

B.H. ROBERTS
at the

WORLD PARLIAMENT OF RELIGION



1893

CHICAGO

by Davis Bitton



"Some western warrior forgetting this was a friendly conference, uttered his warcry."

ONE of the exciting events of the late nineteenth century, from the point of view of religious history and especially of the still feeble ecumenical movement, was the World Parliament of Religions held at Chicago in the fall of 1893. That Parliament—a huge congress with representatives from many faiths throughout the world—was so multifarious, so massive in its impact, in terms of sheer volume of words if nothing else, that most participants probably knew nothing of a small contretemps, a side eddy that did not fit into the otherwise impressive and generally harmonious exterior. This was the belated effort of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints to participate in the proceedings, an effort pushed primarily by the energetic, thirty-six year old Mormon General Authority B. H. Roberts. This episode tells us something about relations between presiding quorums of the Church, and about the compromise that often results when ultimate objectives give way to immediate needs, about the inadequacy of public relations efforts, and the relationship between Mormonism and the larger Christian community.¹

The World's Parliament of Religions was the brain-child of Charles C. Bonney, who first advanced the idea in the summer of 1889. The basic idea, as he expressed it, was that the forthcoming World's Fair, the great Columbian Exposition, would exhibit "material triumphs, industrial achievements, and mechanical victories." Would it not be appropriate, he asked, to celebrate also the intellectual, spiritual, and religious achievements of the age? Committees were set up, invitations sent out. As a matter of fact, a series of congresses or, as we might say, departments were set up, programs to take place in the year 1893. Religion was just one of these, but it is the one that concerns us here. Its president was the Reverend John Henry Barrows, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Chicago.²

When the opening meeting of the Parliament convened on 11 September 1893, ten strokes were sounded on the Liberty Bell, upon which were inscribed the words, "A new commandment I give unto you that ye love one another." The ten strokes represented the "ten chief religions of the world." Four thousand people were in the audience. The Lord's Prayer was pronounced. Opening addresses were given by Bonney and Barrows. Then there were responses from a dozen or more religious leaders from different parts of the world. Japan was represented, as were Ceylon, India, Greece, Russia, Sweden, France, and Great Britain. If there was a common note to all of these addresses it was that of good will and tolerance. The message of the Parliament's organizers had been heard. That which the religions of the world had in common would be emphasized. This would not be a forum for theological controversy.

The proceedings of the Parliament unfolded in seventeen successive days, papers or addresses being given from the main platform on a variety of subjects by speakers representing many different points of view. Since at least ten major presentations were made each

day, thus totaling over 170 addresses—this not counting the review sessions held in adjacent rooms—it is impossible to list all of the topics treated. There were major addresses essentially setting forth the basic position of major religions: Hinduism, Buddhism, Shintoism, the Parsees, Judaism, Islam, Confucianism, Jainism. Christianity was generously represented, of course, both in that some general topics—ancient Egyptian religion, the scriptures of mankind, concepts of man—were treated by Christians, and in that several addresses dealt specifically with the divinity of Jesus Christ. A generous selection of talks dealt with religion in social life, the general relationship between morality and religion, and social reform. As printed in the mammoth collections compiled after the Parliament, the papers are not footnoted; they appear to be addresses, intended for oral delivery as speeches. It was a gigantic smorgasborg with something for everyone. The keynote—intended and apparently well achieved—was toleration and ecumenism rather than religious controversy and acerbic claims and counter-claims. Reading the proceedings of the World's Parliament of Religions is a very good way of taking the pulse of religious thoughts and assumptions at the end of the past century.

The organizers of the Parliament, having been solicited by individual denominations, decided to hold adjunct sessions in the form of denominational congresses which would precede and follow, as well as, run parallel with the Parliament itself. The aim was "to have a presentation of the faith and creeds of every denomination in Christendom as well as expositions of the beliefs of peoples and sects outside its pale." There were forty-one of these separate congresses held at the Art Institute. Not only denominations were involved in these conventions but also such groups as the Theosophists, the Sunday School Union, the International Board of Women's Christian Associations, the Christian Endeavor Society, and the Evolutionists. Nor was it all over when these denominational meetings had been held. Following the Parliament of Religions itself, still continuing the original design of Bonney, there were congresses having to do with other religious and spiritual questions: Sunday-Rest Congress, Congress of Missions, Ethical Congress, Congress of Woman's Missions, and the Evangelical Alliance. If ever a gathering—actually a series of interconnected conventions—deserved the title of "ecumenical," truly general and broad-ranging in its offerings, it would seem to have taken place in 1893.

One group not in attendance at the great Parliament of Religions was the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, the Mormons. This might not occasion very much surprise. It might be suspected that the Mormons, having no professional clergy, simply chose not to appear on the same platform with these other religions, ecumenism having less appeal for them than a continuation of missionary activity. We might, in other words, simply dismiss the Mormon absence as the result of mutual agreement, or mutual neglect. As it is, however, we know more about this question and almost

entirely as a result of the efforts of B. H. Roberts and his determination, after the fact, to leave a record of the whole transaction as he saw it.³

The Parliament did not spring into existence in 1893. The original germ of 1889 led to serious organizational efforts by 1891. In that year the subject was much discussed. Some religions were not favorably disposed. The sultan of Turkey took a dim view of the whole idea. The Church of England took exception to the assumption that the Roman Catholic Church was *the* Catholic Church and declined to participate. Christians of evangelical disposition were not inclined to favor the love-feast approach that treated all world religions on an equal footing. "Let me warn you," wrote a minister from Hong Kong, "not to deny the sovereignty of our Lord by any further continuance of your agitation in favor of a Parliament not sanctioned by his word." It would not have been entirely surprising if a similar firm rejection had come from Mormon leaders in Salt Lake City.

But during the summer of 1891, about as soon as information of what was happening reached Utah, we find B. H. Roberts, then an assistant editor of the Salt Lake *Herald*, writing an editorial. Among other things, he said that the Church "should seek to make itself heard in that congress, and since it has justly complained of misrepresentation from others, let it seek in such an important gathering to represent itself by sending to that congress its most competent men as delegates."

Interestingly, Roberts already thought of the possibility of rejection by the Congress itself. Certainly, he said, a church with such a "remarkable origin" could not be denied admission, "unless, indeed, a narrow and most ungenerous prejudice should prevail in the counsels having the arrangement and management of the congress." In that event, he continued, the Mormon church "should certainly secure a fine public hall during the continuance of the exhibition, erect a pulpit, and fill it with its ablest men, who, in the course of lectures and by holding religious services could make the visitors from other nations and the uninformed of our own nation, acquainted with the Mormon religion." In fact, Roberts suggested, such a "bureau of information" should be set up even if formal participation in the Parliament were achieved.

Despite this forceful suggestion, the Church leadership showed little enthusiasm during the two years leading up to the beginning of the Parliament itself. The matter was discussed at the priesthood meeting of October conference in 1891 and again in April of 1892. A committee was appointed, but "the general feeling prevailed that the matter was unimportant." We do not know the details of these discussions. One might assume a certain amount of disinterest in cooperating with those churches that had been at the forefront of the crusade against the Mormons. And one cannot discount the possibility that Roberts himself, always a bit abrasive, may have alienated support by his audacious way of presenting the proposal.

When the Chicago fair opened in the summer of 1893, Utah visitors were dismayed to find that "nearly every other religious denomination" had special booths there, in the Liberal Arts Building, but that there was nothing

representing the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Letters "began to pour into the Church headquarters, and to the Salt Lake papers expressing regret" that Mormonism was not represented. Under this stimulus, Church leaders now decided to resurrect the earlier proposal and seek admission to the World Parliament of Religions.

It would be tedious to discuss in detail how admission was sought and how the effort was finally frustrated. B. H. Roberts has provided the documents in one of the early volumes of the *Improvement Era*. Perhaps it will be sufficient merely to list the steps. I invite your attention to a certain bulldog tenacity in Roberts, a quality which he demonstrated on other occasions as well.

1. A letter to Charles C. Bonney from the First Presidency noted that the Church had received no formal invitation, briefly set forth reasons for thinking the Mormon story would be of interest and significance, and asked for the privilege of sending a delegation to the Parliament.

2. When a reply was not received in ten days, Roberts set out for Chicago. There he looked up Solomon Thatcher, one of the U.S. Commissioners of the Columbian Exposition, who happened to be a relative of Mormon apostle Moses Thatcher. Thatcher obtained an appointment with General Director Davis, who was asked for space to erect a booth, again called a "bureau of information." This proposal was reluctantly turned down because of lack of space. Davis expressed regret that the application had not been made earlier.

3. Again using the Thatcher connection, Roberts obtained an interview with Charles C. Bonney, the prime mover of the Parliament. One has the impression that Bonney and Roberts saw themselves as antagonists. Both appeared a bit testy. Bonney defensively explained that there had been no answer to the First Presidency's letter because of a difference of opinion in the general committee, where "there was a very general opinion that the Church ought not to be admitted to representation for the reason that it would doubtless prove to be a disturbing element in the Parliament, and it was doubtful in their minds if any good would come from its admission." Roberts, far from meekly accepting such an explanation, demanded to know on what grounds the committee thought that including the Mormon church would be disturbing. Because of the prejudice against the plural marriage system, Bonney explained. Roberts argued forcefully that this should not be compelling. Some oriental religions known to practice polygamy had already been included. Besides, the Mormon church "had officially announced the discontinuance of plural marriage." When Bonney agreed to present the matter once again to the general committee, Roberts quickly prepared a paper summarizing the ideas that would be presented by the Church representative if admission were granted.

4. Roberts then waited ten days without a reply. Frustrated, perhaps irritated or even angry, he dashed off a note to Bonney and returned to Salt Lake City. He still hoped the application would be approved but the opportunity seemed "very remote." One would not think at this point that there would be so much as a

reply, much less a favorable one.

5. Some two or three weeks later, Roberts received a letter dated August 28. Since the train took five days between Chicago and Salt Lake, we can guess that it was received about September 2. This was getting close to the September 10 beginning of the Parliament. What the letter announced was a willingness to receive "from your Church the statement of its faith and achievements . . ." and to "make such use of it as, under the circumstances, may seem wisest and best." The First Presidency having already left Salt Lake City in company with the Tabernacle Choir to go to the World's Fair, Roberts consulted with President Lorenzo Snow of the Council of Twelve. One has to admire the vigorous realism of President Snow's recommendation. Roberts should prepare the address as the letter had asked but instead of mailing it he should travel to Chicago, carrying it personally. "If you merely send your paper they will pigeon-hole that," Snow said, "but if you go down for the purpose of reading it they will not pigeon-hole you so easily."

6. The next scene in the drama brings us to September 8. Roberts had arrived in Chicago and now presented himself at the office of the Rev. John Henry Barrows, chairman of the Parliament. This conversation was not exactly cordial. Surprised and annoyed at seeing Roberts in person, Barrows reminded him of "the very guarded promise." An "earnest" conversation ensued, Roberts reminded Barrows that there was a public opinion that would pass judgment upon the unfairness of a rejection. This was a kind of threat: reject us and the world will know of "the narrow, sectarian bigotry which had denied to us that right." Barrows kept the paper for inspection and promised to give answer the next day.

7. The next day, when Roberts called at Barrows's office, Mervin Marie Snell, the secretary, was present and gave Roberts an inside description of the discussions that had taken place. Editor of *Oriental Magazine*, Snell was upset by the treatment of the Mormons and spoke up in their behalf more than once.

8. Enter Dr. Barrows. He had not had time to read the paper but had had it read by others who had advised him that it was "unobjectionable" and could be read at the Parliament. This would appear to be a victory for Roberts and Mormonism, patience having paid off and the goal realized. An invitation was extended to attend a reception at a beautiful private home. The First Presidency, still at Chicago, were also invited but could not attend. So Roberts himself went and, as he put it, "had the pleasure of meeting the distinguished gentlemen who represented nearly all the faiths of the world." It is mildly amusing to think of our good Brother Roberts, cookies and punch in hand, circulating among the guests at a celebration of this kind.

9. The little side drama, quite hidden to the thousands of visitors in Chicago, was not over. The opening session of the conference, a great display of variety and color and exotic visitors, took place on September 11. While attending this meeting, Roberts realized that what he had been given assurance of was that the paper would be read, not that he himself would be allowed to read it. So he dashed off another communication to Barrows asking for clarification and assurance that he himself would

read the paper. He did get an immediate response: "My Dear Sir: An opportunity will be given you to read your paper on Mormonism, but the date I cannot fix at present."

10. End of the story? Hardly. Another six days passed before Roberts received a note asking him to read his paper in Hall No. 3. Since this was not the main hall of the convention, Roberts was immediately suspicious. He fired back a note agreeing to read there but only if that reading—before perhaps one or two hundred people—did not take the place of a presentation before the Parliament in the main hall. Seeing Barrows between sessions, Roberts handed him a note in person. Obviously distressed at all this repeated beseeching, Barrows informed Roberts that Hall No. 3 would be the only presentation. Roberts said that Barrows was anxious to get rid of "a very troublesome church and its representative." I think we can believe him.

11. We are almost through. Roberts must have spent the evening in his hotel room drafting his response—if, indeed, he didn't have it ready from the beginning. It took the form of an extended letter dated September 22. He rehearsed the whole scenario we have been going over. In a rather full statement Roberts declined the offer. "I may be pardoned for saying that to ask me to read my paper there and let that be the only hearing that 'Mormonism' has, looks very like an attempt to side track the Church I represent while the Parliament preserves a reputation for broad-minded toleration . . ." On the 24th of September in Hall No. 3 Merwin Marie Snell made the announcement that the speech on Mormonism would not be presented. He was not exactly neutral in his tone; this new friend of the Church denounced what had happened as "the darkest blot in the history of civilization in this country." Roberts continued to linger at the Parliament for the last few days, attending all of the main sessions. He never got a reply to his last communication, and the Parliament concluded on September 27, 1893.

Although the Parliament itself was over, Roberts was not through with his own activity in Chicago. He wrote a long letter of protest and succeeded in getting it printed in the *Chicago Inter-Ocean*. B. H. Roberts was not called the blacksmith orator for nothing; he could wax eloquent when aroused. If they thought the Mormons were in error, they should have kindly pointed out where the Mormons were wrong. But they had missed their opportunity:

I hold the smiling, benevolent mask of toleration and courage, behind which the Parliament has been hiding, in my hands, and the old harridan of sectarian bigotry stands uncovered, and her loathsome visage, distorted by the wrinkles of narrow-mindedness, intolerance and cowardice, is to be seen once more by all the world.

Gentlemen, 'where you should have been lions, you have been hares; where foxes, geese.' Turn which way you will and you will be confronted by the facts which proclaim that you have shrunk before the fear of public sentiment outside of your churches which demands generous, open, and fair treatment even for 'Mormons,' in such a gathering as your Parliament.

Finally, Roberts challenged Bonney and Barrows to appear before "the Parliament of an enlightened public opinion" and explain their conduct.

WHAT is the significance of all this? Was it merely a tempest in a teapot that would have languished in well deserved oblivion had it not been for the determination of Roberts to rehearse the whole confrontation, blow-by-blow as it were? It is not exactly edifying and can perhaps be summarized in the following statement: "The Mormon church was not invited to attend the World Parliament of Religions and did not itself manifest an interest in doing so until very late, when, through persistent efforts, it was granted an opportunity to make a presentation. Since the Mormon paper was scheduled for one of the side halls rather than the major hall, the Church representative, B. H. Roberts, rejected the offer."

I would suggest that there are four angles of vision from which the series of events assumes significance. First, that of Roberts. For him the whole episode was evidence of prejudice against Mormonism. It is easy to ridicule his assertion, and in just a moment I will cast some doubt on it. But let us recognize that this was 1893. It was not only that many Mormons alive in that year remembered persecutions of the past. Lynchings of missionaries were still going on, especially in the Southern states; and Mormons were imprisoned for preaching in Norway. Roberts, you may remember, as acting president in the Southern States, had gone in to get the bodies of two missionaries killed in the Cane Creek Massacre. It was not necessarily crying "wolf" to think that there might be some anti-Mormon sentiment in the group. Non-Mormon Mervin Marie Snell was almost as outraged as Roberts himself, and Snell had heard the discussions about whether the Mormons should be allowed to participate or not.

But rather than simply accepting this as the one true version of the whole procedure, let us consider the question from the viewpoint of people like Barrows. The complexity of this Parliament is almost impossible to imagine. It was not just the total number of participants; it was also their diversity, coming as they did not only from all parts of the United States but also from many foreign countries. The job of coordination must have been enormous. This would require getting out the advanced publicity, formally lining up the speakers with their topics, arranging them in sessions, and at the end getting out some kind of published proceedings of the event. During the course of the meetings there would have been innumerable details, ranging from lost children to sick participants, mix-ups on room schedules, and arranging seating and entertainment so as not to offend distinguished visitors. In the midst of this maelstrom came the Mormons, saying, in effect, "Oh, by the way. We have decided that we would like to be included." And once the decision had been made to provide for the reading of the Mormon paper, here was the energetic, zealous young B. H. Roberts constantly pushing, repeatedly coming back for further clarification. Looking at the whole thing from the point of view of the organizers we must, I think, acknowledge that Roberts appeared to be a disturbing, even provocative intruder. I am guessing that Barrows and his colleagues thought that they had gone the extra mile. They had arranged to have a Mormon presentation long after the deadline for such things; they had lined up a hall that

would accommodate one or two hundred people; and they had agreed that Roberts could present the paper himself. But that wasn't good enough. Roberts wanted to be inserted into the main program, along with speakers representing the different world religions. That was too much, Barrows in effect said, "Mr. Roberts, if what we have been able to do does not satisfy you, you may go home." For a comparison we should remember that at the same time that a proposal was sent to the Parliament a request for exhibit space was sent to the officials of the main Exposition. It was turned down flatly; the deadline for requests was long since past and there was no more room. The leaders of the Parliament might have responded similarly, but they tried to do what they could, only to have this orator from the Far West lecture them on their lack of toleration.

At the conclusion of the Parliament of Religions, in his closing address, Bonney did not want to indulge in personalities. His whole purpose was to emphasize the spirit of good will and understanding that had prevailed. Yet he did allude to one untoward incident. "If some Western warrior, forgetting for the moment that this was a friendly conference and not a battlefield, uttered his warcry, let us rejoice, our Orient friends, that a kinder spirit answered: 'Father, forgive them, for they know not what they say.' No system of faith or worship has been compromised by this friendly conference; no apostle of any religion has been placed in a false position by any act of this congress." B. H. Roberts is probably the "Western warrior" Bonney had in mind.

One of the most interesting perspectives to consider, it seems to me, is that of the First Presidency of the LDS Church. Their attitude from the beginning had been lukewarm. Although careful not to be overtly critical, Roberts's own rehearsal of the events in 1891 and 1892 clearly implies that the Church leadership had failed to show foresight as to the importance of the meeting. It was not until the summer of 1893, after the final program for the Parliament had long since been drawn up and finalized, that returning visitors to Chicago raised enough questions to lead the First Presidency to send off a letter of inquiry. After that letter, if I have understood things accurately, they basically gave B. H. Roberts a free hand, telling him in effect, "You are the one who has been interested in this. We have now asked to be included. Do whatever is in your power to bring that about." We have already been over what he did, and however we might question his judgment at times, we cannot question his determination and tenacity.

But what was the First Presidency doing in the meantime? They were not losing a lot of sleep over the World Parliament of Religions. They had other things on their minds, as they had back in 1891. Now, in 1893, they were trying to improve the popular image of Mormonism and to do whatever was possible to move the Territory of Utah toward statehood. This meant playing down religious differences, the old animosities. It was this thrust for an improved reputation with the nation that helps to explain the various lobbying efforts examined by Leo Lyman in his recent doctoral dissertation.⁴ These efforts tied nicely with presenting Utah's best face at the World Columbian Exposition. This meant raising money, emphasizing the economic

opportunities, the existence of different religious groups. Falling in line with this public relations effort were the preparation of an ecclesiastical history of Utah, the great Utah building at the fair itself (which concentrated on mining and agricultural opportunities), and the visit of the Tabernacle Choir to Chicago, where they participated as part of Utah Day.⁸ The Church First Presidency was there for that occasion; it enjoyed the favorable publicity achieved by the Choir. Even though an invitation was extended to attend a reception of the delegates to the World Parliament of Religions, the Presidency was unable to attend that. They probably had very good reasons for declining, but it seems to me a symbolic indication of their priorities. The World Fair with its huge public attendance and press coverage was central. The adjacent meeting of religionists presenting papers to one another was seen as incidental. If Brother Roberts could succeed in getting a hearing there, that would be good. But it scarcely had the same importance as the main Fair.

If what I have said about the attitude of the First Presidency is close to the mark, then this whole episode is a foreshadowing of future friction between the militant, outspoken Roberts and his older colleagues who were less anxious to rock the boat. In this respect, perhaps, it is a case study of the decision making process and of the relationships within the Church's governing councils.

We have noticed how this whole little drama appeared from the point of view of Roberts, of Barrows, and of the First Presidency. If there is time, I would like to add a slightly different perspective on the World Parliament of Religions. One of the participants, one who actually received some public recognition, was Swami Vivekenanda.⁵ Vivekenanda is one of a half dozen acknowledged great Hindu masters between the mid-nineteenth century and the present. In the generation after the great Ramakrishna and the generation before the celebrated Yogananda, Vivekenanda was a powerful voice in the spread of Eastern religion to the West. And there he was at the World Parliament, among the dignitaries on the stand at the opening ceremonies, giving a major address and receiving a good deal of press attention. In addition to major addresses on both Hinduism and Buddhism, Vivekenanda called Christians to task for being overly concerned with conversions. "You Christians, who are so fond of sending out missionaries to save the souls of the heathen—why do you not try to save their bodies from starvation?"

I particularly like Vivekenanda's short address of September 15, 1893, entitled "Why We Disagree." He told a story. A frog lived in a well, he said. "It had lived there for a long time. It was born and brought up there." It ate worms and became sleek and fat. Then one day another frog, which had lived in the sea, came and fell into the well. As the story continues, there is a short dialogue between the two frogs:

"Where are you from?"

"I am from the sea."

"The sea! How big is that? Is it as big as my well?"

The frog from the sea ridiculed the question. How could the other frog possibly compare the sea with the little well.

"But," said the frog of the well, "nothing can be bigger than my well; there can be nothing bigger than this."

The moral should have been inescapable. But Vivekenanda hastened to explain that he was not claiming to represent the sea. As a Hindu, he lived in his little well, thinking it was the whole world. The Christian sat in his little well, confident that it was the whole world. And so on for all religions.

But Vivekenanda did not find the World Parliament of Religions and his general reception much more satisfactory than did B. H. Roberts. In his correspondence, written during the Parliament and during the months he stayed in Chicago afterwards, we discover a strong sense of discouragement and frustration. People were not really listening to him. He too was often patronized. Yet he was confident that he had a message of great value for the whole world.

All of this should make us cautious about accepting the official evaluation of the Parliament officials. As far as they were concerned, the religions that really mattered had received a fair hearing. During the nearly ninety years since the Parliament, and especially since World War II, the impact of Eastern thought on Western religion has become more and more powerful. Vivekenanda, could he come back, would undoubtedly say, "I told you so." During the same years, Mormonism has continued to expand. B.H. Roberts was anxious to have it recognized as a world religion. Increasingly, it has become so. Were Brother Roberts to come back for a visit, he too would probably get some pleasure out of saying, "I told you so." As far as ultimate victory is concerned, if such a term is applicable, Vivekenanda and Roberts would not have agreed. Where we stand on that question depends entirely on our faith commitments. But at the very least perhaps we can recognize that some of the most interesting activity at Chicago in 1893 was behind the scenes and that the significance of the event was not necessarily what it seemed to be on the surface.

As a brief postscript, Roberts would probably gain no small pleasure in the fact that his recommendation for a Bureau of Information at the Parliament was picked up. Not only does the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints now try to have a quality exhibit at all world fairs and expositions, but it has also established bureaus of information on a permanent basis at all temples and various historic sites.

Footnotes

1. The recommended biography is now Truman G. Madsen, *Defender of the Faith: The B.H. Roberts Story* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1980). It does not treat the present subject in detail.

2. An excellent basic treatment and compilation is Walter R. Houghton, ed., *The Parliament of Religions and Religious Congresses at the World's Columbian Exposition*, 2 vols. in one (Chicago: F.T. Neely, 1893).

3. Published as a series under the title "The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints at the Parliament of Religions" in *Improvement Era* 2 (1898-1899). Unless otherwise indicated information about Roberts and his activities comes from this source.

4. Edward Leo Lyman, "The Mormon Quest for Utah Statehood" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Riverside, 1981).

5. Vivekenanda: *The Yogas and Other Works*, ed. Swami Nikhilananda (New York: Ramakrishna-Vivekenanda Center, 1953), p. 185.

DAVIS BITTON is a professor of history at the University of Utah and co-author of *The Mormon Experience*.