Germany and its Relationship with the German Governments from World War I to the Rise of Hitler" (M.A. Thesis, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah, 1991), pp. 214-215.

⁷ Douglas F. Tobler and Alan F. Keele, "The Saints and the Reich: German Mormons under Hitler" (unpublished essay), pp. 3-4. Copy in author's possession.

⁸ Douglas F. Tobler, "The Narrow Line: The Experiences of the American Mormon Missionaries in Hitler's Germany, 1933-1939" (unpublished essay), p. 12. Copy in author's possession.

gime.⁹ Although Church leaders in Utah had advised the mission presidents to “get along” with government officials, they did not provide specifics on how to proceed.¹⁰ As a result, Salzner and Budge, in written statements, had the unenviable task of formulating Church policy with regard to the German state. Their responses to the Nazi inquiries, which became the basis of Mormon policy toward the Third Reich, were nearly identical and will be examined together.

The essence of the mission presidents’ statements was to affirm the Church’s spiritual mission. Salzner and Budge emphasized that, although Mormons considered themselves “apolitical,” the Church taught its followers to be good and law-abiding citizens and to support the “powers that be” in accordance to the Church’s Twelfth Article of Faith.¹¹ They stressed the Mormon belief in religious toleration¹² and asserted that the Church would not attack other denominations including the German Christians. Furthermore, the statements suggested that the Church’s lay ministry and self-supporting missionary program brought foreign currency into Germany.¹³ Finally, the mission presidents addressed values such as the family that were shared by both parties.¹⁴

⁹ For the text of the respective responses to the Gestapo, see Oliver Budge letter to State Secret Police office, 8 September 1933, in “German-Austrian Mission Quarterly Reports, 1930–1937,” Archives, Historical Department of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City, Utah, entry for “Visit of Secret Service Agent, (hereafter cited as “German-Austrian Quarterly Reports),” and “Ein Aufklärender Brief,” *Der Stern*, 65 (15 July 1933), 214–218. See full text in Appendix A and Appendix B.

¹⁰ Tobler and Keele, “The Saints and the Reich,” p. 8.

¹¹ Or in other words whatever regime was in power at the time. *Pearl of Great Price*, Article of Faith 1:12. “We believe in being subject to kings, presidents, rulers, and magistrates, in obeying, honoring, and sustaining the law.”

¹² *Pearl of Great Price*, Article of Faith 1:11. “We claim the privilege of worshipping Almighty God according to the dictates of our own conscience, and allow all men the same privilege, let them worship how, where, or what they may.”

¹³ John A. Dahl, “Book Review of *Building Zion*,” typed manuscript, Archive MS 15335, unpublished manuscript dated 14 October 1997, Archives, Historical Department of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City, Utah, comment #16, pp. 10–11. Dahl states that “Rudolph Noss ... President of the Frankfurt am Main LDS district ... after clearing with Francis Salzner ..., armed with a briefcase full of all the pamphlets and the Standard Works then used in Germany met with the proper office of the Department of Culture and Education in Darmstadt, Hessen–Darmstadt. He invited them to study this material containing the principles of the gospel which our Elders were teaching

There were three goals the mission presidents sought to achieve. First, they wanted to “get along” with the Nazi regime and avoid confrontations that could place the Mormon community in peril. Second, they sought to maintain the Church and its “gains” in Germany. Finally, mission leaders hoped to continue spreading the spiritual message of Mormonism through missionary activity.¹⁵ The German mission leaders’ policy was congruent with the prevailing Church accommodation policy toward secular government and the Twelfth Article of Faith established in 1890.

Apparently, the mission presidents’ statements satisfied Nazi authorities. There are no immediate reports of harassment of any kind. Commenting on conditions in Germany, the 21 October 1933 issue of the Salt Lake City *Deseret News*, Church Section, reported, “The German–Austrian mission has been left almost untouched by the revolution in Germany.”¹⁶

Harassment of the Mormons

Although Mormons escaped the initial persecution suffered by other denominations, they did not go unnoticed by Nazi authorities. As Hitler tightened his grip, the Gestapo kept vigil on all religious groups,¹⁷ including the Mormons. On occasion, Gestapo agents monitored LDS worship services,¹⁸ interrogated branch and district presidents, or confis-

freely to those interested in their message; and also to convince them that members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints were admonished to be law-abiding citizens. He further pointed out that these *American Elders would bring in sorely needed US dollars.*” (Italics added)

¹⁴ See Appendix A and B.

¹⁵ Tobler and Keele, “The Saints and the Reich,” pp. 6–7.

¹⁶ Fay Ollorton, “A Visit to the German–Austrian Mission,” *Deseret News*, 21 October 1933, Church Section, p. 3.

¹⁷ Eric A. Johnson, *Nazi Terror: The Gestapo, Jews, and Ordinary Germans* (New York: Basic Books, 1999), p. 229; John S. Conway, *The Nazi Persecution of the Churches, 1933–1945* (New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 1968), p. 69.

¹⁸ Many German Mormons have discussed visits to church meetings by the Gestapo. See, for example, Karl-Heinz Schnibbe, Oral History, Interview by Steve Carter, 2 May 1998, Holladay, Utah, Tape Recording/Typescript, 1, Copy in author’s possession; Inge Lang, Oral History, Interview by Steve Carter, 28 June 1998, Bountiful, Utah, Tape Recording, Copy in author’s possession; Dahl, “Book Review,” comment, #14, pp. 9–10; John A. Dahl, Oral History, Interview by Steve Carter, 21 March 2000, Salt Lake City, Utah, Tape Re-

cated branch records.¹⁹ Some requested a list of names of branch members accompanied by their political party affiliation.²⁰ In their effort to “get along,” LDS leaders complied with these demands.²¹

A real concern for branch presidents, though, was that a member might say something that Gestapo agents would consider subversive. Local leaders and American missionaries cautioned their congregations about such dangers and reminded them to follow the Twelfth Article of Faith.²² Because of these measures, the secret police was unable to detect anything “subversive” about Latter-day Saint meetings.²³

cording/Typescript, p. 18, Copy in author’s possession; Walter H. Speidel, Oral History, Interview by Steve Carter, Tape recording/Typescript, Provo, Utah, 30 April 1998, p. 7, Copy in author’s possession. Gestapo monitoring of Mormon meetings varied from place to place. Usually, a plain-clothed agent slipped in and sat quietly in the back of the church. Occasionally, he might solicit information about upcoming “sermons.” In these cases, the branch president provided the agent with a list of scheduled speakers for the next couple of weeks. In some branches, Gestapo agents attended meetings on a regular basis, and a few showed some congeniality with Church members. In other areas, there were few Gestapo visits. One German branch president recalled only one encounter with the Gestapo and that the agent left satisfied with what he found.

¹⁹ Both the Swiss-German Mission Manuscript History and German-Austrian Mission Manuscript History detail incidents where Gestapo agents interrogated missionaries and branch presidents as well as confiscated branch records. Agents usually seized the documents, examined them for a space of several weeks and returned them without explanation to the local LDS leader. See “German-Austrian Mission Manuscript History,” Archives, Historical Department of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City, Utah. Hereafter cited as “German-Austrian MSS History.” See also “Swiss-German Mission Manuscript History, 1904-1938,” Archives, Historical Department of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City, Utah. Hereafter cited as “Swiss-German MSS History.”

²⁰ For instance, see “German-Austrian MSS History,” entry for September 1934. German-Austrian mission records state: “The president of the Zwickau District was requested by the police in Plauen to furnish them with a list of the members of his district, and to *inform them as to the party membership of each political party.*” (Italics added)

²¹ Tobler and Keele, “The Saints and the Reich,” p. 15.

²² Speidel, Oral Interview, 30 April 1998, p. 2; Walter H. Speidel, Oral History, Interview by Steve Carter, Tape recording/Typescript, Provo, Utah, 1 May 1998, p. 7.

²³ “Swiss-German MSS History” entry for January 1934. “The Police in Germany investigated our case in many branches but apparently did not come to

Elimination of the LDS Scouting Organization

On the national level, Mormons did not experience any pressure from the regime until 1934. In 1933, Hitler had begun the process of dissolving youth organizations or incorporating them into the Hitler Youth including the Boy Scouts.²⁴ In early March 1934, Nazi authorities notified Mormon officials to incorporate the LDS Scouting program²⁵ into the Hitler Youth or to disband. For several weeks, Mormon youth leaders corresponded with government officials pleading their case for maintaining the program.²⁶ Throughout the correspondence, Mormon Scouts continued to function and carry out their activities.²⁷ Finally, under duress, and desiring to “remain in harmony with” the Nazi re-

any conclusions about us as no further steps were taken to stop out missionary activity.”

²⁴ One of Hitler’s goals was to indoctrinate German youth in Nazi values which meant control of education and youth organizations.

²⁵ In Germany, the Boy Scouts had grown rapidly after its founding in 1911, and by 1914, it numbered over 80,000 members. Scouting attracted many German Mormon youths in part because of the Church’s sponsorship of the organization in the United States. In 1911, the LDS Church endorsed Scouting in the US and shortly thereafter adopted it in Germany. Mormon authorities in Europe believed the Boy Scouts could strengthen the LDS youth and bring others into contact with their religion. By the 1930s, the Mormon Church had become a primary sponsor of the German Scout Association. By the end of 1933, the regime had eliminated all Scouting organizations except the two affiliated with the Mormon missions in Germany. At the time, according to mission records, there were 33 local Scout troops in the Swiss–German Mission alone. The German–Austrian Mission reported that over 150 teen-aged boys were registered in Scouts in that mission with another 100 youth who were involved in Scouting activities but were not registered. See Lawrence D. Walker, *Hitler Youth and Catholic Youth, 1933–1936: A Study in Totalitarian Conquest*, (Washington D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1970), p. 8; “The Story of Scouting in the LDS Church,” comp. LDS Relationships Boy Scouts of America, <http://gemstate.net/scouter/story.htm> (28 September 2000); Tobler, “The Narrow Line,” p. 15; “German–Austrian Quarterly Report,” entry for 30 June 1934; “Swiss–German MSS History,” entry for May, 1934; “German–Austrian Quarterly Report,” entry for 30 June 1934.

²⁶ “German–Austrian Quarterly Report,” entry for 30 June 1934. The German–Austrian Quarterly Report contains copies of the letter exchange of March and April, 1934.

²⁷ “German–Austrian MSS History,” entry for 30 March 1934. The Scout troops from Weimar and Erfurt held a four-day outing. This is the last recorded Scouting activity in Germany before the program was dissolved.

gime, the Mormons acquiesced and dissolved its Scouting program on 30 April 1934.²⁸

The dissolution of the Scouting program sheds light on Mormon policy toward the Nazi regime. By abandoning the Scouts, the Mormons indicated their willingness to oblige the Nazis. Still, they haggled with the regime and then dissolved their troops rather than incorporate them into the Hitler Youth. The Mormons chose to accept their fate,²⁹ but in such a way as to avoid direct Party control over their youth.

There were also cases where Mormons were affected by the general prohibitions placed on all religions by the Nazi regime. In 1934, the National Socialists issued a decree that no denomination could use Hebrew words such as “Israel”, “Sabbath”, “Zion”—words common in Mormon usage.³⁰ In keeping with the spirit of accommodation, Mormons throughout Germany complied with this decree.³¹ The decree also led government officials to ban the book, *The Articles of Faith* by James

²⁸ “Swiss-German MSS History,” entry for May 1934; “German-Austrian Quarterly Report,” entry for 30 June 1934.

²⁹ Although the LDS regretted the end of the Scouting program, many Mormon youngsters joined the Hitler Youth. Some became active participants in the Nazi organization and fondly recalled the experience. Other boys either did not participate or, under pressure, merely went through the motions. Of the latter, many found it difficult to attend Sunday church meetings; still others reported renewed harassment by the Hitler Youth. Mormon girls, too, joined the BDM (*Bund Deutsche Mädel*), the female counterpart to the Hitler Youth. And, as with the boys, they had mixed reactions to it. Some were active participants, others were not. See Tobler and Keele, “The Saints and the Reich,” p. 13; Fred Gassner and Erich Bernhardt, Oral History, Interview by Justus Ernst, 8 June 1985, transcript, Archives, Historical Department of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City, Utah, 26; Rudi Wobbe and Jerry Borrowman, *Before the Blood Tribunal* (Salt Lake City, UT: Covenant Communications, Inc., 1992), pp. 7–8.

³⁰ “Chonik der Gemeinde Karlsruhe,” comp. Karl Lutz, (Karlsruhe, Germany: Gemeinde Karlsruhe, Kirche Jesu Christi der Heiligen der Letzten Tage, 1997), p. 92. See also Doris L. Bergen, *Twisted Cross: The German Christian Movement in the Third Reich* (Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996), pp. 165–171, on the German Christians and Jewish expressions in church hymns.

³¹ Both mission presidents instructed members to avoid such terms in talks and to omit them from church hymns. See Dahl, Oral Interview, pp. 4–5 and Speidel, Oral Interview, 30 April 1998, p. 4.

E. Talmage, because of its references to “Zion” and “Israel.”³² The Nazis also banned Church tracts, including “Göttliche Vollmacht” (“Divine Authority”) and “Signs of the Great Apostasy” which, Party activists claimed, constituted an affront to their own power in Germany.³³

Nazi officials were also concerned that foreign-based religions might drain the Reich of much-needed currency.³⁴ This concern led German authorities to monitor LDS financial activities, insist that LDS tithes remain in Germany, and confiscate donation records from branches.³⁵ In October 1934, as part of Finance Minister Hjalmar Schacht’s new economic plan to control foreign exchange,³⁶ the government withdrew from the LDS missionaries the privilege of purchasing valuable “Registered Marks.”³⁷ Although Mormons were not the primary target of this plan, German officials charged that the missionaries were not paying their own way. Schacht’s policy had a profound impact on the Church forcing the missions to curtail many of their activities.³⁸ In

³² “German–Austrian MSS History,” entry 11 July 1936; Gilbert W. Scharffs, *Mormonism in Germany: A History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in Germany* (Salt Lake City, UT: Deseret Book Company, 1970), p. 85.

³³ Kriminalpolizei Blatt no. 1751/54, in “Swiss–German MSS History,” entry for January 1934. See also, “German–Austrian MSS History,” entry for 5, 25 and 29 January 1934. During the first week of January 1934 the police forbid any further distribution of “Göttliche Vollmacht” in Germany. In both missions, the mission presidents complied with the order and had all copies of the tract either sent to the respective mission offices, turned over to the government officials or destroyed.

³⁴ In the mid-1930s, for example, the regime banned the Christian Scientists from sending proceeds from the sale of their literature to the United States. Correspondence between the Christian Science Church and the United States diplomatic corps covering the period of 16 July 1936 to 28 July 1937, U. S. State Department Documents, 362.116.Christian Science Church/8-12, National Archives, College Park, Maryland.

³⁵ “Swiss–German MSS History,” entry for September 1934.

³⁶ The previous month, Finance Minister, Hjalmar Schacht, had launched a new economic policy that sought to impose “strict controls on the allocation of foreign exchange” for the purpose of building up currency reserves. See Ian Kershaw, *Hitler 1889–1936: Hubris* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1999), p. 576.

³⁷ Registered Marks were more valuable than regular Marks and used for international trade. Mormon missionaries had had the privilege of purchasing Registered Marks since the Weimar era. See also “German–Austrian Quarterly Reports,” December 1934, entry for October.

³⁸ “Swiss–German MSS History,” entry for October 1934; “German–Austrian

response, the mission presidents³⁹ in Europe and the First Presidency in Utah worked through the U.S. State Department, the American diplomatic corps, and the American Express Company to resolve this crisis. In March, 1936, the regime let up and restored to the missionaries the privilege of remitting Registered Marks.⁴⁰

The Nazi “Let Up” on the Mormons and the Illusion of “Good Relations”

Between 1934 and 1936, most religious denominations suffered increased persecution at the hands of the Nazis. Both Catholic and Protestant clergymen encountered Nazi harassment and imprisonment. The Nazis also proceeded viciously against the smaller denominations. By contrast, harassment of the Mormons suddenly subsided in mid-1934 as noted by both Mormon and American government officials. In July, Francis Salzner, was questioned about Mormon views of the regime to which he reaffirmed the LDS accommodation policy and positive attitudes toward secular government. After the meeting, a surprised Salzner reported that the Gestapo agent confided to him that the Mormons had

MSS History,” entry for 6 October 1934; Tobler, “The Narrow Line,” p. 17. The exchange rate for the Registered Mark was 3.31 per dollar, and for the regular Mark it was 2.48. According to Tobler, “the resulting loss of over 30% of the purchasing power of their \$25 monthly check was difficult, if not devastating.”

³⁹ On 1 August 1934, Roy Welker replaced Oliver Budge as president of the East German Mission.

⁴⁰ Correspondence between the LDS First Presidency and the United States diplomatic corps covering the period of 3 April to 13 April 1935, U. S. State Department Documents, 362.116.M82/35, 36, National Archives; Correspondence between William E. Dodd and Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, and correspondence between U. S. State Department and LDS First Presidency covering a period between 28 May to 21 June 1935, U. S. State Department Documents, 362.116.M82/38, National Archives; “Swiss–German MSS History,” entry for July 1935. See also Tobler, “Narrow Line,” p. 17. The Benevolent Mark was an exchange rate which allowed missionaries to exchange fifty percent of their foreign currency for Registered Marks and fifty percent for Free Marks. “Swiss–German MSS History,” entry for March 1936; “German–Austrian MSS History,” entry under “During the month of March.” According to records, missionaries would have to apply for the privilege of buying Registered Marks. They received an exchange rate of about RM 4 per \$1. They could purchase up to 200 Registered Marks per month.

nothing to fear from the Nazis.⁴¹ On 31 July, Utah Senator Elbert Thomas met with American Ambassador William Dodd in Berlin to discuss issues relating to Mormon missionaries in Germany. After the meeting, Dodd noted in his diary, "There are a number of Mormons in Germany and Hitler has not dissolved their organizations or expelled their active preachers. There are other than religious aspects to Hitler's let-up on the Mormons."⁴²

Some historians have suggested a collaborationist relationship between Mormons and the Nazis based on a conjunction of worldviews including similar beliefs, doctrines and practices. Moreover, they argue that Mormons tried to convey this view to Nazi officials in order to escape persecution.⁴³

Historian Douglas Tobler counters this thesis by arguing it was actually a disjunction of worldviews which formed the "foundation of the Nazi-Mormon relationship." According to Tobler, although there was some agreement of peripheral principles, the Nazis were concerned with gaining a "monopoly of power" and considered sectarian theology nonsense. On the other hand, Mormons were interested in their spiritual mission, not political power.⁴⁴ Mission documents further bolster this argument. In 1935, for example, mission records indicate "that the German attitude toward the [Mormon] Church, or any church, was that the churches were for the 'soul saving' part of life only, and that the state

⁴¹ "Chronik der Gemeinde Karlsruhe," pp. 92-93. President Salzner and his co-worker had a conversation with two officials of the State Police. He reported: 'The NS officials inquired about our work for the Church and requested that we should go to their office the next day for a discussion. I and my co-worker came as requested, were treated politely and thoroughly questioned. The officials had a pile of newspaper and magazine articles about the Church to which they often referred during the conversation. After we were there an hour, they requested that we write a short history of the Church and describe the organization, goals and dimensions of our work. We complied with the request and presented the document on the following day. The officials informed us they were satisfied and assured us that we had no reason to fear. (Author's translation.)

⁴² William E. Dodd, *Ambassador Dodd's Diary: 1933-1938*, ed. by William E. Dodd, Jr., and Martha Dodd (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1941), p. 136.

⁴³ King, *The Nazi State and the New Religions*, chapter 3. See also King "Strategies for Survival," pp. 225-228.

⁴⁴ Tobler, "The Narrow Line," pp. 2-3.

should develop the youth, and that the churches should not interfere in state affairs.”⁴⁵

The Nazis, in other words, found little in Mormonism they considered subversive. The regime seems to have regarded Mormons as “apolitical” and patriotic citizens. They may also have accepted some Mormon beliefs and practices as compatible with their own values. Tobler maintains that “presumably, the Nazis found no specific doctrines like rejection of military service, occultism or total reliance upon God’s power in healing the sick” that would cause them concern.⁴⁶ Hitler’s regime was thus willing to tolerate Mormons while it continued to consolidate power. In many respects, the Nazis’ attitude toward the Latter-day Saints resembled their views of the Free churches who desired to retain independence to preach the gospel.⁴⁷ The Free Churches advocated separation of church and state, supported themselves financially and had relatively insignificant membership in Germany. Furthermore, many of these denominations had some influence abroad. Therefore, the Nazis, in the interests of foreign relations refrained from blatant harassment of these denominations.⁴⁸

Official tolerance of the Mormons, however, turned out to be a mirage. Douglas Tobler and Alan Keele have described this two-year illusion of harmonious relations as a “fool’s paradise.”⁴⁹ Mormons continued their policy of accommodation with the Nazis, though the regime appears to have paid little attention to them except within the context of an overall policy on religion.⁵⁰ Each side was willing to ignore the other as long as it was left alone. As Tobler and Keele assert, “[b]eing largely oblivious to the thrust of the numerous major events and policy changes going on at the time, Mormons tended to evaluate their circumstances largely in isolation on the basis of their personal well-being and the condition of the Church.”⁵¹ Nevertheless, both sides took advantage of opportunities presented by the other to advance their goals.

⁴⁵ “German–Austrian MSS History,” entry for Thursday, 8 August 1935.

⁴⁶ Tobler, “The Narrow Line,” p. 3.

⁴⁷ Helmreich, p. 405.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 370 and 372.

⁴⁹ Tobler and Keele, “The Saints and the Reich,” p. 14.

⁵⁰ Anderson, p. 157.

⁵¹ Tobler and Keele, “The Saints and the Reich,” p. 14.

Doctrinal Parallels and Compatibility

That said, it cannot be denied that Mormons and Nazis did by coincidence rather than design share some common doctrinal ground, and both were aware of the similarities.⁵² And it was the parallels that reinforced the illusion held by German Mormons.⁵³

Among views shared by the two parties were an emphasis on genealogical research, the family, and the importance of health. Many Mormons also viewed several Nazi programs as resembling their own such as one of Hitler's program known as Eintopf Sonntag or "stew Sundays," in which participants fixed a modest meal and donated what they saved to the Nazi welfare program; a practice similar to the traditional Mormon "Fast Sunday."

Although superficially similar, the goals and objectives of the Mormons and Nazis were quite different.⁵⁴ Mormon programs reflected the faith's spiritual mission, while those of the Nazis represented their obsession for political and racial domination. Even so, common attitudes made Nazism more palatable to Mormons and Mormonism less suspect to Hitler's minions.⁵⁵

Contacts with the Government

On 1 August 1934, Roy Welker became president of the German-Austrian mission; his tenure as mission president contributed to the illusion of "good feelings." Before leaving for Berlin, Welker met with President Heber J. Grant to discuss the German situation. Grant simply instructed Welker verbally to "meet the situation as it was," and to "exercise [his] own wisdom."⁵⁶ These vague directions left Welker on

⁵² Joseph M. Dixon, "Mormons in the Third Reich: 1933-1945," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 7 (Spring 1972), 74. Dixon, argues that no "connection existed between the two ... but any parallels ... resulted from circumstance rather than plan."

⁵³ For a thorough analysis of doctrinal common ground, see William D. Underwood, "Religions are Ordained of God: The Mormon Church in Nazi Germany" (M.A. Thesis, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio, 1992), pp. 40-48.

⁵⁴ Anderson, pp. 154-155.

⁵⁵ Tobler, "The Narrow Line," pp. 2-3.

⁵⁶ Roy A. Welker, Oral History, interviewed by Richard Jensen, 2-3 February, 1973, Archives, Historical Department of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City, Utah, pp. 28-29.

his own to deal with the Nazi regime.⁵⁷ Throughout his presidency, Welker continued the accommodation policy by complying with Nazi requests and investigations⁵⁸ which he later asserted was the “best policy.”⁵⁹

Welker also sought contacts with government officials. In 1936, he sent copies of Mormon scriptures to government officials including Adolf Hitler himself.⁶⁰ Furthermore, Welker met a low-ranking official from the Ministry of Religion who assured the mission president that the Mormons were in no danger.⁶¹ Welker’s wife, Elizabeth, also cultivated ties with the regime by occasionally meeting and establishing a working friendship with Gertrude Scholtz-Klink, head of the Nazi women’s auxiliary, the NS Frauenschaft.⁶²

Although both Welkers believed that their efforts improved the status of the Mormon Church in Germany, there is little evidence to bolster their claims. As Tobler concludes, “Welker apparently was convinced that ‘...Hitler was very much impressed with the Mormons,’ a statement lacking support from other evidence.”⁶³

Harassment of LDS at the Local Level

While governmental pressure on the Latter-day Saints at the national level subsided considerably during 1934, at the local level harassment became quite intense.⁶⁴ In their 1933 year-end reports to

⁵⁷ Tobler and Keele, “The Saints and the Reich,” pp. 13–14. Grant, more than likely, gave similar instructions to others who served as mission presidents during this period.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

⁵⁹ Welker, *Oral History*, p. 31.

⁶⁰ Scharffs, pp. 86–87.

⁶¹ “German–Austrian MSS History,” entry for “During the Month of July, 1936; “German–Austrian Quarterly Reports,” 30 September 1936; Welker, *Oral History*, pp. 62–64.

⁶² Several times Elizabeth Welker, when meeting with Scholtz-Klink, found herself in the presence of Hitler. Nevertheless, she never had occasion to speak personally with the dictator, according to her account, because of the language barrier. See Welker, *Oral History*, pp. 23–25 and 29–30.

⁶³ Tobler and Keele, “The Saints and the Reich,” p. 15.

⁶⁴ Such harassment on the local level did not affect only the Latter-day Saints. In fact, many groups including other Christian denominations, Communists and Socialists, and Jews faced increased local intimidation during the second half of 1934 going into 1935. See Ian Kershaw, *Popular Opinion and Political*

Salt Lake City, both Francis Salzner and Oliver Budge wrote that the Reich government had interfered little with the activities of the Church.⁶⁵ However, Budge also indicated that zealous party members had harassed both the members and the missionaries; a point alluded to by Salzner.⁶⁶ Mission records from 1933 on indicate that local Nazi officials, aided by Catholic and Protestant clergymen, led attacks against Mormons.⁶⁷

Nazi persecution on the local level took one of two forms. The first was the harassment of missionaries. In many localities the police limited missionary proselyting activities such as prohibiting going door to door or banning "cottage meetings."⁶⁸ Occasionally, police arrested missionaries and searched their apartments for subversive items. Throughout Germany, party officials banned missionaries from their cities. In extreme cases, local brown shirts used physical violence against the missionaries. For example, in April 1933, missionaries in Hindenburg were attacked by a uniformed Nazi who beat them with his belt. Party members also nearly beat Reed Bradford to death for refusal to salute a Nazi flag.⁶⁹

The second technique used by local authorities was to attack the native branches. Agents interrogated local members, confiscated branch records, and disrupted worship services.⁷⁰ Usually, members met with

Dissent in the Third Reich: Bavaria 1933–1945 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983), pp. 82–83, 165–74, 195–96, 205–06, and 232–38.

⁶⁵ "Swiss–German MSS History," entry December 1933, "General Summary of the Year"; "German–Austrian Quarterly Reports," entry for 31 December 1933

⁶⁶ *Ibid.* See both of the above reports.

⁶⁷ Both mission presidents suggest that the Catholic and Evangelical clergy were responsible for much of the action against the Mormons trying to halt their proselyting activities. *Ibid.*

⁶⁸ For example, see "Swiss–German MSS History," entries for May and June 1933. In Minden, police interrupted a cottage meeting, holding all at gunpoint. After the missionaries explained the circumstances, the police left. See also "German–Austrian Quarterly Reports," entry for 31 December 1933, "October", a cottage meeting in Beuthen was disrupted and all participants taken into custody.

⁶⁹ See "German–Austrian Quarterly Reports," entry for 30 June 1933, "April," and Tobler, "The Narrow Line," p. 12.

⁷⁰ For example, see "German–Austrian MSS History," entry for Wednesday, 18 October 1933. See also "Swiss–German MSS History," entry for December 1934. "The police summoned the appearance of all members of the Göppingen Branch between the 10 and 16 December. The officers apparently wanted to

the police, explained Mormon activities and they quoted the Twelfth Article of Faith. Most of the time they convinced party officials that their “intentions were in harmony with those of the government” and not subversive.⁷¹ In extreme cases based on “political suspicion,” police closed the meeting halls⁷² used by Mormons forcing the closure of several branches.⁷³

Local harassment of Mormons varied from place to place, and from official to official. In Karlsruhe, Mormons were treated well.⁷⁴ On the other hand, branches in Breslau, Dresden and Hamburg suffered intense harassment. In 1935, missionaries were banned in Saxony.⁷⁵ This pattern of uneven treatment suggests that local Nazi leaders, not the Reich government, determined policy regarding Mormons.

The 1936 Berlin Olympics

Local harassment did have an effect on missionary proselyting activities. By mid-1935, mission documents state “tracting averages for the missionaries have reached a low point. Plans are being worked out to find a way in which this important missionary activity, in spite of police restrictions, can be increased.”⁷⁶ Missionaries in both missions turned to

learn the meaning of our meetings, since Germany is at present in an anxious state of political agitation and all meetings are looked upon with suspicion.”

⁷¹ See for example “Swiss-German MSS History,” entries for January 1934, April 1934, September 1934.

⁷² In Germany, Mormons rented meeting halls to hold their services. There were only one or two Church-owned chapels in the whole country.

⁷³ “Swiss-German MSS History,” entry for May 1933. “The Hanau branch was denied the right to hold meetings in the ‘Hohelandschule.’ The reason being political suspicion.” “Swiss-German MSS History,” entry July 1933, “Branch Closed.” “The Hanau branch was closed due to not having a meeting hall....” See also “German-Austrian Quarterly Reports,” entry for 30 June 1933, heading of “May.” On 9 May the use of public schools to hold meetings was refused in Stargard. In this case, no reason was given.

⁷⁴ In Karlsruhe, according to the branch president, John Dahl, Mormons were treated well by the Party. See Dahl, Oral Interview, p. 18. Other Mormons and missionaries were able to maintain harmonious relations with local Party leaders or encountered little trouble.

⁷⁵ Efforts by President Welker, European mission president, Joseph Merrill, and the American diplomatic corps to get the expulsion rescinded failed. See Steven E. Carter, “The Mormons and the Third Reich” (Ph.D. diss., University of Arkansas, 2003), pp. 110-112.

⁷⁶ Swiss-German MSS History, entry July 1935, “Tracting Averages.”

unorthodox methods to contact potential converts. In particular, the American missionaries turned to basketball,⁷⁷ which President Welker endorsed.⁷⁸

It is impossible to determine the impact of “basketball proselyting” although some missionaries were able to develop a good rapport with the local officials at a time of intense local harassment.⁷⁹ One unexpected outcome occurred in 1935 when the German army recruited several missionaries to teach basketball to the soldiers.⁸⁰ Later, officials asked several missionaries to train the German Olympic basketball team and help officiate during the 1936 Berlin Olympic Games.⁸¹ Mormons saw this representing recognition by national leaders and as a way to improve the religion’s status. The Nazis believed that Mormon missionaries could help them in their propaganda effort by achieving a victory for the German basketball team.⁸² In the end, however, the German Olympic basketball team exited the tournament early. And although Mormons were involved in such a high profile event, there is no evidence the Olympics improved their image or respectability.⁸³

⁷⁷ It was not uncommon for missionaries in Europe to be using basketball. Missionaries in Czechoslovakia, Great Britain and Sweden all participated in “Basketball Proselyting.” See Bruce C. Van Orden, *Building Zion: The Latter-day Saints in Europe* (Salt Lake City, UT: Deseret Book Company, 1996), p. 135.

⁷⁸ President Welker, himself, encouraged the use of basketball in proselyting activities and believed that it “did quite a bit of good.” Welker, Oral History, p. 59.

⁷⁹ Les Goates, “Mormon Missionaries Train German Basketeers,” *Deseret News*, 7 February 1936, p. 14.

⁸⁰ “German–Austrian MSS History,” entries for 8 August 1935 and 26 August 1935.

⁸¹ Goates, p. 14; Glynn Bennion, “New Ways of Proselyting and the Reason Therefore,” *Deseret News*, 25 January 1936, Church Section 1, p. 7. As German basketball officials, the official Olympic report listed Charles Perschon, Jerome Christensen, Edward Judd and Vinton Merrill. *XI Olympiade Berlin 1936, Amtlicher Bericht*, vol. II, (Berlin: Organisationskomitee Für die XI. Olypiade Berlin 1936 e.V., Wilhelm Limpert-Verlag, 1936), pp. 1078–1079.

⁸² Bennion, p. 7. “In Germany Herr Hitler has sought the services of the Elders to teach basketball to the teams he hopes will achieve a Nordic victory at the Olympic games to be held this year in Berlin.”

⁸³ Even within the LDS community there were few German Mormons who were aware that missionaries were involved in the Olympics. Dahl, Oral Interview, p. 20.

The Olympics, however, did benefit Mormons indirectly as the Hitler dictatorship put forth its best appearance and temporarily relaxed its attacks on religion.⁸⁴ Under these conditions, Mormons held their largest youth conference before World War II in Berlin, and missionaries found it easier to proselytize at this time. Mission records from October, 1936, noted “[t]racting and visiting totals continue to show increased activity on the part of the missionaries.”⁸⁵

Renewed Harassment

The Olympics represented the climax of a two-year period of seemingly cordial relations between the Mormons and the Nazi regime. Shortly after the Olympics, however, the Nazis renewed their assault on the Christian churches.⁸⁶

Mormons also experienced an intensification of harassment. In Hamburg, Nazis charged district president, Alwin Brey, with spying for the United States.⁸⁷ For months, government authorities monitored LDS congregations and missionaries, censored their correspondence, and confiscated records and publications. Moreover, officials informed Brey “[I]f the Church wished to remain in [Hamburg] they must cease all youth activities and gathering.” Brey complied with this demand and canceled a proposed “Youth Day.” The impact upon the LDS community in Hamburg was chilling. Church reports noted, “[a] decided

⁸⁴ In Berlin and throughout the country, the Nazis relaxed much of their censorship and restrictions they had imposed and did their best to hide anti-Semitic programs, including the Jew-baiting publication, *Der Stürmer*, and other racial signs from public view. They also let up on their attacks against the Christian churches. For example, they halted the show trials of Catholic priests charged with immorality and currency smuggling. See Duff Hart-Davis, *Hitler's Games: The 1936 Olympics* (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1986), p. 126 and 129, and Helmreich, p. 279.

⁸⁵ “Swiss-German MSS History,” entry for October 1936, “Missionary Activities.”

⁸⁶ Conway, p. 168.

⁸⁷ Sanford M. Bingham, Oral History, Interviewed by Douglas Tobler and Alan F. Keele. Provo, Utah, 1974, Typescript, The James Moyle Oral History Program, Archives, Historical Department of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City, Utah, pp. 5-6. Alwin Brey had been collecting a list of Mormons in the military from the Hamburg district in order to send them copies of Church publications. Nazi officials believed he was gathering the information to turn over to American intelligence.

tension between the government's attitude in this district was everywhere apparent."⁸⁸ Similar harassment and "investigations" occurred throughout the Reich.⁸⁹

Many missionaries felt the sting of renewed Nazi persecution. In addition to the usual harassment, a number of missionaries were arrested as suspected American spies and incarcerated for several days.⁹⁰ There were incidents of anti-Mormons who denounced the missionaries as representatives of a banned sect. The missionaries would have to prove, through intense interrogations, that this was not the case.⁹¹

There was always a concern among Mormon leaders that young callow missionaries might do or say something to endanger the Church,⁹² and during the late 1930s there were two incidents in which missionaries did offend Nazi sensibilities. In 1937, Alvin Schoenhals was arrested after the Nazis intercepted a letter he wrote criticizing the regime. After a month in jail, Schoenhals was deported.⁹³ Later, a set of missionaries had to flee to Switzerland after the Gestapo obtained a photo of the two with a party flag wrapped around themselves like a breech cloth.⁹⁴

⁸⁸ "Swiss-German MSS History," entries for "March 1937: Difficulties in Hamburg District", "April 1937: Government wants Financial Report", and "April 1937: Conferences". The youth gathering was then moved to Switzerland where there was less oppression.

⁸⁹ For example, in the Breslau district, the Walthenburg Branch was closed "on account of so much difficulty in obtaining permission to hold meetings." Moreover, "[p]olice refused the Saints permission to hold 'open' meetings in November the previous year, allowing only two outsiders to one gathering." In April 1937, the Reich and Prussian Minister of Science issued a decree making it unlawful for any religious meeting to be held in public school buildings. This decree affected several branches in the Breslau and Berlin districts that met in schools. "German-Austrian MSS History," entry for "During the Month of January 1936"; "Friday 29 April 1937."

⁹⁰ Scharffs, p. 85.

⁹¹ Wallace D. Montague, "I was a 'Political Prisoner' of Hitler," *The Instructor* (March 1963), 90-91.

⁹² Scharffs, p. 90.

⁹³ "Swiss-German MSS History," entry for "Missionary Imprisoned," June 1937; Bingham, Oral History, pp. 8-11; Tobler, "The Narrow Line," pp. 19-21.

⁹⁴ Donald M. Petty, Oral History, Interviewed by Douglas Tobler, Salt Lake City, Utah, 6 and 13 August 1985, Typescript, The James Moyle Oral History Program, Archives, Historical Department of The Church of Jesus Christ of

Mormon leaders in both Germany and Utah took these incidents seriously. During the summer of 1939, the Church sent Apostle Joseph Fielding Smith to Germany in part to investigate these events.⁹⁵ Such incidents, no doubt, contributed to the Nazis' growing suspicion of the Mormons. A 1935 Gestapo report on "subversive activities" of religious organizations omitted mention of the Latter-day Saints.⁹⁶ Three years later, the Security Service (SD) labeled Mormons "enemies of the state."⁹⁷ By late 1937 and early 1938, however, as Hitler was preparing for war and needed national support, the overall church struggle in Germany subsided.⁹⁸ This, in part, prevented the Nazis from attacking the Mormons more vigorously. At the same time, not wanting to antagonize the United States unnecessarily, especially while high LDS dignitaries from Utah, including J. Reuben Clark and church president Heber J. Grant, were touring Germany, the Hitler regime "did not look at [the Mormons] as a very serious problem."⁹⁹

The Mormons and the German Media

One of the more controversial events concerning the relations between Mormons and the regime centered on the Church and the media. Ever since the founding of Mormonism, Latter-day Saints faced unflattering accounts in the media at home and abroad. During the Nazi era, however, they experienced both positive and negative media coverage.¹⁰⁰

Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City, Utah, 50. According to Petty, the missionaries wrapped the flag around them like a "breech cloth;" and M. Douglas & Evelyn N. Wood, interview by Richard O. Cowan & Davis F. Boone, typescript, The James Moyle Oral History Program, Archives, Historical Department of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City, Utah, pp. 3-5.

⁹⁵ Petty, Oral History, pp. 50-51.

⁹⁶ *Sonderbericht über die Lage der Protestantischen Kirchen und in den verschiedenen Sekten und deren Staatsfeindliche Auswirkung*, 1935, National Archives Microcopy No. T-175, Guide 39, Roll 409, National Archives.

⁹⁷ *Sonderbericht über die Lage der Protestantischen Kirchen und in den verschiedenen Sekten und deren Staatsfeindliche Auswirkung*, 1938, referenced in Tobler and Keele, "The Saints and the Reich," p. 22, and Tobler, "The Narrow Line," p. 9.

⁹⁸ Ian Kershaw, *Hitler: Nemesis* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2000), p. 41 and 46.

⁹⁹ See Tobler's comments in Bingham, Oral Interview, pp. 26-27.

¹⁰⁰ A "positive" article, "A Visit with the Mormons", that explained Latter-day Saint doctrine appeared in the *Rheinische Zeitung* in February 1933. The follow-

Mormons, too, appreciated the media and utilized it in Europe to spread their message.¹⁰¹ Moreover, LDS leaders sought opportunities to rebut false accounts of Mormonism in local newspapers.¹⁰² It was this activity that led to the appearance of a controversial article in the *Völkischer Beobachter* in the spring of 1939.

In November, 1938, the Nazis unleashed their most brutal attack on the Jews up to that time. In response to American criticism in the aftermath of Kristallnacht, the *Völkischer Beobachter* published an article entitled, "The State within a State: An American Parallel to the Jewish Question in Germany."¹⁰³ The column, addressed to "fair-minded Americans" compared Nazi treatment of the Jews to the official handling of the "Mormon question" in Missouri and Illinois during the nineteenth century. Both Mormons and the Jews, the writer claimed, were enemies of mankind.¹⁰⁴

The article outraged Alfred Rees who was the president of the newly formed East German mission.¹⁰⁵ Rees, who believed that his pur-

ing July, the *Herforder Zeitung* ran an article about the Mormon pioneers in Utah and the "sea-gull miracle." In contrast, a "slanderous" article, entitled "The Mormons Seek to Rule the World" appeared in the *Wilhelmshavener Zeitung* in April 1934 and a 1938 *Bremen Nachrichten* article discussed Mormon "indulgence" in polygamy. See "Swiss-German MSS History," entries for February 1933, "Printed Article"; July 1933, "Newspaper Print Favorable Article"; April 1934, "Newspaper Article"; and October 1938, "Opposition."

¹⁰¹ At a 1932 mission presidents' conference held in Prague, then-European mission president, John Widtsoe, encouraged the European Church leaders to use "all forms of publicity" and to organize mission central publicity bureaus. "European Mission Presidents in Conference," *The Latter-day Saints' Millennial Star* 25 (August 1932), 536-537.

¹⁰² For instance, when the article, "The Mormons Seek to Rule the World" appeared in the *Wilhelmshavener Zeitung*, the missionaries got permission to write a rebuttal that appeared on 20 May 1934. See "Swiss-German MSS History," entry for April 1934, "Newspaper Article."

¹⁰³ "Germany Shifting Her Foreign Policy: Reaction Abroad Criticized," *New York Times*, 21 November 1938, p. 4. "Chancellor Hitler's own newspaper, the *Voelkisher Beobachter*, published what it called a history of the ejections of Mormons from the States of Missouri and Illinois, describing it as an 'American parallel to the Jewish problem in Germany.'" See also "West German MSS History," entry for Tuesday, 22 November 1938.

¹⁰⁴ "West German MSS History," entry for Tuesday, 22 November 1938.

¹⁰⁵ During the summer of 1937, Heber J. Grant announced that a third German-speaking mission would be created from the German-Austrian mission

pose was to work with government officials, had been making contacts with influential Nazi organizations since he arrived in Berlin. As early as November, 1937, he had established a relationship with “a certain influential agency,” most likely the Propaganda Ministry.¹⁰⁶ At the time, Rees believed that he had struck a “secret deal” with the Ministry in which the press would refrain from publishing unfavorable articles about the Latter-day Saints.¹⁰⁷ In return, Rees agreed to write “positive” articles about Germany for the American press.¹⁰⁸ Although Rees believed that he had bested the Propaganda Ministry, he did not realize that Goebbel’s Ministry had been making quid pro quo agreements with other denominations in exchange for favorable public relations abroad.¹⁰⁹ Furthermore, on 19 April 1939 Rees published an article on Mormonism in the *Völkischer Beobachter*.

Rees, in his article entitled, “In the Land of the Mormons,” favorably compared Mormonism and Nazism and emphasized doctrinal similarities. He also suggested that common experience gave Mormonism a unique understanding of the “new Germany,” especially its grievances resulting from World War I. Rees asserted “to a student of Mormonism, recent developments in Germany present a most impressive study.” He

and the Swiss-German mission. The new missions, West German, East German and Swiss-Austrian missions would be organized on 1 January 1938. A third mission president, Alfred Rees was called at that time and arrived in Germany to help with the transition in the fall of 1937.

¹⁰⁶ Ralph Mark Lindsey, Oral History, Interviewed by Matthew Heiss, Oakmont, California, 22 April 1990, Typescript, The James Moyle Oral History Program, Archives, Historical Department, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City, Utah, pp. 1-2. Lindsey confirms that Rees had connections with the Propaganda Ministry. However, Lindsey states that the scandalous article was on Mormon polygamy. In searching mission records in late 1938 and early 1939, there is no mention of such an article.

¹⁰⁷ Bingham, Oral History, pp. 25-26.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 22.

¹⁰⁹ Roland Bleich, “Selling Nazi Germany Abroad: The Case of Hulda Jost,” *Journal of Church and State* 35 (Autumn 1993), 807-808. According to Bleich, “Concerned about the impact of a bad press on his foreign policy, Hitler realized that several small American-based denominations could be useful in influencing public opinion abroad. Methodists and Baptists, particularly, wielded considerable influence in America while posing little risk to Nazi totalitarian designs in Germany because of their small membership. These churches, on the other hand, had reasons of their own to collaborate; for in return they could expect toleration by the Nazi state.”

mentioned J. Reuben Clark, no doubt, reminding the Nazis of Clark's efforts to relieve the financial situation in Germany as president of the Foreign Bondholders' Association. Rees concluded that Mormons exhibited the "application of the German ideal: Community welfare before personal welfare," an allusion to Point 24 of the Nazi Party program of putting "common interests before self-interest."¹¹⁰

Rees believed that the article would help the Mormon cause in Germany and even had it published in pamphlet form for missionary use.¹¹¹ Douglas Wood of the West German mission, however, opposed the article and objected to Rees' "friendly relationship" with the Nazis.¹¹² Wood refused to distribute the tract in the West German mission arguing that it linked Mormonism too closely to National Socialism.¹¹³ Ultimately, it was Nazis who restricted distribution of the tract because the swastika on the front cover implied Party sanction of an American denomination.¹¹⁴

While Rees intended to spread the Mormon message and to provide safety for the 8,000–9,000 Mormons living in the East German mission¹¹⁵ he underestimated the ruthlessness of the Nazis and overestimated his ability to deal with them.¹¹⁶ Rees, rather than help the Mormon cause with the publication of his article in the *Völkischer Beobachter*, unwittingly tied his religion to the pagan cult of National Socialism.

Conclusions

The outbreak of war a few months after the publication of Rees' article dramatically changed church/state relations in Germany. Hitler, needing national support, let up on the church struggle. In August, 1939 the Mormon Church withdrew its missionaries from Europe leaving

¹¹⁰ Alfred C. Rees, "Im Lande der Mormonen," *Völkischer Beobachter*, 14 April 1939.

¹¹¹ After its publication Rees petitioned the Propaganda Ministry to reprint thousands of copies of the article in pamphlets for missionaries to use. The ministry obliged apparently believing that distribution of the pamphlet would also benefit the Party. See Lindsey, Oral History, p. 2.

¹¹² This led to a heated debate between Wood and Rees. Tobler, "The Narrow Line," pp. 26–27.

¹¹³ Ibid.

¹¹⁴ Dixon, p. 72.

¹¹⁵ Lindsey, Oral History, p. 2.

¹¹⁶ Tobler, "The Narrow Line," p. 28.

more than 13,000 coreligionists in the Third Reich. Both the Hitler regime and the Mormon Church sought to survive the war.

Between 1933 and 1939, Mormons, like other denominations struggled to formulate strategies to deal with the Nazi regime. LDS attitudes were shaped by the mandates of the Twelfth Article of Faith and the accommodation policies developed at the turn of the century. This meant that the Latter-day Saints would concern themselves with spiritual rather than political matters in the Reich. They pledged themselves to be loyal citizens and support the regime that was in power; it was an approach that alleviated Nazi suspicions to a considerable degree.

Relations between Hitler's government and the Mormon Church were, therefore, better than those involving most other small denominations. That does not mean that the Latter-day Saints escaped Nazi harassment. Instead a two-tiered pattern developed. On the national level, the Nazis eliminated the Church's Boy Scout organization while the Gestapo monitored LDS meetings and financial activities. During the middle of the decade, Mormons felt optimistic. This was because the Nazis, at the national level, paid very little attention to the Mormons. As long as there was something to be gained internationally, the regime tolerated Latter-day Saints in much the same way it tolerated Baptists and Methodists. After the Olympics, Nazi suspicions of the LDS had grown substantially while toleration had waned considerably.

Locally, Mormons faced continued harassment, and in some places, outright persecution. As with other denominations, grass-roots Party activists determined the degree and nature of this harassment. For example, Nazi officials nearly succeeded in banishing Mormonism in Saxony in 1935. Nevertheless, LDS leaders were willing to tolerate such abuse because of their seemingly "privileged" status nationally.

But overall, the Mormons did not endure the intense persecution suffered by other religions. The Party never banned the Mormons.

Appendix A

Der Stern

No. 65

14. Juli 1933

Ein aufklärender Brief

Der unter abgedruckte Brief wurde durch die Schwierigkeiten veranlaßt, die unsern Missionaren in Darmstadt entstanden waren. Die Behörden hatten die Ausweisung der Missionare verfügt, weil ihre Anwesenheit angeblich nicht im Interesse des deutschen Volkes liege. Unser zuständiger Bezirksleiter, Ältester Rudolf A. Noß, nahm sofort die Verhandlungen mit den Regierungsstellen auf, um eine Zurückziehung der Ausweisungsverfügung herbeizuführen. Die Verfügung wurde denn auch, wenn zunächst auch nur vorläufig, zurückgezogen und das Missionsbüro ersucht, eine offizielle Erklärung über einige die Regierung besonders interessierende Punkte in bezug auf unsre Lehren und Bestrebungen, Stellung zu Staat und andern Kirchen, Organisation, Arbeitsweise usw., belegt mit entsprechenden Unterlagen aus der Kirchenliteratur, abzugeben; auf Grund dieser Erklärung und Unterlagen werde die Angelegenheit eingehend geprüft und eine endgültige Entscheidung getroffen werden. Daraufhin hat das Missionsbüro das folgende Schreiben abgefaßt und mit zahlreichen Belegen aus unsrer Literatur durch den Bezirksleiter der hessischen Staatsregierung überreichen lassen. Wie uns Bruder Noß soeben mitteilt, hat die Regierung die Ausweisungsverfügung nunmehr endgültig aufgehoben und ihre Entscheidung dahin getroffen, daß Aufenthalt und Tätigkeit unser Missionare nicht mehr beanstandet werden.

Da der Brief über den Kreis der Betroffenen hinaus von Interesse sein dürfte, bringen wir ihn nachstehend auch unsern Lesern zur Kenntnis.

Schriftleitung.

Basel, den 22. Juni 1933.

An die Hessische Staatsregierung zu Händen des

Herrn Staatskommissars Dr. Best

Darmstadt

Betr. Ausweisungsverfügung gegen die Missionare Ryman und Niederhauser.

Sehr geehrter Herr Staatskommissar!

Sie hatten die Freundlichkeit, die angeführte Ausweisungsverfügung auf Grund einer Besprechung zwischen einem Ihrer Herren Regierungsräte und unserm zuständigen Frankfurter Bezirksleiter, Herrn Rudolf Noß, einstweilen zurückziehen zu lassen.

Wir danken Ihnen herzlich für diese Entgegenkommen und geben der Zuversicht Ausdruck, Sie möchten sich an Hand der Ihnen heute zugehenden Unterlagen davon überzeugen, daß die Bestrebungen unsrer Kirche durchaus geeignet sind, das Wohl des deutschen Volkes zu fördern und daß deshalb die Verfügung endgültig zurückgenommen werden sollte.

Es wird in diesem Scheiben weder möglich noch erwünscht sein, die Lehre unsrer Kirche in allen Punkten eingehend darzustellen, wir beschränken uns daher im folgenden auf solche, von denen wir annehmen, daß Sie ihnen besonders Wert beilegen, und verwiesen im übrigen auf die angeschlossene Literatur. Etwa weiter gewünschte Unterlagen und Erklärungen stehen Ihnen jederzeit zur Verfügung.

1.

Unsere Lehre ist das alte, ursprüngliche Evangelium Jesu Christi, rein und unverfälscht von irgendwelchen unchristlichen, fremdartigen Einflüssen, wie es Christus verkündigt hat. Grundlage ist die Bibel, insbesondere das Neue Testament. Dieses Evangelium ist nach einem jahrhundertlangen Abfall in unsrer Zeit durch Offenbarung der Menschheit von neuem gegeben worden, eine Offenbarung, durch welche die Reformation weitergeführt und vollendet wurde. Wir sehen in Martin Luther einen Mann Gottes und den Vorläufer der in der Schrift vorausgesagten „Wiederherstellung aller Dinge“.—Die Hauptpunkte unserer Lehre sind in den 13 „Glaubensartikeln“ der Kirche zusammengefaßt.

(Beilagen 1.)

Das Evangelium ist uns der große Plan des Lebens, dessen Befolgung uns zu bessern Männer und Frauen macht. Wir legen keinen Wert auf theologische Spitzfindigkeiten, gehen allem religiösen Streit aus dem Wege, betonen aber um so stärker die Notwendigkeit eines praktischen Christentums, das sich im täglichen Leben des Einzelnen auswirken muß, zu seinem Wohle und zum Wohle des Gemeinwesens, in dem er lebt. Wir erlangen von unsern Mitgliedern Enthaltensamkeit von Rauschmitteln jeder Art und Form, leben also alkohol- und tabakfrei, verpönen den Genuß von Bohnenkaffee und Schwarztee und übermäßiger Fleischkost und verpflichten die Mitglieder zu einer einfachen, natürlichen Lebensweise, wie sie bekanntlich auch der deutsche Volkskanzler Adolf Hitler führt. Dabei halten wir uns frei von Fanatismus und maßen uns nicht an, unsre Umgebung bevormunden zu wollen. Vernünftige Belehrungen und unser eigenes gutes Beispiel sollen die andern überzeugen, daß Gehorsam gegenüber den reinen, unverfälschten Lehren Jesu Christi zu einem wahrhaft befriedigenden, fortschrittlichen Leben führt.

(Beilagen 2.)

2.

Die sittlichen Lehren unsrer Kirche machen diese zu einem eisernen Bollwerk gegen alle Besetzungsbestrebungen. Geschlechtliche Reinheit wird beiden Geschlechtern als eine höchste religiöse Pflicht gelehrt, unbedingte Enthaltensamkeit vor der Ehe und lebenslängliche gegenseitige Treue in der Ehe als Oberstes Gesetz verkündigt und Ehebruch als ein Vergehen betrachtet, das an Fluchwürdigkeit gleich nach dem Mord kommt. Reinhaltung der Rasse wird als eine Verpflichtung der kommenden Generation gegenüber mit aller Strenge gefordert, auf körperliche Ertüchtigung durch Arbeit, Sport und Spiel großer Wert gelegt, und selbstverständlich alle jene Bersetzungserscheinungen, wie sie sich noch bis vor kurzem in Literatur, Theater, Presse, Film und Funk so widerwärtig breitmachten, rücksichtslos abgelehnt und bekämpft. Es gibt keine

Kirche, die den großen Volksschäden unsrer Zeit entschiedener zu Leibe rückt und ihnen den Boden mehr entzieht als unsre. Auf die Pflege des Familienlebens als der Keimzelle des Volkes, und auf die Achtung vor Frau und Mutter als der Mittlerin zwischen Himmel und Erde wird der größte Nachdruck gelegt. Kurz: es wird eine planmäßige Höherzüchtung und Veredlung des Menschen angestrebt wie sie in der bewußten Höherzüchtung von Pflanzen und Tieren ihr niedrigeres aber symbolisches Gegenstück hat. Auf die Früchte dieser Bestrebungen darf die Kirche Jesu Christi bei aller gebührenden Bescheidenheit doch mit berechtigtem Stolze hinweisen.

(Beilagen 3.)

3.

Die Stellung der Kirche Jesu Christi gegenüber dem Staat wird durch ihren folgenden Glaubensartikel gekennzeichnet:

„Wir glauben daran, Königen, Präsidenten, Herrschern und Obrigkeiten untertänig zu sein, den Gesetzen zu gehorchen, sie zu ehren und zu unterstützen.“

Die Kirche hält sich von jeder Einnischung in Politik fern. Zwar strebt sie bewußt und mit allen Mitteln darnach, ihre Mitglieder zu tüchtigen Staatsbürgern zu machen, die die Förderung des Wohles ihres Vaterlandes und Volkes als eine heilige Pflicht betrachten, aber sie mischt sich nicht in Angelegenheiten, deren Regelung dem Staat vorbehalten ist, so wenig wie sie mit Parteipolitik je etwas zu tun hatte oder zu tun haben möchte. Ihre Mitglieder sind mündig genug, um von ihren staatsbürgerlichen Rechten und Pflichten ohne jede Bevormundung den rechten Gebrauch zu machen; die einzige Bedingung ist, daß dies stets auf dem Boden der christlichen Weltanschauung geschieht, was aber als selbstverständlich gilt.

Die Mission der Kirche enthalten sich aufs strengste jeder politischen Tätigkeit. Ihre Sendung ist eine rein religiöse. Sie verkündigen das wiederhergestellte Evangelium, unterweisen die Menschen darin und arbeiten mit ihnen, daß sie seinen Gesetzen und Geboten gehorchen.

Die Kirche legt großen Wert darauf, die vaterländische Gesinnung bei ihren Mitgliedern zu pflegen. Jung und alt werden ermahnt, die guten alten Sitten und Grundsätze ihrer Väter als kostbares Gut treu zu bewahren. Die jetzt endlich wieder zu verdienten Ehren kommende alte Wahrheit „Gemeinnutz geht vor Eigennutz“ wird in unsrer Kirche seit ihrer Gründung, also seit über 100 Jahren, gelehrt und allgemein befolgt. Wir lehren unsre Mitglieder, ihr Volk als eine große erweiterte Familie zu betrachten mit all den damit verbundenen Pflichten und Verantwortlichkeiten. Als ein besonderer Beweis für die Pflege des Heimat- und Volksgefühls darf die Errichtung des deutschen Kriegerdenkmals in der Salzseestadt in den Vereinigten Staaten von Nordamerika durch deutschstämmige Mitglieder unsrer Kirche angesehen werden. Wir verweisen angelegentlich auf die hier beiliegenden Nummern des „Salt Lake City-Beobacters“, der von der Kirche für ihre deutschsprechenden Mitglieder in Amerika herausgegeben wird. Die Einweihung dieses Denkmals hat am 30. Mai d.J. im Beisein des deutschen Militärattachés, Generalmajors von Bötticher, stattgefunden. Der zweitoberste Führer des Kirche hat dabei das

Weihegebet gesprochen. „Der Beobachter“ ist die älteste deutsche Zeitung in Westen Amerikas und wurde von der Kirche ins Leben gerufen, um die deutschstämmigen Mitglieder der Kirche in ihrem Bestreben, ihre Sprache und ihr Volkstum sich auch in Amerika zu erhalten, zu unterstützen.

Aus den weiter angeschlossenen gedruckten Unterlagen werden Sie noch manche andre Beweise der gutdeutschen, völkischen Gesinnung und Einstellung unsrer Mitglieder entnehmen können.

(Beilagen 4)

4.

Für das Verhältnis unsrer Kirche zu andern Kirchen ist unser folgender Glaubensartikel maßgebend:

„Wir erheben Anspruch auf das Recht, den allmächtigen Gott zu verehren nach den Eingebungen unsres Gewissens und gestatten allen Menschen das selbe Rechte, mögen sie verehren wie, wo oder was sie wollen.“

Wie schon hervorgehoben, gehen wir allem religiösen Streit aus dem Wege, denn es ist uns durch Offenbarung ausdrücklich geboten worden: „Kämpfet gegen keine Kirche!“ Wir anerkennen das Gute, woimmer wir es finden und nehmen Wahrheit an aus jeder Quelle. Unser Führer Brigham Young hat einst den Katholiken einen Bauplatz geschenkt, damit sie in der Salzseestadt in Amerika eine Kirche bauen konnten, und dieser Seit der Duldsamkeit beseelt die Kirche noch heute. Wir glauben, daß jeder Mensch für sich selbst verantwortlich ist, und daß den Stifter des Christentums nichts so sehr betrübt wie die Unduldsamkeit und der Bruderzwist in den Reihen Seiner angeblichen Jünger. Deshalb schärfen wir allen unsern Mitgliedern und Beamten ein, andre Kirchen in Ruhe zu lassen, und diese Vorschrift wird auch allgemein befolgt.

(Beilagen 5)

5.

Zur Erreichung der kirchlichen Zwecke und Ziele dient eine Organisation, die der von Christus ins Leben gerufenen entspricht: Profeten, Apostel, Patriarchen, Hohenpriester, Siebziger, Aelteste, Bischöfe usw. Sind als Beamte und Lehrer tätig, um die Mitglieder zu unterweisen und die Verwaltungsarbeiten zu erledigen. Alle Beamten üben ihre Tätigkeit ehrenamtlich aus und erhalten keinerlei finanzielle Entschädigung. „Umsonst habt ihr's empfangen, umsonst gebet es auch!“ ist ein grundlegendes Gesetz in der Kirche. Da die Organisation sehr reichhaltig gegliedert ist und infolgedessen sehr viele Mitglieder ehrenamtlich tätig sind, kann die Arbeit so verteilt werden, daß sie in der Regel neben der Berufsarbeit getan werden kann, den einzelnen also nicht zu stark belastet. Im Außendienst sind Missionare tätig, die ebenfalls ohne Lohn oder Gehalt arbeiten, sogar die Kosten ihres Unterhaltes aus eigener Tasche oder mit Hilfe von Angehörigen und Freunden bestreiten müssen. Meist sind es jüngere Leute, die sich der Kirche zu diesem Zwecke für zwei und mehr Jahre freiwillig zur Verfügung stellen und dabei von ihren Eltern unterstützt werden, soweit ihre eigenen Ersparnisse nicht ausreichen.

Die Kirche huldigt dem Grundsatz der Selbstverwaltung. Die in über hundert Orten des deutschen Sprachgebietes bestehenden Gemeinden werden

meist von einheimischen Mitgliedern geleitet: gewöhnlich ist es ein Präsident mit zwei Ratgebern, denen noch eine Priesterschaft, bestehend aus Aeltesten, Priestern, Lehrern und Diakonen, zur Seit steht. Die Priesterschaft besteht ausschließlich aus einheimischen Männern. Die Frauen haben ihre eigene Organisation, den sogen. Frauenhilfsverein, der vornehmlich Wohltätigkeits- und Ausbildungszwecke verfolgt und dessen Leitung ganz in den Händen ortsansässiger, deutscher Frauen liegt.

(Beilagen 6)

Wir hoffen, Ihnen hiermit einen Einblick in unsre Lehren und Bestrebungen gegeben zu haben und würden uns freuen, wenn Sie sich aus der beiliegenden Literatur über die einzelnen Punkte noch weiter unterrichten würden. Im übrigen verbürgen sich die Unterzeichneten ausdrücklich dafür, daß sich unsre Körperschaft allen staatlichen Gesetzen und Einrichtungen unterwirft, und daß sich insbesondere unsre Missionare, ihrer rein religiösen Sendung gemäß, in keinerlei Weise politisch betätigen.

Wir sehen Ihrer endgültigen Entscheidung nunmehr gerne entgegen und verharren inzwischen in vollkommener Hochachtung.

Schweizerisch-Deutsche Mission

(Unterschrift)

Appendix B

September 8th, 1933
 State Secret Service Police Office
 Service Station Ad. II E, Room 218
 Prinz Albrechtstr. 28
 Berlin

Gentlemen,

In keeping with our conversation yesterday, and in compliance with your request, I make the following statement concerning

THE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST OF LATTER-DAY SAINTS

The name of the Church is the “Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints,” often called “Mormons.” Although the word “Mormon” is but a nickname, we recognize it when we hear it. This name is derived from a book by the same name, which book was translated from golden plates on which was engraved a history of the American people. We claim it to be the first authentic history of the American people as far back as 600 B.C. It is particularly the history of the American Indian.

The Church was organized on the sixth day of April in the year 1830 at Fayette, state of New York, United States of America. It is called the “Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints” because we claim that through Christ it was organized. The term “Latter-day Saints” is to distinguish the followers of Christ in this day from those in former days, or in the days of the Apostles.

Our articles of faith are: (quoted article of faith)

The German–Austria Mission of the Church Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints comprises the north central and southeast part of Germany, and all of Austria; therefore it is called the German–Austrian Mission.

Our teachings are that those desiring to become members of the Church must be converted of their own free will and choice to the Gospel of Jesus Christ as found in the Bible and is taught by the Church. Before their baptism, or entrance into the Church, individuals must prove themselves worthy of membership; and certainly afterward are they expected, above all else, to be trustworthy, honest, virtuous, kind, and faithful.

If a member, or members, of the Church are known to be engaged in immoral practices, and do not immediately repent and lived in keeping with the teachings of the Church in this respect, they are excommunicated. These members are also taught to be exemplary in their own homes. The man is to make peace with his wife, and a wife is to make peace with her husband, and the parents are to make peace with children. It is expected that love abide in their homes,

and that they thank the lord, morning and evening, for every blessing received, and, at the same time, ask for his protection during the day.

It is expected that every eligible member of this Church marry and live first great commandment—"multiplied to replenish the earth"—and that each of the contracting parties be true to themselves and to each other—a single standard of morality. Their children, and their children's children are taught personal cleanliness, and also to keep what we call the "Word of Wisdom," abstaining from the use of tobacco, intoxicating liquors, and other harmful beverages.

They are also taught, especially, to be able to class themselves with the best citizens of the country, and to support, in the full sense of the word, the ordinances and laws of the town, the state, and the country in which they live. The authorities of our Church have no advice to give regarding party politics, leaving the members free to identify themselves with whatever party they choose; but in any event, we teach that the present party in power, and the laws governing the country, be supported by the members of the church.

We have our own Church and own convictions concerning what it advocates, and we expect to carry our convictions through for the sake of our eternal salvation, so long as we do not come in conflict with the fixed laws of the government.

Our organizations are kept up, more or less, by free will donations. Considerable amounts of money come in and from America every year and are spent in Germany by the missionaries of this Church, which money is spent for their traveling, board and living expenses. Not a cent is received by these missionaries from the mission, but they're supported by themselves or by their parents in America.

Our work in this country is headed by an organization called the "Association of the German–Austrian Mission of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter–day Saints," consisting of German citizens. It is a registered corporate body like any other organization in Germany.

Now in conclusion, as to your question concerning my attitude as president of the mission, let me say that nearly 40 years ago I spent three years here in Germany, at which time I learned the language in Berlin and had a splendid opportunity throughout the country to become acquainted with the German people. Therefore, for nearly 40 years, I have studied this people, and not only studied them, but have actually spent six years, all told, in the various cities in Germany, and up to the present time I have been a friend and supporter of the German people in their righteous endeavors. I have, possibly, seen this country at its best and again at its worst. And through it all I can truthfully say that the Germans possess a personal pride that is seldom found in other countries. They're full of vitality and ambition and are workers of the first class. No mat-

ter whether they possess much or little, their personal appearance is kept up to the highest degree, clothes pressed, shoes polished, hair combed and all in all, those who desire to live the good life are wholesome to look upon.

Of all the many foreign countries it has been my privilege to visit, give me Germany with its activity and high notions of thrift and prosperity. I have spent many thousands of Marks for railroad fare alone, and have visited many cities time and time again in this beautiful country. I can truthfully say that every courtesy has been accorded me by railroad officials, city officials, traffic officers, and the citizens of the country generally. I most highly appreciate the privilege of spending some time among this great people, representing as I do the Church to which I belong in a most worthy cause for the good and benefit of mankind, as well as for their moral and spiritual uplift.

Any detailed information regarding our faith or general attitude will be gladly furnished.

I thank you for the privilege of making the foregoing statement.

I am
Respectfully yours,
Oliver H. Budge
President of the German–Austrian Mission
Of the Church Jesus Christ of Latter–day
Saints.

PS. I am enclosing a number of cards with the 13 Articles of Faith, and two copies of our magazine, “Der Stern,” no. 2 from the volume for the year 1931, and no. 15 from the volume for the year 1933. In the latter number permit me to refer you to the article entitled “A Friend of Justice.”

Translation of illustrated article under the title

“In The Land of the Mormons”

by President Alfred C. Rees

Völkischer Beobachter

Berlin, Germany

April 14, 1939

How would you like to live in a city that is 4,300 feet above sea level; that nestles in a broad valley, surrounded entirely by rugged, picturesque mountains, whose tops are covered with eternal snow, a veritable fortress set up by Nature, apparently intended to defy invasion either by water, land or sky?

Such a place is Salt Lake City, capital of the state of Utah, scenic centre of America, the renowned gathering place and radiating point of the Mormon church; two day's travel from New York, one day from the Pacific Coast.

As any one of us, who have visited that remarkable city, will testify, it is one of the most attractive, beautifully situated cities in all the world; clean, modern, pulsating with life and glowing with hospitality; with a history of achievement that at once challenges out admiration.

And what a tragedy lies back of this outstanding accomplishment! Less than 100 years ago, all that vast, limitless territory, encompassed by the Rocky Mountains, was the very symbol of desolation. Little was known of it. Only a few venturesome trappers entered that forbidding waste. The silence of centuries brooded over that region of violent excesses of heat and cold.

It was in this very valley of threatening starvation and death that a little band of people sought refuge in 1847, after they had been persecuted, pillaged, plundered and driven from their comfortable homes in Eastern United States by mobs of priests and politicians.

Since there were no railroad connections until the late '60s, those who joined the early Mormon forces came by ox-teams and even handcarts. There are still men and women living in Utah, who, as girls and boys, covered that entire distance on foot, sustained and strengthened in all of their trials and tribulations by the knowledge that they were escaping the cruel persecutions that had been heaped upon them on account of their religious beliefs; and by the hope that peace and security awaited them somewhere in the unknown West.

This bitter, historic experience had produced out of the Mormons a determined, practical people, as a result of which, they perhaps, better than many other, can appreciate what the German people endured as they passed through their hardships.

Thus the Mormon people know what persecution and suppression mean. And the German people, who have gone through the shadow of the valley since the World War; and who have been forced to rely upon their own strength and determination, and upon their undying belief in their own ability to restore their self-respect and their merited place among the mighty in the sisterhood

of nations, reveal that same progressive character, which does not shun obstacles. For that reason, to a student of Mormonism, recent developments in Germany present a most impressive study.

From the very beginning, the Mormon people took care of their poor. They saw to it that the administration of relief was always in local hands, in order to limit abuses. They provided for an intimate personal acquaintanceship between those who gave and those who received. The result of this system of Mormon relief has brought about the total absence of want and suffering among their people in every community where the established principles and rules of the church are observed. It is upon this deep rooted principle that the Mormon church is now carrying out its widely publicized and praised program of self help at a time when ten million Americans are jobless and idle, due to a departure from America's traditional economic, industrial system.

In order to produce a sound body, Mormons have advocated and practiced, since 1830, what they call the "Word of Wisdom", which calls for the total abstinence from the use of tobacco, alcohol, tea, coffee, and for the sparing use of meat. Statistics in the United States show that, as a result of close adherence to this formula, the Mormon people are freer from contagious and hereditary diseases, than any other people in the United States; and, in fact, the world. That is why the Mormon people, perhaps, more than any other people in all the world, pay high tribute to the German government for its bold declaration of war against the use of alcohol and tobacco by the youth of Germany.

Mormon people are proverbially practical believers, not only in the sanctity of the home, but also in large families. They are unalterably opposed to birth control, which they view as a contributing factor to the destruction of any race. The industry of men and women throughout Germany is a reminder of the proverbial attitude of the Mormon people toward work. It was Brigham Young who announced that the loafer should not eat the bread of the worker. In fact, the coat of arms of Utah is the beehive, indicative of the industry and cooperative spirit of the people.

Perhaps the outstanding financial system of the world for the maintenance of a religious organization is to be found in Mormonism: It is their Tithing System. A true, faithful Mormon pays to the church one-tenth of his total income for the upkeep of the church and its institutions. This has placed the church on a sound financial basis, and has made possible its remarkable expansion, growth and development and operation of its far flung educational and social institutions, all conducted under church supervision; also in the erection and maintenance of commodious places of worship, which dot and beautify the entire length and breadth of the land, in which the church has a following. Here is the application of the German ideal: Community welfare before personal welfare. Mormons are practical exponents of that wholesome doctrine.

Among these institutions of learning of which the Mormon church is especially proud, is the Brigham Young University, located in Provo, about a two hour's drive from Salt Lake City. That institution was established under the direction of a distinguished German, Dr. Karl G. Maeser, who was born in

Meissen, Saxony, joined the Mormon faith, came to Utah, and was charged by Brigham Young with the responsibility of establishing that institution.

The Mormon church makes the unique claim of having been established by direct revelation from God, through the instrumentality of a young man by the name of Joseph Smith, who, though unlettered and untutored, laid down principles of conduct in the realm of religion; announced truths in the field of general science; and gave to the world a philosophy of life, that challenge the thinking of every unbiased mind.

Among the Mormons who have made notable contributions to world thought is also J. Reuben Clark Jr., a member of the First Presidency of the Mormon church. He is an acknowledged diplomat, was United States Ambassador to Mexico, and today is the head of the Foreign Bondholders Association, which represents not only the United States government, but all Americans who hold securities of foreign countries. Mr. Clark is a frequent visitor to Berlin.

Perhaps the persistent driving force and the unfailing courage of the Mormon people find explanation in their belief that man is immortal; that he lives beyond the grave; that he continues in his program of eternal progression; that divinity and complete mastery over all forces is his goal and destiny. In fact, their belief is crystallized thus; "As God now is, man may become." Mormonism sees in God a personal, living Being.

**RELIGIOUS FREEDOM IN BELGIUM: A LIMITED STUDY OF
CHALLENGES AS EXPERIENCED BY LDS CHILDREN AND YOUTH IN
FLEMISH CLASSROOMS FROM THE 1970'S UNTIL TODAY**

Ingrid Sherlock-Taselaar

Abstract: The 19th and 20th Articles of the Belgian Constitution provide for freedom of religion. The Federal and Flemish Regional governments generally respect this right in practice even though they only accord so-called “recognized” status to a small number of mainstream religions. The lack of “recognized” status does not prevent a religious group from practicing freely and openly but the repercussions of this interpretation of the constitution does affect many aspects of life for members of religious organizations without “recognized” status. By law, all Belgian school have to provide two hours of religious education yet the religions covered are only those which have “recognized” status or non-confessional moral education. This means Latter-day Saint (LDS) pupils are faced with having to attend two hours of religious education in a religion which is not their own because the LDS church does not have “recognized” status. This paper is a limited study about the challenges LDS children, youth, and their parents experience in Flemish classrooms.

For some time now there has been a debate in Belgium about the acceptability of displaying and/or wearing religious symbols of any kind in public and whether a restriction would represent an infringement on religious freedom. Unlike in France there is no unified policy or law on this subject. This may, in part, be due to the complexity of the issue as T. Jeremy Gunn so eloquently explained in his article on the subject but looking at Belgium specifically one cannot escape the feeling that there is a degree of complacency.¹ As the matter stands now individual schools and public institutions set their own policies ranging from complete freedom to comprehensive restrictions. Lately this has led to bitter confrontations between interested parties.²

¹ Gunn T. Jeremy, ‘The Complexity of Religion and the Definition of “Religion” in International Law’, *Harvard Human Rights Journal*, 16 (Spring 2003), 189-215.

² A ban on the wearing of Muslim head scarves in several Flemish Community Education schools from September 1, 2009, has led to angry demonstrations

Displaying and/or wearing of religious symbols are, however, but a small part of freedom of religion. In Article 18 of The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 10th December 1948 freedom of religion is defined as follows:

Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right included freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance.

The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (March 23rd 1976) elaborates on the 18th Article of the UDHR by adding that 'the States Parties to the present Covenant undertake to have respect for the liberty of parents and, where applicable, legal guardians to ensure the religious and moral education of their children in conformity with their own convictions'.³

Earlier this year I was talking to some youth of the Antwerp ward of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints and perchance the conversation turned to their experiences in school in relation to their church membership. It appeared that their experiences were different from my own recollections of school life in the 70's through the mid 80's and an opportunity seemed to present itself to take a closer look at the experiences and possible challenges faced by Latter-day Saint (LDS) pupils and their parents in Flemish classrooms. Through a voluntary survey Latter-day Saint parents and youth were asked about their choice of schools, their experiences, and challenges.⁴ This paper is only a small part of more extensive research into the subject.

and counter demonstrations near government buildings and the schools concerned, intimidation of girls complying with the new policy, law suits, and withdrawal of girls from the schools concerned.

³ International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, G.A. res. 2200A (XXI), 21 U.N. GAOR Supp. (No. 16) at 52, U.N. Doc. A/6316 (1966), 999 U.N.T.S. 171, entered into force on March 23, 1976.

⁴ Due to its voluntary nature, end of year examinations, proximity of the holidays and time constraints the survey was limited. There was a survey for parents of children and/or youth who are or were in school (17 parents responded about 39 children/youth). There was also a survey for the youth themselves (9 youth responded).

Belgium attracted a lot of media attention in the months following the federal elections of 10 June 2007. The cause for this attention, often in the form of an analysis of Belgium's history and future, was in part due to the fact that for nigh to a year after this election the country had effectively no government and in part because the headquarters of the European Union and NATO are in Brussels. Once again rumours about Belgium's future were rife. In spite of all this attention, the historical, lingual, and indeed political situation of Belgium is for most outsiders shrouded in obfuscation.

For the purposes of this paper it suffices to say that in 1830, the year that The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints was organized, Dutch-speaking Flanders was joined to French-speaking Wallonia, to form a small independent and in many aspects artificial country called Belgium. It would be fair though perhaps not politically correct to say that Belgium was created as a buffer-state between its neighbours. Throughout history, from the moment that the Latin and Germanic worlds met around the start of the Common Era, the boundaries and the sovereigns of this tiny piece of land have been in constant flux. Battles were fought and patrimonies were spread and as a result of these different influences Belgium is a country abounding in peculiarities. Outsiders are often left to wonder how in this age when many new countries are formed from the disintegration of old powers, Belgium remains one country. Perhaps it is just a matter of making the best of a bad deal.

One of Belgium's peculiarities, pertinent to this paper is the issue of freedom of religion. Belgium was a signatory to the UDHR and the 19th and 20th Articles of the Belgian Constitution provide for freedom of religion. The Federal and Flemish Regional governments generally respect this right in practice even though they only accord so-called "recognized" status to a small number of mainstream religions. The lack of "recognized" status does not prevent a religious group from practicing freely and openly but the repercussions of this interpretation of the constitution does affect many aspects of life for members of religious organizations without "recognized" status. The most obvious repercussion is that it precludes these organisations from government subsidies. In 2008 the subsidies made by the Belgian federal government amounted to €106 million.⁵ On the face of it this lack of government

⁵ United States Department of State, 2008 *Report on International Religious Freedom – Belgium*, 19 September 2008. Online. UNHCR Refworld, available at <http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/docid/48d5cbd46f.html> (accessed 14 April 2009).

subsidy should not pose a problem for The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints as it is a church with a lay ministry. While this is true, government subsidies to “recognized” religious organizations do not only cover their ministers of religion but also, for example, the salaries and social contributions of teachers in public schools. It is in the area of education that the lack of “recognized” status is potentially an issue for Latter-day Saint parents and pupils.

In order to understand why this is an issue one has to have a modicum of understanding of the educational system. In Belgium compulsory education does not mean compulsory schooling so children do not have to go to school to learn, home education is also possible. The Constitutional Amendment of 15 July 1998 transferred the responsibilities of education from the federal government to the communities and each community now has their own educational system. The federal government only decides on the start and the end of compulsory education, the minimum conditions of obtaining a diploma and education staff pensions.

In Flanders there are three educational systems. The first one is Community Education (GO). Primary schools in this system attract 14.4% of pupils while 16.5% of pupils attend its secondary schools. Secondly there are the Subsidised Publicly Run Schools (OGO). These are municipal or provincial run schools and 22.3% of pupils attend its primary schools and 7.8% attend its secondary schools. Thirdly there are the Subsidised Privately Run schools (VGO). These are the confessional schools (Roman Catholic, Anglican, Jewish and Islamic schools) and the method schools such as Steiner and Montessori schools. The vast majority of these schools are however Roman Catholic. The Subsidised Privately Run schools attract 63.3% of primary school pupils and 75.7% of secondary school pupils.⁶ The curricula and certification of each of the three systems are officially recognized as equal. In the mind of the people, however, they are not equal and the Subsidised Privately Run schools are generally thought of as providing a higher standard of education and a stricter discipline.

Unlike some other European countries all three Flemish educational systems are required to provide a minimum of two weekly hours devoted to religious education or ethics on their timetables. In the

⁶ Figures taken from: *Synopsis van de onderwijssystemen en lopende hervormingen in Europa. België-Vlaamse gemeenschap*, januari 2009, p. 1, available at http://www.ond.vlaanderen.be/english/eurydice/downloads/Synopsis_BN_NL_2008-2009_final.pdf (accessed 14 April 2009).

Community Education schools and in the Subsidised Publicly Run Schools these hours are filled in by lessons on a confessional basis i.e. Roman Catholic, Anglican, Jewish, Islamic, or Orthodox. For those who do not identify with any of the former there is Non-Confessional Moral Education. The Subsidised Privately Run schools are only required to provide their own religious or ethical education but are free to offer lessons in any other main-stream religions or Non-Confessional Moral Education.⁷ Although by law they must accept children that are not of their confession, a direct result of this freedom to offer only one choice in religious education is that, with the exception of Muslim schools, Subsidised Privately Run schools have fewer non-European immigrants attending than in the other two education systems.

As can be deduced from above only the religions with a “recognized” status can provide confessional schools or confession specific education within the educational system. For LDS parents this means that in all education systems in Flanders they have to make a choice with regards to religious education. Either they choose a confessional school where their child will follow classes in a specific religion or they choose one of the other non-confession specific school systems. If they choose the latter they need to choose whether they register their children for religious classes or for Non-Confessional Moral Education. If they opt for religious classes they have to choose one of the religions with “recognized” status. In the secondary schools of the Community Education a pupil can apply for an opt-out of these classes but the schools do not offer it as an option in their list of choices and thus parents have to be aware that they can apply for an opt-out. The school is legally obliged to grant the opt-out when requested. Among teaching staff, however, there is often an unspoken opposition to these opt-outs because some pupils use these two hours as free periods rather than study their own religion. This is rightly perceived as unfair.

In summary one can say that although Flanders is multi-religious, it is not yet inter-religious and the majority of the Flemish people still identify with the Roman Catholic Church even though they seldom set foot in a church. This is strongly reflected in the educational system and the choice of schools.

As to the results of the questionnaires, a number of interesting general observations can be made:

⁷ <http://www.ond.vlaanderen.be/edulex/database/document/document.asp?docid=12254#135343>

1. The choice of school: in the past LDS children were fairly evenly spread over the three education systems (of the answers received eleven attended a Subsidised Privately Run school, six a Community Education school, and three a Subsidised Publicly Run Schools). Reasons for this were not given in the questionnaires but it appears that most parents were converts to the LDS Church and the choice of school was made before their conversion. Present-day parents, however, chose overwhelmingly for Subsidised Privately Run schools (for every three pupils in Subsidised Privately Run schools only one chose for the two other educational systems together).
2. As to the question of whether their choice of school was a conscious choice we see that both in the past as well as today the choice often was a conscious choice. In the past, however, many factors played a role, not least the proximity of the school but also the reputation of the school or the school where all the neighbours went to. Today, however, parents are looking for schools where Christian values are taught, where there is a strict discipline, and where there are standards in clothing, language, and behaviour.
3. Today the religious beliefs of the parents influence the choice of school more than they did in the past. The data, however, could be flawed inasmuch as many parents in the past were converts themselves and their children were already in a particular school system whereas the majority of parents today are second generation LDS. A few chose on purpose a Community Education school for their children because of the negative attitudes they experienced themselves in a Subsidised Privately Run school when they and their parents converted to the LDS Church.
4. In the past few pupils opted out of religious classes to take classes in Non-Confessional Moral Education. This was due in part because not every school offered the subject and in part because these classes did not coincide with the regular religious classes and the pupil had to be taken out of other lessons or was taught during the lunch break. Today about a third of LDS pupils that take Non-Confessional Moral Education and where

the subject is on offer, the classes coincide with the other religious education classes.

5. Both in the past as well as today schools, individual teachers, friends and their parents of primary school children know that a child is LDS. Usually this is mentioned at registration by the parents or the children themselves talk about it. In secondary education this picture changes. In the past the schools were informed by the parents upon registration, the teachers were informed by the school management and other pupils soon found out from the youths themselves or via the grapevine. Bearing in mind that a relative small number of youth as of yet have answered the questionnaire due to end of year examinations it appears that today's youth is more inclined to only tell their best friends. Schools appear rather ambivalent as is evinced by teachers of religion or Non-Confessional Moral Education asking at the beginning of a new school year whether there are any pupils with a different faith even though the school management is aware of this fact. Without surveying schools, it is difficult to establish why schools appear to be ambivalent. Perhaps it is connected to funding because the school receives a certain amount of money per pupil and every Euro counts in the current climate of reduced subsidies. Perhaps schools are afraid for legal repercussions if they select pupils based on their religious affiliation.

The questionnaires further indicated that in general LDS pupils were and are well accepted in all three Flemish education systems. Many positive experiences were shared but there were also quite a number of negative experiences. In light of the fact that it is quite difficult to quantify an experience as positive or negative because it is entirely subjective, the experience will be viewed through the eyes of the person who shared the experience.

As was expected there were less challenges and more positive experiences for pupils in primary education in the past as well as today. Among the positive experiences reported were:

1. Quite a number of pupils in the past and today were given an opportunity to give a presentation about their faith in class.

2. A few pupils today invited some of their classmates and their teacher to their baptism. These were impressed by the service, the high moral standards that are taught and adhered to from a very young age and the dedication of members. This was of later benefit inasmuch as it precluded pupils from asking awkward questions later or teasing the LDS pupils.
3. Children in the past and today were popular because they knew the stories of the Bible very well.
4. Several modern parents mentioned that they considered the dress standards of and discipline in Subsidised Privately Run schools a positive experience as it agreed with their own dress standard and views on discipline and behaviour in general.

There were very few negative experiences reported during the years in primary education:

1. One respondent answered that being Dutch was more of a problem than being LDS although the school had handled the issue effectively.
2. One seven-year old in the 70's was told that she was going to hell because she was not going to receive Holy Communion for the first time nor had she been baptized. The pupil was sufficiently secure in her faith to tell her parents that the other children did not know any better so it did not really matter what they said.
3. Another who had missed the school bus was questioned by the teacher whether they had come to school late on purpose so as to miss the Mass the class was attending that morning.
4. Some parents of pupils who chose Non-Confessional Moral Education found that rather than non-confessional the teachings were atheistic.
5. Some parents reported that parents of their children's friends are very suspicious if their child is invited to a church activity even when this activity is not church orientated.

In secondary education the picture changes once again. It appears that in the past teenagers had no problems telling peers and teachers that they were LDS whereas today it is more on a need-to-know basis only. Nevertheless the amount of negative experiences seems to remain constant. Negative experiences reported by pupils in the past centred on:

1. Questions around polygamy which were in contrast to the pupil's own moral standards.
2. Some pupils were singled out during sex education classes as the old fashioned ones or those without experience.

3. Fellow pupils were bothered by encounters with overzealous missionaries in town and projected this on the LDS pupils.
4. The Word of Wisdom. Adherence to the Word of Wisdom was considered childish. One pupil was given a baby bottle with milk at the start of a party. Rather than being subject to ridicule, this young man calmly unscrewed the top of the bottle, drank the milk and handed the bottle back. They clearly had not expected that and backed off.
5. By far the worst experience reported was an incident that took place in the late 70's and early 80's where a pupil was repeatedly pressured into leaving the church or denying her ridiculous beliefs. It was known in the school that the pupil had been accepted by Brigham Young University for the Fall semester of that year, starting in the middle of August. Quite surprisingly she failed the final examination of one of her best subjects and the teacher gloated that now she could not go to BYU as she had to re-sit the examination in the last days of August. Upon submitting her second examination the stunned pupil was told that she had passed already the first time. The result, however, was that she was not able to start at Brigham Young University in the Fall semester and had to postpone her studies to the Winter semester.⁸
6. On the whole it appears that negative experiences reported by modern pupils centre more on what they do or do not do rather than their faith. Comments are made about their choice of music, the films they watch or do not watch, and very often their

⁸ At that time Belgian secondary school examinations were not state-run as is the case in many countries. Individual subject teachers wrote, corrected, and marked the examinations. Pupils or parents generally did not question marks and subjected themselves to the verdict on the report card. This is demonstrated by the fact that neither the pupil nor the parents questioned the result and accepted that the pupil had seemingly failed in one of her best subjects. Belgium is generally not a society where litigation is the norm and so legal action against a school with regards to school results would neither have been considered by parents nor feared by the school. Things have changed since and parents now have the right to see the examinations of their children in the presence of the teachers and someone from the school management.

dress standard. It was interesting that a number of male respondents answered that they did not encounter problems being LDS as such but that they were bothered by the behaviour and dress standard of females at parties. The single item that came up most was church attendance. Friends and acquaintances often declared the respondents mad to not only go to church but to go so early and for three hours. It was also regarded as frustrating that parties outside church which are often attended with friends from school only start on Saturday evening at 23:00.

Positive experiences included being given an opportunity to give a presentation about their faith. Someone reported that she was asked by a fellow pupil to pray for him so he would pass his music examination. She was relieved to hear he passed when he came to thank her.

Although there are not yet enough data to draw firm conclusions, we see that the secularization of Belgium, its general aversion to organised religion after centuries of what is perceived as oppression by the Catholic Church, and the compulsory lessons of religion or ethics do create challenges but also unique experiences for LDS youths. In the past the majority of the country was observant Catholic to some degree. This religiosity was most apparent in schools where pupils in all but the Community Education schools often attended masses and engaged in other religious festivals and/or projects. By partly participating in these activities (e.g. attending mass but not partaking of the sacrament) LDS pupils were mostly perceived as somewhat different but not as “the other.” As a result of today’s LDS youths being more selective in sharing the fact that they are LDS and schools, especially secondary schools, being less involved in offering religious activities outside the regular hours religious tuition, the positive and negative experiences have moved somewhat away from the classroom setting and pupil’s “otherness” is less pronounced in their school lives but more pronounced in their out of school lives.

The above results and the current charged situation surrounding public display of religious symbols make one wonder whether the Belgian government can continue to be complacent in the issues surrounding the freedom of religion. Furthermore perhaps a case can be made that the Belgian government is in breach of the UDHR and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Such a case would be based on the assumption that a government cannot compel all pupils to take two hours of religious education or non-confessional moral edu-

cation yet at the same time seemingly prohibit any religion without “recognized” status to provide teachers to teach their adherents thereby forcing them to choose the next best thing. An initial step to remedy this situation is perhaps to separate the issue of subsidies from the liberty of parents to ensure that the religious and moral education of their children is in conformity with their own conviction as enshrined in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Equally one is left to wonder whether the LDS Church should not do more to receive “recognized” status by challenging the current interpretation of both Article 18 of UDHR, its amendment in the form of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the Belgian Constitution on the above grounds. Were the LDS church, however, to succeed in this challenge it would have to provide qualified teachers of religion because voluntary teachers without the proper qualifications as is the case with most teachers in an LDS setting would, for obvious reasons, not be acceptable by the law and that too costs money. Perhaps, as with all things, it comes down to money.

UTAH AND ALL THESE CHERRIES: MORMONISM IN FALLACI'S *UN
CAPPELLO PIENO DI CILIEGE*

Massimo Introvigne

Oriana Fallaci (1929–2006) originally planned to divide her historical novel *Un cappello pieno di ciliege*, which was published posthumously in 2008, into five parts dealing with the branches of her family which descended from her four grandparents. The story is a complicated one, and would be of interest only to the Fallaci family, if it was not for the fact that the late journalist is world famous. The fourth part, particularly, was published as it was left by the author even though it was clearly in need of revisions. The final part on Fascist Italy, and the activities of her parents as anti-Fascist freedom fighters, was never written.

Fallaci's observations concerning religion are particularly instructive. *Un cappello* includes in its second part a number of anti-Islamic remarks, which would sound familiar to readers of Fallaci's post-9/11 anti-Islamic bestsellers. Her maternal grandmother's ancestor Daniello Launaro (1731–1773), who was kidnapped, enslaved, and killed by Algerian pirates. Fallaci paints a grim picture of slavery under North African Moslems, and compares it unfavourably with other forms of slavery which were admittedly practised by Christians. Fallaci claimed that those enslaved by Moslems, unless they converted to Islam, were much more likely to be tortured or killed. The passages are not exactly new, and a number of historians would agree with her conclusions, but they will surely incense critics of Fallaci, who will claim that she does not see the evil of Christian slavery and that her book is full of her vintage anti-Islamic tirades.



Figure 1. Oriana Fallaci (1929–2006).

But *Un cappello* is not particularly pro-Christian. Fallaci's family was secular and anticlerical and she also became an atheist and never converted to Christianity. But after 9/11 she came to the conclusion that Christianity, and particularly the Catholic Church, was the only agency capable of providing the West with the essential moral force to fight Islam. Much to the chagrin of her liberal friends, she came to the conclusion that the public role of the Catholic Church, and its opposition to abortion and gay rights, should be firmly supported in order to defend the Western tradition which was threatened by Islam. She also expressed a new respect for religion and for the Catholic Church, sought a private meeting with Benedict XVI (whom she greatly admired), and on her deathbed she was assisted by the pro-life Roman Catholic Bishop Rino Fisichella. To the further chagrin of her anticlerical family, she left her papers and library to the Catholic Church, although Bishop Fisichella said that in her last moments he respected her willingness to not convert.

It is unlikely that *Un cappello* was revised after September 2001 because of its anticlericalism and criticism of the Catholic Church. One of the characters she most admires in her genealogical tree is Caterina Zani (1765–1841) who is nicknamed “Caterina the Great.” She was the wife of Carlo Fallaci (1752–1839) and a typical village atheist of the Enlightenment. An equally typical Italian anticlerical character is Gio-

batta Cantini (1823–1861), great-grandfather of Fallaci's mother. Fallaci praises the socialist activities of Giobatta in the Italian Risorgimento (i.e. the national fight to create a unified Kingdom of Italy, not supported by the Catholic Church since the fight was led by anti-Catholics and would necessarily involve depriving the Pope of his political power on Rome and the neighbouring regions), and his anticlericalism. The Catholic Church is depicted as a sad, sexist, and anti-feminist institution. The only Catholic priests and friars who are treated sympathetically are those who fought Islam, or tried to help the prisoners enslaved by Moslem pirates, in the 18th and early 19th centuries. Arguably Fallaci would certainly not have presented, at least in these crude terms, such a characterization of the Catholic Church after 9/11.

In *Un cappello* Fallaci's grandmother, on her father's side, was raised in a Waldensian family. Although Fallaci praises the Waldensian resistance against Catholic persecution, she regards the Waldensians of the nineteenth century as no better than their Catholic counterparts. Her ancestors were part of the so called Revival Movement, which swept the Waldensian valleys in the mid-nineteenth century and which was similar to revival movements that took place in other parts of the Protestant world. Fallaci depicts the Revival as an explosion of fanaticism and puritanism, which reduced Waldensian women who were caught in the movement to a status where their sexuality was entirely denied, which was even worse than the situation of women in contemporary Catholicism.

Fallaci notes that some of these Piedmontese Waldensians escaped their valleys by converting to Mormonism and emigrating to Utah. This is a subject almost forgotten in Italy, particularly during the 1990s when Fallaci was writing *Un cappello*. Although Fallaci was obviously familiar with this history it is unclear how much of her family history is true and how much was improvised. But Fallaci claims that she is relating family traditions that she heard from her paternal grandmother. Fallaci wrote that her great-grandmother Anastasia Ferrier (1846–1889) was an illegitimate child of a Waldensian mother and since such children were routinely taken from their mothers and educated in the Catholic faith, her birth was not registered and there was no birth certificate. In fact, there is no firm evidence that this great-grandmother ever actually existed.

Fallaci claims that Anastasia was a successful dancer at the Teatro Regio of Turin, until she was seduced when she was 18 and left pregnant by "the Unnamed" who was a famous character in the Italian

Risorgimento. Although Fallaci promised her grandmother to never reveal the entity of “the Unnamed,” she does give both his birth and death dates (1816–1878). Those who think they can simply google the dates and identify the Unnamed are quickly disappointed. There is no famous Risorgimento character, living in Turin when Anastasia was allegedly there, corresponding to these dates (the nationalist painter Domenico Induno would fit the dates, but he lived in Milan and was never as rich and famous as Fallaci’s Unnamed). Fallaci’s fans, who are part of an active network on the Internet, have speculated that giving the exact dates would have been tantamount to disclosing the identity of the Unnamed. They believe that the death date, 1878, is correct but the birth date, 1816, is a pun on “1861,” the date the Kingdom of Italy was proclaimed, a clue to the fact that the Unnamed was in fact the first Italian King, Victor Emmanuel II (1820–1878), who had many lovers and illegitimate children, who is mentioned in the book as an admirer of Anastasia as a dancer, and who otherwise fits the clues disseminated in *Un cappello*. It is of course also true that fans are quite happy to place royal blood in Fallaci’s veins.

According to Fallaci, the Unnamed gave a fair amount of money to Anastasia to permit her to leave Turin and travel to Cesena where she found revolutionary friends, developed an interest in politics and gave birth to a daughter. Anastasia sent her daughter (Fallaci’s grandmother) to an orphanage, and shortly thereafter she immigrated to the U.S.A.

Of course, Fallaci’s great-grandmother was not one of Italy’s poor immigrants. The Unnamed provided her with money and contacts. She travelled in first class accommodations to New York and was met by friends of her new contacts in Cesena. In New York she lived a great lifestyle and her only worry was that she entered the U.S. with a counterfeit passport. When she was about to be discovered and arrested in 1865, she decided to leave New York and travel to Salt Lake City where she joined her former Waldensian nurse. In Utah the nurse had converted to Mormonism and became one of Brother Dalton’s polygamous wives. Although Anastasia realized that she would probably also need to become a polygamist, she did not really care since she was quite promiscuous in her sexual life and anticipated that she will have another exciting adventure in Utah.

Although Fallaci knows the basic facts about Joseph Smith, Brigham Young, and the Mormons, her picture is painted in black-and-white—mostly black. She may have read some books concerning the “new Mormon history” but *Un cappello* lacks any sympathy for the pioneers’

predicament. Brigham Young is “a liar,” Brother Dalton “a scoundrel,” Anastasia’s conversion a mockery. Fallaci regards Mormonism as yet another instance of a patriarchal and anti-feminist religion, similar to traditional Catholicism and Revival Waldensianism. In fact it was even worse because of polygamy which reminds Fallaci of her main foe, Islam. Finally Anastasia sees the light, skips town, and leaves Salt Lake City forever. Fallaci claims that she found very limited and hypothetical clues about Anastasia’s whereabouts after she left Utah. Based on family traditions (or possibly tall tales) she places in a saloon as a dancer, as a friend or lover of several rough characters and famous Western outlaws, and finally as a madam of a luxurious San Francisco brothel. Eventually she finally succumbs to homesickness and the desire to find her long-abandoned daughter. She returns to Italy to look for her lost child, finds her, and tells her the story. She lives with her for a while before committing suicide in Cesena in 1889.

Of course Anastasia may not even have existed and may have been a figment of the Fallaci family’s imagination that was unwilling to admit that the journalist’s grandmother was simply an orphan of unknown origins. It is also suspicious that Anastasia’s last name, Ferrier, is the same of Lucy Ferrier, the unfortunate girl involved in Utah polygamy in Arthur Conan Doyle’s anti-Mormon novel and his first novel featuring Sherlock Holmes, *A Study in Scarlet*. Nevertheless Anastasia, who was created under the pen of such a marvellous writer, is a great character and one that readers will affectionately remember. Less memorable is Fallaci’s treatment of the Revival among nineteenth century Waldensians and of Mormonism. Although she did some homework, and avoids the most obvious mistakes, Fallaci reinterpreted the material she obtained through the prejudices of classical Italian secular humanism and anticlericalism.

We know that in her last years Fallaci changed her mind about Roman Catholicism and Christianity in general. Unfortunately, the illness prevented her from revising *Un cappello*, although she regarded it as her magnum opus. We will, accordingly, never know whether her later, kinder treatment of religion would have extended to Mormonism. Perhaps not, since polygamy was in Fallaci’s mind connected to Islam, and her negative assessment of Islam and Islamic treatment of women (which was born in years of active duty as a journalist in the Middle East, but became a veritable obsession after 9/11) never changed.

ORIANA FALLACI, THE MORMONS AND ME:
A PERSONAL RECOLLECTION

Michael W. Homer

Some of the most enduring stories concerning nineteenth-century Mormons has been written by famous authors who utilized polygamy as a backdrop in books of historical fiction. After Brigham Young moved the church to the Salt Lake Valley in 1847, and announced to the world that the church practiced polygamy five years later, many fantasy writers began to write about polygamy. Thereafter those seeking lurid details about the way Mormons lived used these stories as primary sources for their works. Terryl Givens has identified fifty-six novels written between 1850 and 1900 that utilized Mormonism as a backdrop or plot device because it was “salacious, lucrative, pious, chivalrous, and patriotic all at once.” Mormon polygamy was considered illicit sex and illicit sex has always sold books.

Eventually prominent writers, such as Artemus Ward, Mark Twain, Robert Louis Stevenson, Arthur Conan Doyle, and Zane Grey, wrote stories about Mormons in the West. Similar accounts were also written by European writers who were hugely popular in their own countries including Germany’s Balduin Möllhausen and Karl May, France’s Jules Verne and Albert Robida, Belgian George Simonin, and Italy’s Emilio Salgari. These stories have remained in print for decades after their deaths and the distorted snapshots they made of frontier America are now frozen in time. They are the key sources from which thousands of Europeans have formed their opinions concerning Utah and the Mormons, not only in the nineteenth century but also in the twenty-first.

Oriana Fallaci was very popular in Italy prior to her death in 2006. She was born in Florence, Italy, in 1929. Her father Edoardo was a cabinet maker and a political activist. Fallaci joined the Italian resistance movement during World War II and later claimed that she helped run weapons past German soldiers on her bicycle.



Figure 1. Oriana Fallaci (1929–2006).

Fallaci began her journalistic career in her teens when she became a special correspondent writing about crime for the Italian paper *Il mattino dell'Italia centrale* in 1946. But she achieved worldwide fame during the 1960s when she began working as a war correspondent. During this period she was a special correspondent for the political magazine *L'Europeo* and wrote for a number of leading newspapers and *Epoca* magazine. She spent seven years in Vietnam, both in the north and south, and was eventually thrown out by the corrupt leadership in the south. She reported on revolutions in Latin America including Brazil, Peru, Argentina, Bolivia and in Mexico. She was shot by police during demonstrations in Mexico protesting the enormous amounts of money spent by the government on the 1968 Olympics. She also reported during the Lebanese civil war and during the first Gulf War.

As a war correspondent Fallaci developed a particular talent for doing interviews with famous people, or as she wrote, with “those bastards who decide our lives.” She interviewed Muammar Qaddafi, Ariel Sharon, the Shah of Iran, Haile Selassie, Lech Walesa, Indira Gandhi, Ayatollah Khomeini, Willy Brandt, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, Deng Xio Ping, Golda Meir, and Henry Kissinger. During her 1972 interview with Henry Kissinger the former Secretary of State agreed that the Vietnam War was a “useless war” and he compared himself to “a cowboy leading the caravan alone astride his horse, a wild west tale if you like.” Kissinger

later wrote that it was “the single most disastrous conversation I have ever had with any member of the press.”

During the early 1970s Fallaci interviewed Alexandros Panagoulis who had been a solitary figure in the Greek resistance against the 1967 dictatorship. Panagoulis was captured, heavily tortured and imprisoned for his (unsuccessful) assassination attempt against dictator and ex-Colonel Georgios Papadopoulos. Following her interview she began a long drawn-out love affair with him until he died in 1976, under controversial circumstances, in a road accident. Fallaci maintained that Panagoulis was assassinated by remnants of the Greek military junta and her book *Un Uomo* (A Man) was inspired by the life of Panagoulis.

Fallaci eventually wrote thirteen books which were translated into 26 languages and published in 31 countries. After publishing *Inshallah* in 1992 (a book about the Lebanese Civil War) she began what she hoped would be her *magnum opus*, an epic tale about her family’s history. But this writing project was interrupted by 9/11. Thereafter the former liberal journalist discontinued her family saga and published three international bestsellers which contained vitriolic criticism against Islam and support for United States President George W. Bush’s war on terrorism. In 2001 she wrote *The Rage and the Pride* which sold more than 1,000,000 copies in Italy and in which she attacked radical Islam. In 2004 she wrote *The Force of Reason* which also sold more than 1,000,000 copies in Italy and which argued that the fall of the west had commenced because of radical Islam and that western-style democracy, with liberty, human rights, freedom of thought and religion, could not co-exist with radical Islam.

Finally in 2004 she wrote *Fallaci Interviews Herself and the Apocalypse*, in which she continued her attacks on radical Islam and began to see Christianity, particularly the Roman Catholic Church, as the only possible foil for terrorism. She continued on this path until she finally succumbed to cancer in 2006. Although Fallaci was a best-selling author for more than forty years before she died, many younger Italian readers are only familiar with Fallaci’s anti-Islamic books which were written after September 11, 2001.

Following Fallaci’s death her ultimate book, *Un cappello pieno di ciliege* (A Hat Full of Cherries), which chronicled her family’s history, was published. Although she had devoted nearly a decade to writing the book it was unfinished at the time of its publication. Of particular interest here is the portion of the book which contains the story of a family member who travelled to Utah where she described “first hand” the evils

of polygamy. This portion of the novel was utilized in exactly the same way that previous famous authors have used the Mormon subplot to add some excitement to her tale. While Fallaci was beginning to do research on her epic family novel she contacted Massimo Introvigne, an Italian scholar of minority religions in New York. Introvigne was having dinner at Siro Maccioni's Le Cirque restaurant, which was then located in the Mayfair Hotel and a favourite gathering place for Italians in Manhattan, when he was called to a house phone by a waiter. He was quite surprised to learn that the caller was Oriana Fallaci who was living in New York. In her typical hurried tone, Fallaci did not explain why she wanted information about 19th century Mormonism, but simply told Introvigne that she had read material by him on Joseph Smith and the Mormons, had learned from the scholar's secretary in Italy that he was in New York, and wanted to tape-record an interview on Mormon history. Although she was feeling too sick to interview Introvigne in person they later completed a telephonic interview. The interview was arranged for the following day. It lasted something less than an hour, and Introvigne suggested that the journalist try to get a direct feeling of the "new Mormon History" at that time blossoming in Utah by meeting somebody from Salt Lake City.

Introvigne also recommended that Fallaci contact me because I had written about the original Italian converts who immigrated to Utah during the 1850s. Soon thereafter Fallaci contacted me and said that she was interested in doing research concerning why a small group of Waldensians (a group of Protestants who had resided in Italy since the thirteenth century) had converted to Mormonism and left their homeland to reside in Utah. She retained me to advise her concerning the Waldensian migration to the United States and about the first Italians who converted to Mormonism in the Waldensian valleys.

I explained to Fallaci that in 1849 Brigham Young instructed three of his apostles—John Taylor, Erastus Snow, and Lorenzo Snow—to travel to Europe to organize missions in Scandinavia, France, and Italy. The Mormon hierarchy had monitored the revolutionary activity that had disabled the continent for almost two years and it was convinced that these events created an opportunity to expand the church from England—where missionaries had labored since 1837—to the European continent. In June 1850 missionaries arrived in Denmark, France, and Italy, and soon thereafter others were sent to Switzerland and Prussia.

Lorenzo Snow commenced his missionary activities among the Waldensians, a Protestant enclave in north-western Italy, because he

believed, based on a RTS tract he had read in England that they were a remnant of the primitive church who would recognize the message of the restored church. The Waldensians were concentrated primarily in three valleys in Piedmont and are the oldest and until recently they were the largest (they are now greatly outnumbered by Pentecostals) Protestant minority in Italy. They are pre-Reformation Protestants, who left the Roman Catholic Church in the early thirteenth century, espousing proto-Protestant ideas. They joined the Calvinist Reformation at their Synod of Chanforan in 1532.

Snow and his band of missionaries published tracts and began preaching to the Waldensians. The missionaries received resistance from both the Protestant clergy and the larger Catholic population. In 1852, *L'Armonia*, a conservative Catholic newspaper labelled Joseph Smith as a "new Muhammad" and detailed the Mormons' practice of polygamy. They also complained that the government had allowed the Waldensians to publish a newspaper and build a temple in Torino and warned that the Mormon missionaries would soon seek to do likewise. They also warned that the Mormons were attempting to convert the local population and take them to Utah where they would be forced to practice polygamy. The Protestant clergy also compared Mormonism with Islam and attacked the practice of plural marriage.

Despite this war of words the Mormon missionaries eventually converted two hundred Waldensians (or roughly one percent of the entire Waldensian community) and more than seventy of these immigrated to Utah. Most of the Waldensians who converted were part of the so-called revival movement who were dissatisfied with the current state of affairs in their church. Fallaci seemed quite pleased with this history and I eventually met her in Italy and introduced her to the Waldensian valleys and many of the primary sources concerning their history. We also discussed Italian history, particularly the Italian Risorgimento, since it created the environment in which Italy unified and made possible the introduction of Mormon missionaries into the country. I also advised her concerning the migration of the first Italian Mormons to Utah.

When the famous Italian author asked me what fee I would charge her for my services I told her that I would require her to locate an Italian edition of Alexandre Dumas *Storia di Casa Savoia*. She said no problem. Although I never received the book she did send me the following hand-signed "Apology" (A ballad):

I am the woman who
Made Khomeini laugh.

I am the woman who
 Made Gheddafi and Kissinger cry.
 I am the woman who
 Made Deng Xiao Ping remove
 The gigantic portraits of Marx
 and Engels and Lenin and Stalin
 from Tien An Men square.

I am the woman who
 Made Golda Meir shout:
 "She is a genius!"
 and the king of Ethiopia yell:
 "Throw her out! In the garden!"
 (Which they did, and there was
 a huge lion in the garden.
 Have you ever been face to face
 with a huge lion in the garden?)

I am the woman who
 Escaped her execution in Hungary
 and survived the massacre of Mexico City
 where she laid for hours
 with three bullets in the morgue.

And yet, and yet, and yet, my friends,
 I am also the woman who
 did not get the f***ing "Storia di Casa Savoia"
 for Michael Homer.

I apologize.

Oriana Fallaci
 Turin, April 1997

POLES APART? A LOOK AT MORMON DOCTRINE IN LIGHT OF HISTORIC CHRISTIANITY

Johnnie Glad

Introduction

In the past various church denominations have arrived at the conclusion that they were standing far apart in regard to matters of doctrine. From the outside differences seemed to appear so great that similarities were difficult to find. The distance from one denomination to another seemed extremely long and insurmountable. However, by a closer analysis and dialog one discovered that the areas of disagreement and differences of opinion often were due to problems of definition. In this respect it is sufficient to refer to the many dialogues and discussions that have been held in recent years between representatives from various church denominations. Experiences derived from such encounters indicate that dialogues and talks reveal that the distance between the ones involved was perhaps not as great as first expected. Actually, there was a lot one had in common. Much of that which appeared to be different was mostly on the “outside.”

On the other hand, there are situations that point to quite the contrary. Doctrinal statements of different churches seem to be of a concurrent nature. Theological expressions and the manner in which they are formulated seem familiar. Some of these formulations and expressions are familiar from childhood and adolescence. When a person later in life is confronted with similar expressions, associations are immediately made with what one previously have been introduced to. At the same time it is taken for granted that one’s counterpart gets the same associations and thoughts. However, what one thought to have had in common now turned out to be quite the opposite. The messenger and the receiver stood far apart from one another. What from the outside seemed to be a similarity now turned out to be a deep-rooted difference. A typical example in this respect is *The Articles of Faith* of Joseph Smith:

We believe in God, the Eternal Father, and in His son, Jesus Christ, and in the Holy Ghost.

We believe that men will be punished for their own sins, and not for Adam’s transgression.

We believe that through the Atonement of Christ, all mankind may be saved, by obedience to the laws and ordinances of the Gospel.

We believe that that the first principals and ordinances of the Gospel are: first, Faith in the Lord Jesus Christ; second, Repentance; third, Baptism by immersion for the remission of sins; fourth, Laying on of hands for the gift of the Holy Ghost.

We believe that a man must be called of God, by prophecy, and by the laying on of hands, by those who are in authority to preach the Gospel and administer in the ordinances thereof.

We believe in the same organization that existed in the Primitive Church, viz., apostles, prophets, pastors, teachers, evangelists, etc.

We believe in the gifts of tongues, prophecy, revelation, visions, healing, interpretation of tongues, etc.

We believe the Bible to be the word of God as far as it is translated correctly; we also believe the Book of Mormon to be the word of God.

We believe all that God has revealed, all that He does now reveal, and we believe that He will yet reveal many great and important things pertaining to the Kingdom of God.

We believe in the literal gathering of Israel and in the restoration of the Ten Tribes; that Zion will be built upon this (the American) continent; that Christ will reign personally upon the earth; and, that the earth will be renewed and receive its paradisiacal glory.

We claim the privilege of worshipping Almighty God according to the dictates of our own conscience, and allow all men the same privilege, let them worship how, where, or what they may.

We believe in being subject to kings, presidents, rulers, and magistrates, in obeying, honouring, and sustaining the law.

We believe in being honest, true, chaste, benevolent, virtuous, and in doing good to all men; indeed, we may say that we follow the admonition of Paul, We believe all things, we hope all things, we have endured many things, and hope to be able to endure all things. If there is anything virtuous, lovely, or of good report or praiseworthy, we seek after these things.¹

After having read the Articles of Faith the reader may conclude that these articles constitute a platform upon which various Christian denominations may meet and discuss viewpoints they might have in common. In spite of particular points that cannot be accepted there are nevertheless statements that seem familiar and that do not appear to deviate from the Christian faith. As an example one may refer to the first article: "We believe in God, the Eternal Father, and in His son, Jesus Christ, and in the Holy Ghost." A Protestant or Catholic will no doubt feel at home here, because the article referred to can be considered a brief résumé of the Apostles' Creed to which most Christian Churches adhere. A Lutheran will in addition discover the three articles of faith from Luther's Small Catechism - true enough in a condensed and abbreviated form. On this basis some might arrive at the conclusion that we were standing on common ground. However, to draw such a conclusion would be all too hasty and incorrect. Before any final assessment is made it is necessary to go beyond the statements in order to discover what lies behind and what they represent. What do the statements actually say? It is first after having arrived at this point one is able to detect whether or not we are standing on common ground with a common consent. What makes the whole situation so difficult is that these thirteen Articles of Faith give no hint or distinctive information on important Mormon beliefs such as the plurality of Gods, pre-existence, baptism for the dead, the endowment ceremony and eternal marriage. This was most likely done in order to minimize the differences between the Mormons and the other existing Christian denominations in an

¹ Joseph Smith, *Articles of Faith* (Salt Lake City, Utah: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1952).

effort to make Mormonism more palatable in their missionary endeavour to non-Mormons.

The Concept of God

We believe in God, the Eternal Father. (Art. 1). The Christian concept of God is monotheistic. There is one God. He is eternal and unchangeable. He is transcendent. God differs from man whom he created. God is also a spirit (John 4: 24). This means that God does not consist of this world's substance. The Bible does not prescribe sexuality to God. He is the Creator who created everything. He is from eternity.

According to Mormon theology God cannot have created the world out of nothing since matter has existed from eternity. Matter and intelligence are from eternity. Consequently, God has only rearranged or organized matter. The Mormon concept of God is materialistic. God has a body of flesh and bones. This body is just as sensitive as any human body:

The Father has a body of flesh and bones as tangible as man's.²

We affirm that to deny the materiality of God's person is to deny God; for a thing without parts has no whole, and an immaterial body cannot exist. The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints proclaims against the incomprehensible God, devoid of "body, parts or passions," as a thing impossible of existence, and asserts its belief in and allegiance to the true and living God of scripture and revelation.³

In Mormon teaching the concept of God is indeed anthropomorphic. Brigham Young taught that God the Father was once a man on another planet. He passed the ordeals man now is passing through. He received an experience and suffered and enjoyed. He knew all that man knows regarding toils and sufferings, life and death of this mortality. According to Brigham Young it was impossible to believe that God was destitute of body, parts, passions or attributes. Attributes could only be

² *Doctrine and Covenants* (Salt Lake City, Utah: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1952) 130:22 (hereafter *D&C*).

³ James E. Talmage, *A Study of the Articles of Faith* (Salt Lake City, Utah, Deseret Book, 1966), p. 48.

made manifest through an organized personage. All attributes were expressed in and were the results of organized existence.⁴ Bruce R. McConkie emphasized the very same:

Joseph Smith said: 'God himself was once as we are now, and is an exalted man, and sits enthroned in yonder heavens'. I am going to tell you how God came to be God. We have imagined and supposed that God was God from all eternity. I will refute that idea, and take away the veil, so that you may see. "God the Father is a Holy Man, an exalted, perfected, and glorified Person."⁵

The development of God from that of being a man is an important concept in Mormon doctrine. Mormon Apostle James E. Talmage emphasized this in the following manner:

We believe in a God who is Himself progressive, whose majesty is intelligence; whose perfection consists in eternal advancement - a Being who has attained His exalted state by a path which now His children are permitted to follow, whose glory it is their heritage to share. In spite of the opposition of the sects, in the face of direct charges of blasphemy, the Church proclaims the eternal truth: "As man is, God once was; as God is, man may be".⁶

Brigham Young expressed the same train of thought when he pointed out that God had passed the ordeals that man was now passing through. God had received an experience, had suffered and enjoyed, and knew all that man knew regarding the toils, sufferings, life and death of this mortality, for he had passed through all of it, and had received his crown and exaltation and held the keys and the power of this Kingdom.⁷

⁴ *Teachings of Presidents of the Church: Brigham Young* (Salt Lake City, Utah: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1997), p. 29.

⁵ Bruce R. McConkie, *Mormon Doctrine* (Salt Lake City, Utah: Bookcraft, 1979), p. 467.

⁶ James E. Talmage, *A Study of the Articles of Faith* (Salt Lake City, Utah, Deseret Book, 1966) p. 430.

⁷ *Teachings of Presidents*, p. 30.

Joseph Smith made it perfectly clear that men would become gods if they complied with the revelations he had received.⁸

Throughout the history of the Mormon Church there has been quite some controversy in regard to the nature of God. Brigham Young, the second President of the church, taught that Adam was the God who made the world. He was the father of the human family as well as the father of Jesus:

When our father Adam came into the Garden of Eden, He came into it with a celestial body, and brought Eve, one of his wives, with him. He helped to make and organize this world. He is Michael, the archangel, the ancient of Days! about whom holy men have written and spoken – He is our Father and our God, and the only God with whom we have to do.” “Jesus, our elder brother, was begotten in the flesh by the same character that was in the Garden of Eden, and who is our Father in heaven.⁹

This doctrine caused problems for many not only in America, but also among members of the Mormon Church in England. Although the Mormon Church has officially rejected this doctrine there can be no doubt that Brigham Young was the source of this teaching. The documentation is too solid to deny the facts. It was not only in America and England, but also in Norway as well as in other countries that people reacted to this strange doctrine that differed so drastically from common Christian beliefs. Orson Pratt once pointed out:

As God the Father begat the fleshly body of Jesus, so He, before the world began, begat his spirit. As the body required an earthly Mother, so his spirit required a heavenly Mother. As God associated in the capacity of a husband with the earthly mother, so likewise He associated in the same capacity with the heavenly one.¹⁰

Orson Pratt continued:

⁸ H. Michael Marquardt, *The Joseph Smith Revelations. Text & Commentary* (Salt Lake City, Utah: Signature Books, 1999), p. 325.

⁹ *Journal of Discourses*, vol. 1, pp. 50–51.

¹⁰ Orson Pratt, *The Seer (1853–1854)* (Salt Lake City, Utah: Eborn Books, 1990), pp. 158–159.

We have now clearly shown that God the Father had a plurality of wives, one or more being in eternity, by whom He begat our spirits as well as the spirit of Jesus His First Born, and another being upon the earth by whom He begat the tabernacle of Jesus, as His Only Begotten in this world.¹¹

The “Mother in heaven” is God’s wife. This means that God in heaven first begat the spirit of Jesus and then in this world begat him again in the flesh. According to Pratt:

The fleshly body of Jesus required a Mother as well as a Father. Therefore, the Father and Mother of Jesus, according to the flesh, must have been associated together in the capacity of Husband and Wife; hence the Virgin Mary must have been, for the time being, the lawful wife of God the Father: we use the term lawful Wife, because it would be blasphemous in the highest degree to say that He overshadowed her or begat the Saviour unlawfully. It would have been unlawful for any man to have interfered with Mary, who was already espoused to Joseph; for such a heinous crime would have subjected both the guilty parties to death, according to the law of Moses.¹²

In other words, Jesus was not conceived by the Holy Ghost as confessed in the Apostolic Creed, but by a sexual union between God and the Virgin Mary. Indeed, the conclusion must be that the concept of God in Mormon doctrine differs radically from that which is generally accepted within Christendom.

The Interpretation of Salvation

Mormons believe that through the atonement of Christ all mankind may be saved, but at the same time add by obedience to the laws and ordinances of the gospel. (Art. 3). According to Mormon theology salvation by grace means that someday everyone will be resurrected. This is called unconditional or general salvation that comes by grace alone without obedience to gospel law. It consists in the mere fact of being resurrected. Thus salvation is synonymous with immortality. “It is

¹¹ Pratt, *The Seer*, p. 172.

¹² Pratt, *The Seer*, p. 158.

the inseparable connection between body and spirit so that the resurrected personage lives forever.”¹³ However, full salvation or exaltation is only achieved by obedience to the laws and ordinances of the gospel. This means one has to live according to the principles and rules as defined by the Mormon Church.

Immortality is a free gift and comes without works or righteousness of any sort; all men will come forth in the resurrection because of the atoning sacrifice of Christ (1 Cor. 15:2). In and of itself the resurrection is a form of salvation meaning that men are thereby saved from death, hell, the devil, and endless torment (2 Nephi 9:17-27). “Salvation in the celestial kingdom of God, however, is not salvation by grace alone. Rather, it is salvation by grace coupled with obedience to the laws and ordinances of the gospel.”¹⁴ This interpretation of salvation by grace does not correspond with the Lutheran or Protestant way of thinking. Salvation means “all this is from God, who reconciled us to himself through Christ, and has given us the ministry of reconciliation; that is, in Christ God was reconciling the world to himself, not counting their trespasses against them, and entrusting the message of reconciliation to us” (2 Cor. 5:18-19). Works are not a means for achieving salvation. They are only a thankful response of a living faith.

Art. 5 of Articles of Faith deals in essence with the priesthood that in Mormonism is considered of the utmost importance. It is through the power of the priesthood that the message of salvation is channelled to mankind. According to Mormon thinking the church they represent is the church and kingdom of God, and possesses the only faith by which human beings can be brought back into the presence of God.¹⁵ In this sense the priesthood plays an extremely important role that none other can exercise. The gospel and the priesthood are the means God employs in order to carry out the work of salvation.

The priesthood is the power by which the gospel is preached; by which the ordinances of salvation are performed so that they will be binding on earth and in heaven; by which men are sealed up unto eternal life, being assured of the fullness of the Father’s kingdom hereafter; and by which in due course the Lord will govern the nations of the earth and all that pertains to them. As there is only one God and one power of

¹³ Bruce R. McConkie, *Mormon Doctrine* (Salt Lake City, Utah: Bookcraft, 1979), p. 669.

¹⁴ *Mormon Doctrine*, p. 671.

¹⁵ *Teachings of Presidents*, p. 18.

God, it follows that there is only one priesthood, the eternal priesthood.¹⁶

Thus the Mormon Church claims to have the sole right to minister the ordinances of salvation through their priesthood.

The Authoritative Scriptures

Mormons believe the Bible to be the word of God as far as it is translated correctly. (Art. 8). They use the authorized King James Version (KJV). Joseph Smith meant that the biblical texts had been corrupted and altered by the so-called great apostasy of the post-apostolic church. Many important passages of Scripture had been removed by corrupt ecclesiastical powers as described in the *Book of Mormon*: “Wherefore, thou seest that after the book hast gone forth through the hands of the great and abominable church that there are many plain and precious things taken away from the book of the Lamb of God” (1 Nephi 13:28). All of the existing Bible translations were corrupted and flawed. None were translated correctly.¹⁷

In order to “rectify” the situation Joseph Smith decided to correct, revise, alter, add to and delete from King James Version of the Bible what was necessary. Joseph Smith claimed that God intended him to publish a complete restored version of the Bible, the so-called Inspired Version of the Bible. The project was never completed.¹⁸ Joseph Smith’s new translation is published by The Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints.¹⁹ In addition to the Bible, the Mormons also believe the *Book of Mormon* to be the word of God. The two books of Joseph Smith, the *Doctrine and Covenants* and the *Pearl of Great Price*, are also considered authoritative and basis for Mormon belief. These four documents comprise what is called the “Four Standard Works.” Together with the statements of the prophets and presidents of the Mormon Church they actually constitute the true sources of Mormon doctrine.

¹⁶ *Mormon Doctrine*, p. 594.

¹⁷ R. Philip Roberts, *Mormonism Unmasked* (Broadman & Holman Publishers, 1998), pp. 96–97; *Mormon Doctrine*, pp. 422–423.

¹⁸ *Mormon Doctrine*, pp. 383–385; Jerald and Sandra Tanner, *Mormonism—Shadow or Reality?* (Salt Lake City, Utah: Utah Lighthouse Ministry, 1982), pp. 386–389.

¹⁹ Joseph Smith, *Joseph Smith’s “New Translation” of the Bible* (Independence, Missouri: Herald Publishing House, 1999).

The Problem of Revelation

Article 9 deals with revelation. “We believe all that God has revealed, all that He does now reveal, and we believe that He will yet reveal many great and important things pertaining to the Kingdom of God”. This means that the Mormons believe in continuing special revelations through the Prophet who also is the President of the church. Mormon documents contain an abundance of references to these revelations. From 1823 to 1847, 136 of these revelations were recorded. In 1890 the Manifesto and in 1978 the acceptance of black men into the Mormon priesthood were proclaimed.²⁰ Lutherans and many with them believe that God has revealed himself conclusively and authoritatively in Jesus Christ and he continues to make himself known through the Word and Sacraments, where he reveals all that is necessary for the salvation of man. All other claims to revelation must be examined by the church in the light of God’s revelation of himself through Word and Sacraments.

The Millennium

Millenarian movements were a known phenomena among a number of religious groups in the United States in the nineteenth century, such as the Mormons, Millerites, Seventh Day Adventists and Jehovah’s Witnesses. The subject of the Millennium played an important role in Mormon missionary work and emigration history. It was closely knit to that which often was referred to as the “gathering.” According to William Mulder, the gathering and not polygamy was Mormonism’s oldest and most influential doctrine:

It was the signature of the “new and everlasting covenant” which the Lord had made with his elect in this last of all gospel dispensations. The doctrine reflected a tradition of golden dreams and fierce desires reaching back to the promises made to Israel and forward to the Second Coming. The gathering was as new as the latest proselyte, as old as prophesy.²¹

²⁰ *Mormon Doctrine*, pp. 466, 526–528.

²¹ William Mulder, *Homeward to Zion: The Mormon Migration from Scandinavia* (Minneapolis: Minnesota Press, 2000), p. 18; Meredith B. McGuire, *Religion: The Social Context*, 4th ed. (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1997) p. 44; Norman Cohn, *The Pursuit of the Millennium. Revolutionary millenarians and mystical anarchists of the Middle Ages* (London: Pimlico, 1993), p. 13; Per

In Article 10 of the Articles of Faith reference is made to the Mormon belief in the literal gathering of Israel and in the restoration of the ten tribes, that Zion will be built upon the American continent, that Christ will reign personally upon the earth, and that the earth will be renewed and receive its paradisiacal glory. According to Apostle James E. Talmage the millennium or the thousand years immediately following the establishment of Christ's reign on earth will be specially characterized and different from both preceding and succeeding time. The gathering of Israel and the establishment of Zion on this earth will take place before the coming of Christ. Simultaneously the destruction of the wicked will take place and an era of peace will be inaugurated. The righteous shall reign with God and Christ a thousand years. During this period conditions will be propitious for righteousness. Satan will be restrained. During this period Latter-day Saints will be able to carry on their vicarious work for the dead. When the thousand years are passed Satan will be permitted to once again assert his powers, but that will be for just a short duration before his final doom and punishment. Then the earth will pass to a celestial condition and become a place for the sons and daughters of God.²² In regard to the millennium issue the Mormons appointed a place rather than set a time as millenarians did. The *Book of Mormon* and the *Doctrine and Covenants* transferred the biblical prophecies and events to the American scene. America was the promised land, the land of Zion. Missouri, that previously had been the site of old Eden, was to be the site of the New Jerusalem. All the believers were to gather in Zion.²³

The history of the gathering and the allocation for this event was not fully developed from the beginning. Shortly before the Mormon Church was organized the *Book of Mormon* revealed that there would be a New Jerusalem in the New World. However, no location was specified.²⁴

M. Aadnanes, *Det nye tusenårsriket. New Age som livssyn* (Oslo: Scandinavian University Press/Universitetsforlaget, 1997), pp. 17–21.

²² James E. Talmage, *A Study of the Articles of Faith* (Salt Lake City, Utah, Deseret Book, 1966) pp. 368–371, 374; James E. Talmage, *Jesus the Christ: A Study of the Messiah and His Mission according to Holy Scriptures both Ancient and Modern* (Salt Lake City, Utah: Deseret Book Company, 1956), pp. 790–792.

²³ William Mulder, *Homeward to Zion: The Mormon Migration from Scandinavia* (Minneapolis: Minnesota Press, 2000), pp. 22–23; Mette Skougaard, *Mormonudvandringen fra Danmark 1852–1900. En undersøgelse af baggrunden for udvandringen og en analyse af udvandringens struktur 1873–93* (København, 1976), p. 10.

²⁴ *Book of Mormon*, Ether 13:4–8.

A few months later a new revelation pointed out that although it was not yet known where the city Zion should be built it would nevertheless be located on the borders of the Lamanites, i.e. the western boarder of the United States, particularly in Missouri. This was the boundary separating the states from the Indian territories. The Latter-day Saints often referred to the Indians as Lamanites believing that they descended from those referred to in the *Book of Mormon* (D&C 28:9). Not knowing the exact place of the gathering the Latter-day Saints were nevertheless called upon to bring to pass the gathering of the Lord's elect. They were to be gathered upon the face of this land to prepare their hearts and be prepared in all things against the day when tribulation and desolation were to be sent forth upon the wicked.²⁵ In June 1831 Joseph Smith and other leading elders started from Kirtland, Ohio, for the land of Missouri where they arrived about the middle of July. In that very same month Joseph Smith claimed that he had received a revelation from the Lord indicating that Missouri was the land the Lord had appointed and consecrated for the gathering of the Saints. This was the land of promise and the place for the city of Zion. This was the spot for the temple. "Behold, the place which is now called Independence is the center place; and a spot for the temple is lying westward, upon a lot which is not far from the court-house."²⁶

The city of Zion was to serve a double purpose. First of all, it was to be the place where the house of Israel was to be gathered in the last days. Secondly, Zion would serve as a refuge from the wicked and the tribulations associated with the coming destruction.²⁷ The millennium would not dawn until the elect from the various parts of the world would be gathered. Not even one person was to be left behind. It was first then that Christ would return. The worldwide missionary work of the church was to provide for the recruitment of obedient gentiles who had accepted the gospel that had been presented to them. Through baptism they would become God's chosen people and become part of the gathering that was necessary to precede the Lord's Day of judgement.²⁸

²⁵ D&C 29:7-8; Grant Underwood, *The Millenarian World of Early Mormonism* (Urbana, Illinois: University of Chicago, 1993), p. 31.

²⁶ D&C 57:1-4; *History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints* (Salt Lake City, Utah: Deseret Book, 1978), vol. 1, pp. 188-190.

²⁷ Dan Erickson, *As a Thief in the Night: The Mormon Quest for Millennial Deliverance* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1998), p. 97.

²⁸ Erickson, *As a Thief in the Night*, p. 81.

Mormon gathering as a millennial event was of great importance to Joseph Smith:

Take away the Book of Mormon and the revelations, and where is our religion? We have none; for without Zion, and a place of deliverance, we must fall; because the time is near when the sun will be darkened, and the moon turned to blood, and the stars fall from heaven, and the earth reel to and fro. Then, and if this is the case, and if we are not sanctified and gathered to the places God has appointed, with all our former professions and our great love for the Bible, we must fall; we cannot stand; we cannot be saved; for God will gather out His Saints from the Gentiles, and then comes desolation and destruction, and none can escape except the pure in heart who are gathered.²⁹

Millennialism, the New Jerusalem and the gathering were all intertwined in Mormon doctrine during the 1830s-40s. The forthcoming of the *Book of Mormon* was a most important sign that the gathering had begun (3 Nephi 21:1-7). In addition to being authoritative scripture for the Mormons the main mission of the *Book of Mormon* was to recover the lost remnant of the house of Israel. "The Book of Mormon has made known that Israel is, upon this continent."³⁰ The importance of the New World was brought forth through the *Book of Mormon*. Joseph Smith's revelation identified where Zion was to be located. From now on the Mormons could direct their attention to the gathering in America.³¹

The Mormon doctrine of the gathering served two purposes. First, it would be the place where the house of Israel would assemble in the last days. Here the Saints could prepare themselves properly for the coming of the millennium. Second, the gathering would provide a means of escape or refuge from the wicked and from the tribulations that were expected during the last days. The gathering has been described as "the pivotal pre millennial event in Mormon eschatology".³² This Mormon eschatology was in a way a unique form of millennial hope. It incorporated the building of a physical city, the City of Zion. This city was to be located within the borders of the United States where

²⁹ *History of the Church*, vol. 2, p. 52.

³⁰ *History of the Church*, vol. 2, p. 358.

³¹ Erickson, *As a Thief in the Night*, p. 94.

³² Underwood, *Millenarian World*, p. 29.

the gathering of the elect from all over the world would take place. All this was to fit into the divine plan of preparing the world for Christ and the millennium. Millennialism was an important factor in all aspects of early Mormon teaching and missionary activity.³³ As Noah gathered the various animals into the arch in like manner shall the Saints from all over the world be gathered in the western part of America in the land of Zion waiting for the coming of Christ and the millennium. The Saints interpreted Dan. 2:4 into their own context: "And in the days of those kings the God of heaven will set up a kingdom that shall never be destroyed, nor shall this kingdom be left to another people."

After the Mormons had moved to the west their preoccupation regarding the destruction of the world and the coming of Christ continued to remain as a major topic in their teaching. They were constantly reminded of that these two events would come sooner than expected and follow each other rapidly. The Lord would cut his work short. Those who eagerly had been used to looking for signs forecasting things to come could now relax, according to Jedediah M. Grant, member of the First Presidency. The events were now developing so rapidly that they exceeded "even our most sanguine expectations."³⁴ Children would live to raise the dead and that in no more than fifty years worthy Saints would be caught up in the clouds to meet Christ. Apostle George A. Smith cautioned the world that the day of the Lord was near and the Saints should watch for the coming of the Son of Man. As pointed out earlier, the gathering of the elect was an important part of Mormon doctrine that continuously was held before the Saints, now with Utah set apart as the place where God wanted his chosen people to gather. In this connection it has been pointed out, that crossing the plains to Zion in the valleys of the mountains was not just a journey but a rite of passage, the final, devoted, enduring act that brought one into the kingdom. The entry into Utah was not only entry into sacred space, i.e. into the Promised Land, but a move into sacred time.³⁵

Brigham Young considered the "gathering of Israel" to be of such importance for the work of the church that he was willing to give priority to these matters, even if it meant that one had to infringe upon other requirements. He restricted certain religious ceremonies to Utah

³³ Underwood, *Millenarian World*, pp. 90-91.

³⁴ Underwood, *Millenarian World*, p. 151.

³⁵ Erickson, *As a Thief in the Night*, pp. 151-152; Jan Shipps, *Mormonism: The Story of a New Religious Tradition* (Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1987), p. 122.

in the belief, that if this was not done it could have negative effect on the gathering. One of these ceremonies was the so-called “second anointing” when a person had to gather with the “body of the church.” According to Dan Erickson, this was “part of the Mormon empire building effort.” The “second anointing” was also referred to as the “fullness of the Priesthood.”³⁶

Conclusion

We have in this article made an attempt to look at important Mormon doctrine in light of historic Christianity. How close or how far apart do we stand from one another? Are we total strangers to one another or do we have a common ground from which we may start our orientation?

The first Mormon missionaries who came to Norway in the beginning of the 1850s were of Norwegian decent. As emigrants to America they had become acquainted with this new religion Mormonism and converted to the new faith. Many of these converts felt the call to return to their original homeland as missionaries. In proclaiming their new faith in Norway they used the same words and expressions that were familiar among their former countrymen. But now these words and expressions had gotten another connotation or meaning. The audience was confronted with a new religion clothed in familiar linguistic wrappings while the contents differed considerably from the religion they had been brought up in. The reaction occurred when people became aware of this. In addition the missionaries introduced a new book, the *Book of Mormon*, that seemed just as important to them, if not even more important than the Holy Bible. In Norway Martin Luther’s Catechism was highly regarded and much used particularly in the religious instruction of children as well as of adults. However, Luther’s Catechism, as important as it was, was never put on the same level as the Holy Bible. The road of dialogue is no easy road to travel. Time and time again we may find hurdles and obstacles on our journey, obstacles that seem insurmountable. In our search we may find some points of contact, but in many doctrinal matters we have to admit that we still stand far apart as outlined in this article. However, whatever the situation may be, the door for dialogue must always remain open.

³⁶ Erickson, *As a Thief in the Night*, p. 152; David John Buerger, *The Mysteries of Godliness: A History of Mormon Temple Worship* (San Francisco, California: Smith Research Associates, 1994), p. 99.

ARE JESUS AND SATAN BROTHERS? A SHORT EXPLORATION IN MORMON CHRISTOLOGY

John Walsh

Recently, various media sources, such as MSNBC, Fox News, and the Associated Press, have attributed to Mormonism the idea that Jesus and Satan are brothers.¹ In my view, this idea is a theological misunderstanding that incorrectly interprets Mormon Christology. While it is beyond the scope of this study to do a complete Christological analysis of the Mormon Jesus, this specific issue will be discussed in enough depth to allow the reader to understand that Joseph Smith's theology does not allow the idea that Jesus and Satan can be considered as brothers in their primary relationship.

As I have discussed this issue with non-Mormons, I have learned some important things about our topic. When non-Mormons hear it said that Jesus and Satan are brothers, they often believe that the New Testament Jesus and Satan are being compared. It should be remembered that in traditional Christianity there is no premortal Jesus, as the Holy Trinity created Jesus ex nihilo in Mary's womb as part of the Incarnation. Since I have discussed how the Mormon Jesus differs from the Jesus of traditional Christianity in considerable detail elsewhere,² I will not address it further here. But since non-Mormons are often focused on the mortal Jesus, I will begin my analysis on this point.

Let us consider first the definition of the term "brother." To be brothers, two persons must share a relationship of significance. As a result, for us to determine if Jesus is the brother of Satan, we must examine the nature of their relationship. Normally, we call two people brothers when they share the same genetic physical heritage.³ A brother would have the same father and mother. A half-brother would share one parent, but not the other.

¹ See Lawrence O'Donnell of MSNBC while appearing on The McLaughlin Group television show on December 9, 2007; Father Jonathan Morris, "Mitt Romney, the Mormon (What's That!)," on foxnews.com, on December 6, 2007; Associated Press, "GOP Hopeful Mike Huckabee Asks if Mormons Believe Jesus, Devil Are Brothers," on December 12, 2007.

² W. J. Walsh, *The Ascension Theology of Joseph Smith* (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wales, Lampeter, 2005).

³ *Random House Dictionary*, 2009 (see <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/brother>).

In Mormonism, Jesus is the Only Begotten Son of God the Father and the mortal woman Mary.⁴ Satan is a malignant spirit who never was nor ever will be born into this mortal world.⁵ Since Satan does not even have a physical body, the Father did not sire him, and Mary did not conceive him. Therefore, Satan cannot be considered either Jesus' brother or half-brother on the basis of physical genetic heritage.

On the other hand, after delivering Jesus, Mormons believe that Mary went on to have other children who were begotten by her mortal husband Joseph.⁶ Mormons deny the post-marital virginity of Mary.⁷ Thus, Jesus did have true half-siblings, though Satan was not one of them. Nicene Christians are split as to whether Mary had additional children. Many Protestants agree that she did, while most Catholics and

⁴ Joseph Fielding Smith, ed., *Teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith* (Salt Lake City: The Deseret Book Company, 1976 reprint edition), pp. 58 and 323; Ezra Taft Benson, *The Teachings of Ezra Taft Benson* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1988), p. 7; Bruce R. McConkie, *A New Witness for the Articles of Faith* (Salt Lake City, Utah: Deseret Book Company, 1985), pp. 67–68, 75, and 111; Gerald Hansen, Jr., “Jesus Christ, Only Begotten In The Flesh,” in *Encyclopedia of Mormonism*, vol. 1, ed. by Daniel H. Ludlow (New York: Macmillan, 1992); Andrew C. Skinner, “Jesus Christ, Birth Of Jesus Christ,” in *Encyclopedia Of Mormonism*, vol. 1.

⁵ Joseph Fielding Smith, ed., *Teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith*, pp. 181 and 297; Joseph Fielding Smith, *Doctrines of Salvation*, vol. 2 (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1954), p. 279; Joseph Fielding Smith, *Answers to Gospel Questions*, vol. 2 (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1958), pp. 170–72; Spencer W. Kimball, *The Teachings of Spencer W. Kimball* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1982), pp. 33–35; Bruce R. McConkie, *Mormon Doctrine*, 2nd ed., (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1966), pp. 109 and 566; LeGrand Richards, *A Marvelous Work and a Wonder* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Company, 1976), pp. 293 and 308; Kent M. Van De Graaff, “Physical Body,” in *Encyclopedia of Mormonism*, vol. 3; Jay E. Jensen, “Spirit,” in *Encyclopedia of Mormonism*, vol. 3; Chauncey C. Riddle, “Devils,” in *Encyclopedia of Mormonism*, vol. 1.

⁶ Camille Fronk, “Mary, Mother of Jesus,” in *Encyclopedia of Mormonism*, vol. 2; Bruce R. McConkie, *The Mortal Messiah*, vol. 1 (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Company, 1979), pp. 227, 377, and 466–67; James E. Talmage, *Jesus the Christ: A Study of the Messiah and His Mission* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Company, 1982 reprint edition), pp. 116–17 and 279–80.

⁷ Bruce R. McConkie, *Mormon Doctrine*, p. 546; Alfred Benney, Roger R. Keller, “Catholicism and Mormonism,” in *Encyclopedia of Mormonism*, vol. 1. Cf. “Virgin Birth of Christ,” in *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, ed. by F. L. Cross and E. A. Livingstone (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), p. 1703.

some Protestants believe that Jesus' siblings mentioned in the New Testament⁸ are actually children of Joseph from a previous marriage, or possibly cousins.⁹ So Mormons differ from some traditional Christians on this point. Further, in a unique Mormon understanding, Adam is referred to as "the son of God,"¹⁰ and thus is another half-sibling of Jesus, though he was not begotten as a mortal being in the mortal world.¹¹ While there are issues that could be discussed regarding Jesus' half-siblings, as well as Mormon Christological issues concerning Jesus' divine nature, those issues are out of scope in regards to clarifying whether Jesus and Satan have a sibling relationship in Mormonism. Now, having established that Jesus and Satan did not share the same genetic physical heritage, we must ask if they share any other significant relationship which might justify usage of the term brother.

Let us next consider the issue of adoption. In the New Testament, Christ is referred to as the "firstborn of many brethren,"¹² and from a Mormon perspective, this expression partly refers to how people can assume aspects of divine nature through adoption by God.¹³ Sometimes children are adopted into a family and considered brothers, even if they have no shared genetic heritage. If the relationship is close and loving, they are not called adopted brothers, but true brothers. Normally, a person would introduce "James" simply as "my brother" instead of "my adopted brother," because whether he had been adopted into the family would be an irrelevant point based on the strength of the relationship. So, even though a person is not the physical son of the Father or Mary, and thus a natural sibling to Jesus, Mormons believe that they may become a covenant child of God, and therefore a true sibling via adoption. For those so chosen, Jesus is a true brother. Satan has not been adopted

⁸ Matthew 13:55–56; Mark 6:3; Gal. 1:19.

⁹ Cf. J. M. Frame, "Virgin Birth of Jesus," in *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, ed. by Walter A. Elwell (Grand Rapids: Baker House Books, 1984), pp. 1143–46.

¹⁰ Moses 6:22.

¹¹ Joseph Fielding Smith, *Doctrines of Salvation*, vol. 1, p. 159; Bruce R. McConkie, *Mormon Doctrine*, p. 546.

¹² Romans 8:29.

¹³ John Taylor, *Mediation and Atonement* (Salt Lake City: Deseret News, 1882), ch. 20; Brigham Young, *Discourses of Brigham Young* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Company, 1941), pp. 282–83; Bruce R. McConkie, *Mormon Doctrine*, p. 23.

by God and thus cannot be considered a brother to Jesus in this sense of the term either.

Let us now examine the issue of relative place in the divine hierarchy. Mormons recognize the resurrected Jesus as reigning in celestial glory, at the right hand of the Father, receiving the everlasting praise and worship of the heavenly hosts.¹⁴ In comparison to Jesus, it is true that Satan was originally one of the greatest of angels.¹⁵ In fact, his name Lucifer, which means Light-bearer in Latin,¹⁶ reflects the intense heavenly glory he previously had in heaven. Through disobedience Satan lost whatever glory he had in the beginning, and dwells in Hell as a fallen angel who is eternally called Perdition.¹⁷ As someone who did not conform to the divine lifestyle, Satan has lost his status as a heavenly brother.

A famous scene from Edmond Rostand's *Cyrano de Bergerac* will help to illustrate this issue. In the play, the nobleman De Guiche was ridiculed and rejected by the Gascon cadets because they did not believe that he acted in the way a true Gascon should act. Later, in the Battle of Arras, De Guiche changes his behavior and is finally accepted as a comrade in arms, not only by the Gascons, but also by Cyrano as well.

In ancient Jewish records, the hosts of the divine council are often called the heavenly family of the Most High God.¹⁸ However, Mormons believe that Satan is no longer a member of the heavenly hosts and family of God. The Book of Moses helps articulate this point:

... Satan came tempting him [Moses], saying: Moses, son of man, worship me. And ... Moses looked upon Satan and said: Who art thou? For behold, I am a son of God, in the similitude of his Only Begotten; and where is thy glory, that I should worship thee? For behold, I could not look upon God, except his glory should come upon me, and I were transfig-

¹⁴ *Doctrine and Covenants* (hereafter *D&C*) 76:23, 119; 1 Nephi 1:8.

¹⁵ Chauncey C. Riddle, "Devils," in *Encyclopedia of Mormonism*, vol. 1.

¹⁶ "Lucifer," in *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, p. 1002.

¹⁷ *D&C* 76:26; Moses 4:3.

¹⁸ Nathaniel Deutsch, *Guardians of the Gate: Angelic Vice-Regency in Late Antiquity* (Boston: Brill, 1999), pp. 22 and 53; Macy Lesses, *Ritual Practices to Gain Power: Angels, Incantations, and Revelation in Early Jewish Mysticism* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1998), p. 239. Cf. Frank Moore Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973), p. 45; 3 Enoch 16:1-5 (Synopse [20]).

ured before him. But I can look upon thee in the natural man. Is it not so, surely? Blessed be the name of my God, for his Spirit hath not altogether withdrawn from me, or else where is thy glory, for it is darkness unto me? And I can judge between thee and God ... And now, when Moses had said these words, Satan cried with a loud voice, and ranted upon the earth, and commanded, saying: I am the Only Begotten, worship me. And it came to pass that Moses began to fear exceedingly ... Nevertheless, calling upon God, he received strength, and he commanded, saying: Depart from me, Satan, for this one God only will I worship, which is the God of glory. And now Satan began to tremble, and the earth shook; and Moses received strength, and called upon God, saying: In the name of the Only Begotten, depart hence, Satan. And it came to pass that Satan cried with a loud voice, with weeping, and wailing, and gnashing of teeth; and he departed hence, even from the presence of Moses, that he beheld him not.¹⁹

In this text, just as De Guiche was rejected by the Gascons for not displaying the attributes inherent to any true Gascon, Satan is rejected by Moses for lacking the glory inherent to anyone that is really a member of the family of God. As De Guiche did not act the way a true Gascon should act, Satan does not act the way a true member of the family of God should act. Therefore, from a Mormon perspective, Jesus and Satan are not comrades in arms and thus cannot be considered brothers in this sense of the term either.

It should be noted that Satan declares, "I am the Only Begotten, worship me." Therefore, Satan wants Jesus' place in the divine hierarchy. Satan wants equality with Jesus as his true brother. However, Moses rejects this idea because he sees that Satan lacks the defining divine glory. If Satan were the brother of Jesus, Moses knows he would have the same type of glory inherent to Jesus and members of the divine family. And Satan does not. Further, Moses calls upon the power of the Only Begotten to banish Satan, thus showing that the power of Jesus is greater than the power of Satan. This story is inconsistent with the idea of Satan being a true brother to Jesus, a member of the divine family, and enjoying any type of equality with Jesus.

Having established this analytical foundation, it can be noted that some Mormons may not immediately object to the idea that Jesus and Satan are brothers due to what I believe is their incomplete under-

¹⁹ Moses 1:12-22.

standing of Mormon theology. In addition, some Mormon ecclesiastical leaders and others have on rare occasions used imprecise language indicating some type of sibling relationship in a few of their homiletic discourses and writings.²⁰ By few, I mean that such usage is relatively rare in Mormon discourse; and thus, is not the primary way in which the relationship between Jesus and Satan has historically been described in Mormon culture. By imprecise, I mean that these people would probably rephrase their homiletic discourses if they thought that their word choice might somehow cause some people to accept the notion that Jesus and Satan have some type of family relationship.

In my view, those Mormons who fail to object to the suggestion of such a family relationship probably overemphasize a common aspect of nature that Jesus once shared with Satan prior to his mortal birth and underemphasize all the aspects of nature that made Jesus the unique Son of God.

For context, it should be noted that Mormons reject the Greek Neo-Platonic philosophical tenets adopted by Nicene Christians that divide existence between two separate realities: divinity and the created world, with an irreconcilable gap between these two realities.²¹ From a

²⁰ For example, see John A. Widtsoe, *Evidences and Reconciliations* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1960 edition), p. 209; Gary P. Gillum, "Christology," in *Encyclopedia of Mormonism*, vol. 1.

²¹ For an overview Nicene theology merging with Greek philosophy, see Jaroslav Pelikan, *Christianity and Classical Culture: The Metamorphosis of Natural Theology in the Christian Encounter with Hellenism* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993), p. ix; Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Vindication of Tradition* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984), pp. 12–13, 54, 77; Henry Chadwick, *Early Christian Thought and Classical Tradition* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1966), p. 3; Sterling M. McMurrin, *The Theological Foundations of the Mormon Religion* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 2000); Hans Küng, *Christianity: Essence, History, Future*, trans. by John Bowden (New York: Continuum, 1994, 1998); Keith E. Norman, "Ex Nihilo: the Development of the Doctrines of God and Creation in Early Christianity," *BYU Studies*, vol. 17 (1977), no. 3; Edwin Hatch, *The Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages Upon the Christian Church*, ed. by A. M. Fairbairn (New York: Burt Franklin, 1888, 1972); Craig L. Blomberg and Stephen E. Robinson, *How Wide the Divide?: A Mormon and an Evangelical in Conversation* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1997), p. 88; Stephen E. Robinson, *Are Mormons Christians?* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1991, 1996), pp. 38–40; Blake T. Ostler, "The Mormon Concept of God," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought*, vol. 17 (1984), no. 2; David J. Halperin in *Death, Ecstasy, and Other Worldly Journeys*, ed. by John J. Collins and Michael Fishbane (Albany: State

Nicene perspective, this rejection by Mormons is heretical. Nicenes believe that it causes Mormons to confuse Creator and creature. Mormons believe that this division between Creator and creature is not correct. This is a true point of distinction between Mormonism and Nicene theology.

Because of their rejection of the Nicene perspective, Mormons believe that all existence, including God, angels, and humanity are part of the same continuum of reality, though in different stages of development.²² This means that as part of the natural order, God is mutable and subject to change.²³ In association with this mutability, Mormons believe that Gods, angels, and humanity all began as self-existing Intelligence, or

University of New York Press, 1995), p. 282; Guy G. Stroumsa in *Death, Ecstasy, and Other Worldly Journeys*, p. 147; Larry W. Hurtado, *One God, One Lord: Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism*, 2nd ed., (New York: T&T Clark International, 1998), pp. 73 and 127; Timo Eskola, *Messiah and Throne: Jewish Merkavah Mysticism and Early Christian Exaltation Discourse* (Tubingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 2001), p. 278; Robert Louis Wilken, *The Christians As the Romans Saw Them*, 2nd ed., (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), pp. 79 and 175; Daniel W. Graham and James L. Siebach in *Early Christians in Disarray: Contemporary LDS Perspectives on the Christian Apostasy*, ed. by Noel B. Reynolds (Provo: FARMS and Brigham Young University Press, 2005), pp. 205–37; Noel B. Reynolds in *Early Christians in Disarray: Contemporary LDS Perspectives on the Christian Apostasy*, p. 314; R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy, 318–381* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005), pp. 856–69; A. H. Armstrong, ed., *The Cambridge History of Later Greek and Early Medieval Philosophy* (UK: Cambridge University Press, 1967); Richard Lyman Bushman, *Joseph Smith: Rough Stone Rolling* (New York: Knopf, 2005), p. 57; Shaye J.D. Cohen, *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah*, ed. by Wayne A. Meeks (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1987, 1989), p. 36; Jarl E. Fossum, *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord* (Tubingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1985), p. 9 [f. 31]; Norman Russell, *The Doctrine of Deification in the Greek Patristic Tradition* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), p. 96; Jules Gross, *The Divinization of the Christian According to the Greek Fathers* (Anaheim: A&C Press, 2002), p. 97; Jeffrey R. Holland, cited in Elise Soukup, “The Mormon Odyssey,” in *Newsweek* at <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/9630255/site/newsweek/>.

²² John Taylor, *The Gospel Kingdom*, ed. by G. Homer Durham (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1987), pp. 52–53; Spencer W. Kimball, *The Teachings of Spencer W. Kimball*, p. 170; Ezra Taft Benson, *The Teachings of Ezra Taft Benson*, p. 21. See Walsh, *The Ascension Theology of Joseph Smith*.

²³ Joseph Fielding Smith, ed., *Teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith*, p. 345.

light and truth,²⁴ though with different levels of ability. God the Father, the Intelligence of greatest ability, instituted laws whereby the other Intelligences could progress in power and knowledge as he himself had progressed.²⁵ Part of this plan of progression was to graduate from Intelligence to premortal spirit. From existence as a premortal spirit, the Intelligences graduated to mortal physical bodies. After death and resurrection, the Intelligences would enter into their final state, having a resurrected physical body of flesh, bone, and spirit, like the Father.

This Mormon scheme of reality means that Jesus and Satan can be compared in several ways. They could be thought of as brothers in the sense that each began as self-existing, co-eternal Intelligence, though Mormon teachings indicate that Jesus was of greater ability than Satan. They could also be thought of as brothers in the sense that God the Father helped each graduate to a premortal spirit body that he himself had procreated.²⁶

However, if a person accepted these lines of reasoning, then he must also state that Jesus and Satan have no special unique relationship between them. In other words, if a person were to accept that Jesus and Satan are brothers as a natural derivative from these Mormon teachings, each God, angel, and human would also have to be considered a brother or sister to them both as well. Of course, if we are all brothers and sisters, then these relational terms lose much of their meaning due to too much commonality.

This being said, it is important to know that calling Jesus and Satan brothers is still a distorted view of Mormon theology, in my opinion. Since Jesus and Satan have no special relationship between them, it seems improper to describe shared partial ontology as the basis for brotherhood. Because calling them brothers implies a special significant relationship, and this does not actually exist, it would be more accurate to say that Jesus and Satan both exist in the same continuum of reality as humanity does. It's simple, concise, and clearly distinguishes Mormonism from traditional Christianity.

It should be noted that Jesus' primary relationship is with his Heavenly Father, and his mother Mary. In Mormon theology, Jesus is called the Son of God because of his physical body with its unique ge-

²⁴ D&C 84:45; 88:6, 40; 93:28-40; John 3:21 (Joseph Smith Translation).

²⁵ Joseph Smith in *History of the Church*, ed. by B. H. Roberts, vol. 6, 2nd revised ed., (Salt Lake City: The Deseret Book Company, 1980), p. 312.

²⁶ Bruce R. McConkie, *Mormon Doctrine*, p. 251.

netic heritage.²⁷ Even though Jesus had received a spirit body from the Father, Mormon scripture says he was not called the Son of God until he received his physical body from God the Father and Mary.²⁸ This special physical body, with its unique mixture of divine and mortal chromosomes, was necessary for Jesus' calling as Savior and Redeemer of the world.

While Mormons are famous for calling themselves children of God, they do not believe that this gives them the same distinctive divine sonship that Jesus has with the Father. Jesus could be considered a son of God (with a small s) when he was a premortal spirit, but he did not become the Son of God (with a capital S), until he was begotten by the Father and conceived by Mary. It is true that Jesus was referred to as the Only Begotten and similar titles prior to his physical birth, but he claims these titles in anticipation of his mortal birth and unique genetic heritage.

In my view, people who call Jesus and Satan brothers because they both received advancement from Intelligence to premortal spirit with the Father's help seem to fail to grasp that this commonality is not the basis of Jesus' unique divine Sonship. It is very important to note that Mormons call Jesus the divine Son of God because the Father begat his physical body which he did not do for Satan. Thus, in Mormon theology, Satan is not another Son of God (with a capital S), and he is not Jesus' brother.

While it is a Mormon theological dogma that both Jesus and Satan received premortal spirit bodies from the Father, I believe it is improper emphasis to create a brotherly relationship based on it. It has a tendency to create a distortion in the listener's mind by underemphasizing the primary importance of the literal physical genetic relationship between Jesus and the Father that Satan does not enjoy. This is especially true for those of a Trinitarian mindset who do not believe in premortal existence for either Jesus or the rest of humanity.

It is interesting that Mormons call each other "brother" or "sister" within their religious community. For example, someone might say that this is "Brother Johnson" or "Sister Smith." This usage reflects the shared covenantal responsibilities of the people and is not a reference to their shared premortal heritage. A person would not call his non-Mormon neighbor "Brother Jones" just because they share the same

²⁷ Joseph Fielding Smith, ed., *Teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith*, p. 187.

²⁸ Cf. Moses 4:1-2.

premortal nature. Likewise, if a non-Mormon neighbor is not a brother despite a common spiritual heritage as a spirit child of the Father, then it is inappropriate to consider Jesus and Satan as brothers for the same reason. Instead, Satan is “the common enemy”²⁹ of God and humanity. Again, when discussing shared premortal heritage, the issue of emphasis is important. Imagine for a moment that I were to take my wife to a party and when introducing her to people, I said simply, “This is my friend.” It is a true statement that she is my friend. Still, that simple description in isolation lacks the emphasis needed to properly portray the significance of our relationship. If people were to later find out that she is also my wife, and I failed to mention it, then they would likely believe that I was less than forthright in describing our relationship when I simply said “friend.” And they would be correct. Likewise, while Jesus has occasionally been called “Elder Brother” in Mormon discourse, this is not his primary title and inadequately describes his relationship to either Satan or humanity in general when used in isolation or without proper context.

Importantly, this title is not used in Mormon scripture. In contrast, Jesus’ title of “Only Begotten” is used 9 times in the *Book of Mormon*,³⁰ 13 times in the *Doctrine and Covenants*,³¹ and 25 times in the *Pearl of Great Price*.³² Many of the uses within the *Pearl of Great Price* are actually extractions from the Joseph Smith Translation of the Bible. This means that Joseph Smith believed that the biblical text made more sense to him when it stressed the particular title of “Only Begotten.” This relative usage of “Elder Brother” versus “Only Begotten” is very important to understanding the relationship between Jesus and Satan in the mind of Joseph Smith.

²⁹ Bruce R. McConkie, *Mormon Doctrine*, p. 151; Bruce R. McConkie, *The Promised Messiah: The First Coming of Christ* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Company, 1978), pp. 221 and 235; Bruce R. McConkie, *The Mortal Messiah*, vol. 3, p. 204; Bruce R. McConkie, *The Millennial Messiah: The Second Coming of the Son of Man* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Company, 1982), p. 14; Hugh Nibley, *The Prophetic Book of Mormon* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Company, 1989 reprint edition), pp. 461–62.

³⁰ 2 Nephi 25:12; Jacob 4:5, 11; Alma 5:48; 9:26; 12:33–34; 13:5, 9.

³¹ D&C 20:21; 29:42, 46; 49:5; 76:13, 23, 25, 35, 57, 93:11; 124:123; 138:14, 57.

³² Moses 1:6, 13, 16–17, 19, 21, 32–33, 2:1, 26–27; 3:18; 4:1, 3, 28; 5:7, 9, 57; 6:52, 57, 59, 62; 7:50, 59, 62.

What does “Only Begotten” signify? It signifies that within the mortal world Jesus is the only one to have been sired by God the Father, and thus has no siblings in his primary relationship to divinity. Jesus’ unique genetic heritage was an essential component of his ability to act as Savior and Redeemer.

Can people be adopted into the family of God, according to Mormonism? Yes. Do Jesus and all of humanity share common spiritual heritage as spiritual offspring of the Father? Yes. Before he was cast down, was Satan once a member of the premortal family of God, and thus shares this premortal heritage? Yes. However, for Joseph Smith, “Only Begotten” was a far, far more crucial title for Jesus than “Elder Brother,” as evidenced by the Prophet’s relative usage of the two terms. Therefore, in my view, use of the title “Elder Brother,” especially in reference to Satan, neglects the importance and uniqueness of Jesus in Mormon theology as the Son of God (capital S). I believe the lack of proper emphasis distorts the place of both Jesus and Satan in Joseph Smith’s thought.

REVIEW – PEOPLE OF PARADOX: A HISTORY OF MORMON CULTURE

Reviewed by Carter Charles

Terryl L. Givens, *People of Paradox: A History of Mormon Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), Paperback: \$29.95.

Terryl Givens' *People of Paradox* is with two exceptions a carefully worded, structured, and well-documented book (67 pages of index and endnotes) that mobilizes various humanistic fields (history, sociology, philosophy and arts, mainly) in an attempt to map out and to explain "some key components of [Mormonism's] cultural identity" since the LDS Church's inception in upstate New York (viii). His panoramic view of Mormon culture stretches from the invisible and at times irrational aspects expressed in words (books) to the more concrete, outward manifestations of that culture as they appear in city planning and architecture, or in painting and cinema. Givens' emphasis is on the making of institutional Mormon culture and how it situates in the larger American context, and on dissonances generated by the way individual Mormon artists and intellectuals negotiate their places inside the faith. The diversity in approach and the content of the book will appeal to a wide readership. But they also make it more difficult to produce a comprehensive enough review.

As one will gather from the book's, and several chapters' well-chosen titles, the intellectual and artistic experience in Mormonism is replete with paradoxes, divergent dynamics, which Givens has referred to as "a field of tensions", a phrase borrowed from a third party (xiv). The first part of the book is devoted to explaining how those tensions, paradoxes, are a constituting part of Mormon religious and cultural identity: they are the outward expression of something deeper, something couched in holy writ and prophetic statements,¹ fossilized in language ("I

¹ On page 5, Givens quotes D&C 93:29-30 which likens "the agency of man" to independent truths: "All truth is independent" says the first segment of verse. But the same passage specifies the bounds of independence/agency: it

know”; 26), and in history and tradition.² According to Givens, the existence of such tensions is validated by Joseph Smith, the prophet of Mormonism³: he introduces the book quoting Smith’s statement that “by proving contraries, truth is made manifest” (xi). Unfortunately, Givens does comment on the statement.⁴

The book shows that Givens is heir to a Mormon tradition of intellectualism. But, he has to keep a delicate balance as an author and a Mormon intellectual writing on Mormonism for a wide readership. As such, he tries to assess without over-alienating inside while making sure that his work is not labeled “apologetic” outside. But even the distinguished scholar that he is has not yet found how to maintain the balance without offending “by dint of something left out, something overpraised, or something undervalued” (vii). This delicate balance, how Mormon artists reconcile religious demands (orthodoxy, The Iron Rod) and personal judgment (The Liahona),⁵ is one of the major themes that cuts through the book. His “Fomenting the Pot” chapter and the discussion on Eugene England’s “path of faithful dissent” (216) is quite illustrative of something typically Mormon that “even careful observers”

must be constrained within the “sphere in which God has placed it”. Givens implicitly shows the parallel of such paradox in summing up Jonathan Edwards’ argument that “men are both free *and* morally determined” (Givens’ emphasis).

² A precedent was established in Oliver Cowdery’s assertion of personal judgment over ecclesiastical authority when it comes to his temporal affairs (12). See also page 94 for a concrete application of that precedent.

³ My italic to render Givens’ “unique place [of Joseph Smith] in Mormonism” (xii).

⁴ I am more than prudent with Smith’s statement because of its polysemy. It does not tell what and whose truth will be made manifest. Is it the truth that will help understand why contraries do not go together? How do we go about proving contraries? Did he mean that by experimenting different, opposing values one will ultimately come to a personal opinion/truth? Or, did he mean that by placing side by side opposing values one may be able to discriminate/tell fundamental differences?

⁵ “The Iron Rod” in Mormon belief system is a sort of safety barrier that protects from falling into the Precipice as they walk “the strait and narrow path” that leads to eternal bliss (1 Nephi 8 and 11). It also carries the idea of “compulsion” (discussed on page 5), of “religious imperative” and “ecclesiastical authoritarianism” (15). And the Liahona is a miraculously compass that guided one of the parties mentioned in the *Book of Mormon* (1 Nephi 16:10; see also Alma 37:38). The Liahona is also understood to be a Mormon’s right to personal guidance from God.

may not fully grasp (15). It is clear that this readership is the main target of the book.

But a distinction is to be made between what observers may not fully understand and what they may fairly be critical about. Some may for instance find issues with Givens' lengthy quotes of Mormon religious writings or history which he could have summarized as he has done with some biblical stories.⁶ Givens tries to rationalize Mormonism and does not try to "mormonize." So it may well be argued in his favor that the lengthy quotes are the result of a desire to provide his readership with as many first-hand accounts as possible of the defining constituents of Mormon identity.

Mormons not accustomed to exegesis of their theology will have to read some passages of the book a couple of times before they can fully grasp their meanings. Such is the case of the passage beginning from the end of chapter 2 (30) through chapter 3. Such careful reading is recommended because those readers might otherwise come out with the impression that they are on a sort of Ulysses voyage. For although we have "a relentlessly optimistic theology" in that we do not preach "hell, fire and damnation" anymore, "salvational fullness", *the end* is actually "endlessly deferred", "relegated to a future that seems indefinitely remote" (34). One year supply will definitely not be enough. Givens' subsequent discussion in the same chapter on how and why the sacred and the banal sometimes merge in Mormon culture is a good way to keep busy during the trip,⁷ to forget about its near-endless nature and worry about "now".

Another way Mormons keep busy during the trip is through the quest of knowledge or education whose principle Givens lays down in chapter 2, and whose evolution he surveys in the history of Mormonism at large, especially in the second part of the book. It will be no surprise to anyone that Mormons have always been interested in education. The interest of the book on this issue is that it sheds light on what might

⁶ Contrast for instance the story of Balaam and his ass (7 lines) to the account of the "First Vision" which covers more than one page (159–61). About the same length for the quotations on the Haun's Mill Massacre (163–164); although he tries to make for the imbalance with almost a page summary (not direct quotations) on the Mountain Meadows Massacre (211–12).

⁷ Reminds also of the use of the same building for both religious and mundane activities (146).

have escaped Mormons and observers: the details that matter,⁸ the historical shifts and phases, the main actors and the way the pursuit of secular knowledge and faith have been intertwined or disentangled.⁹ A case in point is the fact that the Mormon millennial enterprise, something wholly religious, began with the construction of something wholly secular, “a school, not a temple” (72). It is helpful to learn about the tradition of debates and intellectual jousts that characterized early Mormonism¹⁰ to understand why some of today’s Mormon intellectuals may sound a bit nostalgic of a past, of a time when it was possible to dissent without being ostracized and labeled an “apostate”.¹¹

Instead of the label “apostate”, Givens prefers to speak of “modern Galileos” in Mormonism. He advocates that “they deserve their day in the court of public opinion”, citing Joseph Smith in support of his case (220). This position will definitely please the “Liahona Mormons” but the “Iron Rod” ones¹² and the Church’s hierarchy will probably reply that the Church is no public court. Nor will his quoting Joseph Smith help. For as shown in his introduction, Brigham Young instituted the doctrine that the words of the living oracles have precedence over those of the dead prophet; though we may esteem him. That is a twist (paradox?) of continuing revelation.

Given the fact that Givens constantly refers to the internationalization dimension of Mormonism,¹³ I find it appropriate as a non-American Mormon interested in this process to conclude my review with a few remarks on it. To begin with, it is fair to note that unlike some

⁸ See for instance page 99 for comparative data showing Utah Mormons’ access to education and literacy rate between 1870 and 1888.

⁹ The “Godbeites,” and “the demise of the Polysophical Society” period under Brigham Young when some began to feel “that Mormonism was becoming inhospitable to true intellectuals” (92–94). See also the development on the Church Educational System and the post Talmage, Roberts era (206), the Correlation program of the 1960s and its impact “on the fortune of Mormon art” (338).

¹⁰ Orson Pratt’s boldness defending Mormonism outside and dismissing President Young’s declaration inside the faith (96–97) as illustration that the thinking began only after the Brethren had spoken.

¹¹ Compare for instance the account of William Smith siding against his prophet/brother (80) with the cases of Juanita Brooks (212), Heber Snell and Sterling McMurrin (235–36).

¹² Richard Poll’s categorization quoted by Givens (16–17).

¹³ He discusses the internationalization of the Church in his introduction and closes the book on the question. See also page 59–61.

Mormons who feel that they always have to preach the universality of the Church;¹⁴ Givens does not try to deny the Americanness of Mormonism. For him, “it is *rooted* in a plethora of circumstances” which eventually make it difficult to tell “which aspects [in Mormonism] are essential to the faith and which are expendable features deriving from American culture” because “the two ... have become imperceptibly fused” (61; my emphasis). In my opinion, such acknowledgment is the beginning of the true international dimension of the Church. Sure, the Church can never be a utopian United Nations but accepting that it is so far inherently American implies that it is not impossible to make room for other cultural influences. Otherwise, it will continue to be perceived abroad as an arrogant religion, even by such faithful Mormons as the Mexican stake president (338).

That Givens concludes the chapter in which he acknowledges the Americanness of Mormonism, stating that “the challenge would be to exploit the accoutrements of the host culture without suffering contamination or loss of mission and identity in the process” (62) is paradoxical (internal paradox?), maladroit and unfortunate. So is the comparison of the Mormon nightmare in Missouri with “ethnic cleansing” (153). Why? Because in its globalization process, Mormonism goes or may go to countries that have been traumatized with colonialism (African nations, my home country of Haiti, for instance) and which have experienced *real* ethnic cleansings (Rwanda, Ex-Yugoslavia). There is no denying that the early Mormons suffered unspeakable atrocities because of their religion. But that chapter cannot be called “ethnic cleansing”; even if the religion has an entry of its own in the *Harvard Encyclopedia of Ethnic Groups* (56). The words “exploit” reminds of the oppressor, the imperialist; “without suffering contamination or loss” are so American, they remind of Truman’s “Containment” with its idea of quarantine and protection. It is impossible to evoke “contamination or loss” when it comes to contact to other cultures without implicitly casting them as inferior and malignant.

Those last words sound very harsh for a book which I actually enjoyed reading and which I maintain has been otherwise carefully worded. They are a sign that beside talking to those who are not of the

¹⁴ Givens speaks in his introduction of Mormons who “are [...] rethinking the limitations and obstacles” of the Americanness of Mormonism and who are “raising the possibility of a church surreptitiously engrafted with at least some expendable and merely *accidental* local baggage” (xvi, my emphasis).

Mormon faith for greater understanding, Mormons also need to bring down the national barriers and the distances that separate them and have constructive dialogues.

Carter Charles
University of Bordeaux, France
c_jcharles@hotmail.com

REVIEW – THE MISSION OF MORMONISM IN NORWAY, 1851– 1920

Reviewed by Christian Euvrard

Johnnie Glad, *The Mission of Mormonism in Norway, 1851–1920, A Study and Analysis of the Reception Process*, (Frankfurt am Main, Germany: Peter Lang Publishers, 2006), Paperback: £58.00.

It was my pleasure to meet with Johnnie Glad last August, on the occasion of the Annual Conference of the European Mormon Studies Association (EMSA), in Turin, Italy. Born in Norway in 1929, this gracious gentleman is an eminent theologian. After his studies at the University of Oslo, Det Teologiske Menighetsfakultet, he pursued studies at the Columbia University and the Theological Seminary, both in New York, as well as at the School of Theology, in Boston, receiving a master's degree in Religious Education and a doctor's degree in Theology. He then served as a member of the clergy of The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, in different parishes in New York, New Jersey, Wisconsin and Massachusetts. Returning to Norway in 1968, he started teaching religion at Levanger Teachers' College and what is now the University of Stavanger.

His interest in Mormonism started while working as a parish pastor in the United States. He has conducted thorough research on Mormonism and Norway over the years with regular visits to Utah, particularly to the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints' (LDS) Church History Library. He has also done a very complete survey of all archival documents about Mormonism in Norway available in the Church Department, Justice Department, National Archives and University Library in Oslo, as well as in the Institute of Missiology and Ecumenical Theology, University of Aarhus, Denmark.

Glad begins with a general introduction. He looks at previous works on the topic of the Mormon Mission in Norway, most of which written by Mormon authors, which he labels as "Mormon apologists" while recognizing their interest to his study. The great interest and contribution of his work will be the research among reports, studies, letters of prominent clergymen, theologians and professors in relation with

what our author calls the “Mormon issue” as well as the study of newspapers, magazines and periodicals’ articles about the Mormons in Norway. Judging by the list of references he was able to consult (26–27), it seems he had access to most documentation at the LDS Church History Library.

Glad states as his approach to his work: “Our study dealing with Mormonism and Norway during the period 1851–1920 is a study and analysis of the reception process when this new and strange religion Mormonism first arrived in Norway in 1851. What happened when that which was old and familiar was being confronted and challenged by something new and strange? Or to be more specific, what happened when this new religious movement met the official and well established religion that had ruled the grounds for years?” (27). This statement should be kept in mind. The author’s approach is not a history of the Mormon Church in Norway. Anybody expecting this would be disappointed. Glad centers on how the Lutheran Church and the Norwegian State reacted to the introduction of this “new and strange” religion. He states: “The resistance in Norway against the Mormons was not primarily a defense for the State Church but for the common Christian religion. In other words, Mormonism was considered a deviation not only from the teachings of the Lutheran State Church but from Christendom as a whole,” adding a little further “The Mormon missionary work was considered an attack against the homogeneous culture and society” (31). This is the key to understand the work of Glad.

His study is divided in three parts: Part I – “How it all started” is intended to be first of all, a general presentation of Mormonism. He addresses the history of Mormonism in the United States (Chapter 1). It offers no surprises for a scholar of LDS history. To account for the success of the Mormon missionaries in the British Isles, Glad places more emphasis on the emigration system than on conversion.

Chapter 2, the “doctrinal foundation of Mormonism,” starts with the Articles of Faith and then presents different beliefs of the LDS Church. However, the leitmotiv is always to show how these concepts “deviate from the Christian faith.” Whether the concept of God, the interpretation of salvation, the scriptures and revelation, all doctrines are different from what is generally accepted by what we could call “mainstream Christianity.” The author’s position is summarized in the following statement: “Lutherans and many with them believe that God has revealed himself conclusively and authoritatively in Jesus Christ and he continues to make himself known through the Word and Sacra-

ments, where he reveals all that is necessary for the salvation of man” (73). Anything added by the Mormons is clearly presented as deviation. Millennialism and baptism for the dead are studied in that light. The last section of this chapter deals with polygamy. The title is “Polygamy. A historical retrospect on the problem of dual communication and practice,” a chapter which emphasizes the secrecy of the practice, as well as the fact that it was practiced even after the Manifesto of 1890. Glad concludes: “It is therefore important to go somewhat in depth into this subject in order to unveil methods and strategies that were used by the leadership of the Mormon Church” (111).

The chapter that follows is a brief historical retrospect (only 25 pages) of Mormonism’s arrival in Norway (Chapter 3). We are disappointed that the historical facts are so sketchy. It would have been interesting to know to what extent Mormonism developed in Norway. Very few numbers are given. We learn of the Norwegians converted to Mormonism in western settlements in Wisconsin. Mention is made of the calling of Apostle Erastus Snow to start missionary work in Scandinavia, but with little details about their arrival and the development of their congregations. We discover that the first branch was organized in Norway in Risør in 1852 with 18 members and in the next paragraph that the Norwegian Mission was divided in three districts, Oslo, Bergen and Trondheim, which implies that in these areas the LDS Church had found success in a numerical amount of converts. Another figure mentioned is the report of a Mormon missionary in 1858 counting 376 members in 11 branches. The first building is erected in 1870 and dedicated in 1871 with the presence of 400 LDS members. Finally (133) we learn that, for the period 1851–1920, the Mormons had in Norway:

“Baptisms	7939
Emigration	3326
Removed	1304
Deaths	769
Excommunications	1997
Total membership as of 31 December 1920 was 1287.”	

We can regret that Glad did not investigate, or share more information, on who were the first generations of Norwegian converts to the Mormon Church, their motivation and emigration. What classes of society were they from? Did they enter the Church as families or individuals? Did they remain faithful or did they come back to Norway after

the emigration? No portrait, no example is given of who they were and why they converted. This leaves aside a whole side of the question. If Mormonism was so uncharacteristically un-Christian, as Glad asserts, why did these nearly 8,000 Norwegians, many of whom were no doubt Christians, embrace Mormonism and still consider themselves as being Christian? Glad fails to answer these questions.

Part II is entitled "The issue of religious freedom" and goes from Chapter 4 to 7. One might have wished that this part came first as it gives the religious, historical, political and social background necessary to understand fully the challenge that the introduction of Mormonism in Norway represented. Most people know the history of the conversion of Norway to the Reformation movement and particularly to the Lutheran faith. After the Peace of Augsburg of 1555, and according to the famous motto "Cujus regio, ejus religio", meaning each country in Northern Europe could choose its faith and religion according to the decision of its king or prince. What was developed in most countries is a State-Church theory, pointing out the absolute necessity of religious uniformity. France, which had both Catholic and Protestant subjects under a catholic monarchy would be a counter example of this policy with the tragic religious wars as a consequence. From this time on, being Norwegian and being Lutheran was considered one and the same thing. Glad concludes his chapter 4 with this sentence: "In other words, non-Lutherans were prohibited from practicing their religion" (153). Quakers, Russian Orthodox, Catholics and of course Jews, whether coming from emigration or conversion, soon had to face the restrictions of the law. This was the start of a heroic fight for religious freedom.

Glad examines (Chapter 5) the steps going from the Conventicle Law of January 1741 (dealing with religious awakening, the influence of pietism) to the abolition of it under the influence of the Haugean Movement, in July of 1842. This was the end of the strict dominion of the Lutheran Church as a State Church. He then follows (Chapter 6) how a real religious freedom would emerge with the Dissenter Law which received royal sanction in July 1845, mainly for denominations recognized as professing "Christian Religion." Glad explains: "The fight to abolish the Conventicle Law was a fight against the monopoly position of the clergy in the State Church. The fight for the Dissenter Law was a fight against State Church domination within society in general" (195).

Did this evolution profit the Mormons who had arrived in the meantime? As early as September 1852, five Mormons sent a letter to the

regional commissioner of Ostfold to organize "The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints" under the §2 of the Dissenter Law. This brought the authority to examine whether or not the Mormons qualified as Christians. Glad takes us into the meanders of the religious and political institutions to determine the "official" position granted to the Mormons (Chapter 7). This is a long but very interesting part of his book. In the case of Mormonism in Norway, neither the Lutheran bishops, nor the Theological Faculty could agree, leaving the Church Department perplexed as to what should be decided. However, the Mormons were left as outsiders in regard to the Dissenter Law. It was not until 1969, with the replacement of the Dissenter Law with *Lov om trdomssamfunn og ymist anna* that the Mormons received an official recognition.

Part III offers another very insightful study of the reaction to Mormonism in Norway through the press and some major figures of theologians, professors and other prominent speakers. Glad did a wonderful job in cataloging a series of books and newspaper articles on Mormonism. We could be tempted to say "against" Mormonism, for although he states "the reactions were to a great extent negative while others again were more open minded and liberal" (235-36), he does not give many examples of the latter. We shall not attempt to cover all articles and books summarized by Glad (Chapter 8) but only list the themes of oppositions. "Are Mormons Christians?" is of course the root of all debate since disqualifying them as non-Christians seems sufficient. The Mormons are accused of using a Christian vocabulary and Christian concepts but distorting them so much that this apparent familiarity is another trap for credulous people. The Mormons are dangerous, they "fool" people, they conceal "grave and divergent doctrines," they seduce young girls to whom they offer "free passage" to Utah. The polygamy issue occupies many of such articles: "Daddy has gotten a new wife," "The life of women among the Mormons," "The Mormons' girl-catching," "The Mormon Maid," are only a few examples of such titles in articles, books, plays and even, later, motion pictures. The authors try "to remove the mask of the terrible and blasphemous sect" (249). We regret that Glad always gives a summary of the different articles or books without ever actually quoting the original text. This leaves a doubt as to the personal opinion of Glad himself. Does he agree with and take for himself the many accusations, criticisms and extremely negative reports on the Mormons? The reader hopes for a personal position, a critical distance, a committed opinion, unfortunately in vain. We are served the nineteenth century propaganda without any attempt of critical analysis.

This deficit strongly hampers the credibility of the study as scientific research. When he adds “Mormonism was described as a fantastic and confused mixture of Judaism, Mohammedism and simple paganism mixed in with strongly distorted Christian thoughts” (255), one wonders who is speaking.

Chapter 9 follows with a long series of portraits of prominent bishops, theologians and teachers who have encountered the Mormon issue. Each is introduced by a long, somewhat unnecessary, biography. What is interesting is to follow the difficulties such intellectuals have in admitting divergent views, differing doctrines, contradictory beliefs. For one, “Mormonism embodied in its very nature lies and immorality that carried the seed of destruction” (271). For another, “how the Mormons, whom he considered to be apostles of lies, could be accepted in a country that had been blessed with the Word of God and the means of grace” remains a question (317). Yet another wanted “to help prevent fellow Christians from becoming ensnared in this trap of lies and if possibly rescue some who already had fallen into it” (350).

In this long list, Mormonism is compared “to a monster with long tentacles several fathoms long” (357), the converts are “unhappy and deceived people who had been strapped in the firm net of a deplorable religion by a bloodsucking priesthood” (358). All this literature urged some pastors to organize a rescue mission in Utah to save the “hundreds of compatriots...brought into bondage, sliding on the slippery downward path to eternal perdition” (359). Glad gives the report of some 132,776 persons converted from Scandinavia with the result of some 30,000 to 40,000 in Utah around 1881. However, “the mission work in Utah was hard and difficult,” “during a ten-years period from the founding of the congregation about seventy adults had joined” and “only thirty members were left” (368). Andreas Mortensen, for his part, concluded that Mormonism “felt as if a creepy snake was coiling itself around his feet and was moving up around his body. At this point Mortensen understood what a Satanic power that lay at the bottom of Mormonism” (378).

In chapter 10, Glad covers the anti-Mormon campaigns of the first decades of the 1900s. The material covered there is essentially the same as the anti-Mormon propaganda. Similar themes are addressed in the content of chapter 12 by presenting the reaction from dissenters (mainly Methodists) and Lutheran non-State organizations. They apply the same accusation of misusing “the name of Christianity in an attempt to cover up the worst carnal debaucheries in connection with desecrated

priestly tyranny” (436). However, one interesting point is the documentation of the US Secretary of State’s plan to use diplomatic ways of limiting the impact of Mormon missionaries in Europe in order to limit the number of Mormon emigrants in the US. This well orchestrated campaign had lasting consequences, forcing the LDS Church to send a special “embassy” to Scandinavia in the persons of LDS Senator and Apostle Reed Smoot and Apostle John A. Widtsoe in the 1920s, which is only briefly mentioned by Glad (130–32).

At the end of this long one-sided catalog of harsh criticism against Mormonism in a book one would hope would possess more objectivity, some remarks are necessary:

1. In presenting only the opposition to Mormonism in Norway, one gets a very unbalanced feeling. Glad argues that to understand “why did people react the way they did” one has to consider “the historical and doctrinal aspects of Mormonism.” However, how can we explain the thousands of converts from Norway? Especially since those who emigrated to Utah seem to have remained attached to their new faith as a majority.

2. Again, it is unclear who is speaking? Is it Reverend Glad, the former Lutheran Minister? Is it Professor Glad, the Theologian? By rarely using quotation marks, Glad leaves the strong impression that most critical positions presented reflect his own views. But then, it would have been fair to present the counter arguments of the LDS position. Even the “Epilogue” is in this regard disappointing. In many ways this makes the book appear more like an opinionated attack on Mormonism rather than an objective and balanced scholarly study of Mormonism.

3. What is missing? We wish Glad would have mentioned the excellent work of Terryl L. Givens, *The Viper on the Hearth, Mormons, Myths and the Construction of Heresy*, which title fits so well with the image used by Mortensen (quoted above) of the Mormon Church as a “viper on the hearth” (a phrase from an article in the *Cosmopolitan*, in 1911). Givens explains: “One of the challenges Mormonism – like other heterodoxies – presented to its detractors...was that its religious radicalism was an opportunity for toleration at the same time it was an occasion for outrage. At those times when outrage carried the day, the pressure of pluralism made it desirable to cast the objectionability of Mormonism in

non-religious terms.”¹ In other terms, if Mormonism is labeled as a non-religion, then there is no need to tolerate it, or as famous French author Molière put it “Qui veut noyer son chien l’accuse de la rage” [if you want to kill your dog just say he got the rabies]. On what ground will a new Church or religion “deserve” the honorable label of religion?²

4. The process is well known today, each new religious group has to go through a period of persecution and criticism before, eventually, reaching a level of social normalization. This is the other problem with the process of introduction of Mormonism in Norway described by Glad: it stops in 1920. At least in the epilogue, it would have been interesting to know the position of the Norwegian State, of the Lutheran State Church, of the Norwegians themselves towards Mormonism today. Without going into details, the presentation of the results of Smoot and Widtsoe’s visit to Norway (including their visit to the King), the official recognition of 1988 and the more than 4,000 members presently in Norway could have given us the end result of the process described. In reality, the whole topic centers on the question of religious propaganda and counter-propaganda. People can reject Mormonism and criticize it all they want of course. The purpose is not to declare which Church or Religion is true, but to recognize that in the reaction of a given denomination towards a new faith, we learn more about that denomination than about the new faith. In other words, what Glad has presented us with, and in this regard it is extremely interesting, is more a description of the tensions of the Lutheran Church, the conservatism of Norwegian intellectuals (particularly theologians) and Norwegian society as a whole, rather than a description of what Mormonism actually was or is in Norway.

5. But the real topic that is addressed and should have been developed in a more systematic way is the question of religious freedom. Ole Vig, “A Norse Educator” (331), is probably one of the few that really understood what was at stake. We thank Glad for presenting this thoroughly. Vig clearly separated the two issues: On one hand whether

¹ Terryl L. Givens, *The Viper on the Hearth, Mormons, Myths and the Construction of Heresy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), p. 7.

² On this topic, see the excellent article by Alain Dierkens and Anne Morelli, “L’honorable label de ‘religion’ et son homologation par les pouvoirs politiques,” in *Sectes et hérésies, de l’Antiquité à nos jours* (Bruxelles: Editions de l’Université de Bruxelles, 2002), pp. 9–14.

Mormonism was true and corresponded to the standards of mainstream Christianity had to be determined, and eventually attacked through “spiritual weapons.” This could be the function of the Lutheran Church, or any other Church. But, on the other hand, coercion (police, civil courts, etc.) could not be used against a religion only on doctrinal grounds: “The duty of the state was to see to it that everyone followed the civil laws, but otherwise were given the rights to live and enjoy freedom” (340). And the author of the article goes as far as explaining that “the demand for religious and intellectual freedom was not modern liberalism or philanthropy, but true Christian virtue” (340). At least, the Mormons “awakened clergymen and teachers of religion,” and Mormons could “become good Norwegian citizens,” concluding that “a serious Mormon stood much closer to the Lord than a false Lutheran” (430–31). This development brings a refreshing balance and Glad could have developed this aspect some more.

6. Congratulations also to Professor Glad for chapter 11 in which “The problem of tolerance–intolerance” is discussed (407–29). Most Norwegians thought that religious freedom had been introduced with the Dissenter Law but the case of Mormonism demonstrated the contrary. In one article in the newspaper *Morgenbladet*,³ entitled “Mormonism and Religious Freedom”, the author explains that since “every religion needed outward signs and manifestations in life” (freedom of worship), the Dissenter Law, not recognizing Mormons as Christians, practically declared “that it was punishable to be a non-Christian” (408). By labeling Mormonism a crime, the Norwegian law and State denied freedom of religion but “an aberration great or small [is] not a crime” (409). Thus, legally, there is “a middle road between recognition and protection, and that was toleration, nothing more or less” (411). The author also insisted that “among Lutherans the law of tolerance was deeply imprinted, as they emphasized the importance of free research and the freedom of choice” (411). Consequently, they should have more inclined to grant that same freedom to others.

As a conclusion, we can emphasize how the problem of reception of Mormonism in Norway follows a pattern that is easily

³ Johnnie Glad, *The Mission of Mormonism in Norway, 1851–1920, A Study and Analysis of the Reception Process* (Frankfurt am Main, Germany: Peter Lang Publishers, 2006), pp. 408–411.

recognizable. It has very modern implications: who will be qualified, in a given State, to legitimize a religious movement? Can the official Church or religion do it? It would seem tempting in a regime of State–Church, but how can one expect this given Church to accept a competing faith within its territory? The question has a very acute application today with the acceptance of Christian denominations in Islamic countries. Can the State authorities declare what is religiously correct? It seems hardly possible, especially when the State proclaims to be ideologically neutral. The difficulties are obvious in France with its regime of Separation of Churches and State, while trying to define which “sects” or “cults” can be accepted or not. Of course, concerning Mormonism, during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, polygamy was a difficult issue. But even beyond polygamy after the Manifesto, being a religious minority remains a challenge for the hosting societies. The examples of the Baptists, the Quakers, the Adventists or the Jehovah Witnesses, all give ample illustration of this difficulty. Mormons are no different. Today, with the phenomenon of globalization, new challenges have emerged. To what extent will the Muslims be accepted in Western societies? The news media bring their lot of examples: the scarf, the “burka,” the minarets in the mosques, etc. Whether the turban of the Sikhs, the kippah of the Jews, the cross of the Christians, what is it that can be tolerated in public spaces such as schools, hospitals, or administrations? It will still be debated for a long time. Johnnie Glad’s book has the merit of giving us an example of the past, Mormonism in Norway (1851–1920) which offers a fundamental paradigm very useful today.

Christian Euvrard
LDS Paris Institute of Religion, Tourman, France
EuvrardC@ldschurch.org

REVIEW – MORMONY V ROSSII: PUT' DLINNOI V STOLETIE

Reviewed by Jeffrey Hardy

Sergei G. Antonenko, *Mormony v Rossii: put' dlinnoi v stoletie* (Moscow: Rodina, 2007), Hardback: \$45.00.

Beyond Gary Browning's *Russia and the Restored Gospel* (1997) and Howard Biddulph's less informative *The Morning Breaks* (1996) on the opening of missionary work in Ukraine, those interested in history of the Church of the Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in Russia have been largely limited to a few chapters in broader works—such as Van Orden's *Building Zion* (1996), Cannon and Cohen's *Unto Every Nation* (2003), or Kahlile Mehr's *Mormon Missionaries Enter Eastern Europe* (2002)—and a couple of articles by Mehr (1986–87) and Zachary Jones (2009) in the *Journal of Mormon History*. The Russian-language historiography, meanwhile, is devoted almost exclusively to the question of Mormon missionary work in contemporary Russia rather than the intersections of Mormonism and Russia over the past 150 years. Beyond the work under review, the lone monograph on Mormons in Russian, I. V. Devina's *Mormony: filosofiiia, religiia, kul'tura* (1994), is unfortunately short, misinformed, and makes no mention of Mormonism in Russia. Thus, as the first Russian-language monograph devoted to the history of the LDS Church in Russia and really only the second such work in any language (after *Russia and the Restored Gospel*), Antonenko's work is certainly a welcome addition to the slim historiography on the subject. Yet the title of the book—*Mormons in Russia: A Century-Long Journey*—is a bit misleading. First, the book spans much more than a century, and second, although Antonenko provides some history of Mormons in Russia, the majority of the text is devoted to two related subjects: the (primarily early) history and doctrine of the Church at large and the treatment of Mormonism in the Russian scholarly (and to a lesser extent clerical) press.

Because of the sparse and often slanderous information available in Russian on the LDS Church, Antonenko devotes approximately one-third of the book to explaining to the reader the origins, doctrine, and contemporary state of the Church as a whole. His aim in this, he ex-

plains, is to “not praise and not disgrace, but to understand,” yet in his discussion of early LDS history and Mormon doctrine, Antonenko is more than fair to his objects of study (9). Indeed, believing Mormons could not hope for a more favorable presentation of their history and doctrine from a (presumably non-Mormon) scholar. Summarily dismissing the Church’s critics at every turn, he accepts largely at face value Church history and doctrine as presented by McConkie, Talmage, and Bushman. Even the apologetics of FARMS is recited without questioning. This is certainly a departure from, if not reaction to, traditional treatments of Mormonism in Russia, and much of the rest of *Mormony v Rossii* is devoted to uncovering precisely such accounts.

Antonenko’s discussion of the reception of Mormonism in Imperial Russia begins with a series of articles published in 1857 in the journal *Otechestvennye zapiski* and concludes with Lev Tolstoi’s famous proclamation on the Church’s potential to become “the greatest power the world had ever known.” He covers several articles and their authors in detail, including a few that have not been previously noted by Browning or others, and it is here that Antonenko is at his strongest. Although his ultimate conclusion that Russian authors more than Western ones were more perceptive and less drawn in by blatant anti-Mormon propaganda is not tenable with the evidence he musters, the level of detail that accompanies his analysis of the “Mormon” writings of such notable figures as N. N. Krasnov, A. I. Benni, F. M. Dostoevsky, P. L. Lavrov, and V. L. Solov’ev is without parallel. In the case of Duma member Solov’ev’s 1896 encyclopedia article, for example, Antonenko perceives that his harsh treatment of Mormonism lay in its implicit challenge to his own vision of a universalizing theocracy under the Russian monarch, who would also be prophet and high priest. Thus, Solov’ev saw Mormonism as the “thwarting of an ideal” (176). When the encyclopedia was revised in 1916, however, the well-known historian M. M. Kovalevskii gave a much more positive view of the Church, accepting the argument that polygamy was necessary to boost the population and crediting the Church for turning a barren desert into a state full of flourishing settlements. On Tolstoy, we learn that his copy of the Book of Mormon occupied a central position on the shelf in his home in Yasnaya Polyana, that he also possessed a biography of Joseph Smith (George W. Cannon’s *Life of Joseph Smith*), and he corresponded with one of Brigham Young’s daughters.

A briefer discussion on Soviet reactions to Mormonism in the 1970s and 1980s is likewise illuminating. Largely in response to a spread

on Utah and Mormons in the American propaganda vehicle *America*, which was distributed in very limited quantities in the Soviet Union, a 1978 monograph on American religious life claimed that Mormon missionaries sent to other countries were primarily not proselytizing, but spreading the political propaganda of and “defending the interests of colonialists and neo-colonialists” (195). Likewise, a 1982 article in the atheistic journal *Nauka i religiia* (*Science and Religion*) painted Mormonism in terms of class antagonism, arguing that it offered “the illusion of ‘salvation’ to the petty bourgeoisie” (198). Ironically, the author notes, just ten years later the same journal, by then devoid of its militant atheism, published one of the first favorable articles about Mormonism in post-Soviet Russia.

Antonenko’s final survey of Russian reactions to Mormonism treats the post-Soviet period. Similar to his previous sections, the author chooses here to relate in detail the works of a few authors as representative samples rather than provide a more comprehensive overview. He begins with the observation that whereas the usual slander soon followed, early press reports of the post-Soviet period were on the whole neutral, or even positive in their treatment of the Church. But the press is not of primary interest to Antonenko; rather, much of the ensuing section deals with attempts by Russian religious scholars to classify the LDS Church and its doctrines within (and sometimes outside) the traditional Orthodox-Protestant framework. Similar to their predecessors in the nineteenth century, Antonenko finds, post-Soviet intellectuals engaged in “Mormon studies” (*mormonovedenie*) also paid significant attention to the social and cultural aspects of Mormonism. Not surprisingly, Orthodox clerics and apologists in the 1990s and 2000s attacked the Church as a fundamentalist sect that had no proper place in Russia, but even some of these, the author discovers, were forced to acknowledge many positive traits shared by Mormons: devotion to family, abstinence from alcohol and tobacco, a strong moral code, regular church attendance, and so forth. To conclude this section, Antonenko provides a brief review of Russian-language discussion on Mormonism on the Internet.

In the midst of his lengthy discussion of Church history and doctrine and reactions to Mormonism from Russian intellectuals, the author, almost as an afterthought, relates the actual history of Mormons in Russia. With the exception of a few notable details—such as a long passage from a letter from Joseph Cannon during his brief visit to Russian in 1903 and the baptism of an American servicemen near

Vladivostok in 1919—most of the early history of Mormons in the Russian Empire related by Antonenko has been covered already by Browning and others (and Browning is indeed cited as a source). And whereas his recognition of Latter-day Saints in the Kaliningrad (Königsberg) area who converted to Mormonism under German rule but who after World War II found themselves in Soviet territory is certainly this, this makes the author's omission of the history of Mormonism in the Grand Duchy of Finland, part of the Russian Empire in the nineteenth century, all the more unfortunate. As Zachary Jones shows in a recent essay, LDS missionaries proselytized (for a time illegally) and converted some 200 subjects of the Russian Empire to the faith beginning in 1875 before abandoning such efforts in 1895 in the face of government repression. Antonenko also fails to discuss for the sake of clarification the Orthodox sectarians in Samarra Province who were given the label *Mormoni* in the mid-1800s, a nickname that has persisted to this day.

In relating the reemergence of the Church in Russia at the end of the Soviet period Antonenko likewise provides an underwhelming account of the spread of the Church into Russia and the other satellite states. Devoting only several pages to the subject, he all but ignores developments in Russia outside of Moscow and St. Petersburg and provides no information on the growth of the Church past the early 1990s. There are, however, a few interesting details not found in *Russia and the Restored Gospel*. We learn, for instance, that Beverly Kimball took a keen interest in spreading the gospel in Russia and to this end befriended Yuri Dubinin, Soviet ambassador to the United States, and his wife. Although this friendship may not have born direct fruit in relation to Mormon proselytizing in Russia, it appears to have played a significant role in the extension of Church aid to earthquake-ravaged Armenia and the subsequent opening of Armenia to missionary work. At the end of the post-Soviet section Antonenko provides a list of four accusations that have inhibited the growth of Mormonism in Russia: denigration of women (including, most prominently, polygamy), the anti-ecumenical stance of the Church, aggressive missionary work by foreigners, and invasive genealogical work. (A fifth, church-state relations, is also provided, but it is unclear what the author is referring to). For each of these “hot” issues, Antonenko recites the general accusation before demonstrating their falsehood using LDS scripture and contemporary Church leaders and scholars such as Gordon B. Hinckley and James A. Toronto.

Included in *Mormony v Rossii* are thirty-two pages of illustrations, among which are quite a number showing Russian Church

members performing service or providing humanitarian aid. Footnotes, unfortunately, are extremely sparse, even by the low standards of referencing maintained by Russian academia, and there is no bibliography (or index, for that matter). The book has a mostly chronological, though at times convoluted and ineffective, organizational structure.

In sum, Antonenko's *Mormony v Rossii* is a valuable addition to the historiography (and history!) of Mormonism in Russia. It is neutral when not outright favorable toward the Church and it serves the important purpose of summarizing the early history of the Church and its doctrines for a Russian-language audience that is likely ignorant on such matters. Its primary contribution, however, lies in detailing the reception of Mormonism by Russian (and Soviet) intellectuals from the 1850s to the early twenty-first century and although Antonenko's survey of this literature is far from exhaustive, its depth more than compensates for its lack of breadth. Those looking for a history of the Church itself in Russia, however, will no doubt be disappointed, for that book remains to be written.

Jeffrey Hardy
Princeton University
jshardy@Princeton.edu

REVIEW – GERMAN SAINTS AT WAR

Reviewed by Zachary Ray Jones

Robert Freeman and John Felt, eds., *German Saints at War* (Springville, Utah: Cedar Fort Inc., 2008), Hardbound: \$29.99.

With World War II studies remaining highly popular among readers and scholars, Freeman and Felt bring something valuable and new to the historiography with *German Saints at War*. This book consists of twenty gripping firsthand accounts by LDS Germans, both soldiers and civilians, and their stories of living and surviving inside Germany during the World War II era. With detailed information on how German Mormons lived under Nazi rule during the war period, this book will not only find favor among its primary audience of faithful Latter-day Saints, but also among scholars of religion during the Second World War period.

Although Freeman has written on this topic before,¹ *German Saints at War* is actually the fifth book produced by Freeman examining Mormonism and world wars, though I would rate this book as his best to date. Freeman, who has a J.D and comes from a legal background, is a professor at Brigham Young University where he teaches religion and history and heads the Saints at War Project, a project that encourages publications and films on the Mormon experience during wartimes. John Felt is not a professional historian, but rather served a LDS mission in Germany, Switzerland, and Austria, and assisted with the project because of this background. In regards to Freeman, his first book was *Saints at War: World War II* (2003) which examined nearly all American soldiers who served in World War II, and contains primarily published oral history accounts of their service. *Saints at War* was produced in conjunction with a veteran's research project conducted with Brigham Young University's L. Tom Perry Special Collections department. Freeman's second book, *Saints at War: Korea and Vietnam* (2006), did not stray far from this

¹ Robert Freeman, "When the Wicked Rule, the People Mourn: The Experiences of German Saints During World War II," in *Regional Studies in Latter-day Saint Church History*, ed. by D. Cannon and B. Top (Provo: Brigham Young University Press, 2003), pp. 89-108.

mold and amounted to another book of primarily published oral history accounts of LDS American veterans. Both of these books have since been made into documentary films. Prior to *German Saints at War*, his two most current books, *Nineteenth Century Saints at War* (2006) and *Saints at War: I'll be Home for Christmas* (2006), both departed from the structure employed in his previous two books in that they contained accounts from written primary source materials, as opposed to oral histories. Freeman is currently working on book to document the Mormon experience during the First World War.

Although *German Saints at War* employs the use of oral histories as with Freeman's first two books, this volume effectively breaks the mold and ventures into new territory by including civilian and female accounts. In this study Freeman and Felt present nineteen oral history accounts of LDS German citizens and soldiers, and one transcribed diary, seven from women and the remaining from men, to document the lives of twenty LDS Germans during the war. It appears most all the individuals interviewed for this publication resided in Utah at the time while the authors were collecting sources. Thankfully, the individual accounts in this book are much longer than in previous books, such as in *Saints at War: Korea and Vietnam* where Freeman often only included a short and incomplete one or two page account from an individual. In this book he grants a more free-reign and includes lengthy accounts from individuals, sometime up to forty pages or more. This increased amount of text grants the reader the ability to see the depth and gravity of ideas and emotions found in the German population endured during the Second World War and Mormonism's place in this scenario.

The book is arranged with a short Preface and Introduction, and then eighteen chapters with individual accounts. In the Preface the authors assert that this "volume attempts to convey something of the impact of the war on German Saints. While most of the stories in this volume derive from firsthand accounts of Latter-day Saints who fought for the German forces, it also provides glimpses into the trials endured by civilian Latter-day Saints who bore such heavy burdens both during and after the war" (ix). The authors also assert that the book "endeavors to commend the faith of German Latter-day Saints who lived through the war and relied upon their Heavenly Father to see them through this terrible time" (ix). In this respect, the authors have done a laudatory job of following this goal. This study is also important because as World War II began, Germany had one of the largest population of Mormons compared to other European nations, approximately 15,000, and accord-

ing to the authors' sources, and 85 percent of LDS Germans were left homeless at the conclusion of the war (xiv).

Many Christian faiths and religious scholars have published works on religious topics concerning the Second World War period, and studies on Mormonism during this period are growing. Perhaps the most examined topic of this period for Mormon studies consists of books and essays on German Latter-day Saint youth Helmuth Hubener, and his small Nazi resistance movement, for which Hubener was executed by the Nazis. Other studies on Mormonism in Germany during this period have also discussed missionary work surrounding the wartime period, the lives of LDS Germans during the war, and some on how LDS Germans and the Church in general reacted to Nazism and World War II. Although some of the existent studies are not scholarly and many topics still remain unstudied by scholars, nearly all publications have sought to demonstrate how the LDS Church did not cooperate or support the Nazi Party and prove that some LDS Germans fought against the Nazi regime. In 1972 a scholarly study confirmed these findings,² and based on what Freeman and Felt present in their book it appears LDS Germans were not swayed by the Nazi message. Based on accounts in this book, Freeman and Felt have sought to portray Mormons as victims of Nazism and that Mormons eschewed the Nazi message.

As for some individual accounts from the book, for those familiar with ranking German leaders in the LDS Church, readers will find accounts by LDS Apostle Dieter F. Uchtdorf (and his wife) and Elder F. Enzo Busche. For those also familiar with the book by Patricia Reece Roper, *We Were Not Alone: How an LDS Family Survived World War II Berlin*, readers will find an account by the principle author's brother, Horst Kurt Hilbert, and other characters in the book, which greatly adds to *We Were Not Alone*. As for content, many stories in the book follow the lives of LDS German soldiers; their life at or near the front, being wounded, and during their years of suffering in Soviet and/or East European prison camps. In this volume number of the soldiers discussed how the Nazi regime discriminated against Mormons because of their religion, and in various instances would not allow a soldier to be promoted to a higher officer rank because they were LDS. Walter K. Rohloff experienced this after attending an officers training school, and though his instructors gave him very good marks, his report read that he could

² Joseph M. Dixon, "Mormons in the Third Reich: 1933-1945," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 7, no. 1 (Spring 1972), 70-78.

not become an officer because he was a “religious fanatic, belonging to the Mormon sect. Politically not trustworthy” (218). Other stories include eyewitness accounts of the firebombing of Dresden, the mass westward flight of civilians away from the Russian advance during winter, the rape of German women by Russian soldiers, the tragedies of food shortages, and in some cases the death of LDS children to these and other harsh conditions. For example, Martha B. Duckwitz remembered a scene while fleeing, with her children, from the Soviet advance into her town of Stettin (in modern day Poland), “We saw dead people lying in the streets, beautiful homes turned into rubble, and many fires burning in many areas of the city. Yet the Russians did not let up their artillery fire” (64). Overall, these survival stories seek to demonstrate how the interviewed individuals saw God watching over them and their families during the war period and how Mormons reacted to war. These accounts are gripping, terrifying, and help the reader better understand the plight of German civilians and even soldiers drafted into the Nazi war machine. Overall, the book creates a frightening picture of the suffering experienced by German civilians during and towards the end of the war.

Although the overall book is arranged well and the content included is superb, it does suffer from some flaws regarding objective selection. The one main flaw with the book is that the authors were selective of accounts included in the book. As Americans, and with part of its proposed American audience, it appears the authors selected the interviews they felt would appeal to an American audience, which resulted in a rather one-sided view of the war. For example, no German soldiers featured in the book fought against the western Allies; all fought against the Russians and on the Russian front. And nearly all soldier accounts featured in the book consisted of narratives showing soldiers who avoided violence and did not kill enemy soldiers. Additionally, all of the included interviewees explained their revulsion or apathetic attitude toward the Nazi regime and its actions. These methods of selection result in a number of problems. For example, this selective process has functioned to create an overly favorable image of Mormonism during the World War II period, which tends to leave the reader wondering about the wider story and if these accounts were average or exceptional. While I understand why the authors avoided accounts that would possibly offend their intended audience, objectively speaking, selectively withholding historical accounts for these reasons detracts from the full story and distorts history. Surely LDS Germans fought against American, British, or French forces, likely killed soldiers on the Western Front, or

simply killed other soldiers during a military conflict, which is all part of the terrible nature of war. Leaving such accounts out from a scholar's perspective is an injustice to the historical record. It was also rather troubling that the authors saw it as ok to allow accounts discussing Russian and German soldiers dying in combat, but not soldiers serving in the western Allied Forces. Such a bias is troubling in any book examining World War II, but then again, choosing sides is regrettably a problem with many publications on World War II. Lastly, as for providing sources that could have captured a LDS opinion in favor Nazi fascism, and although it's quite possible such an opinion was not found among those interviewed for this study, this selective withholding of accounts gives the impression that the authors were hiding or withholding certain non-flattering aspects of history. Yet in defense of these authors, this book was not meant for a scholarly audience, but rather the majority of the faithful LDS laity.

Aside from these flaws, this book is an excellent read and a publication I would heartily recommend to scholars of Mormonism, German history, World War II, and general religious studies.

Zachary Ray Jones
University of Alaska Southeast, Juneau
zachhistory@hotmail.com

REVIEW – MASSACRE AT MOUNTAIN MEADOWS

Reviewed by Ingrid Sherlock–Taselaar

Ronald W. Walker, Richard E. Turley Jr., and Glen M. Leonard, *Massacre at Mountain Meadows* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), Hardback: \$29.95.

Studying Mormon history is, to say the least, a thorny road with here and there some traps. Some of these traps are imagined but others are very real. As a result Mormon historical research has, until recently, been somewhat polarized. One camp most often contained the conservative and faithful Mormons who consider everything that is not positive or uplifting as negative or anti-Mormon. On this side of the divide one also finds a number of apologists. In the other camp one finds the anti-Mormons (often conservative Protestants or disaffected Mormons) who consider everything connected to the Mormon Church, its leaders or members evil. This group has produced an array of one-sided and condemning literature on Mormonism that also does an injustice to honest Mormon history. Luckily, the group that generally seems to be able to toggle both camps has been professional historians and scholars of Mormonism who have generally sought to determine the truth about Mormon history from an objective perspective. While this group does receive opposition from the latter two groups, it often seems to be the body that brings balance to the ideas of two polarized camps.

In recent years, however, it seems that archivists at the Mormon Church's Church History Library, which contains the archival collections of the Mormon Church, have striven for more openness, though full access to archival materials at the Church History Library is still not granted to the public. At the same time some Mormon intellectuals and academics have worked for more openness by writing a number of books that certainly give the appearance of dealing with some of the skeletons in the Mormon cupboard. A number of these books are published by well known non-Mormon publishers. Although not sanctioned by the Mormon Church, a good example of this is the biography *Joseph Smith: Rough Stone Rolling* by practicing Mormon Richard Lyman Bushman, an emeritus historian of Columbia University, which is an excellent and long overdue warts and all biography of Joseph Smith. *Massacre at Mountain Meadows* by Ronald W. Walker, Richard E. Turley, and Glenn

M. Leonard, published by Oxford University Press in 2008 and the subject of this review, also contributes to more openness about a black page in Mormon history. The Mountain Meadows Massacre is one of the most tragic and shameful events of Mormon history and an open account of what really happened that day was long overdue. The fact that the book was published is in no small part due to the Mormon Church's generous sponsorship of and support for the project. The three authors are all practicing Mormons, and were employed by the Mormon Church to write this book. The Family History Library was granted permission from church officials to allow the three authors unprecedented access to Mormon archival materials and the result is an intended honest assessment of the Mountain Meadows Massacre.

To get down to business I have to say that the book is scrupulously researched, well documented, and considering the complexity of the subject fairly easy to read. For scholars there is a wealth of footnotes to check and for the non-scholarly reader there is a well told transparent account of a very controversial event.

I am not an authority on the Mountain Meadows Massacre nor have I studied any of the primary sources. I have only read the book and done a lot of background research into what others have said and written about this event. While this may count against me in the eyes of some, I think that one of my trump cards is the fact that I am a European Mormon and, therefore, I can look at the available material on this dreadful massacre without ever having been taught about it in school or church and thus judge what I read without any preconceived ideas.

A brief sketch of what happened at Mountain Meadows reveals that on 11 September 1857, Mormon settlers in southern Utah with the aid of some Indians and using a false flag of truce persuaded a group of California-bound emigrants to leave the relative safety of their circled wagons. The cornered emigrants did not have a lot of choice as conditions within their circle of wagons had become impossible. Reluctantly they accepted the terms of the truce which was presented to them as a rescue and protection plan. Nothing was further removed from the truth. As the emigrants trudged out of Mountain Meadows, leaving behind most of their property they were slaughtered in cold blood by their 'rescuers and protectors'. Their property, estimated to be between \$27,240 and \$48,102.50 (251–254) was largely divided among the perpetrators of the massacre. That day about 120 emigrants, men, women, and children were massacred. Only 17 children age six and under, deemed to be too young to tell the story, were spared.

Many books have been written about the Mountain Meadows Massacre, each with their own approach. Some portray the perpetrators as the good people and victims as evil people who somehow deserved what happened to them because of their behaviour while travelling through central and southern Utah. Some use exactly the opposite approach and center their work not only on blaming the perpetrators but also trying to prove that the highest leaders of the Mormon Church of the time in general and Brigham Young in particular were involved in some kind of conspiracy. Therein, of course, lurks the danger that it becomes personal. This, unfortunately, is e.g. the impression Will Bagley, who is undoubtedly a great historian, gives through some of his works. A third approach, adopted by e.g. Juanita Brooks in her *The Mountain Meadows Massacre* (1950), is to navigate between both extremes and look at both perpetrators and victims and try and understand how such a terrible tragedy could ever take place.

The authors of the book under review warn that people expecting either the first or second approach are going to be disappointed by their book because these approaches do not take into account the complexity of human beings. In this there is logic because history is not a fairytale where there is a clear line between good and evil. Furthermore the authors wisely steer away from writing a book that is to serve as a response to arguments or conclusions of any previous author on the subject. The advantage of this is that the book is not an exhausting work of argument and counter argument.

What then, one may ask, is their approach? In the preface we can read more about their approach. They state that their aim is to take 'a fresh approach based on every primary source we could find' (x) and to give the reader a work that tells the story and lets the events speak for themselves (xv). The sheer amount of material they thus accumulated was such that they concluded that there was enough for two books, the first one, here under review, tells the story of the massacre itself and the events leading up to it and a future second volume will tell the story of the aftermath of the massacre although the tip of the veil is lifted in the epilogue of the current volume in order to conclude it. They also state that they largely shy away from topical or critical analysis in order to make the book more appealing 'to a larger audience than just scholars' (xii). This approach has obviously many advantages inasmuch as it leaves the reader free to draw his or her own conclusions. It certainly avoids the pitfalls of presentism where current values and standards are projected back to events of the past. Last but not least, instead of assigning

blame, they hope to answer the troubling question: How could basically good people commit such a terrible atrocity? (xiii). The story itself is underpinned by a thorough explanation about nineteenth century American violence, group psychology, the history of violence in general and last but not least the atmosphere in Utah at the time.

I read the book without preconceived ideas about what had happened that fateful day and was pleasantly surprised how clear and organised the lay-out of the book is. In this respect I think the authors have succeeded inasmuch as the book caters to both scholars and non-scholars. The fourteen chronological chapters are well organised and dates are given to indicate which period is going to be discussed. In the back there is a list of names for the emigrants and a list of names for the perpetrators which makes it easy to quickly refresh one's mind with the details of persons mentioned in the book. There is also a list of the property of the emigrants. All through the book there are relevant pictures. The book can roughly be divided into four parts, each comprising of a few chapters viz. chapters 1-3, 4-6, 7-12, 13-14.

Chapter 1 (1830-1846) sets the scene with a description of the time before the Saints crossed the plains. This description readily prepares the reader to wonder how a people that were tormented by illegal actions in Missouri and Illinois were soon to become the perpetrators of an illegal action themselves.

Chapters 2 (1847-1857) and 3 (July 24, 1857) give a clear sketch of the local and federal political situation and elaborate the on the religious and cultural events such as Pioneers' Day. They chronicle, however, that all was not well in Zion and that by the mid-1850's the Mormon leaders believed that there was a great religious lethargy. There were several reasons for this lethargy; the decade-long focus on pioneering, the droughts, the poor crops, the insect plagues, and also the growing number of apostates and dissenters. Knowledge about Brigham Young's character and background easily explains how his preaching caused the Mormon Reformation (1856-1857).

Chapter 4 (July 24-August 8, 1857) explains that the people believed that their prophet, country, and religion were once again in danger from the advancing American army and the various militias were on high alert.

Chapter 5 describes in great detail the main perpetrators of the Mountain Meadows massacre.

Chapter 6 (1857) describes the emigrant trails and the emigrants, including the Fancher party that was to become the victim of the

Mountain Meadows Massacre. In the third and largest part the reader is presented with a picture of the direct and indirect preparations that would eventually lead to the massacre itself. Various policy changes such as the prohibition on selling grain to non-Mormons are described but the reader also can read about meetings, public and clandestine of local leaders that would change 'the Cedar City plan' from 'a harsh response to a minor conflict' into a planned 'massacre of men, women, and children'(143).

Chapter 7 (July–August 1857) describes how the prohibition of selling grain to non-Mormons came into being and how hard Brigham Young came down on Mormons who out of greed and out of anger about the emigrants' behaviour wanted to mob some of the emigrants. It also describes the reluctance of the Indians to help the Mormons in their up-coming war. As far as the Indians were concerned they would watch the war unfold and negotiate with the victor.

Chapter 8 (August 1857) describes the ongoing conflicts between settlers and emigrants and how minor incidents were completely blown out of proportion. As the authors wrote in the previous chapter 'There were conflicts on the southern road. But the emigrants did not deserve what eventually happened to them at Mountain Meadows' (115).

Chapter 9 (late August – Early September 1857) mainly describes the step-by-step process that led ordinary decent men (according to the authors) to commit atrocities by transforming their opponents into the Other (127).

Chapter 10 (July 24 –September 5, 1857) shows how devastating incitement and rumours can be to a community. It also highlights the internal strife between the local leaders and the militia and Isaac Haight's peculiar interpretation of Brigham Young's new Indian policy. Instead of adopting a non-interfering stance as Brigham Young had counselled, Haight armed the local Indians and sent them after the emigrants.

Chapter 11 shows that the emigrants were 'unaware that their hour in Cedar City has lasting repercussions, the emigrants had no reason to believe they were in danger. But side by side with the emigrants' feelings of security were the deadly plans of Cedar City's leaders which were going forward at several places' (152). This chapter also describes the two initial failed attacks on the emigrant camp which let them to circle their wagons. The authors show that 'the Paiutes would not have attacked the company unless local settlers had stirred them up' (158). They also indicate that at this point the first effort at a cover-up was

made when Haight sent a messenger to Salt Lake City with a letter that omitted key details (164).

Chapter 12 (September 7–10 1857) reveals the frantic efforts made to have a straight story and to cover up the participation of the settlers in the first two attacks which led to more bloodshed. Most importantly this chapter includes the letter of Brigham Young to Haight, dated 10 September. In it Young informs Haight that the American army is not going to arrive in Utah that season and that disaster has been averted with the help of God. Young further advises Haight to stay friendly with the Indians but to let ‘Indians and emigrants resolve their own problems without Mormon interference’ (184). As far as Mormon relations with the emigrants the letter states that any emigrant trains already in the area should be left ‘to go in peace.’ (186)

Chapters 13 (September 10 –11, 1857) and 14 (September 11 – 13, 1857) tell the story of the massacre and the horrible aftermath. Aside from describing the horrors of that day the authors conclude that ‘the plan was succeeding because it was so calculated, [...], because it was improbably sinister’ and that the emigrants ‘could not have imagined anything happening to them that was so premeditated, evil, and cunning’ (199). Visiting the scene of the massacre, William Dame and Isaac Haight, two of the main instigators though not the perpetrators realised that ‘the twisted bodies of the dead, some already torn open by wolves and coyotes, mocked the armchair planning that had led to the deaths of so many men, women, and children’ (213–214).

Have the authors succeeded in shedding long overdue light on the complex issues behind the Mountain Meadows Massacre? I am convinced they did, their presentation of the enormous amount of primary sources provides the reader with a transparent and organised account. This style of writing makes topical and critical analysis indeed obsolete for the most part. As to answering the question of how ‘basically good people’ could commit such a terrible atrocity, I must admit that I feel the jury is still out on this. I may be guilty of presentism but I am left to wonder whether the main perpetrators were what I would call ‘basically good people’. I am more inclined to call them religious fanatics who had lost all perspective of the ideals their faith stood for. Granted that their fanaticism was fuelled by the historical circumstances, nevertheless their attempts at covering up their roles is evidence enough that their conscience was not clear. Quite apart from any Mormon ideals, they were guilty of breaking two of the basic laws of the Ten Commandments viz. thou shalt not kill and thou shalt not covet.

Nevertheless I cannot escape the feeling that this book is also, at least in part, an institutional exercise in truth telling. On the one hand I am left to wonder whether this book should be seen as part of a worldwide wave of governments and institutions apologizing for all sorts of misdeeds hundreds of years in the past as a way of making reparations to the descendants of the victims while at the same time unburdening, as it were, the descendants of the perpetrators. On the other hand I am left with a feeling that this exercise aims to absolve the institution i.e. the Mormon Church from the crime by shifting the blame on lesser individuals who indeed were guilty but who did not wake up one morning deciding out of the blue to kill a train of California-bound emigrants. The nine indicted men and indeed everyone involved in the Mountain Meadows massacre must bear that awful responsibility but what about Brigham Young, George A. Smith, and some of the others? Looking at the evidence presented in the book I cannot agree with Will Bagley and his, in my view, personal vendetta against Brigham Young. The evidence is clear that Brigham Young did not secretly or otherwise order the massacre. It is not only evinced from his letter (183–185) which unfortunately arrived too late but also by earlier sanctions against settlers who were intent on mobbing the emigrants. At the same time I also cannot agree with the authors that Brigham Young was not to blame in any way.

The Mormon Reformation (1856–1857), a direct result of Brigham Young's preaching created a climate of violence, his orders not to sell any goods to non-Mormons, although understandable under the circumstances, caused problems and his ambiguous statements about the New Indian Policy (August 16, 1857) caused confusion. As far as Brigham Young and some of the others were concerned I would, therefore, suggest something like guilt by association. I come to this conclusion because the sources presented in the book make it clear that Brigham Young did only rarely speak about the events in Mountain Meadows. One could quite cheerfully interpret that as a conspiracy to hide things and no doubt many will be only too happy to do this, not least because the Mormon Church, as an institution, has always struggled with assigning any form of blame for any historical mishap to one of its prophets. I, however, would like to suggest that perhaps Brigham Young had come to the awful realisation that in his capacity as prophet and leader, his preaching had indirectly led to this massacre. He may have come to regret some of the decisions he made but, like the rest of us, he, too, had to live with the consequences.

In conclusion I think the book is certainly worth reading as it lays out the events leading up to that tragic massacre in a transparent and overall balanced manner in spite of the fact that all the evidence is retrospective and that the testimonies of the witnesses are largely exculpatory. I would like to agree with the authors when they write:

The tragedy at Mountain Meadows played out on several levels. The murdered emigrants lost their hopes, their dreams, their property, and their lives. Some lost their very identity, their names forever effaced from human memory. The surviving children were robbed of the warmth and support of parents, brothers, and sisters. Their first sobbing night at Hamblin's was just the start of their ordeal. The Paiute participants would bear the brunt of the blame for the massacre, shamelessly used by the white men who lured them to the Meadows. For the militiamen who carried out the crime—as well as their families, descendants, and fellow church members—there was another kind of tragedy. It was the gnawing, long anguish that flows from betrayed ideals. The burdens of the massacre would linger far beyond what anyone imagined on the night of September 11, 1857. (209)

Ingrid Sherlock-Taselaar
Kalmthout, Belgium
ingrid.sherlock@telenet.be

REVIEW – JOSEPH SMITH, JR.: REAPPRAISALS AFTER TWO CENTURIES

Reviewed by Chrystal Vanel

Reid L. Neilson and Terryl L. Givens, eds., *Joseph Smith, Jr.: Reappraisals after Two Centuries*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009. Paperback: \$24.95.

The year 2005 was the bicentennial of the birth of Mormonism's founder Joseph Smith Jr. (1805–1844), and this anniversary volume addresses Smith's legacy. This volume is a collection of 14 essays on the first Mormon, edited by Reid L. Neilson, an Assistant Professor of Church History and Doctrine at Brigham Young University and Terryl L. Givens, a Professor of Literature and Religion at the University of Richmond, Virginia, both of whom have published extensively on Mormonism. Neilson and Givens stated they decided to organize this collection of articles because "the day has come when the founder of Mormonism and his prominent role in American history and religious thought cannot be denied" (7).

Essays are divided into three sections: American Prophet, Sacred Encounters, and Prophetic Legacy. Articles come from a variety of authors, scholars in different fields, such as US history, sociology, philosophy, literature, and theology. It would be impossible to summarize all the articles in only one book review, as each article deserves a careful and critical reading, since they are all well constructed, sometimes very well documented, and almost all raise important questions. With this said, this review will present the overall assessment of each section and then present briefly on some specific articles that stood out to me.

The volume's first section, American Prophet, addresses and attempts to answer one core question: Are Mormonism and its founder products of their historical context? Richard H. Brodhead (Duke University) offers a very interesting study on "Prophets in America" around 1830, studying Ralph Waldo Emerson, Nat Turner and Joseph Smith. Brodhead examines Joseph Smith in the broader context of American prophets, studying the different texts of those prophets. In "Joseph

Smith vs. John C. Calhoun: The States Rights Dilemma and Early Mormon History,” James B. Allen (Brigham Young University) offers a very clear and well documented study of the “issue of [states’ rights] from the differing perspective of [politician] John C. Calhoun and Joseph Smith” (73).

The only article in this section that I found fault with is the one authored by Professor of English Richard Dilworth Rust (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill). The way Rust compares Joseph Smith with Herman Melville is surprising and perhaps goes a little too far in praise of the Book of Mormon, such as saying “these two contemporaries have given to the world enduring works in the Book of Mormon (1830) and *Moby-Dick*” (48). While it’s arguable that the Book of Mormon has impacted a few million people over the last one-hundred and forty years since its creation, its impact or recognition as a text, however, has not received the attention of the world like *Moby-Dick*. Universities around the world offers classes on American literature which generally include *Moby Dick* in the curriculum, but scholars of American literature rarely teach about the Book of Mormon. Another interesting point, Rust calls the Strangites—led by James J. Strang after Smith’s death—an “apostate colony” (50). However, Strangites would surely say that the “apostates” were actually the “Brighamites.” We then read about “the opening of the Book of Mormon, which Joseph Smith translated” (50). I side with serious scholarship which has shown that the Book of Mormon is a nineteenth century document, not an ancient one translated from ancient languages. Here again, it seems that Rust is expressing a scientifically truth as a religious dogma. In short, Rust’s hagiography of Joseph Smith may be used as a good illustration of what is apologetic LDS history.

In Section II the volume contains an essay entitled “Sacred Encounters” which “addresses more directly the religion-making imagination of Joseph Smith” (9). Renowned historian Richard Bushman in “Joseph Smith and Creation of the Sacred” asks “why, of all the visionaries and reformers in his generation, was [the Joseph Smith] movement the one to survive and flourish”? (93) His answer is that “Joseph Smith met a human need for the sacred” (94). Joseph Smith presented his contemporaries with concrete experiences with the divine and not mere wordy theology; a God one could meet through “Sacred Words” (95–102) and “Sacred Places” (102–106).

Terryl L. Givens’ essay “Joseph Smith: Prophecy, Process, and Plenitude” and Douglas J. Davies’ “Vision, Revelations and Courage in

Joseph Smith” are so deep in questioning and informing that each would need a entire book review. Terryl Givens effectively shows how Joseph Smith used the past in an innovative way. Smith viewed the past as a complete whole, which he had to completely restore. Smith also considered the process of religious formation more than the final product. Perhaps one could complete Givens’ observation by looking at Joseph Smith’s legacy today: whereas the LDS Church today seems to emphasize that the restoration of the primitive church is a final product through “the Prophet” Joseph Smith, the Community of Christ views itself as a prophetic community, always open to new revelations, having 163 sections in its *Doctrine & Covenants* (the last section dating from 2007) and having one of its theologian, C. Robert Mesle, as a leading Process Theologian.

In a complex study of the concept of Courage in Joseph Smith’s Mormonism, Douglas Davies (Durham University) makes an “LDS application” (120) of two books, one from theologian Paul Tillich (*Courage to Be*), the other from sociologist William Whyte (*The Organization Man*). Davies argues that Courage is an important part of Joseph Smith’s life, following the example of the “proactive Christ” (128) of Mormon theology who actively suffered in the Garden of Gethsemane. A theologian and an anthropologist, Davies is very good at interdisciplinary approaches and his work is as usual praiseworthy.

Section III, Prophetic Legacy, puts Joseph Smith in a more global context, and these contributions are very original and important for scholars of Smith. Richard J. Mouw’s essay “The Possibility of Joseph Smith: Some Evangelical Probing” is *prima facie* very intriguing since Mouw is an Evangelical theologian, and his background and findings provide an original view of the “reappraisal” of the Mormon prophet. As President and Professor of Christian Philosophy at Fuller Theological Seminary (Pasadena, California), Mouw intends to offer “several considerations that can serve to create for evangelicals some space between the liar-or-lunatic options. Such an exercise might allow us [evangelicals] to diminish ... our longstanding unqualified hostility toward Joseph Smith, without in any way sacrificing the strong theological convictions that have fed hostility in the past” (191). One example illustrating such an innovative approach occurs when Mouw argues that an aspect of Joseph Smith’s theology functioned to “reduce the distance between God and human beings.” Mouw asserts this action was a response to “the high Calvinism of New England Puritanism” which was, in the 1830s and 1840s, grappling to find a “legitimate *metaphysical* distance between God

and his human creatures ... [which had previously] fostered an unhealthy *spiritual* distance between the Calvinist Deity and his human subjects.” Mouw continues that “it should not surprise us that movements arose to shrink the spiritual distance” and today “It is not enough for traditional Christians to condemn those movements without also acknowledging the spiritual realities that the dissenting groups were addressing” (95). Overall, Mouw’s effort to place Mormon theology within the American religious landscape deserves praise.

Another must read essay is “Joseph Smith and Nineteenth-Century Mormon Mappings of Asian Religions,” authored by editor of this volume and Brigham Young University professor Reid L. Neilson. The author examines how Joseph Smith and his followers viewed Asiatic religions, in the context of their particular theologies and of other Christian theologies. Neilson’s article is my favorite as it breaks ground as a never previously studied topic, which yields new and important findings. Additionally, the article is very well constructed, methodologically sound (using primary sources, putting Joseph Smith’s religion in the broader religious context) and is very clear. Neilson also demonstrates that Mormonism didn’t stop at Joseph Smith’s death, but that his followers reinterpreted Joseph’s legacy because of new experiences (such as at the 1893 Parliament of Religions). The last, but not least in Section III is David J. Wittaker’s (Brigham Young University) contribution, “Studying Joseph Smith: A Guide to the Sources,” which is a very useful bibliography for those who study Mormonism. Wittaker’s bibliography is very complete, ranging from primary sources (such as journals and correspondences) to the most recent studies on the subject. As the book ended with this very well done bibliography, the reader may have wished that it began with a short chronological biography of the Mormon prophet.

Also in Section III is the essay “The Prophethood of Joseph Smith” authored by Professor Wayne Hudson (Griffith University, Australia), but I read this essay with some scrutiny and it left me unsatisfied. In the essay’s introduction, Hudson argues that a “comparative typology of prophethood needs to be developed” in order to understand “what kind of prophet Joseph was” (201). To accomplish this I expected a historical and sociological study of prophetic figures using authors such as Max Weber, but such is not the case. In this essay as Hudson simply and quickly mentions the German sociologist by saying that Joseph Smith “resists reduction to Max Weber’s famous account of prophecy” (204). But what exactly does Hudson mean by “Max Weber’s famous account

of prophecy”? This, and other statements in the essay, seem to skim the surface of complex topics deserving a deeper analysis. Since Hudson touches only slightly on lots of interesting points, I was left craving more detail. To demonstrate this again, at one point Hudson writes that if “we attend to esotericism as a worldwide phenomenon, however, as Antoine Faivre in France is attempting to do, then some features of Joseph’s prophethood may become more intelligible” (206). Even though I am very glad that the author mentions accomplished scholar Antoine Faivre, I wanted to know more about these “features of Joseph’s prophethood” and how they could “become more intelligible” by using Faivre’s work. But in the author’s defense, Hudson does give the disclaimer that “in this essay I have prepared the ground for another reading of the prophethood of Joseph Smith. Obviously this reading needs to be pursued elsewhere at greater length” (207).

All this said, *Joseph Smith, Jr.: Reappraisals after Two Centuries* is a book anyone studying Mormonism should read. The value of the book comes from its pluralism and richness, offering essays from various authors with diverse backgrounds studying Joseph Smith from various social sciences. Ironically however, to me as a scholar of movements that sprang from Smith, such as the Community of Christ and the Strangites, the book seemed to depart from part of its original assumption that “the day has come when the founder of Mormonism and his prominent role in American history and religious thought cannot be denied.” While I agree that Smith indeed played a prominent role in American history and religious thought, such a statement seems to overstep certain boundaries depending upon a person’s point of view. It is sometimes troubling to see scholars equating Smith and Mormonism, often at the expense of the latter. I of course realize that Smith is considered the founder of Mormonism by many, and that his work and influences are very much a part of the various Mormon communities in the world, but the various Mormon movements today are surely not wholly Smith’s. Mormonism is much more complex, pluralistic and dynamic than Smith alone, and studying only Smith and then, whether intentionally or unintentionally, equating his life to the totality of the various Mormonisms seems to misguide the roles of individuals like Sidney Rigdon, Brigham Young, Joseph Smith III, Orson Pratt, Emma Smith, Spencer W. Kimball and others. Even though the book is a “reappraisal of Joseph Smith” one might also wonder if Joseph Smith’s movement survived his death and even flourished because the “entrepreneur” LDS Church President Brigham Young or a “pragmatic prophet” such as RLDS Church Presi-

dent Joseph Smith III. Christian theologians have long debated the question of whether Christianity is the product of the Jesus or of Paul, Clement of Rome, Saint Augustine and others. But then again, this book is a product of its time, celebrating the bicentennial of Joseph Smith. And it's a good celebration.

Chrystal Vanel
École Pratique des Hautes Études (Section des Sciences Religieuses, Sorbonne), Paris
chrystal.vanel@hotmail.fr

ARTICLE CONTRIBUTORS

WALTER VAN BEEK holds the chair of Anthropology of Religion at Tilburg University and has a joint appointment at the African Studies Centre, Leiden. His main research area is West Africa where he has done over four years of fieldwork spread out over three decades, among the Kapsiki of North Cameroon and the Dogon of Central Mali, groups about which he has published extensively. At present he is engaged in a training and teaching programme in South Africa, Tanzania and Mozambique as well. As a 'participant expert' in LDS Mormonism he has published several articles on cultural issues in Mormonism, focusing mainly on the European Mormon experience, including the Dutch temple and LDS temple ritual.

DOUGLAS J. DAVIES is Professor in the Study of Religion at the Department of Theology & Religion, Durham University, UK. and Director of that University's Centre for Death and Life Studies. Previously he was Professor of Religious Studies at Nottingham University whose Ph.D. he holds for a thesis on salvation in relation to the sociology of knowledge. He was born and educated in South Wales, and at Durham University's Departments of Anthropology and of Theology, and at the Institute of Social Anthropology at Oxford University whose M.Litt., and D. Litt. Degrees he holds. In 1998 the University of Uppsala conferred the honorary degree of Doctor of Theology upon him. He has been a visiting research fellow at Oxford's Rothermere American Institute, at the Huntington Library in California as well as at Brigham Young University. He sits on the editorial boards of *Mortality (UK)* and *Thanatological Studies (Italy)*. He has taught course on death, ritual and belief for many years both at Nottingham and Durham Universities. He is also well-known for his research on Mormonism, Anglicanism and theoretical aspects of the anthropology and theology of religion.

JOHNNIE GLAD has studied at the University of Oslo, Det teologiske Menighetsfakultet (MF Norwegian School of Theology), Oslo, Columbia University, New York, Union Theological Seminary, New York, and

Boston University – School of Theology. He is a member of the clergy roster of The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. Dr. Glad served parishes in New York, New Jersey, Wisconsin and Massachusetts. After returning to Norway in 1968 he taught religion at Levanger Teachers' College, Levanger, and later at what is now the University of Stavanger, Stavanger. He is now Professor Emeritus but is engaged fulltime in his research work. He holds master's degrees in Theology and Religious Education and a doctorate in Theology. Dr. Glad's doctoral dissertation *The Mission of Mormonism in Norway 1851–1920. A Study and Analysis of the Reception Process* has been published by Peter Lang (Frankfurt am Main, 2006).

MICHAEL W. HOMER is a practicing trial lawyer in Salt Lake City. He is the Managing Partner at the law firm of Suitter Axland, PLLC. He has published four books, thirteen chapters in books, and over seventy articles on historical and legal subjects. He is the recipient of the 'David Kirby Best Article Award' from the *Arthur Conan Doyle Society*; the 'Lowell L. Bennion Editor's Award' by *Dialogue, A Journal of Mormon Thought*; the 'T. Edgar Lyon Award of Excellence' by the *Mormon History Association*; and the *John Whitmer Historical Association Best Article Award*. His most recent book: *On the Way to Somewhere Else: European Sojourners in the Mormon West, 1834-1930*, was published by The Arthur H. Clark Company in 2006, for which he was a recipient of the *Mormon History Association's 'Best Documentary Book Award'*.

MASSIMO INTROVIGNE was born in Rome, Italy, on June 14, 1955. He received a B.A. in Philosophy at the Gregorian University in Rome and a Dr. Jur. at University of Turin's Law School with a dissertation on John Rawls. He has taught sociology of law and sociology of religion as a part time lecturer, inter alia, at the Pontifical University of the Holy Cross and the European University in Rome. He is managing director of CESNUR, the *Center for Studies on New Religions*, in Torino, Italy, and the author of some 40 books in Italian (some of them translated into French, Spanish, Czech, Croatian, and English) and of more than 100 articles in peer-reviewed journals in the field of sociology of religion and

Phelps's "Paracletes"

religious studies, including *Brigham Young University Studies*, the *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies* and *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought*.

MAURO PROPERZI, originally from Gorizia, Italy, was recently awarded a Ph.D. in Mormon Studies from Durham University in the United Kingdom. In June 2010 he completed one year of further studies at the Pontifical Gregorian University in Rome, where his course-work and research focused on Interreligious dialogue, particularly between Christianity and Islam. He is presently teaching "World Religions" and "Ethics and Values" courses at Brigham Young University and at Utah Valley University, Utah, USA. The author may be contacted at mapropi@yahoo.com.

INGRID SHERLOCK-TASELAAR has a Ph.D. from the School of Oriental and African Studies (University of London). She studied six years at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem being awarded a B.A. in Ancient Semitic Languages, a B.A. in Assyriology, and an M.A. in Ancient Semitic Languages. She taught Judaism and related courses at Middlesex University in the Religious Studies Department (1997–2004) and Hebrew language and literature at Southbank International School in London (1995–2006). She currently lives near Antwerp, Belgium.

JOHN WALSH has a Ph.D. from the Department of Theology and Religious Studies of the University of Wales at Lampeter. In 2007–2009 he undertook post-doctoral studies at the University of Saint Thomas Graduate School of Theology at Saint Mary's Seminary in Houston, Texas, studying subjects such as Christology, church history, and patristics. He currently resides in Missouri City, Texas, USA.