UTAH ELITES

AND

UTAH RACIAL NORMS

A DOCTORAL DISSERTATION

BY DAVID L. BREWER

Robert Boyl

UTAH ELITES AND UTAH RACIAL NORMS

by

David Leslie Brewer

A thesis submitted to the faculty of the University
of Utah in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Sociology

University of Utah
August 1966

This thesis for the

Doctor of Philosophy Degree

by
David Leslie Brewer

has been approved
June 1966

_____

Chairman, Supervisory Committee

_____

Reader, Supervisory Committee

_____

Reader, Supervisory Committee

_____

Reader, Supervisory Committee

_____

Reader, Supervisory Committee

_____

Head, Major Department

_____

Dean, Graduate School

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE   PAGE

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A significant fact of our modern world is that different races
have differential access to material and social advantage. Despite
man's material success and his increasing mastery over the environment,
severe deprivation still exists for many, especially for non-Caucasians.
Although not all Caucasians are better off than non-Caucasians, the
general distribution of wealth and influence in Asia, Africa, and South
America, as well as in the United States, illustrates this contrast.

The discrepancy in advantage may be studied in terms of the way
it is evaluated by different groups. Thus, although most people view
the present situation as a crisis, the exact description of the crisis
varies with the perspective of the observer. Inasmuch as individuals
define their situation in differing ways, depending upon certain
qualities of their own socialization and of the various social groups
with which they identify, racial attitudes, as one aspect of this
definition of the situation, will also depend heavily upon socializa-
tion and group identification.

There are two main ways in which individuals define their
situation, as described by sociologists. These are the definitions of
"what is" and of "what ought to be." The first is a viewpoint defining
existing reality, and the second is a viewpoint defining what reality

should be. These are referred to by Gouldner as "existential beliefs" and "values," respectively.[1]

Most people take it as existential fact that non-Caucasians are on the average less successful materially than Caucasians, and they also tend to agree that this situation is not ideal. In other words, there is for most individuals a discrepancy between the "ideal" and the "actual," with regard to the status of racial groupings.[2] Smelser calls such a discrepancy a "social strain." "Strain, then, always expresses a relation between an event or situation and certain cultural and individual standards."[3] The tendency for such definitions and discrepancies to be experienced by most individuals is taken as indication that a kind of general social strain prevails on the subject of race.

More interesting is the possibility that qualitative differences exist in the social strain experienced in various groups, due to qualitative differences in their socialization experiences and group identification. The question is whether individuals in different categories, roles, groups, or institutions experience different specific meanings, which they attribute to different conditions.

---

[1]Alvin W. Gouldner and Helen P. Gouldner, Modern Sociology: An Introduction to the Study of Human Interaction (New York, Burlingame: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1963), pp. 108-110.

[2]Wilbert E. Moore, Social Change (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963), p. 18.

[3]Neil J. Smelser, Theory of Collective Behavior (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1963), p. 51.

In the United States, for example, the ideal of opportunity has penetrated all social classes, encouraging the civil rights movement and other forces for change. Negroes are seeking now, as never before, to determine their own destiny. One specific social strain, existing in certain social structures, is the discrepancy between the perceived "ideal" that society should provide equal opportunity for all, and the perceived "actual" that social structures are not easily adjusted to achieve this. A contrasting specific social strain, existing in other social structures, is the discrepancy between the perceived "actual" that Negroes are seeking special privilege, and the perceived "ideal" that they should accept the responsibility to prove themselves as other minorities have done.

If these contrasting perspectives are widely shared in various social structures, they can be considered "specific social strain." Both are specific representations of the general discrepancy between the ideal and the actual with regard to racial equality.

Undoubtedly, different specific strains are located in different regions, as well as different social structures of the United States. Utah presents an interesting study with respect to racial strains for two main reasons: (1) The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, or Mormon church, the predominant church in Utah, has a policy that prevents Negroes from holding the priesthood; and (2) the State of Utah has long hesitated to pass civil rights legislation.[4] The degree of

---

[4]The first Utah civil rights legislation was passed a few months after this study began. See Chapter VII for details.

likelihood that racial norms of these two types will be changed in the direction of equalitarianism is the main concern of this study.

During a period of unprecedented affluence, it is estimated that between 20 and 25 per cent of Americans have inadequate housing, medicine, food, and opportunity.[5] Utahns have perhaps not been as aware as many others of such deprivation, partly because of the relative lack of large, vocal, racial minorities. The civil rights movement and other forces of national scope are being felt more and more in Utah, however.

If these social strains are becoming more salient for more Utahns, the urgency to resolve them will increase. This view is expressed by Moore, in his statement that social changes are most likely to occur in those structures where tensions exist. Such changes alter the social system so that tensions are more effectively managed.[6] Smelser discusses at length the manner in which social action guided by generalized beliefs is employed in attempted resolution of strain.[7]

---

[5]The poverty line accepted by Harrington is ". . . somewhere between $3,000 and $3,500 for an urban family of four . . . ." Figures based on this formula are apparently not available for Utah. Interestingly Utah ranks second among the eight mountain states in proportion of families in general with incomes of $3,000 or more; nevertheless, Utah ranks sixth in average per capita income. This difference is undoubtedly related to the larger size of the average Utah family. Michael Harrington, The Other America--Poverty in the United States (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1963), p. 182; and U.S. Bureau of the Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1965, 86th Edition (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1965), pp. 335, 343.

[6]Moore, op. cit., pp. 10-11.

[7]Smelser, op. cit., pp. 47-51.

Moore's conceptualization and Smelser's analysis are clues to the types of things that must be considered in an attempt to predict social change in Utah. If changes are more likely to occur at those points in the social system where strains (tensions) exist, then it is consistent to expect that there will be structural adjustments to the increasing racial tensions we see today.

However, as stated above, specific social strains surrounding the racial problem are likely to differ. How then can we predict the likelihood of alternative types of social change? If the things that people are willing to do to resolve strain depend upon the specific kind of strain they experience, and if contrasting and conflicting strains on the race issue persist in different social structures, how is any consistent prediction possible?

One approach to the prediction of change is to view the social system in terms of the degree of social power existing in different social structures. For example, to what extent do those structures in which strain of one type is most salient have the power to manipulate the social system and thus to alter existing arrangements so as to reduce the strain they experience, as compared to those structures in which strain of another type is most salient?

The point is that more effective prediction regarding changes in the social system should be possible, combining the concepts of social strain and social power. According to Hunter, ". . . Power is a word . . . used to describe the acts of men going about the business of moving

other <u>men</u> <u>to</u> <u>act</u> <u>in</u> <u>relation</u> <u>to</u> <u>themselves</u> <u>or</u> <u>in</u> <u>relation</u> <u>to</u> <u>organic</u> <u>or</u>
<u>inorganic</u> <u>things</u>."[8] His classical study, and the many community power
studies that have followed, show in varying degrees the tendency for power
to be concentrated in a few institutions. The most powerful institutions
are typically found to be controlled by an elite, possessing the ability
to make decisions for the community as a whole.

Obviously, social power, or the ability to control or influence, is
extremely complex. It must include those formal and informal lines of
communication through which one can convey information, develop and main-
tain shared perspectives, motivate behavior, give orders, and mobilize a
following. As Homans has stated, communication or interaction is itself
a form of control. He outlines the tendency for those with more status
to initiate more interaction for others, and to have a wider range of
interaction.[9]

It is thus largely through lines of communication that an elite
exercises control over the community. But lines of communication also
exist for other groups in the community to influence the elite, and thus
exercise indirect social control. Therefore, the degree to which lines
of communication are open to various other groupings will also be important
in the prediction of impending social change.

---

[8]Floyd Hunter, <u>Community</u> <u>Power</u> <u>Structure</u>: <u>A</u> <u>Study</u> <u>of</u> <u>Decision</u>
<u>Makers</u> (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1963), p. 2.

[9]George C. Homans, <u>The</u> <u>Human</u> <u>Group</u> (New York: Harcourt, Brace
and Company, 1950), p. 145.

In summary, Utah presents an unusual situation for study from the standpoint of two types of racial norms: (1) the restriction of Negroes from full fellowship in the Mormon church, and (2) the lack, until recently, of civil rights legislation in Utah. The likelihood of normative change in these two areas will depend partly upon whether there are strong discrepancies between socially shared definitions of the "ideal" and the "actual."

However, the exact types of potential for normative change can better be portrayed by a knowledge of the specific definitions that are shared, and the specific nature of such discrepancies. In addition, the likelihood that such potential will be effective in altering existing racial norms will depend strongly upon the availability of social power, or lines of communication to influence those structures where there is power, namely, the elite structures of the community.

CHAPTER II

RACE AND THE UTAH CULTURE

The racial situation in Utah is unique from the standpoint of

values and policies existing in both religious and secular institutions.[1]

The unique institutional arrangements in religion have to do with

the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, which includes 72 per

cent of the Utah population as members.[2] Although Negroes are allowed

to join the Latter-day Saints, or Mormon faith, they are not encouraged

to do so. There is no "missionizing" among them unless individual Negroes

request it. In addition, for those few who do belong to the faith, full

fellowship is not allowed.[3] While all non-Negro male members over age

12, who are judged worthy, may be ordained to the priesthood, and

both males and females who conform to certain church principles may

_____

[1]It is recognized that a distinction between the religious and
the secular is to some extent artificial. At various points in this
chapter, it will be apparent that religion is merely one way of dealing
with the human situation, a central aspect of culture. As such, it
embodies symbolic definitions of man's relation to the unknown, ways in
which he re-enacts significant life experiences, and standards for his
moral behavior, including relationships with his fellow man.

[2]Personal conversation with the L.D.S. Church Membership Office,
January, 1966.

[3]A prominent journalist and author stated in 1965, in one of a
series of articles on Mormonism, "There are believed to be no more
than about 200 Negroes who are L.D.S. Church members." Wallace Turner,
"Mormon Stand on Negroes Poses Problem for Romney If He Runs for
Presidency," New York Times, December 28, 1965.

receive special endowments and be married "for time and eternity" in the Mormon temples, such privileges are not open to Negroes under any conditions.[4]

The unique situation in secular institutions has to do with the long hesitation of the Utah government to enact civil rights laws.[5] In the summer of 1964, when interviews were conducted, Utah remained the one state outside the Southern or Border states without any civil rights legislation in employment, housing, or public accommodations. All the other Northern states had positive legislation in at least one of these areas.[6]

---

[4]This refers, of course, to the official policy, which is supposed to restrict individuals with even "one drop of Negro blood." In practice, such restriction has proven difficult to uphold. It seems likely that many with Negroid ancestry have been admitted and ordained to the priesthood in Brazil and Hawaii, partly because racial mixture in these areas makes clear distinction difficult. In addition, numerous natives of Fiji are Mormons and priesthood holders. Although the church has considered Fijians to be of non-Negroid ancestry, authoritative evidence contradicts this. See Norman E. Gabel, A Racial Study of the Fijians (University of California Anthropological Records, Vol. 20, No. 1. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1958), p. 25. Other examples of departure from the policy are discussed in Jerald and Sandra Tanner, Joseph Smith's Curse Upon the Negro (Salt Lake City: Modern Microfilm Co., 1965), pp. 8-12. The Tanners present documentary and other evidence that a number of Utahns with Negro ancestry have been ordained.

[5]Because this study originated in the attempt to predict racial normative change from interview data, Chapter II will consider only those events which preceded interviews. Important happenings since the interviews, including bills passed in the 1965 legislature, will be considered in Chapter VII, since they tend to indicate the extent to which real events which followed the predictions also fulfilled the predictions.

[6]The Southern or Border states that had not passed civil rights legislation of these types by the summer of 1964 include Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia. Paul Hartman, Civil Rights and Minorities (New York: Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 1962, with 1964 addendum), pp. 18-31.

The lack of civil rights legislation in Utah before 1964 was apparently not due entirely to the small proportion or total number of the population that are Negroes. In Utah, 0.47 per cent of the total 1960 population, or 4,148, were Negroes, as compared to 0.23 per cent, or 1,502, for Idaho; 0.22 per cent, or 1,467, for Montana; 0.13 per cent, or 519, for Vermont; and 0.12 per cent, or 777, for North Dakota.[7] These other states have civil rights laws dating from 1961 for Idaho, 1955 for Montana, 1957 for Vermont, and 1961 for North Dakota.[8]

An understanding of this lack, until recently, of civil rights legislation probably must include an understanding of the racial attitudes and doctrines that were brought to Utah by its early settlers, and these attitudes and doctrines are best understood in terms of their historical development.

EARLY CHURCH HISTORY

Many things have been written about the history of Mormon racial attitudes and policies. Only a few authors have attempted to study the way these attitudes have developed in relation to their changing social context.[9]

---

[7] U.S. Bureau of the Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1963, 84th Edition (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1963), p. 30.

[8] American Jewish Committee, The People Take the Lead, A Record of Progress in Civil Rights, 1954 to 1964 (New York: American Jewish Committee, 1964), p. 44.

[9] Much of this chapter is based upon secondary sources. A thorough

Fawn Brodie deals with the social context in her description of what was apparently the first racial crisis for the church. According to Brodie, Mormon settlers in Missouri antagonized the old residents, many of whom were slave holders. The Mormons were viewed as tactless zealots, who favored abolitionism. When a handful of free Negroes attempted to migrate to Independence, Missouri, the editor of the Mormon newspaper tried to avoid trouble by publishing a reprint of the Missouri statute forbidding entry without a certificate of citizenship from another state. The Evening and Morning Star article also gave this warning:

> "So long as we have no special rule in the Church, as to people of color, let prudence guide, and while they, as well as we, are in the hands of a merciful God, we say: Shun every appearance of evil."[10]

Significant in this quotation is the suggestion that no policy concerning Negroes existed as yet in Mormonism. The article's moderate tone was not enough for Missourians, however, who were disturbed and angered. The following sentence may have contributed to the uproar.

> "As to slaves, we have nothing to say; in connection with the wonderful events of this age much is doing toward abolishing slavery, and colonizing the blacks in Africa."[11]

---

sociological treatment of race in early Mormon history would be valuable, but is not the focus of this research.

[10] Fawn M. Brodie, No Man Knows My History: The Life of Joseph Smith, The Mormon Prophet (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1960), p. 132. Quotation marks appear here, and in other single space quotes, if they appeared in the original.

[11] Ibid.

According to Brodie, the older settlers misunderstood this publication, receiving it as an invitation for free Negroes to emigrate to Missouri. A manifesto was drawn up threatening the expulsion of the Mormons.

As a result, the editor, W. W. Phelps, ". . . somersaulted backwards to undo the mischief."[12] An extra edition was published which clearly set out some views on the Negro problem. In this first attempt to suggest racial policy, the sacred and secular are already intertwined.

> "Having learned with extreme regret that an article entitled 'Free People of Color' in the last number of the Star, has been misunderstood, we feel in duty bound to state, in this Extra, that our intention was not only to stop free people of color from emigrating to this state, but to prevent them from being admitted as members of the Church [emphasis added]."[13]

Joseph Smith, Mormonism's founder and prophet, was in Kirtland, Ohio, at this time, where he only gradually realized the full significance of events in Missouri, according to Brodie.

Two years later, in the summer of 1835, some papyrus scrolls from Egypt provided Joseph the opportunity to deal with the Negro problem authoritatively. Michael Chandler had been exhibiting some mummies in the vicinity of Kirtland. He brought the papyrus scrolls from the mummies to Joseph. Joseph purchased the scrolls, announced that one of them contained the ancient writings of Abraham, and began to translate.

According to Brodie, the translation that was published in 1842, as the Book of Abraham, was strongly influenced by Thomas Smiley's

---

[12]Ibid., p. 133.

[13]Ibid.

Sacred Geography, a copy of which Joseph possessed, and Milton's Paradise Lost. The Book of Abraham, a fifteen page document in its modern edition, states the following:

> Now the first government of Egypt was established by Pharaoh, the eldest son of Egyptus, the daughter of Ham, and it was after the manner of the government of Ham, which was patriarchal.
>
> Pharaoh, being a righteous man, established his kingdom and judged his people wisely and justly all his days, seeking earnestly to imitate that order established by the fathers in the first generations, in the days of the first patriarchal reign, even in the reign of Adam, and also of Noah, his father, who blessed him with the blessings of the earth, and with the blessings of wisdom, but cursed him as pertaining to the Priesthood.[14]

This passage of Mormon scripture has significance for racial values because Mormons commonly believe that the curse was also a racial curse.

An earlier scripture is used by Mormons to support this idea about race. It comes from the Book of Moses, a 27 page document in the modern edition, which was revealed in 1830. Although most of the Book of Moses was not published until 1851, the portion from which this quotation comes appeared in the August, 1832, Evening and Morning Star.

> For behold, the Lord shall curse the land with much heat, and the barrenness thereof shall go forth forever; and there was a blackness came upon all the children of Canaan, that they were despised among all people.
>
> . . . .
>
> And it came to pass that Enoch continued to call upon all the people, save it were the prople of Canaan, to repent . . . .[15]

---

[14]The Pearl of Great Price, Abraham 1:25-26.

[15]Ibid., Moses 7:8, 12.

In the Book of Abraham, the Pharaoh of Egypt, who was "cursed as pertaining to the priesthood," is identified with the Canaanites. "Now this king of Egypt was a descendant from the loins of Ham, and was a partaker of the blood of the Canaanites by birth."[16]

Although these passages are interpreted by many Mormons today as authority for denying Negroes the priesthood, there seems to be no explicit statement of such a policy until much later. However, soon after Joseph began translation of the Book of Abraham, and while the Missouri colony was still trying to adapt to its hostile situation, explicit statements were made regarding the secular issue—the status of slavery.

Fawn Brodie comments upon this as follows:

The Book of Abraham in effect crystallized Joseph's hitherto vacillating position on the Negro problem. Soon he published a statement in his church newspaper attacking the abolitionist position as one "calculated to lay waste the fair states of the South, and let loose upon the world a community of people, who might, peradventure, overrun our society, and violate the most sacred principles of human society, chastity and virtue."[17]

This statement was published in 1836. Mrs. Brodie concludes that "perhaps this attitude was merely a concession to Missouri."[18] Her treatment of the socio-historical condition for the development of secular racial attitudes does not end here, however. Joseph Smith decided to run for United States President in 1844, to prove that the Mormons were a political force to reckoned with.

---

[16] Ibid., Abraham 1:21.

[17] Brodie, op. cit., p. 173.

[18] Ibid.

"We have as good a right to make a political party to gain power to defend ourselves," he said, "as for demagogues to make use of our religion to get power to destroy us."[19]

Joseph was not inflexible on the subject of race; as conditions changed, so did he.

By now Joseph's attitude toward the Negro had become so liberal —partly as a result of his correspondence with the abolitionist C. V. Dyer—that he argued with Orson Hyde that if the roles of Negro and white were reversed the former would quickly assume the characteristics of the latter.[20]

"'Break off the shackles from the poor black man, and hire him to labor like other human beings, for "an hour of virtuous liberty on earth is worth a whole eternity of bondage."'"[21]

But the sacralization of the earlier views was more complete, since they were embodied in scripture.

The Utah Church accepted the ideological fruits of Joseph's earlier stand, which actually had been a political compromise, and rejected this more courageous about-face because it was merely an utterance in a political campaign.[22]

John J. Stewart, a Mormon apologist, takes a simpler view of Joseph's racial attitudes. He makes the following observations to support the contention that Negro policy regarding the priesthood came from revelation, rather than from social conditions.

---

[19]Ibid., p. 362.

[20]Ibid., p. 365.

[21]Ibid., pp. 364-365.

[22]Ibid., p. 365.

Rather than his trying to curry favor with non-Mormons over the Negro question, what was really the conduct of the Prophet Joseph in this matter?

In the early 1830's he wrote and published in the Messenger and Advocate, the Church newspaper at Kirtland, Ohio, an editorial suggesting that leading men in the southern states should take measures to liberate the slaves, so that the Negro could enjoy the blessings of a free nation. He also invited an abolitionist to give a public speech in Kirtland, at a time when abolitionists were generally hated in the North as well as in the South.[23]

Unfortunately, Stewart does not cite a reference for this editorial. Jerald Tanner reports finding only one article on slavery in the Messenger and Advocate for the 1830's, but this is dated 1836. It is a letter which apparently refers to the abolitionist speaker mentioned by Stewart. However, the letter actually ridicules abolitionism and defends slavery.

". . . the first mention we have of slavery is found in the Holy Bible . . . . And so far from that prediction being averse to the mind of God, it remains as a lasting monument of the decree of Jehovah, to the shame and confusion of all who have cried out against the South, in consequence of their holding the sons of Ham in servitude."[24]

Other quotations in Tanner's publications illustrate the pro-slavery or at least anti-abolitionist views held by Joseph Smith for a number of years after the Missouri experience. He agrees with Fawn Brodie's view that Joseph Smith did become more favorable to abolitionism toward the end of his life. Tanner and Brodie also agree that after the

---

[23]John J. Stewart, Mormonism and the Negro (Orem, Utah: Bookmark, A Division of Community Press Publishing Company, 1963), p. 16.

[24]Jerald Tanner, The Negro in Mormon Theology (Salt Lake City: Modern Microfilm Company, [n.d.]), pp. 14-15; Also see Jerald and Sandra Tanner, op. cit., pp. 22-25.

murder of Joseph Smith in 1844, and the migration of the saints to Utah

under Brigham Young, anti-abolitionist values began again to prevail.

Jan Shipps, in an article in the Colorado Quarterly, takes the

same point of view as Brodie and Tanner with regard to the main periods

in Joseph Smith's racial attitudes. Emphasizing Smith's anti-aboli-

tionist attitudes following the Missouri crisis, Shipps adds some other

interesting details regarding this adaptation to social conditions.

> In Ohio, Eber D. Howe had gathered propaganda against the church
> from apostates and had published a damning exposé, Mormonism
> Unvailed [sic], and the church had the formidable task of trying to
> combat this unfavorable publicity—to add unpopular abolitionism
> to the church's beliefs would possibly have been fatal to Mormonism.
> The prophet was heavily in debt and he needed more money to finish
> the Kirtland temple and to help the destitute Saints in Missouri—
> abolitionism would have antagonized potential wealthy converts from
> the Southern states.

° °

> Unfortunately, for the Negro in the Mormon Church . . . the
> prophet—at the same time he presented the elaborate defense
> characterizing slavery as a divine institution—published the
> Pearl of Great Price.[25]

To highlight the way in which the Missouri racial conflict affected

church attitudes, Shipps also describes racial attitudes in the Book of

Mormon as a literary expression of earlier, less troubled conditions, in

which Indians, rather than Negroes, were the problem. The Book of

Mormon, reportedly translated from ancient metallic plates, became the

new church's first and most famous scripture. But it was published in

1830, before the Negro problem arose for the church.

---

[25] Jan Shipps, "Second-class Saints," Colorado Quarterly, X
(Autumn, 1962), pp. 186-187.

In 1827, the year in which Joseph Smith, Jr., the Mormon prophet, said he received the golden plates engraved with Egyptian characters from which he "translated" the Book of Mormon, Andrew Jackson had not yet become the president of the United States. Problems of slavery and the Negro race had presumably been settled seven years before with the acceptance of the Missouri Compromise. In the decade of the 1820's, the immediate racial problem was the disposition of the Indian tribes. The Book of Mormon dealt at length with the history of the American Indian; there was no mention of the Negro race in the new Mormon bible.[26]

Thus, Shipps describes the Book of Mormon as originating partially in an attempt to resolve a particular kind of problem. It was, in fact, the Book of Mormon that first, in Mormon thought, described darkness of skin as the curse of God. This scripture is supposed to be the record of a group of Israelites who migrated to the American continent hundreds of years before Christ. Several groups, the largest of which was the Lamanites, rebelled against the other, called Nephites.

And the skins of the Lamanites were dark, according to the mark which was set upon their fathers, which was a curse upon them because of their transgression and their rebellion against their brethren, who consisted of Nephi, Jacob, and Joseph, and Sam, who were just and holy men.

And their brethren sought to destroy them, therefore they were cursed; and the Lord God set a mark upon them, yea, upon Laman and Lemuel, and also the sons of Ishmael, and Ishmaelitish women.[27]

The lighter groups, those called Nephites in the Book of Mormon, were destroyed in war at a later date, while the Lamanites, cursed with a dark skin, survived to become the American Indians. Despite the curse, exclusion from the priesthood is never mentioned in their case.

---

[26]Ibid., p. 184.

[27]Book of Mormon, Alma 3:6-7.

The whiteness of the Nephites doesn't necessarily evidence a state of righteousness, in the Book of Mormon, but it does indicate membership in the chosen group. As such, it implies a greater responsibility to be obedient to God's prophets, and greater condemnation for disobedience.

> Oh my brethren, I fear that unless ye shall repent of your sins that their skins will be whiter than yours, when ye shall be brought with them before the throne of God.

> Wherefore, a commandment I give unto you, which is the word of God, that ye revile no more against them because of the darkness of their skins; neither shall ye revile against them because of their filthiness; but ye shall remember your own filthiness, and remember that their filthiness came because of their fathers.[28]

There is a sort of mixed message in these passages, emphasizing the curse of the dark skin on the one hand, and the possibility of greater rewards if this disadvantage is overcome. Other passages emphasize the equality of all men before God. In the words of Nephi, ancestor of all the Nephites,

> For none of these iniquities come of the Lord; for he doeth that which is good among the children of men; . . . and he denieth none that come unto him, black and white, bond and free, male and female; and he remembereth the heathen; and all are alike unto God, both Jew and Gentile.[29]

Another interesting fact is that although Indians are believed to be descendants of a cursed group, they are also considered literal descendants of the Israelites. A revelation to Joseph Smith in 1830 encouraged missionizing among the Indians.

---

[28] Ibid., Jacob 3:8-9.

[29] Ibid., II Nephi 26:33.

And now, behold, I say unto you that you shall go unto the Lamanites and preach my gospel unto them; and inasmuch as they receive thy teachings thou shalt cause my church to be established among them . . . .[30]

An 1831 revelation looked forward to their complete redemption: "But before the great day of the Lord shall come, Jacob shall flourish in the wilderness, and the Lamanites shall blossom as the rose."[31]

Thomas F. O'Dea comments as follows concerning the Mormons' attitude toward the Indians:

Not only have the Mormons identified themselves with America, they have also felt an unusual concern with the Indian. In this they have also been unusual among settlers in this country. Basing themselves upon the Book of Mormon, they set out early in their career to bring the gospel to the aborigines. In Missouri, in frontier conditions, their talk of the Indians joining them in the task of building Zion was a contributing factor to the hostility they met among the gentiles.[32]

This discussion of Mormon attitudes toward Indians is offered because it helps highlight the significance of events several years after the Book of Mormon was written, and after beliefs regarding the "Lamanites" had been institutionalized. As stated above, the view in the studies by Brodie, Tanner, and Shipps, is that the negative attitudes with regard to Negroes grew out of different, more threatening experiences, directly associated with slavery in Missouri.

Shipps make one more point to support this contention. The idea, which is perhaps implicit in Brodie's and Tanner's discussions,

---

[30] Doctrine and Covenants, 28:8.

[31] Ibid., 49:24.

[32] Thomas F. O'Dea, The Mormons (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964), p. 256.

is as follows: Not only were Joseph Smith's views pro-slavery after the Missouri disaster—they were typically Yankee before.

Joseph Smith's reaction to the Missouri disaster was typical of a New Englander, which he was. He gave out a revelation that unequivocably condemned slavery:

"That every man may act in doctrine and principle pertaining to futurity [,] according to the moral agency which I [God] have give him, [given unto him,] that every man may be accountable for his own sins in the day of judgment; Therefore, it is not right that any man should be in bondage one to another."[33]

In summary, there seem to be at least two, and probably three different periods in the racial perspectives expressed by the leaders of the pre-Utah Mormon church. With regard to Negroes, the anti-abolitionist views instigated by the Missouri crisis were more highly sacralized than the views of other periods.

Several other writers have commented upon racial values in the Mormon church relative to the difficult social conditions of early Mormon history. Boyd Mathias and William J. Whalen have outlined essentially the same points mentioned above from the works of Brodie, Tanner, and Shipps.[34] According to Sterling McMurrin, as quoted in the Chicago Sun Times, the Mormon doctrine of the "divine curse" was picked up from the Southern protestants.

---

[33]Shipps, op. cit., pp. 185-186.

[34]O. Boyd Mathias, "The Mormon Church and its Negro Doctrine" (term paper for Graduate Social Science Seminar, University of Kansas City, Missouri, 1958), pp. 2-6; William J. Whalen, The Latter-day Saints in the Modern Day World (New York: The John Day Company, 1964), pp. 55-70, 245-257.

. . . The early church got into trouble in the 1840s partly because it had two or three free Negroes "in full fellowship" in the church when the Mormons migrated to Missouri, where Negroes were still considered slaves.

That produced a sort of a Mormon "Missouri Compromise," said the former U.S. Commissioner of education, who as professor of philosophy at the University of Utah has written what many consider the definitive works on Mormon theology.[35]

An article by L. H. Kirkpatrick describes some of the problems of early church history, but disregards Joseph Smith's anti-abolitionist views, as does Stewart's little book and a publication by Yates Heywood. As an interesting contrast, a chapter in Jerreld L. Newquist's ultra-conservative Prophets, Principles, and National Survival on "Mormonism and the Negro," quotes only those statements from the anti-abolitionist period, disregarding entirely the abolitionist attitudes expressed later.[36]

Despite these beliefs about racial origins and opinions regarding Negro slavery, no policy on Negroes and the priesthood seems to have been established until the Utah period. There are apparently no recorded statements by Joseph Smith or anyone else during the Prophet's lifetime.

---

[35]Chicago Sun-Times, April 5, 1965.

[36]L. H. Kirkpatrick, "The Negro and the L.D.S. Church," Pen Magazine, (Winter, 1954), pp. 12-13; Stewart, op. cit., pp. 15-19; Yates Heywood, The Negro Question Resolved (Salt Lake City: Paragon Press, Inc., 1964), p. 20; Jerreld L. Newquist, Prophets, Principles, and National Survival (Salt Lake City: Publishers Press, 1965), pp. 490-492, 502. Kirkpatrick's article and the booklet by Heywood manifest more sympathy for the Negro than do other publications written in support of the Mormon church's policy; yet both oppose civil rights legislation. At present, it appears that all writers who defend the church's policy also oppose legislation.

In 1879, 35 years after Joseph's murder, Zebedee Coltrin test-
ified that Joseph Smith had told him in 1834 that Negroes could not hold
the priesthood, and A. O. Smoot testified that he was given the same
information in 1838.[37] Such testimony is probably questionable, partly
because more than four decades had supposedly passed, and partly because
the testimony was given to support a restrictive policy that had become
well-established in Utah, and to resolve the dilemma created by the fact
that a Negro in the early church had been ordained to the priesthood.

In 1836, according to Andrew Jenson, Assistant Church Historian,
Elijah Abel, an octoroon, was ordained an elder, and a seventy in 1841.[38]

In Nauvoo he was intimately acquainted with the Prophet Joseph
Smith . . . . In 1883, as a member of the Third Quorum of Seventy,
he left Salt Lake City on a mission to Canada, during which he also
performed missionary labors in the United States. Two weeks after
his return he died, Dec. 25, 1884, of debility, consequent upon
exposure while laboring in the ministry in Ohio. He died in full
faith of the gospel.[39]

The martyrdom of Joseph Smith in 1844 seems to have occurred when
there was no particular church policy toward Negroes, and when Joseph's
sentiments were essentially abolitionist. But these later conditions
had little influence after his death and after the migration of Mormons

---

[37]William E. Berrett, "The Church and the Negroid People,"
supplement in John J. Stewart, Mormonism and the Negro (Orem, Utah:
Bookmark, A Division of Community Press Publishing Company, 1963), pp.
9-11.

[38]A seventy is a member of a quorum of seventy elders who are
specially set apart as traveling missionaries.

[39]Andrew Jenson, Latter-day Saint Biographical Encyclopedia
(Salt Lake City: A. Jenson History Company, 1920), III, p. 577.

to Utah. Although Joseph had demonstrated ramarkable ability to draw authoritative answers on the subject of race from ancient revelations and documents, his later views had not been sacralized in this manner.

There is one hint in Joseph Smith's writings that he may have intended to deal again with the Negro question. This incident, once more involving ancient artifacts, occurred in April, 1843, at least three months after he had begun to oppose slavery, and nine months before his announced candidacy for the Unites States Presidency.

According to official church history, Mr. Robert Wiley of Kinderhook, Illinois, and several other men, reported finding a large skeleton and six brass plates buried in a large mound near Kinderhook. Amidst much local excitement, these plates were brought to Nauvoo for Joseph Smith to translate. On May 1, 1843, Joseph wrote in his journal:

> The plates were found on the breast of the skeleton and were covered on both sides with ancient characters.
>
> I have translated a portion of them, and find they contain the history of the person with whom they were found. He was a descendant of Ham, through the loins of Pharaoh, king of Egypt, and that he received his kingdom from the Ruler of heaven and earth.[40]

It is interesting that most of the day's entry, seven pages in fact, deals with the Kinderhook plates. The last sentence, however, is as follows: "Slavery was this day abolished in every part of the British

---

[40]Joseph Smith, History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, ed. B. H. Roberts (Salt Lake City: Deseret News, 1949), V, p. 372.

dominions in India, under the administration of Lord Ellenborough."[41] It seems apparent that the racial problem was on Joseph's mind.

It is not known why Joseph never completed a translation of these plates. Thirty-six years later Mr. Wiley said the plates had been a deliberate hoax, created for the occasion.[42] If this is a fact, it may be that Joseph suspected as much, or it may simply have been that he did not live long enough to complete translation. Joseph was martyred a little over a year after the Kinderhook plates were uncovered.

THE UTAH PERIOD

In the early Utah period it is possible to distinguish well-defined attitudes on the sacred and secular status of Negroes. Fawn Brodie, Jerald Tanner, William Whalen, Boyd Mathias, and Jan Shipps describe the inferior position of Negroes in predominating values. Shipps states, with reference to Brigham Young, the new President

---

[41]Ibid., p. 379; Still another event illustrating the coincidence of artifacts and racial concerns occurred in 1834, when Joseph was leading a group of 150 men from Ohio, to rescue the persecuted saints in Missouri. Finding a number of high mounds, the men dug into one and ". . . discovered the skeleton of a man, almost entire, and between his ribs the stone point of a Lamanitish arrow, which evidently produced his death. . . . the visions of the past being opened to my understanding by the Spirit of the Almighty, I discovered that the person whose skeleton we had seen was a white Lamanite, a large, thick-set man, and a man of God. His name was Zelph. He was a warrior and chieftain under the great prophet Onandagus, who was known from the eastern sea to the Rocky mountains. The curse was taken from Zelph, or, at least, in part . . . ." Ibid., II, pp. 78-80.

[42]Ibid., V, pp. 378-379.

and Prophet of the church, "The Mormon Moses was as inflexible on the subject of the Negro as he was on polygamy."[43]

Since the prophet is always the final authority in the church, believed by Mormons to be in communication with God, his statements to the Utah church are significant. What was Brigham's judgment concerning the status of the Negro in secular matters? The following is from remarks he made in the tabernacle in 1859.

> You see some classes of the human family that are black, uncouth, uncomely, disagreeable and low in their habits, wild, and seemingly deprived of nearly all the blessings of the intelligence that is generally bestowed upon mankind. The first man that committed the odious crime of killing one of his brethren will be cursed the longest of any one of the children of Adam. . . . the Lord put a mark upon him, which is the flat nose and black skin. Trace mankind down to after the flood, and then another curse is pronounced upon the same race—that they should be the "servant of servants;" and they will be, until that curse is removed; and the Abolitionists cannot help it, nor in the least alter that decree.[44]

These pro-slavery, or at least anti-abolitionist beliefs, coincided with the actual status of Negroes in Utah. According to James Boyd Christensen, "The compromise of 1859 opened Utah and New Mexico to slavery when they should be admitted as states . . . . In 1860 there were 59 Negroes in the territory, 29 being listed as slaves, and 30 free colored."[45]

---

[43]Shipps, op. cit., p. 188.

[44]Sermon of October 9, 1859, Journal of Discourses (Vol. VII of 26 vols.; Liverpool: 1854-1886), p. 290.

[45]James Boyd Christensen, "A Social Survey of the Negro Population of Salt Lake City, Utah" (unpublished Master's thesis, The University of Utah, Salt Lake City, 1948), p. 10.

Christensen also comments upon differences in the treatment of Negroes and Indians:

> To begin with, enslavement of the Negro seemed to them a natural thing because many of them had always known it, being converts to the Mormon faith from the Southern States. On the other hand, slave trade among the Indians was entirely foreign to them. There is also a theological aspect to the question. Being a deeply religious people, the Mormons regarded the Negro as a cursed people and doomed to a life of servitude . . . . At the same time, they looked upon the Indians as the same racial strain as themselves, the explanation of which lies in Latter Day Saint doctrine.[46]

Despite the doctrinal justification for slavery used by early Utah leaders, it seems unlikely that Mormons were strongly committed to slavery per se. They were convinced, however, of the inferiority of Negroes and the foolishness of abolitionism. This belief in the basic inferiority of Negroes was based, of course, on scriptural interpretation, while the rejection of abolitionism was apparently related to renewed threats from the gentiles in the East.

> As early as 1856 the Republican Presidential nominee John Charles Frémont blasted "those twin relics of barbarism—polygamy and slavery." The party platform declared it was the "right and duty of Congress" to abate both evils. The Democrats preferred to attack Mormon polygamy rather than to stir up the issue of slavery which could split their party.[47]

It is also true that Utah was never inclined toward slavery as an overall economic policy. Neff, in his History of Utah, records the following interview between abolitionist Horace Greeley and Brigham Young in 1859:

---

[46]Ibid., p. 12.

[47]Whalen, op. cit., p. 133.

"H. G.—What is the position of your church with respect to slavery?

"B. Y.—We consider it of divine institution, and not to be abolished until the curse pronounced on Ham shall have been removed from his descendants.

"H. G.—Are any slaves now held in this territory?

"B. Y.—There are.

"H. G.—Do your territorial laws uphold slavery?

"B. Y.—Those laws are printed—you can read for yourself. If slaves are brought here by those who owned them in the states, we do not favor their escape from the service of those owners.

"H. G.—Am I to infer that Utah, if admitted as a member of the Federal Union, would be a slave state?

"B. Y.—No; she will be a free state. Slavery here would prove useless and unprofitable."[48]

Although abolitionism had its day, the "curse" was not removed. Utah sided with the Union during the Civil War, and Utah slavery was laid to rest—but its soul went marching on.

The following comments by Brigham Young describe a religious racial policy which still exists. The fact that religious and secular perspectives were not separated is illustrated by the fact that these words are a continuation of Brigham's views on slavery, quoted on page 26.

How long is that race to endure the dreadful curse that is upon them? That curse will remain upon them, and they never can hold the Priesthood or share in it until all the other descendants

---

[48]Andrew L. Neff, _History of Utah, 1847-1869_, ed. Leland Hargrave Creer (Salt Lake City: Deseret News Press, 1940), p. 618.

of Adam have received the promises and enjoyed the blessings of the Priesthood and the keys thereof.[49]

If the Mormons had to accept a change in secular policy, an end to slavery, there was no requirement to end the religious policy, namely, the restriction of Negroes as to priesthood. This priesthood policy remains unchanged to the present.

In addition, the belief in the "curse" continued to influence secular policy. Brigham H. Roberts, a Mormon Apostle and historian noted for his liberal views, quoted favorably from a segregationist publication in 1907.

> "We affirm, then, that the south is entirely right in thus keeping open at all times, at all hazards, and at all sacrifices an impassible social chasm between black and white. This she must do in behalf of her blood, her essence, of the stock of her Caucasian race.
>
> o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o
>
> "That the negro is markedly inferior to the Caucasian is proved both craniologically and by six thousand years of planet-wide experimentation . . . ."[50]

This viewpoint may be less surprising when the isolated condition of Utah for many years following the Civil War is considered. The Negro problem was not obvious to Utahns, partly because the Negro Population remained small, numbering only 1,235 as late as 1940.[51] Apparently

---

[49]Sermon of October 9, 1859, _Journal of Discourses, loc. cit._

[50]Brigham Henry Roberts, _The Seventy's Course in Theology_ (Salt Lake City: Deseret News Press, 1907), pp. 165-166.

[51]U.S. Bureau of the Census, _loc. cit._

there was very little agitation on racial questions, either inside or

outside the church, for a long time.

> For many years the Mormon Church has struggled to gain a respect-
> able place in America's religious life. The aftermath of the poly-
> gamy controversy left a great deal of prejudice in the minds of many
> people, but in the years since the turn of the century, the Mormon
> Church has steadily gained members and social acceptance as well.
> The doctrine on the Negro remained virtually unknown outside Utah,
> and since the church accepts all races into full fellowship, except
> Negroes, outsiders finding Indian and Hawaiian and Polynesian Mormons
> assumed that Negroes would have the same privilege.

> Not until after World War II was the doctrine questioned, either
> outside or within the church. The emphasis on civil rights for
> Negroes, brought about initially by the Supreme Court decisions
> regarding public schools, made liberal Mormons aware that the
> church's stand on the Negro could heap new coals of fire upon the
> heads of Latter-day Saints.[52]

Although these comments succinctly describe the maturing of racial

awareness, it seems likely that the Negro policy was questioned earlier

than this. World War II brought difficult new experiences to many,

overseas and abroad. Stress introduced by the war, plus its tragic human

aspect, probably encouraged the questioning of many old institutions,

including racial policies. At any rate, an article titled "Non-Segrega-

tion" was written by Joseph Fielding Smith partly in reaction to questions

asked by servicemen _during_ World War II.[53] Included were the following

statements:

> This tendency for "equality" in all things, has brought a
> flood of correspondence from all parts of the Church asking how

---

[52]Shipps, _op_. _cit_., p. 188.

[53]Personal Correspondence of the Author, Letter from the Office
of President Joseph Fielding Smith, February 21, 1966.

it is that The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints stands
out in opposition and teaches a doctrine of segregation denying
the Negro the right to hold the priesthood. Some of these letters
border on a spirit of resentment and claim that the Church is
guilty of a great injustice, since "all men were created free and
equal."[54]

Another interesting reaction on the Negro policy occurred soon
after the war. The question of doing missionary work in areas with
racially mixed populations led to an exchange of communications between
Lowry Nelson, a prominent sociologist, and the L.D.S. First Presidency.
In a series of letters now considered classical, Nelson expressed his
hope that the Negro doctrine had not become crystallized beyond the
possibility of revision. He reflected upon his own background in the
church, "It seems strange to me in retrospect—as it must have seemed
to you—that I should never before have had to face up to this doctrine
of the Church relative to the Negro."[55] One particularly ebullient
passage is the following:

> Now, you say that the "social side of the Restored Gospel is
> only an incident of it; it is not the end thereof." I may not
> have the same concept of "social" as you had in mind, but it seems
> to me the only virtue we can recognize in men is that expressed
> in their relations with others; that is their "social" relations.
> Are the virtues of honesty, chastity, humility, forgiveness,
> tolerance, love, kindness, justice, secondary? If so, what is
> primary? Love of God? Very well. But the second (law) is like
> unto it.[56]

---

[54]Joseph Fielding Smith, Answers to Gospel Questions (Vol. II,
Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Company, 1958), p. 184.

[55]Correspondence from Lowry Nelson to the First Presidency,
October 8, 1947.

[56]Ibid.

The authoritative reply from the First Presidency includes the following sentences:

> We feel very sure that you understand well the doctrines of the Church. They are either true or not true. Our testimony is that they are true. Under these circumstances we may not permit ourselves to be too much impressed by the reasonings of men, however well founded they may seem to be.[57]

Writing again in 1952, Nelson noted that the Mormon church's Negro policy was widely discussed.

> A very real difficulty is the fact that those who disapprove the church's attitude have no way of expressing their point of view . . . .

> Such open discussion, especially in print, however, is a perilous undertaking for any member. It automatically leaves him open to the charge of "disobedience to constituted authority" which may lead to his being excommunicated. The upshot is that discussions by interested persons are largely sub-rosa. So widespread are such discussion groups that they might be said to constitute a "Mormon underground."[58]

If local concern regarding the issue was increasing, events were unfolding outside the United States that would also have an important bearing upon L.D.S. Negro policy. In 1953, some Mormon books and tracts, including a short autobiography by Joseph Smith, came into the possession of Anie Dick Obot of Uyo, Nigeria.

> Fascinated by the dramatic life of the Mormon prophet, . . . [he] decided to form a branch of the church in Nigeria, and wrote for more information to Mormon headquarters in Salt Lake City. Mormon leaders sent back books explaining their laws and doctrines,

---

[57]Correspondence from the First Presidency to Lowry Nelson, November 12, 1947.

[58]Lowry Nelson, "Mormons and the Negro," The Nation, CLXXIV (May 24, 1952), p. 488.

and in 1959 dispatched to Africa Elder Lamar Williams, who was much impressed by the Nigerians' zeal and orthodoxy. Since then, the Nigerian Saints, governed by Obot and a council of 75 elders, have established branches in six cities.[59]

In 1963, when more than 7,000 Nigerian Negroes had joined, David O. McKay, Prophet and President of the Mormon church, announced that "missionaries will be sent to Nigeria in West-Central Africa in response to requests from people in that country to learn more about Church doctrine."[60] Unmentioned in this carefully-worded announcement was the fact that this was to be the first mission to Negroes.

However, less than two months after the announcement, the Nigerian Outlook, published in Enugu, headlined an article entitled "Evil Saints," which proposed restriction of the Mormon church from Nigeria. The article asserted that

> The formation of a religious body in far away America should not have been the concern of any Nigerian but for the fact that this sect, otherwise known as Mormons, believe as a cardinal of their faith that the Negro race is not equal to any other race in the eyes of God, as a result of which Negroes who are foolish enough to choose Mormonism as their religion can never be ordained priests . . . .
>
> . . . .
>
> These so-called Latter Day Saints must be recognised [sic] for what they are—godless Herrenvolkism—and must not be allowed into the country . . . .

. . . .

---

[59]"Mormons," Time, LXXXV (June 18, 1965), p. 56.

[60]Deseret News and Telegram [Salt Lake City, Utah], January 11, 1963.

Since the United States Government preaches the equality of all
races, Mr. Kennedy must ban this anti-Negro organisation [sic]
that preaches heretic doctrines.[61]

Shortly after this was published, the Nigerian Government decided

against giving visas to Mormon missionaries, and the mission remained

in Salt Lake. This attempt to teach Mormonism, for the first time, to

large numbers of Negroes, thus faltered upon traditional policy regard-

ing the priesthood. It should not be surprising, under such conditions,

if the Nigerians assume priesthood on their own. Something like this

is implied in Obot's statement.

"I don't have to wait for revelation to know that I am the
natural head in Nigeria," snaps Obot, who is accepted by his elders
as their bishop. "Nigerian priests will run their own branch.
This is their creation, and they are in their own country."[62]

The development of this reluctant sect of Mormondom presents

difficult alternatives to L.D.S. authorities. On the one hand, mission-

ary work in Nigeria may prove impossible unless traditional policy is

changed and the opportunity for full fellowship is extended to all

Negroes. On the other hand, the continual defense and re-assertion of

traditional policy could encourage further development of Mormon

sectarianism among Negroes and continued criticism by civil rights

supporters around the world.

Another phenomenon with possible significance for Utah racial

norms has been the prominence of George Romney. His candidacy for and

---

[61]Nigerian Outlook [Enugu, Nigeria], March 5, 1963.

[62]"Mormons," Time, LXXXV, loc. cit.

election to the governorship of Michigan, in 1962, aroused a great deal of concern among civil rights supporters. Since Romney was president of the Detroit Stake of the Mormon church, it was speculated that he could not sincerely support civil rights for Negroes. A Michigan Negro population of over 700,000 made this a salient issue.[63]

Despite the fact that Romney vigorously supported civil rights after his election, and succeeded in getting an unusually strong bill through the Michigan legislature, the controversy is not finished. In articles and publications too numerous to document, Romney has been discussed as a possible Republican nominee for the United States Presidency. Often these publications discuss the problem of civil rights relative to his church membership.

Typical questions include the following: (1) Could Romney win a national election while believing in a religion that refuses equal opportunity to Negroes? (2) How likely is a change in Mormon church policy, relative to the desire of Mormons and Utahns to see a favorite son attain such political prominence? Romney is a favorite son of Utah as well as of the Mormon church, having lived in Salt Lake City during his youth.

According to Shipps, Romney's political prominence has embarrassed his church.

> Even if the Republican Party's campaign to make George Romney the next governor of Michigan and thereafter a candidate for the

_____

[63]U.S. Bureau of the Census, loc. cit.

Presidency is successful, there can be no doubt that his candidacy has seriously hurt the public image of the Mormon Church.[64]

Whether or not Romney's prominence increases, his experiences may be a portent of the future. To the extent that other Mormon officials become politically important, strains regarding traditional racial policy may again be aggravated.

While the Mormon church's Negro policy was receiving national attention, local civil rights leaders were pursuing a direct confrontation with the church. In October, 1963,

. . . Negro leaders in Salt Lake City threatened to picket the Mormons' 133rd semiannual conference unless church leaders broke silence and formally denounced segregation. N.A.A.C.P. leaders finally heard what they had been waiting for last week in an address by Hugh D. [B.] Brown, newly chosen First Counselor to David O. McKay, 90, who is the Mormons' First President, Prophet, Seer, Revelator and Trustee-in-Trust. "We would like it to be known," said Brown, "that there is in this church no doctrine, belief, or practice that is intended to deny the enjoyment of full civil rights by any person regardless of race, color or creed."[65]

Also included in the statement, but not quoted in the *Time* article, was the following:

We call upon all men everywhere, both within and outside the Church, to commit themselves to the establishment of full civil equality for all of God's children. Anything less than this defeats our high ideal of the brotherhood of man.[66]

This statement by a member of the L.D.S. First Presidency is interesting because it illustrates one possible response to social pressure. It is not, of course, a statement of religious equality for

---

[64]Shipps, op. cit., p. 183.

[65]"Mormons," *Time*, LXXXII (October 18, 1963), p. 83.

[66]Church News section of the *Deseret News* [Salt Lake City, Utah], October 12, 1963.

Negroes; nor is it an endorsement of civil rights laws, although it does encourage the principle of civil equality.

If there is a growing tide of interest in the Negro question among Mormons, if the church encounters continued missionizing difficulties, if its racial policy becomes a political issue, and if civil rights groups continue to agitate, a change in Mormon church racial policy might seem likely or even inevitable.

But there are institutional resistances that make change difficult. The sacralization of the policy, supported by the doctrine of the "curse," would suggest that successful re-interpretation must be equally sacred. Such adventurous response to the modern situation is difficult because the church has become somewhat conservative.

In his discussion of Mormonism in the modern world, Thomas O'Dea has emphasized the significance of persistent agrarian values institutionalized in the Utah culture and the Mormon religion. These values enjoy doctrinal legitimation in that

> Mormon orientations toward mastery over the environment and their related dedication to progress were . . . contained within an agrarian context. As a result, the more prosaic virtues of hard work, responsibility, thrift, and getting ahead were concretely perceived in rural terms.[67]

One result of such an emphasis is a particularly aggressive version of competitive middle-class mores, when agrarian values are projected into urban middle-class occupations.[68] Another result is the difficulty of coming to terms with contemporary problems.

---

[67] O'Dea, op. cit., p. 251.

[68] Ibid., p. 252.

> Modern industrial relations, limitation of hours of work in factory and office, and the inhibition of the businessman's quest for wealth by social regulation—all brought into existence by a complex, highly differentiated, and interrelated industrial society—tend to be seen from the older, agrarian viewpoint.[69]

Thus, one implication is the existence of strong conservative inclinations within economic and other institutions.

Another dilemma, also given a great deal of attention by O'Dea, has to do with intellectualism.[70] Although pressures toward academic attainment exist in the culture, partly through the Mormon theologizing of knowledge and intelligence, the power structure of the Mormon and Utah community has traditionally not been built upon intellectualism. Strong agrarian values, institutionalized in government, business, and religion, offer considerable resistance to such tendencies. In addition, Mormon leadership consists exclusively of lay priesthood. At the present time, little intellectualism is found among high church officialdom.

The character of such institutions as these in Utah suggests considerable resistance to normative liberalization on any issue. Added to this is the fact that racial norms tend to assume a sacred character, particularly in the Mormon church. As stated above, Mormon policy toward the Negro is typically explained by reference to Mormon scripture.

---

[69] Ibid.

[70] Ibid., pp. 147-149, 224-240, 250-255.

If the sacralization of Mormon church racial policy makes change especially unlikely, what about political-legal racial policy? Liberalization in this area has also proven difficult. Civil rights bills concerning public accommodations, employment, and housing, which were introduced in the Utah legislature previous to this study, all failed. Included are the following bills, introduced between 1945 and 1963.[71]

Year	Accommodations	Employment	Housing
1945	S. B. 21, H. B. 94		
1947	S. B. 25	S. B. 26	
1949	S. B. 100, H. B. 87	S. B. 125, H. B. 63	
1951		S. B. 16	
1953			
1955			
1957	H. B. 87		
1959	H. B. 16		
1961	H. B. 83		
1963	H. B. 111, H. B. 242	H. B. 121	H. B. 258

Most of these bills were held in committee and never freed for a vote. None were voted upon in both Senate and House. The first vote on any bill apparently took place in 1947, when Senate Bills 25 and 26 were

---

[71]Data for this list of bills were compiled from volumes of the House Journal of the State of Utah and the Senate Journal of the State of Utah, for each of the years shown. It was necessary to identify in the index of each journal, those bills dealing with civil rights, and then to follow each bill through successive pages of the journals. These journals are published for the State in Salt Lake City, by Lorraine Press.

both defeated in the Senate with the same vote of six for, sixteen against, and one absent. In 1959, House Bill 16 passed the House with fifty-two for, eleven against, and one absent, but was never voted on in the Senate. In 1961, House Bill 83 was defeated in the House with thirty-two for, thirty against, and two absent (a majority of the entire House membership is necessary for passage).

Although it doesn't fall into the areas under consideration, one enforceable bill, granting equal rights regardless of race, was enacted by the Utah government prior to this study. Senate Bill 80, which removed restrictions on intermarriage, became law in 1963.[72]

Senate Joint Resolution 8 was passed in 1955, but this was merely a resolution "reaffirming equal rights of all citizens" and congratulating President Eisenhower, Congress, and the Supreme Court for accomplishments on this subject.[73]

In 1959, House Bill 254, to provide for appointment by the governor of a Utah Advisory Committee on Human Relations, was introduced. This bill, which could have had considerable significance for civil rights, never came to a vote.[74]

The consistent failure of legislation has been a source of discouragement to civil rights leaders. In 1961, the Utah Advisory

---

[72]Ibid.

[73]Ibid.

[74]Ibid.

Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights published a

report which was pessimistic regarding the Utah situation.

But by its recent action in refusing to pass the extremely
limited public accommodations bill in 1961, the Utah Legislature
has clearly indicated its unwillingness to assume responsibility
for correcting the injustices to Utah's minority races. There-
fore, we urge federal legislation and we urge it as a critical and
imminent need . . . .

Your Committee feels that nothing can be gained by further
study or committee investigation: the facts are now clearly
established and the need, critically apparent. We are done with
studies. We now look to Washington for the needed action . . . .[75]

This report also outlined major problems of inequality in several

areas besides public accommodations. Nevertheless, it recognized that

there was no discrimination in voting, and that public schools had

never practiced racial segregation.[76] A great deal of school segrega-

tion existed, but it was de facto, derived from residential patterns.

This lack of segregation policy in the schools undoubtedly

explains why the 1954 Supreme Court ruling against school segregation

had little effect in Utah. In fact, national forces were less signifi-

cant over the years than were local and state groups, who had worked

hard for civil equality and civil rights legislation in Utah.

Utah's first civil rights organization was the Salt Lake branch

of the N.A.A.C.P. Although this group began in 1919, little informa-

tion is available regarding its early activities. Attempts to influence

---

[75]Utah Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on
Civil Rights, 1961 Report (Salt Lake City: 1961), p. 7.

[76]Ibid., p. 4.

the Utah legislature began in the 1930's, but success was limited—no

bills were introduced until 1945. In 1956, research regarding the status

of Negroes in Utah was conducted, voter registration activities were

increased, and legislative efforts were intensified. Also, beginning

about this time, there was increased direct action to influence busi-

nesses discriminating in employment and accommodations.

Although a striking feature of the group has been its apparent

lack of militancy over the years, events in recent years have brought

hundreds of participants to demonstrations led by the Salt Lake

N.A.A.C.P., especially during legislative sessions.[77]

In 1943, the Ogden branch of the N.A.A.C.P. was organized in

connection with the police slaying of a young Negro Army draftee. The

branch established five different committees in 1944, and began direct

contacts to stop discrimination. Specific concerns have included

employment, hotel accommodations, theatres, transportation, bank loans,

housing, newspaper reporting, and police arrest policy. Small gains

were made in most of these areas.[78] In 1963, the Ogden branch retained

---

[77]Personal Correspondence of the Author, letter from Albert B.
Fritz, former President, Salt Lake branch of the N.A.A.C.P., May 21,
1966.

[78]The activism of the Ogden branch has undoubtedly been affected
by the presence of a large contingency of military personnel, including
Negroes, at nearby Hill Air Force base. Ogden had a larger Negro
population than Salt Lake in 1960, despite the fact that the overall
population was only about one-third as large. U. S. Bureau of the
Census, United States Census of Population: 1960. General Population
Characteristics, Utah. Final Report PC(1)-46B (Washington: Government
Printing Office, 1961), pp. 35-36.

a lawyer to help with civil rights legislation, and attempts to influence policy moved to a higher level.[79]

The first civil rights bills had been introduced to the legislature in 1945; it was this same year that saw the creation by the twenty-sixth legislature of another important group. This was the small, temporary Senate Committee to Investigate Discrimination against Minorities in Utah. This committee of three studied accommodations, but focused especially on employment, reasoning that this was the most fundamental need. After a survey of discriminatory practices and attitudes, the committee reported to the twenty-seventh session of the legislature the existence of severe discrimination which could and should be curtailed by legislation.[80] Senate bills 25 and 26 were introduced in 1947, the year of this report, but were defeated. Apparently, no civil rights bill came to a vote again until 1959.

It was also in 1959, after the legislative session had closed, that the Utah Citizens Organization for Civil Rights was established. It began as an organization of forty members, including several prominent individuals, and people of various ethnic backgrounds. The U.C.O.C.R. has been active in lobbying in the legislature, and has also

---

[79]Personal Correspondence of the Author, letter from James H. Gillespie, President, Ogden branch of the N.A.A.C.P., January, 1966.

[80]Utah Legislature, Senate, "Report of Senate Committee to Investigate Discrimination Against Minorities in Utah," 27th Legislature, Senate Journal of the State of Utah, 1947 (Salt Lake City: Lorraine Press, 1947), Day 4, pp. 64-68.

been a clearing house and coordinating group for a number of ethnic and
civil rights groups in the community. In addition, it has conducted
research on discrimination, and has cooperated with interested groups in
various kinds of direct contacts to stop discrimination.[81]

Although it is not entirely a local organization, the Utah
Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights has
also been active locally. Established through the Civil Rights Act of
1957, this small, voluntary committee has been empowered mainly to
investigate discrimination and to publish reports for the Commission.
It has also functioned as an educational unit, making information on
discrimination available to interested individuals and organizations.[82]

There are a number of other Utah groups that have been active in
the civil rights field, but those described above seem to have been
both active and relatively effective in bringing the cause before the
legislature.

A blow-by-blow account of their activities would be valuable,
but difficult to assemble. This is so because Utah civil rights activi-
ties have been neither so controversial nor so well-publicized as
attempts to influence the Mormon church. It is true that some civil
rights issues tend to generalize into religious controversy (several
instances have been discussed), but much of the civil rights campaign

---

[81] Documentary Organizational Data Provided by Utah Citizens
Organization for Civil Rights, January, 1966.

[82] Personal Interview with Adam M. Duncan, August 26, 1964.

has been relatively unobstrusive and inconspicuous. In addition, the legislature keeps no public record, other than journals of the two houses —and these are not detailed accounts of legislative happenings. Also, no copies of civil rights bills introduced before 1965 are available, since only those which succeed are preserved.

If the civil rights campaign has received less attention, it has shown greater persistence and better organization than attempts to influence church policy. The fact that no legislation had been achieved when this study began was doubtless attributable to many of the same conditions that were discussed in relation to the fixity of Mormon church Negro policy, including the conservatism of the Utah culture in the context of agrarian-based business individualism. Finally, the tendency for sacred and secular values to intertwine suggests partial sacralization of existing racial discrimination in civil matters.

To the extent that the sacralization of political-legal norms is less complete, however, and to the extent that such norms are subject to other than religious influences, they are probably more liable to liberalization than are Mormon church racial norms. The difference in flexibility of the two types of norms is a basic proposition of this study.

This chapter has been concerned with social-historical events which led to the development of Utah's unique racial norms, and the significance of these norms in local, state, national, and international matters. If these facts and interpretations help in the understanding of race in Utah, they provide a baseline for predicting future trends.

However, the future being somewhat inscrutable, a more detailed study of Utah's basic institutions is probably necessary. Social-historical events affect formal policy, after all, only to the extent that major institutions are influenced by these events. Such influence is ultimately the involvement of individuals, of certain key leaders who control these major institutions, and who make the important normative decisions. Therefore, it is vital to know who these leaders are, and how their perspectives are affected by traditional and modern racial values.

CHAPTER III

THEORY AND HYPOTHESES

A basic perspective in sociology is the view that the meanings
shared in society develop from social interaction. By interacting with
others, humans are socialized throughout their life span to accept group
definitions of the situation. These definitions of the situation include
some kind of awareness of what exists in reality as well as how we should
behave in relation to this reality.

It is this dual tendency to define the world in group ways, and
to prefer group-prescribed ways of acting out the meaning of such defini-
tions, that receives special attention in sociological theory. Assuming
this group basis of things that are defined as preferable, how may
sociological theory be used in a study of social change? How can predic-
tions be made regarding the changes likely to occur in the Utah community?

According to Bredemeier and Stephenson, people

. . . will have an incentive to change if something happens to their
situation that (1) reduces the rewards they are receiving from their
present behavior (which is the same as reducing the costs of chang-
ing) or (2) increases their estimate of the rewards they will receive
from the new behavior, or both.[1]

In this statement the central idea is that humans balance off the
gratifications and deprivations of which they are aware, and then arrive
at goals which they prefer.

---

[1]Harry C. Bredemeier and Richard M. Stephenson, The Analysis of
Social Systems (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964), p.
92; Gouldner, op. cit., pp. 630-632.

Preferences attain social significance when they are explicitly defined in terms of specific values and are shared by many people. When this occurs, it may be said that such preferences are a salient part of the culture.

The racial problem has recently attained dangerous proportions in the United States. As a result of the many exciting events connected in the popular mind with the civil rights movement, racial values have assumed impressive salience. Americans seem strongly concerned with the status and activity of the Negro. Although Utah is not so directly involved in these conflicts as states with a larger Negro population, the excitement communicated in the mass media has not been lost to Utahns. Like most Americans, they tend to dislike many things that are happening, and to prefer something better. Actual conditions are not ideal.

In certain respects Utah is unique from the standpoint of racial strains, as discussed in the last chapter. The unique religious defini-tion of racial status has significance because of the sheer predominance of the Mormon religion. The question has been raised over and over whether this religious view is right in terms of principles of humanitar-ianism and brotherhood, also implied in Mormonism. From another perspec-tive, the question has been asked again and again whether the civil rights movement itself may not be wrong from the standpoint of time-honored principles of government and orderly relations between people.

Wilbert Moore has used the concept of "strain between the ideal

and the actual"[2] to describe the sources of some kinds of social change. His viewpoint is that "usually the inconsistency between the ideal and the actual is tension-producing and hospitable to change."[3]

If the racial problem is conceptualized in terms of strain between explicit, socially-shared definitions of the ideal and the actual, this may offer important clues for prediction. "Once the tensions characteristic of all or of particular types of social systems are identified, they are predicted to be the probably sites of change."[4]

Smelser employs a similar viewpoint when he states, "Strain, then, always expresses a relation between an event or situation and certain cultural and individual standards."[5] His entire monograph is an analysis of the kinds of collective beliefs which people accept and the kinds of collective behavior in which they engage in order to resolve strain.

The assumption is that there are significant strains between ideal and actual racial conditions in Utah, and that such strains are expressed in the culture. If this leads to prediction that social change is likely to occur in the area of race relations, then a beginning has been made.

---

[2] Wilbert E. Moore, Social Change (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963), p. vi.

[3] Ibid., p. 20.

[4] Ibid., pp. 10-11.

[5] Neil J. Smelser, Theory of Collective Behavior (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1963), p. 51.

It is still necessary, however, to know what kinds of strains inhere in the subcultures of various social classes, groups, or institutions. Different sub-cultural strains are likely to have different meanings and therefore to require entirely different kinds of resolution. For example, one possible racial perspective, usually called "conservative," involves the belief that the Negro can and should attain equality only through his own "initiative" or through God's intervention. The specific strain in this perspective is discrepancy between the "ideal" that people should accept these conditions and the perceived "actual" that many are not doing so.

A contrasting perspective, usually called "liberal," is that the Negro should attain equal opportunity through the alteration of social arrangements, so that discrimination on the basis of race can not occur. The specific strain in this perspective is a discrepancy between the "ideal" that institutional arrangements should be changed, and perceived "actual" that prejudice and institutional rigidity makes such change difficult.

An awareness of these specific strains experienced in various social structures would seem necessary to the prediction of the kinds of changes necessary to deal with such strains. Only by some knowledge of the kinds of change leaders prefer, to gratify their interests, can one predict the changes that are likely to occur. Their preferences must be understood.

But even assuming a precise knowledge of the kinds of racial strains that are experienced and a knowledge of where in Utah's social system they are located, how is it possible to make significant predictions? If different specific strains on the race issue require different, even contradictory forms of enactment, doesn't a knowledge of such strains merely confuse the issue? How does one predict that one form of enactment rather than another is likely to occur?

The simple fact is that people differ in the ability to enact their propensities. If different persons located in different social structures in Utah experience contrasting kinds of strain on the subject of race, then certain strains are more likely to be resolved than others, simply because some individuals are more powerful than others. C. Wright Mills states, "By the powerful we mean, of course, those who are able to realize their will, even if others resist it."[6]

Who are these persons of power? "The power elite is composed of men whose positions enable them to transcend the ordinary environments of ordinary men and women; they are in positions to make decisions having major consequences."[7] But the power of the elite does not exist in a social vacuum. It derives from and is exercised through stable, legitimate organizational systems.

. . . the elite are not simply those who have the most, for they could not 'have the most' were it not for their positions in the

---

[6] C. Wright Mills, The Power Elite (New York: Oxford University Press, 1956), p. 9.

[7] Ibid., pp. 3-4.

great institutions. For such institutions are the necessary bases
of power, of wealth, and of prestige, and at the same time, the
chief means of exercising power, cf acquiring and retaining wealth,
and of cashing in the higher claims for prestige. . . . No one,
accordingly, can be truly powerful unless he has access to the comm-
and of major institutions, for it is over these institutional means
of power that the truly powerful are, in the first instance, power-
ful.[8]

Applied to the Utah situation, this approach would seem to involve

the identification of major institutions, followed by the location of

those leaders who command them.

For a number of reasons, this may prove more difficult than is

apparent. One reason is the fact that social power, or the ability to

command these institutions, is extremely complex. It is both direct and

indirect. It must include those formal and informal lines of communica-

tion through which the elite can convey information, develop and main-

tain shared perspectives, motivate behavior, and give orders. Power

implies that the elite have reasonably well-defined goals, some plan

of action, and efficient organization. It also requires a following of

individuals who are willing to commit time and energy to organizational

goals.

Other problems in the identification of the elite are suggested

in the literature on community leadership. Hunter and his supporters

hold the view that community power is typically held and exercised by a

small number of important persons, the elite, who have general power

over most important community decisions. They are known to other

---

[8]Ibid., p. 9.

important individuals and to each other, partly because they are directly
involved in decision making and partly because of their general "inf-
luence" over the decisions others make. Since such power is general in
the community, it is possible for knowledgeable persons, usually well-
known leaders themselves, to identify the elite by reputation.[9]

Among those who have taken strong issue with the Hunter approach
are Polsby, Wolfinger, and Dahl.[10] These authors suggest that the
reputational method is not empirical enough. Having a reputation for
power or influence is not the same as having power or influence. For
correct identification of those with these characteristics, direct
observation of the influencing or the decision-making process is necessary.

In addition, they suggest that more than a few persons may have
power—that a relatively large number of persons are involved in mak-
ing important decisions. Their studies in New Haven support these
conclusions. According to this more pluralistic conception of American

---

[9]Floyd Hunter, Community Power Structure: A Study of Decision Makers (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1963), pp. 11-13.

[10]The controversy between proponents and opponents of the reputa-
tional method has been so intense, particularly in successive issues of
the American Sociological Review, that Nelson Polsby comments, "If the
present trend continues long into the future, the field will be better
suited to a sociologist of knowledge who can disentangle who said what,
than to the scholar who wants to know about political decisions in
American communities." Nelson Polsby, "Community Power: Some Reflec-
tions on the Recent Literature," American Sociological Review, XXVII
(December, 1962), p. 838; The next two articles in the same issue
also illustrate the fervor of this controversy. Raymond E. Wolfinger,
"A Plea for a Decent Burial," pp. 841-847; and William V. D'Antonio,
Howard J. Ehrlich, and Eugene C. Erickson, "Further Notes on the Study
of Community Power," pp. 848-854.

communities, either the elite is a larger category or else power and influence are so diffuse that the term elite cannot apply to the many who exercise power and influence.[11]

The articles and studies selected for review here identify strengths and weaknesses in the use of both the reputational and the decision-observational methods for identifying leaders. The implication is that the two methods are actually complementary.

Danzger approaches this problem with the view that it is primarily conceptual rather than methodological.[12] He suggests that "power" and "salience" must both be taken into account to identify those actors who dominate in specific instances. Power is viewed as the availability of potential and resources to achieve a goal, while salience is the extent to which the goal is believed by the actor to be important or worthwhile. Therefore, the reputational method may identify those who hold power, but not necessarily those who exercise it.[13] Danzger thus only partially supports Hunter, who maintains that power holders actually use it.

---

[11]Polsby, loc. cit.; Wolfinger, loc. cit.; D'Antonio, Ehrlich, and Erickson, loc. cit.; Also see Robert A. Dahl, Who Governs? (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961); Nelson W. Polsby, "The Sociology of Community Power: A Reassessment," Social Forces, XXXVII (March, 1959), pp. 232-236; Nelson W. Polsby, "Three Problems in the Analysis of Community Power," American Sociological Review, XXIV (December, 1959), pp. 796-803.

[12]M. Herbert Danzger, "Community Power Structure: Problems and Continuities," American Sociological Review, XXIX (October, 1964), p. 712.

[13]Ibid., pp. 714-715.

Another possibility, not unrelated, is that the reputational method and the decision-observational method may identify different elites. Freeman, Fararo, Bloomberg, and Sunshine tested four different methods of identifying community leaders in Syracuse.[14] These methods and the leaders identified are as follows: (1) For the "decision-making" method, those 550 persons who participated in thirty-nine important community issues were identified ex post facto. Then the 32 who participated in the most decisions were identified. (2) For the "social activity" method, those 32 of the 550 identified above who were most active in community organizations were identified. (3) For the "reputation" method, the same 550 identified above were asked to list the most influential members of the community. The 32 selected most often were identified. (4) For the "position" method, 32 heads of the most important organizations were identified.

The authors report that these techniques reveal three kinds of leaders, and the type uncovered ". . . seems in large part to be a function of the mode of study."[15] The "reputation" and "position" methods uncover largely the same persons, who are identified as "Institutional Leaders." These are the persons who lead the important organizations in Syracuse. "These Institutional Leaders, however, are for the most

---

[14]Linton C. Freeman, et al., "Locating Leaders in Local Communities," American Sociological Review, XXVIII (October, 1963), pp. 794-795.

[15]Ibid., p. 797.

part not active participants in community affairs."[16] On the other hand, the "decision-making" method identified the "Effectors." These are the underlings of the Institutional Leaders, and sometimes members of other organizations, who are the active workers in the actual process of community decision making. The authors judge from their data that Effectors are not directly influenced by Institutional Leaders in the decisions they make. The Institutional Leaders ". . . might conceivably be participating decision makers in secret, but more likely they serve chiefly to provide access to the decision-making structure for their underlings: the _Effectors_."[17] Thus, although the Syracuse study does play down the significance of Institutional Leaders in decision making, the authors admit that "in some cases, the Effectors are in touch with their employers, and it seems likely thattheir activities are frequently guided by what they view as company policy. . . ."[18]

The possibility that top leaders may be extremely influential precisely because they work indirectly is supported by Presthus in his study of two small towns. Presthus assumed initially that ". . .the decisional method would prove to be superior to the reputational in identifying 'real' community power."[19] He assumed this because of the

---

[16]_Ibid._

[17]_Ibid._

[18]_Ibid._, p. 798.

[19]Robert Presthus, _Men at the Top: A Study in Community Power_ (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), p. 59.

severe criticisms of Hunter's reputational method in the literature. He concluded, however, that the two methods were better conceived as mutually supportive means of locating persons of power. The disadvantage of the decisional technique was its tendency ". . . to assign high power ranks to individuals largely on the basis of merely formal or ministerial participation in several decisions."[20] Presthus cites instances in which the potential power of top leaders influenced greatly the exercise of overt power by others.

On the other hand, the weakness of the reputational method resulted from the ". . . tendency of respondents to mix personal preferences with objective judgments in attributing power to community leaders. A related and well-known tendency was to equate potential with overt power."[21]

Jennings, who studied Atlanta eight years after Hunter's research, outlined an interesting conceptual scheme with respect to the way power is exercised.

> To the extent that a person affects outcomes in accordance with his own intentions he has positive power. . . . Power may also prevent others from accomplishing their goals—veto power. Preventing a change in the status quo is the usual application of veto power . . . . Finally, filter power consists of the selective exposure of certain people, facts, or points of view (summed up by the term 'information') to positive - or veto-power wielders.[22]

---

[20]Ibid.

[21]Ibid., p. 60.

[22]M. Kent Jennings, Community Influentials: The Elites of Atlanta (London: The Free Press of Glencoe, Collier-Macmillan Limited, 1964), p. 20.

Interestingly, Jennings found the reputational method relatively useful in locating a general elite who, according to his detailed case studies, did participate in the important decisions, thus giving qualified support to Hunter's original method. However, Jennings identified a _different_ _elite_, composed primarily of political and professional leaders. This is a serious challenge to Hunter's study. Jennings tentatively explains the difference by reference to his conceptual scheme involving five main stages in the process of community decision making. These are initiation, fixing priorities, utilizing resources, legitimation, and implementation. Jennings believes that Hunter unduly emphasized the priority-fixing function in his study of decision making.[23]

The insights provided by these studies of the methodological problem seem to suggest the following generalizations: (1) Reputational methods may or may not successfully identify those individuals who make the important decisions in communities. The difficulty is enhanced if, as in some communities, the power is widely diffused. Careful observation of the decision-making process usually increases the reliability of judgments. (2) The observational method is superior wherever direct observation of the decision making or the influencing process if possible, because it is closer to the data. (3) Influence and covert power are more difficult to observe directly. The reputational method is likely to be more effective in this area.

---

[23]_Ibid._, pp. 107-108, 162-163.

We have been considering how power is exercised in communities and the problem intimately tied up with this, how best to identify those who exercise power. Since the research on this subject is still contradictory, and relatively ambiguous, we should be warned against any false expectations concerning Utah elites and decision making. Yet because of certain facts about the Utah culture and because of the nature of the present research, certain definite things are known about the elite. In the first place, this study is concerned with the degree of likelihood that racial norms in the L.D.S. church and Utah political-legal racial norms will be changed. The issue has to do with specific norms controlled by specific institutions; because of the specificity of the norms and of the nature of these institutions, such changes must be enacted by individuals occupying definite roles.

One kind of norm under consideration is the L.D.S. church rule or policy that Negroes may not hold the priesthood as other races may. If this rule is to be changed, the decision must come, according to well-established Mormon church doctrine and tradition, from the church President, and be approved by the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles.

The other kind of normative situation is the absence, when data were collected, of civil rights legislation in Utah. The decision to change this condition was to be the prerogative of the Utah government. Therefore, there are two decision-making elites: the Mormon church authorities and the Utah government leaders. They are the only ones that can make the kinds of decisions under consideration. They can best

be identified by careful analysis of the institutional structures in-volved, based upon information about the most important roles.

However, as indicated in Chapter II, the immediate conditions with respect to racial norms in Utah, at least the Mormon church norms, do not suggest that an immediate change is likely. One aspect of this apparent lack of tendency toward normative change is probably the disin-terest of important institutional leaders in change. This would suggest that their interests must change or else that leadership must change hands before such normative evolution is likely to occur. The implica-tion is that prediction probably requires looking beyond the persons playing decision-making roles at a given time to otherleaders in the commun-ity whose interests might be felt in decision-making positions, either because they influence decision makers or because they, or other persons with similar interests, might actually become decision makers in the future. Therefore, it seems important to include other persons with status and influence, as well as decision makers, in a study of normative change.

How are such leaders to be located? If decision makers are identified by institutional analysis of the Utah government and the Mormon church, how are influentials to be identified?

As discussed above, the reputational method is endorsed by its supporters partly for its usefulness in identifying people who influence--those who may or may not participate directly in community decision mak-ing, but whose judgments and opinions are taken into account by decision makers. There is a tendency, according to past studies, for leaders

identified reputationally to be institutional leaders. It is realized that dependence upon the reputational method alone can lead to the over-looking of influentials whose power is not so highly institutionalized. Nevertheless, partly because the reputational method is supported for its effectiveness in locating influentials, as contrasted to those who act out the explicit consequences of influence, and partly because it is neither prohibitive nor impracticable with the available time and resources, the reputational method is considered appropriate for the identification of influential leaders in this study.

To adjust the reputational method to the purposes of this research, what other institutions besides government and religion should be taken into account? To what extent should the choice of institutions be based upon objective criteria of community power? To what extent should theoretical considerations enter into the choice?

The studies of community power in America have emphasized the significance of economic or business institutions. Much of the contro-versy has, in fact, centered on the question of whether economic or governmental institutions are more powerful.[24] Considering the strong economic ties of the Mormon church, business in Utah is of obvious signi-ficance.

Based partially on theoretical considerations, another institution of importance is probably the academic. Don Martindale has emphasized

---

[24]Lawrence J. R. Herson, "In the Footsteps of Community Power," American Political Science Review, LV (December, 1961), pp. 821-823; Paul E. Mott, The Organization of Society (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965), p. 60.

the long-term importance of the intellectual elite, usually trained in universities, in creating cultural conditions conducive to institutional development and societal change.[25] Although community studies have rarely considered intellectuals as among the powerful elite, intellectuals have had significance for policy development. For example, national racial policy has been developed by members of the executive, judicial, and legislative branches of government, many of whom are intellectuals. Intellectuals have held many important cabinet and advisory positions; others have presented scientific evidence before the courts, leading to vital decisions such as the famous ruling on school segregation. Certainly many of the activities of the entire civil rights movement are given intellectual legitimation and guided by intellectual norms.

Even if intellectuals were never to have direct influence on the subject of race, it is important to recognize that the ideal of equalitarianism is itself worked out partially in intellectual terms. If a normative change of the type under consideration does occur in Utah, institutional structure must come to terms with ideas called "intellectual." From this standpoint of the "ideal type" alone, it would seem useful to include the academic institution in a study of influential leaders.

Finally, the occupations of attorney and physician are generally regarded as professions with considerable influence and status in America. Both occupations operate partially in the business sphere, so that their

---

[25]Don Martindale, Social Life and Cultural Change (Princeton, New Jersey: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1962), pp. 60-92, 424-515.

interests are more strongly tied to the local community than are those
of academia. While they are popularly thought to have considerable
expertise and wisdom because of their special training and complex
specialties, they are undoubtedly considered by the public more practical
and down to earth in outlook than the intellectuals. Although these
professionals do not operate in single well-defined institutions, it
is apparent in Utah that their members derive power from, and exercise
power and influence through, institutional structures including business,
government, academia, religion, community services, and their respec-
tive professional organizations.

Although other elites may have importance for theoretical and
methodological reasons, the ones named above seem minimal for the study
of influence and decision making in relation to Utah's racial norms.

Actually, the decision makers in this study, leaders in the Utah
government and the Mormon church, undoubtedly exert considerable influence
with regard to each other. It is therefore assumed that Mormon church
decision makers may be analyzed as influentials in relation to govern-
mental decision makers, while governmental decision makers be considered
influentials in relation to Mormon church decision makers. All members
of all elites are considered influentials with regard to a given kind
of decision making, except members of the elite responsible for that
particular decision.

The leaders under consideration fall into five main elite cate-
gories: governmental, religious, economic, professional, and academic.

Actually, the religious category has two sub-groups—the Mormon church elite and the non-Mormon church elite. The professional category also has two sub-groups—the medical elite and the legal elite. Therefore, for empirical reasons, there are seven elites, as shown below. Decision-making elites are indicated by an asterisk.

Elites	Membership
1 - Mormon church elite*	Mormon church leaders
2 - Non-Mormon church elite	Non-Mormon church leaders
3 - Governmental elite*	Legislative, executive, and judicial leaders
4 - Economic elite	Business leaders
5 - Academic elite	University and college leaders
6 - Medical elite	Leading physicians
7 - Legal elite	Leading attorneys

Once the kinds of elites under consideration are identified, an important consideration is the way in which they may influence racial norms. It is assumed that elite members are more likely to influence norms in accordance with their interests, and the strains they want to resolve. What are their perspectives regarding race in Utah?

It was suggested in Chapter II that considerable conservatism is introduced by the intertwining of secular and sacred norms. Will leaders' perspectives regarding these norms also intertwine? Since a central aspect of the way people define their relationship to the world and their own identity is often religious, it seems likely that religious

perspectives will be somewhat congruent with secular perspectives regard-
ing race.

Hypothesis 1. Leaders expressing liberal perspectives regarding
L.D.S. church Negro policy will also tend to express liberal perspectives
regarding civil rights legislation in Utah.

Apart from this assumed tendency for leaders' perspectives to be
consistent, what may be said about the particular kinds of perspectives
they are likely to hold? A basic axiom of sociology is that individuals'
perspectives and interests are strongly conditioned by the role require-
ments of important positions in which they perform their day-to-day
activities.

There are seven separate elites in this study, each with typical
statuses involving typical role requirements. It is expected that
racial perspectives within each elite will be considerably homogeneous.

Hypothesis 2. Racial perspectives within elites will be signific-
antly more homogeneous than racial perspectives within the entire sample
of elites.

Based on the discussion above about perspectives being conditioned
by important statuses and their role requirements, and the fact that
elites do come from different sectors of the occupational and social
community, there should be inter-elite differences in racial perspectives.
But on what basis may they be expected to differ?

Mormonism and academia, as institutions, probably require their
leaders to have contrasting racial perspectives. In Mormonism, of

course, this is tied to the conservative policy regarding Negroes. In academia, relatively liberal tendencies are implied in the intellectual approach to various problems, including race relations.

If the elites are categorized in terms of the degree to which orthodox Mormon versus intellectual values are incorporated in their typical role requirements, and/or in terms of the proportion of members of these elites who are adherents of Mormon versus intellectual values, it should be possible to achieve a crude ranking of elites on degree of racial liberalism.

Another important point is that a difference will not be made in predictions concerning secular and sacred values. Since the evidence discussed so far suggests a strong tie between the sacred and secular in Utah, it is assumed that the rankings will be similar.

It seems logical to believe that the Mormon church decision-making elite is the least liberal on racial norms and that the non-Mormon religious elite and the academic elite should be the most liberal. The judgment for Mormon leaders is based on the assumption of total commitment to racial policy that seems appropriate to such institutional leaders, in addition to the apparent existence of considerable anti-intellectualism. As discussed in Chapter II, Mormon leadership does not require college training. The judgment for the academic elite is based on the assumption that academia has a high level of commitment to intellectualism. Even Mormons in the academic setting are less likely to be orthodox; in addition, the staffs of state universities in Utah have a

large proportion of non-Mormons. The judgment for the non-Mormon church elite is based in the vigorous non-Mormon commitment which apparently exists among the "gentile" religionists, in addition to the fact that religious leaders in non-Mormon faiths usually are required to attain a moderate to high degree of academic competence. Since preliminary observation suggests that the influence of orthodox Mormon values is an unknown quantity in the other elites, rankings are tentatively based on the apparent prevalence of intellectual values. It is assumed that the influence of orthodox Mormon values is similarly average in the legal, medical, economic, and governmental elites, since there are no institutional requirements that would seem to impinge differentially in any straightforward way.

The professional elites, both medical and legal, are expected to rank closer to the racial liberalism of the academics and the non-Mormon church elite than do the other elites, because of the level and type of training required, including the emphasis on universalism as a professional value.

Economic and governmental elites are expected to rank closer to the conservatism of the Mormon church decision makers, because there is no necessary prerequisite of academic training in these professions. Such preliminary information doesn't seem to suggest any particular distinction in ranking between economic and governmental elites.

Hypothesis 3. The ranking of Utah elites on average racial liberalism will show that the non-Mormon church elite and the academic

elite express perspectives most favorable toward liberalization of racial norms, legal and medical elites express perspectives next most favorable, economic and governmental elites express perspectives next most favorable, and the Mormon church elite expresses perspectives least favorable toward liberalization of racial norms. The same ranking is predicted for Mormon church norms and for Utah political-legal norms.

Since these expectations are somewhat tenuous, significance of differences between perspectives is predicted only between the extreme ranks of high and low liberalism.

Corollary 3a. Members of the academic elite and members of the non-Mormon church elite will express perspectives significantly more favorable toward liberalization of political-legal racial norms than will members of the Mormon church elite.

Corollary 3b. Members of the academic elite and members of the non-Mormon church elite will express perspectives significantly more favorable toward liberalization of Mormon church racial norms than will members of the Mormon church elite.

The next hypothesis deals directly with the contrast between the two main decision-making institutions in terms of the likelihood of change. As suggested in Chapter II, the sacrosanct nature of Mormon Negro policy probably implies the limited willingness of Mormon church decision makers to change this policy. On the other hand, the relative secularization of government in Utah probably means slightly more willingness on the part of governmental decision makers to consider the needs of modern society, and to adapt the political-legal norms accordingly.

Hypothesis 4. Utah governmental decision makers will tend to
express perspectives more favorable toward liberalization of the norms
they control (political-legal racial norms), while Mormon church decision
makers will tend to express perspectives less favorable toward liberaliza-
tion of the norms they control (Mormon church Negro policy).

This hypothesis, of course, expresses the view that civil rights
legislation will occur sooner in Utah than will a change in L.D.S.
church policy on the Negro, based on contrasting perspectives and inter-
ests of these important institutional leaders. But lines of communica-
tion to these institutional decision makers also should be important.
To the extent that influentials of a certain persuasion can communicate
with decision makers, chances are increased that they can influence deci-
sion making indirectly. Under what conditions do influential elites
have accessibility to the decision makers?

The first consideration has to do with the tendency of people in
general to have stronger relationships with those whose values are similar
to their own. This view, as expressed by Gouldner, suggests that those
influentials who have racial perspectives similar to those of decision
makers will also have stronger lines of communication to the decision
makers.[26] If, as suggested in a previous hypothesis, the Mormon church
decision makers are more conservative regarding Mormon church Negro
policy than are governmental decision makers regarding political-legal

[26]Alvin W. Gouldner and Helen P. Gouldner, Modern Sociology: An
Introduction to the Study of Human Interaction (New York: Harcourt,
Brace & World, Inc., 1963), pp. 337-338.

racial policy, then influentials most able to communicate with the Mormon church decision makers should have more conservative racial perspectives than those most able to communicate with governmental decision makers. This would tend to support further the view that a change of political-legal norms is more likely than a change of Mormon church racial norms.

Hypothesis 5. The ranking of influential elites on perceived accessibility to Utah governmental decision makers will correspond to their ranking on similarity to Utah governmental decision makers in terms of political-legal racial perspectives.

Hypothesis 6. The ranking of influential elites on perceived accessibility to Mormon church decision makers will correspond to their ranking on similarity to Mormon church decision makers in terms of Mormon church racial perspectives.

Another condition of accessibility has contrasting significance for the two decision-making elites. This is the condition referred to by Smelser as differentiation of "interest-aggregation" institutions.[27] It refers to the tendency for human activity in organizations that forge policy to be institutionalized on the basis of a pluralistic division of power. Such pluralistic social structures make allowance for the democratic process, providing legitimate techniques for influence to be received from a number of different sources.

By way of contrast, in non-differentiated organizations, the institutionalization of control and authority are monolithic. The

---

[27]Smelser, op. cit., pp. 278-281.

organization of such non-differentiated structures is such that

> . . . protests against specific normative arrangements inevitably tend to generalize into heresies. Under such conditions the mechanisms for insulating specific demands from challenges to legitimacy itself are not highly developed.[28]

When protests are perceived as threats to the ligitimacy of an institution, lines of communication between would-be influentials and policy makers are likely to break down, or not to form at all.

In the present study this is especially significant with regard to the Mormon church decision-making elite, because the structure of the Mormon church is relatively undifferentiated. A monolithic hierarchical organization is the essence of Mormon church structure.

On the other hand, the governmental decision-making elite operates in a relatively differentiated social system. There _are_ institutionalized mechanisms for "insulating specific demands from challenges to legitimacy itself." In fact, one peculiarity of government in a democracy is probably the existence of well-defined procedures to bring protests to bear upon the decision-making process without challenging the legitimacy of this process. Important procedures exist to forge influence from many quarters into power.

The idea is that Utah government is more differentiated structurally than the Mormon church. Therefore, lines of communication to the governmental decision-making elite should be better in general than to the Mormon church decision-making elite.

---

[28]_Ibid._, p. 280.

Hypothesis 7. Influentials will tend to perceive greater accessibility to Utah governmental decision makers than to Mormon church decision makers.

Each of these hypotheses contributes to the main theoretical viewpoint that liberalization is significantly more likely to occur in Utah political-legal racial norms than in Mormon church Negro policy.

It has been assumed in this chapter that different groups and institutions are the locus of different kinds of social strain on the subject of race. Those groups most able to resolve the strains they experience, and thus control policy, are those having the most social power, and their leaders are the elite of the community. For this reason it is important to identify these elite members, and to study their perspectives and their aims.

The identification of decision makers who directly control race policy requires a knowledge of the power structure of the Utah government and the Mormon church, while other influentials may be identified reputationally, by knowledgeable persons.

The basic proposition that secular and religious norms intertwine, with the persistence of greater conservatism in religious norms, has provided the frame of reference for the development of specific hypotheses.

CHAPTER IV

METHODOLOGY

Since the purpose of the research is to predict the likelihood
of racial normative change, in both governmental and religious institu-
tions in Utah, two main elites are important relative to positions of
influence over these norms. The Mormon church elite has the ability to
maintain or modify norms regarding the Negro in the Mormon church, and
the Utah governmental elite has the power to maintain or modify pol-
itical norms controlling the political-legal rights of Negroes in Utah.

Other elites in the Utah community are considered important
because of their ability to influence the two decision-making elites.
Those chosen as influential elites are the economic elite, the aca-
demic elite, the medical elite, the legal elite, and the non-Mormon
church elite. These groups consist of business leaders, university
leaders, leading physicians, leading lawyers, and non-Mormon religious
leaders.

In addition, the governmental elite is considered an influential
elite in relation to the Mormon church elite, while the Mormon church
elite is an influential elite when decision making by the governmental
elite is being considered. The result is that there are six influen-
tial elites relative to each decision-making elite.

In planning the research, a total sample of about 75 leaders
seemed appropriate. This would allow for about 15 leaders in each of

the five main categories: religious, governmental, economic, profess-
ional, and academic.

The identification of specific individuals in these elite group-
ings was accomplished by two main methods: institutional analysis and
reputation.

The Mormon church leaders and the Utah governmental leaders, who
are the important decision makers for this study, were identified by
careful analysis of organizational structures, in consultation with
University of Utah social scientists, and with the assistance of leaders
in the Utah government and the Mormon church. A prominent university
professor and an important administrative staff member in the Utah
government were asked to describe the power structure of the legisla-
tive, judicial, and executive branches of Utah government, and to name
those positions having the most power. Fourteen persons were thus
identified on the basis of institutional analysis, to constitute the
governmental elite.

Institutional analysis was also employed to identify Mormon church
leaders. The L.D.S. First Presidency and the Council of the Twelve
Apostles have greatest power over church policy. Assistants to the
Twelve Apostles and the Seven Presidents of the Seventy have significant
but more limited power. These combined categories constitute the Mormon
"General Authorities." Using this organizational information, with the
assistance of a University of Utah social scientist and of a member of
the L.D.S. general authorities, seventeen persons were identified to
constitute the Mormon church elite.

The reputational method was used to identify influential leaders, including members of the academic, economic, medical, legal, and non-Mormon church influential elites.

The identification of academic leaders was accomplished by the appointment of eight judges, knowledgeable professors in the social sciences at the University of Utah. Each judge was asked independently to list those "twenty individuals, employed at the college level, who seem to you to have the greatest academic status and influence in Utah as a whole." Although some judges listed as few as thirteen names, all academicians identified by at least three judges were considered members of the academic elite. There were fifteen individuals in all.

Identification of the economic leaders was accomplished by four judges—two college professors who have done extensive research in economic elitism, a professional in a public agency dealing with economic affairs, and an executive in an important inter-business organization. Each judge was asked independently to list those twenty businessmen with the greatest status and influence in Utah as a whole. Although the actual number listed varied between fourteen and twenty-four, all persons listed twice or more were considered members of the economic elite. The complete economic elite consists of sixteen individuals.

The professional elite was to include two sub-groups—medical and legal. Members of the medical elite were identified with the help of two judges—an important staff member in a medical organization and an important staff member of the University of Utah College of Medicine.

Each was asked independently to list those twenty physicians he consi-
dered to have the greatest status and influence in Utah as a whole.
One judge named twenty-two physicians and the other named thirty-six.
Seven physicians were named by both judges.

The two experts assisting in the identification of legal pro-
fessionals were an important staff member in a legal organization
and an important staff member in the University of Utah College of
Law. Both were asked independently to list those twenty active mem-
bers of the legal profession who have the greatest status and influence
in Utah as a whole. One judge named twenty-five and the other named
thirty-one. All eleven subjects on which the judges agreed were consi-
dered members of the legal elite. Thus, the entire professional elite
consists of seven physicians and eleven lawyers.

The selection of non-Mormon church leaders was based upon the
judgments of an important religious leader connected with the University
of Utah and an administrative leader in an inter-denominational organiza-
tion. They agreed in independent judgments upon the six denominations
that should be included. They agreed in four instances upon the individ-
uals with most power and influence in these denominations. In one
instance the first choice of one judge coincided with the second choice
of the other. In the other instance, no second choices were made, but
the individual chosen by one judge was unavailable for interview, so
the other judge's choice was included in the sample. On this basis, six
members of the non-Mormon church elite were identified.

Although the total when all elites are added is eighty-six, there are actually only eighty-two individuals in the study, because four persons were identified in two different elites. It is interesting that all four are legal-professional leaders.

All subjects were contacted for personal interviews, if possible. Of these eighty-two subjects, interviews were obtained for sixty-six. Of the sixteen not interviewed, six refused interviews, six postponed beyond the time of practicability, two were ill, and two were out of the state the entire time.

The interview questionnaire was created especially for interviews with the leaders, and included a combination of subjective and objective items dealing with three main subjects: (1) opinions and views regarding the lack of civil rights legislation in Utah, (2) opinions and views about the Negro policy in the L.D.S. church, and (3) the relationship between civil rights and L.D.S. church policy.[1]

The questionnaire was pre-tested with eight subjects; ambiguous or ineffective items were then eliminated. The length was minimized, since it was felt that leaders would have little extra time for research.

As a rule, appointments were obtained by telephone, often through the respondent's secretary. In each instance, a brief explanation of the researcher's role and purpose of the research was given. The researcher provided his name, then stated,

> I am a graduate student at the University of Utah, working on doctoral research on the subject of race and civil rights. I have

---

[1] See appendix for a copy of interview questionnaire.

> the name of . . . [the leader's name], whom my panel of experts
> judge to have a great deal of status and influence in Utah. I'm
> wondering if it would be possible to have a brief interview with
> . . . [leader's name] in the near future on this subject of civil
> rights.

If time was not immediately available, the interviewer indicated his
willingness to call again at a later date.

Interviews were somewhat flexible, partly because of the contro-
versial nature of the data. At times, questions considered to have
strong emotional significance for the subject were postponed to more
strategic parts of the interview, or even eliminated.

Interviews actually took from ten to forty-five minutes, depend-
ing upon the east of communication, the extent to which subjects wanted
to discuss the controversial subject of race, and the availability of
time. Generally interviews lasted about twenty-five minutes.

All appointments were made and interviews completed between July
6, 1964, and August 30, 1964. This interviewing period came shortly after
President Johnson signed the federal Civil Rights Act of 1964, on July
2. This period was also marked by a series of Negro-white conflicts
and riots in major American cities, connected in the popular mind with
the civil rights movement.

It seems probable that the public excitement during this period
served to make race and civil rights a prominent issue, and to cryst-
allize views and make them available for study. One main reason the
research was undertaken at this time was the fact that civil rights was
a significant issue. Almost all respondants seemed very interested in
the subject and seemed to have given it a great deal of thought.

The most important data that interviews yielded concerned two main questions: (1) the degree of favorability toward changing Utah racial norms, and (2) the degree of perceived accessibility to the institutional leaders who control these norms.

In the absence of interview data, other available data were used. Since the elites consist of individuals relatively well-known in the Utah community, information on their racial perspectives was sometimes available from speeches, newspaper accounts, magazine articles, etc. In addition, it was assumed that opinions of expert judges as to the perspectives of the subjects could, if substantiated, be taken as fact. Interview questionnaires were set up for each respondent, whether or not an interview was actually obtained. Non-interview data judged reliable were included in these questionnaires, wherever needed and available.

Since questionnaire data were largely open ended, it was considered necessary to obtain ratings of data by qualified judges. With the assistance of the research committee, five persons considered knowledgeable about the Utah community in general and about Utah elites in particular were selected. These five include a newspaper writer, three University of Utah professors and a private teacher. Ratings were done independently.

A blank rating sheet was provided for each judge, with the names of leaders in alphabetical order.[2] Judges were asked to examine

---

[2]See Appendix for a copy of rating sheet.

questionnaire data, and to rate each leader from high (1) to low (5), with
the extra category of can't judge (6), on each of four variables: (1)
degree to which informant favors a change in the Mormon church's policy
with regard to the Negro and the priesthood to a more equalitarian policy,
(2) degree to which informant favors civil rights legislation in Utah,
(3) degree of accessibility to the Mormon church decision-making elite,
and (4) degree of accessibility to the Utah governmental decision-making
elite.

The fact that raters were knowledgeable about many of the leaders
was a special advantage. In those instances of incomplete or inadequate
questionnaire data, raters were asked to use their own knowledge, prov-
ided they were reasonably sure of their information.

After all questionnaires had been rated by the five judges, the
ratings were tabulated. The score for each leader on a given variable
was obtained by averaging the ratings of all five experts. If fewer than
two judges attempted a given rating, the actual rating was recorded as
unknown.

Ratings sometimes varied considerably. In six instances, the rat-
ings assigned a subject on favorability toward changing L.D.S. church
racial policy ranged all the way from very high (1) to very low (5). In
four instances, this full range of ratings was assigned to a subject on
the issue of favorability toward passing civil rights laws in Utah. For
four subjects, this full range of ratings was obtained on the degree of
accessibility to governmental decision makers, while for three subjects,

the full range occurred on degree of accessibility to Mormon church

decision makers. Nevertheless, it was considered most feasible to accept

as data any average of two or more ratings of a subject on a given

variable.

It might seem that the inclusion of widely divergent ratings

into an average would tend to bias results by making overall ratings

more extreme than they actually should be, thus creating the risk of

spuriousness.

However, it is suggested that the inclusion of widely divergent

ratings actually has the opposite effect. If ratings that differ by

more than two points are averaged, the result must be somewhat moderat-

ing, since these ratings must be on opposite sides of the midpoint of

a five point scale. In fact, the further apart the scores are, the

greater the likelihood that the average will approximate the mid-point

of the scale. The overall effect would probably be moderating, tending

to conceal real deviations from the average. In averaging the ratings,

therefore, the main risk is probably that significant tendencies will

be hidden, rather than that spurious relationships will appear. This

risk is accepted in the interest of the availability of ratings, even

if some may be only approximate.

Using these methods it was possible to obtain averaged ratings

for all eighty-two subjects on degree of accessibility to governmental

decision makers, and on degree of accessibility to Mormon church decision

makers. Ratings were obtained for sixty-eight subjects on degree of

favorability toward changing Mormon church racial norms, and for seventy-three subjects on the degree of favorability toward passing civil rights laws in Utah.

For a better understanding of institutional elites and their members, an inquiry was also made into certain background characteristics of these leaders. From biographical references, newspaper files, and personal contacts, religious affiliation and year of birth were obtained.

Using these characteristics, plus the interview data (ratings on racial perspectives and on accessibility to decision makers), the next concern is to test the seven hypotheses presented in Chapter III. The main consideration is the likelihood of racial-normative liberalization.

CHAPTER V

QUANTITATIVE RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Before statistics are introduced to test the hypotheses, some
basic characteristics of the population are presented. Table 1 reveals
the distribution of age and religious affiliation of the various elites.

TABLE 1

RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION, YEAR OF BIRTH,
AND ELITE MEMBERSHIP OF ALL LEADERS

Religious Affiliation	Year of Birth	ELITE MEMBERSHIP*							
		Mormon Church	Non-Mormon Church	Governmental	Economic	Academic	Medical	Legal	To-tals
Mormon	1873–1907	16	0	5(1)	4	4(1)	1	(2)	32
	1908–1927	1	0	7(1)	3	7(1)	4	6(2)	30
Non-Mormon	1873–1907	0	3	0	4	1	0	0	8
	1908–1927	0	3	0	5	1	2	1	12
Totals		17	6	12(2)	16	13(2)	7	7(4)	82

*Membership overlaps are indicated by numbers in parentheses.
There are four overlaps. All four belong to the legal elite, while two
also belong to the governmental elite and two to the academic elite.

Members of the Mormon church elite differ from other leaders on
the basis of age as well as religious affiliation. This tendency to be
older than other leaders undoubtedly results from the life tenure policy
for Mormon general authorities.

Also of interest is the fact that the entire elite sample is 76
per cent L.D.S. This is not strikingly different from the figure of 72
per cent for the Utah population. But a tendency toward overrepresenta-
tion of Mormons in positions of power is suggested in that all of the
governmental elite, 91 per cent of the legal elite, and 87 per cent of
the academic elite are L.D.S. Only the economic elite (44 per cent
Mormons) and the non-Mormon church elite have a significant underrepresent-
ation of Mormons.[1]

These facts provide an important basis for understanding the main
dimensions of elite membership in Utah, relative to the likelihood that
elites may influence racial norms. It is emphasized that these are not
entirely arbitrary characteristics, but are to some extent expressions of
institutional structure and function. For example, the religious member-
ship of the Mormon church elite and the non-Mormon church elite are
obviously determinate. The age characteristics of the Mormon church
elite are also an expression of institutional policy, as mentioned above.
The predominance of Mormons within the governmental elite is probably

---

[1]Another important characteristic is place of residence. Only
seventeen of the 82 leaders live outside the Salt Lake urbanized area,
including four academic leaders, three economic leaders, four legal lead-
ers, two medical leaders, and four governmental leaders. Thus, while 79
per cent of the leaders reside in the Salt Lake urbanized area, only 39
per cent of the entire Utah population do so, according to the last
census. The fact that judges who identified leaders are residents of
the Salt Lake urban area may account for part of this difference. Never-
theless, the tendency for cities to attract a disproportionate share of
talent is of obvious importance. In addition, Salt Lake is the center
of administration for virtually all major Utah instititions. See U.S.
Bureau of the Census, U.S. Census of Population: 1960. General
Population Characteristics, Utah, Final Report PC (1)-46B (Washington:
U.S. Government Printing Office, 1961), pp. 19, 35.

somewhat determinate, given the religious membership of the Utah
constituency.

In what way do these qualities of institutions and characteristics of leaders who represent them influence the perspectives of their leaders regarding racial norms?

Attitudes toward political-legal racial norms in Utah were sampled with the question, "Do you favor a civil rights bill for Utah?" Judges rated leaders' responses, using this and other information, from high favorability (1.0) to low favorability (5.0), as described in Chapter IV.

Ratings were not possible for nine subjects. Table 2 indicates the age, religious membership and elite membership of these unrated leaders.

TABLE 2

RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION, YEAR OF BIRTH, AND
ELITE MEMBERSHIP OF LEADERS UNRATED ON
POLITICAL-LEGAL RACIAL PERSPECTIVES

Religious Affiliation	Year of Birth	ELITE MEMBERSHIP						
		Mormon Church	Non-Mormon Church	Governmental	Economic	Academic	Medical	Legal
Mormon	1873–1907	3	0	1	0	1	0	0
	1908–1927	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Non-Mormon	1873–1907	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1908–1927	0	1	0	1	0	0	0

The largest category of unrated leaders are Mormon church leaders and leaders in the older age group. Although the numbers are small, this suggests that favorability among the unrated leaders may be lower than for the entire population.[2]

The grouped distribution of favorability toward Utah civil rights for those leaders that do have ratings is presented in Table 3.

TABLE 3

FAVORABILITY OF LEADERS TOWARD
UTAH CIVIL RIGHTS

Degree of Favorability		Mormon Church	Non-Mormon Church	Governmental	Economic	Academic	Medical	Legal	Totals
		ELITE MEMBERSHIP*							
High	1.0-2.0	2	3	3(1)	2	10(1)	1	4(2)	27
	2.1-3.0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	3
	3.1-4.0	1	1	4(1)	3	0	2	2(1)	14
Low	4.1-5.0	10	0	4	10	(1)	3	1(1)	29
Totals		13	5	11(2)	15	12(2)	6	7(4)	73

*Parentheses refer to elite membership overlap. See Table 1, p. 83.

----

[2]Additional evidence that the nine unrated leaders are relatively conservative is suggested in their ratings on favorability toward liberalization of Mormon church racial norms, to be presented in Table 7, p. 92. Such scores, available for five of the nine, are as follows: 3.0, 3.5, 4.5, 5.0 and 5.0, with a median of 4.5, as compared to the population median of 3.7. Four of the five are members of the Mormon church elite.

For these 73 subjects, it is interesting that attitudes cluster at the extremes of the favorability index, as shown in Table 3, page 86. Leaders tend to be either strongly favorable or strongly opposed to civil rights legislation in Utah. This polarization may be due partially to the salience of the racial question at the time of interviews. In addition, the wording of the question on civil rights might have encouraged either-or answers, much as in voting behavior.

Also of interest is the apparent tendency toward opposition to Utah civil rights of the distribution as a whole. Mormon leaders and economic leaders tend to be strongly opposed, while the academic leaders tend to be strongly favorable. These tendencies seem to be logical expressions of institutional qualities. The racial policy of the L.D.S. church makes this opposition seem appropriate. As discussed in Chapter III, the intellectualism of academic leaders would seem to encourage their favorability. The strength of opposition by economic leaders may be surprising, although it does seem logical from one standpoint. Civil rights laws have a more direct effect upon business enterprises and employers, and may be more threatening for this reason. The view that perspectives are related to institutional characteristics seems to be supported by the data.

To what extent do religious affiliation and age influence these perspectives of leaders? Tables 4 and 5 present data on this question. For both tables the Mormon church leaders are eliminated. Although their inclusion would increase the likelihood of significant tendencies, it

might also introduce spuriousness. For them, the contingency of office

is probably more important than the influence of age or religious

affiliation per se.

TABLE 4	TABLE 5

LEADERS' RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION AND FAVORABILITY TOWARD UTAH CIVIL RIGHTS	LEADERS' YEAR OF BIRTH AND FAVORABILITY TOWARD UTAH CIVIL RIGHTS

Religious Affiliation	Degree of Favorability*		Totals
	High 1.0-3.2	Low 3.3-5.0	
Mormon	21	21	42
Non-Mormon	10	8	18
Totals	31	29	60

Year of Birth	Degree of Favorability*		Totals
	High 1.0-3.2	Low 3.3-5.0	
1889-1910	11	18	29
1911-1927	20	11	31
Totals	31	29	60

*In these tables and most other tables in Chapter V, the distribution of scores is divided with reference to the median, to provide categories as nearly equal as possible. When the chi-square significance test is used with data categorized in this manner, it is referred to as the "median test."[3]

Data presented in Table 4 shows no significant tendency for religious affiliation per se to influence favorability toward civil rights in Utah. This result is somewhat surprising, in light of the previous discussion regarding the Mormon religion and racial norms.

---

[3]Sidney Siegel, Non-Parametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1956), pp. 111-116. On p. 111 Siegel states that "the median test is a procedure for testing whether two independent groups differ in central tendencies. More precisely, the median test will give information as to whether it is likely that two independent groups (not necessarily of the same size) have been drawn from populations with the same median." Since normality cannot be assumed, the use of the median for statistics in general seems appropriate.

One possible explanation is that ron-Mormons who would favor
civil rights as a principle opposed a Utah bill, since federal legisla-
tion had already been enacted. This possibility was checked by examin-
ing the answers to another question included in interviews: "Do you
favor laws guaranteeing that Negroes can (a) work wherever they are
qualified, (b) eat at the better restaurants, (c) register at the better
hotels and motels, and (d) buy or rent in the better neighborhoods?"
With data for 49 subjects, there was no tendency, significant or appa-
rent, for Mormons and non-Mormons to differ with regard to the number
of these possibilities favored. This suggests no difference in
favorability toward civil rights as a principle.

Another feasible explanation for the lack of relationship bet-
ween religious affiliation and civil rights attitudes is that some
Mormon leaders may not be particularly orthodox church members. This
likelihood will be considered again in the discussion following Table
8 on page 93.

Table 5 on page 88 presents data regarding the relationship
between age and favorability toward Utah civil rights. There is a
tendency, significant at the .01 level, for younger leaders to be more
favorable toward civil rights, with a chi-square of 6.64, using a
two-tailed test. This finding seems consistent with the fact, discussed
in Chapter II, that the racial question in Utah has become more signifi-
cant since World War II. It seems likely that such social change would
have greater influence upon those leaders more recently coming to terms

with their elite roles. The result also coincides with the popular view
that older people are in general more conservative. Elite attitudes
thus seem to be related to age, but not to religious affiliation.

Elite attitudes toward Mormon church racial norms were sampled
with the question, "Under what conditions do you feel that Negroes
should be allowed full fellowship in the L.D.S. Church?" Using responses
on this item and other information, judges rated elite attitudes from
high favorability (1.0) to low favorability (5.0), as described in
Chapter IV.

Ratings were not achieved for fourteen leaders. Table 6 indicates
the age, religious membership, and elite membership of these unrated
leaders.

Unrated leaders especially predominate among non-Mormons in the
economic elite. The significance of this for racial perspectives of
these unrated leaders is unknown. It may be that whatever conservatism
is implied in their being members of the economic elite may be balanced
by liberalism implied in their being non-Mormons. On the other hand,
it may be that they were not rated because they held conservative views
which they hesitated to express, not being Mormons. To test this possib-
ility, the six economic leaders without scores on church norms are identi-
fied. Five of the six do have ratings on civil rights, with the following
scores: 3.4, 4.0, 4.4, 5.0, and 5.0. By implication, their conservatism
is probably higher in general.[4]

_____

[4]Unrated leaders in other institutions do not appear to be so
conservative as unrated economic leaders. Among the eight other leaders

TABLE 6

RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION, YEAR OF BIRTH, AND ELITE
MEMBERSHIP OF LEADERS UNRATED ON
RELIGIOUS RACIAL PERSPECTIVES

| Religious Affiliation | Year of Birth | ELITE MEMBERSHIP* | | | | | | |
		Mormon Church	Non-Mormon Church	Governmental	Economic	Academic	Medical	Legal
Mormon	1873-1907	0	0	2	1	0	0	0
	1908-1927	0	0	(1)	0	0	1	1(1)
Non-Mormon	1873-1907	0	1	0	2	0	0	0
	1908-1927	0	1	0	3	0	1	0

*Parentheses refer to elite membership overlap. See Table 1, p. 83.

The distribution of favorability toward liberalization of Mormon church racial norms is presented in Table 7, for those 68 subjects for whom ratings are available.

---

without ratings on religious perspectives, five had ratings on political-legal perspectives, which are as follows: 1.2, 1.5, 1.6, 3.2, and 3.8. When these and the economic leaders' perspectives are combined, the median political-legal perspective for all ten leaders is 3.6, which compares with a population median of 3.6.

One reason for the difference between economic and other leaders is that others, e.g. church leaders, were more often rated on religious perspectives, even though not interviewed, because they are better known in the community. See Chapter IV for the discussion of rating methods.

TABLE 7

FAVORABILITY OF LEADERS TOWARD LIBERALIZATION
OF MORMON CHURCH RACIAL POLICY

Degree of Favorability		Mormon Church	Non-Mormon Church	Governmental	Economic	Academic	Medical	Legal	Totals
		ELITE MEMBERSHIP*							
High	1.0-2.0	1	3	4	2	9	2	2	23
	2.1-3.0	1	0	(1)	0	3(1)	0	1(2)	7
	3.1-4.0	2	0	1	4	0	1	1	9
Low	4.1-5.0	13	1	5	4	1(1)	2	2(1)	29
Totals		17	4	10(1)	10	13(2)	5	6(3)	68

*Parentheses refer to elite membership overlap. See Table 1, p. 83.

As shown in Table 7, the clustering of attitudes at the extremes
is even more apparent for church norms than it was for civil rights.
Again this may be related to the salience of the race issue at the time
of interviews. In addition, partisan answers are probably highly institu-
tionalized on the religious question, in that Mormon leaders, for example,
"should" hold the same view.

Mormon leaders again are strongly opposed to normative change, and
the academic elite is favorable. But the economic elite is not clearly
opposed as in the case of civil rights. As suggested above, one reason
may be that fewer expressed their views on this. It was observed during

interviews that some businessmen were reluctant to express themselves regarding church policy. This seems consistent with the traditional business view that success depends upon self-reliance, individualism, and a "live and let live" attitude toward other groups and institutions, including religion. To this extent, the result also seems to indicate institutional contingency.

What significance do religious affiliation and age of leaders have for their views on L.D.S. church norms? Tables 8 and 9 present these data. Mormon church leaders are again eliminated from the analysis, since tendencies actually due to institutional contingency might falsely seem to be expressions of church membership or age per se.

TABLE 8

LEADERS' RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION
AND FAVORABILITY TOWARD
LIBERALIZING MORMON
CHURCH NORMS

| Religious Affiliation | Degree of Favorability | | To- tals |
	High 1.0-2.6	Low 2.7-5.0	
Mormon	18	21	39
Non-Mormon	8	4	12
Totals	26	25	51

TABLE 9

LEADERS' YEAR OF BIRTH AND
FAVORABILITY TOWARD
LIBERALIZING MORMON
CHURCH NORMS

| Year of Birth | Degree of Favorability | | To- tals |
	High 1.0-2.6	Low 2.7-5.0	
1889- 1911	11	13	24
1912- 1927	15	12	27
Totals	26	25	51

The apparent tendency in Table 8 is much too small to be statistically significant, with regard to religious membership and attitudes toward Mormon church racial policy. This rather surprising result may be

influenced by the fact that so few non-Mormons were rated on this question. On the other hand, the discussion concerning Table 6, page 91, suggested that unrated subjects on this item are probably little different, on the average, than those who were rated. In either case, the surprising fact is that so many Mormon leaders express perspectives relatively favorable to the changing of Mormon church policy. This fact means that orthodoxy is not high for these Mormon church members, which may help to explain the lack of relationship between religious affiliation and civil rights attitudes, discussed in connection with Table 4, page 88.

Table 9, page 93, reveals no tendency for age to have differential significance for elite attitudes toward Mormon church Negro policy. Since age was related to political conservatism, the reason for this lack of relationship is unclear. One possibility is that attitudes toward Mormon racial norms are institutionally patterned to such a degree that age makes little difference. It seems likely that this question is especially salient only for academic leaders, Mormon church leaders, and non-Mormon church leaders. Unlike civil rights, church policy may not be a topic of perennial concern for other elites.

In summary, favorability toward liberalization of Mormon church Negro policy is not significantly related to either age or religious affiliation. Favorability toward Utah civil rights legislation is significantly higher for younger leaders, but religious affiliation makes no difference.

This preliminary analysis of background characteristics of leaders,
and the effect of such attributes upon perspectives, is not intended to
"explain away" the differences in perspectives that exist on the basis of
elite institutional membership. In fact, as mentioned above, institutional
structure and functioning is often behind such elite attributes. Even
when this is not the case, these are the real characteristics of leaders
which may have direct significance for the decisions they make, regardless
of the fact that leaders could conceivably have different attributes. As
such, these attributes are mainly important in understanding possible
reasons for elite perspectives in the prognostication of normative change.

In Chapter III seven hypotheses were presented, dealing with the
general prediction that normative change is more likely in political-
legal racial norms than in Mormon church racial norms. Statistical data
on these hypotheses are presented here.

Hypothesis 1. Leaders expressing liberal perspectives regarding
L.D.S. church Negro policy will also tend to express liberal perspectives
regarding civil rights legislation in Utah.

Leaders are grouped into high (1.0-3.6) and low (3.7-5.0) on both
indices. This is done because the two indices have the same median,
using those 63 leaders who have ratings on both. Table 10 presents
tendencies which suggest a significant relationship.

Since independence of samples cannot be assumed, however, the
chi-square significance test seems inappropriate. Instead, the product
moment coefficient is computed, yielding a correlation of .78 between

Utah civil rights favorability and favorability toward liberalization of
Mormon church Negro policy.[5] Since significance at the .01 level would
require a correlation of only .32, this result supports the view that
sacred and secular racial perspectives intertwine.

TABLE 10

FAVORABILITY TOWARD UTAH CIVIL RIGHTS
AND TOWARD LIBERALIZATION OF
MORMON CHURCH NEGRO POLICY

Degree of Favorability Toward Liberalization of Mormon Church Racial Policy	Degree of Favorability Toward Utah Civil Rights		Totals
	High 1.0-3.6	Low 3.7-5.0	
High 1.0-3.6	28	4	32
Low 3.7-5.0	4	27	31
Totals	32	31	63

These data seem significant in light of the view, often expressed
by leaders and accepted by orthodox members, that Mormon church Negro
policy has nothing to do with the secular matter of civil rights. Such
compartmentalization serves, of course, to defend the church's racial
policy. The data suggest that compartmentalization is less likely when
it requires contradictory personal commitments. Thus, the need for consis-
tent personal commitment probably means that sacred and secular perspec-
tives deeply affect each other.

---

[5] Because judges' ratings were sometimes made from limited data, and
because they were made in immediate succession for each subject, the
statistical strength of this relationship may be slightly exaggerated.
See Chapter IV for the discussion of rating methods.

What other factors influence racial perspectives? Theoretically, the basic institutional roles played by a person significantly affect his views—there is a strain toward consistency between one's day-to-day activities and his perspectives. This reasoning suggests that members within each of the seven elites will have similar views, whereas the entire distribution will be more heterogeneous.

Hypothesis 2. Racial perspectives within elites will be significantly more homogeneous than racial perspectives within the entire sample of elites.

Tables 11 and 12 present the appropriate data.[6] It is apparent from these tables that members of elites deviate less from elite medians (and therefore elites are more homogeneous) than would be expected on the basis of the entire distribution of deviations from the overall median.[7] Table 11 shows a tendency significant at the .001 level, with a chi-square of 20.29, while Table 12 on page 99 reveals a tendency significant

---

[6]The statistic used is an adaptation of the median test. One way of describing the basic problem is as follows: The basis of comparison is the median of deviations from the median perspective of the entire distribution. The question is whether this overall median deviation is significantly larger than the deviation of individual leaders from the median perspective of their elite.

These deviations are compared to yield a chi-square approximation of the extent to which elites are more homogeneous than expected on the basis of the distribution as a whole. See William L. Hays, Statistics For Psychologists (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1963), pp. 620-623.

[7]The tendency of elite members to express similar perspectives does not necessarily mean that each elite is a "group." Similar views can derive from participation in similar activities as well as from common activities.

at the .01 level, with a chi-square of 15.34. The one-tailed test is

used for these data because the direction was predicted beforehand.

TABLE 11

DEVIATIONS OF LEADERS FROM ELITE MEDIANS COMPARED TO
MEDIAN DEVIATION OF ALL LEADERS FROM OVERALL MEDIAN:
FAVORABILITY TOWARD UTAH CIVIL RIGHTS

Deviation of Leaders from Elite Medians Compared to Median Deviation of Entire Distribution from Overall Median	ELITE MEMBERSHIP**						
	Mormon Church	Non-Mormon Church	Governmental	Economic	Academic	Medical	Legal
Equal to or larger* 1.35-3.23	2	2	4	2	2	1	2
Smaller .00-1.30	11	3	8	13	12	5	6
Totals	13	5	12	15	14	6	8

*The median deviation of the entire distribution from the overall median is 1.35.

**Since the median test requires independent samples, for this table the four subjects who belonged to overlapping elites were placed in that elite category where they were apparently most active, based on interview data.

These results suggest that elite racial perspectives are patterned on the basis of institutional roles. This is important in the prediction of normative change because it suggests that different institutions will elicit different perspectives, which may be expressed differently in community action. But what are these institutional differences, and what direction will such different perspectives take?

TABLE 12

DEVIATIONS OF LEADERS FROM ELITE MEDIANS COMPARED TO
MEDIAN DEVIATION OF ALL LEADERS FROM OVERALL MEDIAN:
FAVORABILITY TOWARD LIBERALIZING
MORMON CHURCH NEGRO POLICY

Deviation of Leaders from Elite Medians Compared to Median Deviation of Entire Distribution from Overall Median	ELITE MEMBERSHIP**						
	Mormon Church	Non-Mormon Church	Governmental	Economic	Academic	Medical	Legal
Equal to or larger* 1.35–3.23	4	1	5	2	4	2	1
Smaller .00–1.30	13	3	6	8	11	3	5
Totals	17	4	11	10	15	5	6

*The median deviation of the entire distribution from the overall median is 1.35.

**Elites do not overlap. See Table 11 on page 98.

Predictions regarding the racial liberalism of elites were made in Chapter III, based on the apparent extent to which orthodox Mormon versus intellectual values are institutionalized in their typical role requirements and/or in terms of the proportion of members of these elites who are adherents of Mormon versus intellectual values.

Hypothesis 3. The ranking of Utah elites on average racial liberalism will show that the non-Mormon church elite and the academic elite express perspectives most favorable toward liberalization of racial

norms, legal and medical elites express perspectives next most favorable, economic and governmental elites express perspectives next most favorable, and the Mormon church elite expresses perspectives least favorable toward liberalization of racial norms. The same ranking is predicted for Mormon church norms and for Utah political-legal norms.

Median favorability scores are ranked in Tables 13 and 14.

TABLE 13

MEDIAN AND RANKED FAVORABILITY OF ELITES TOWARD
LIBERALIZATION OF POLITICAL-LEGAL RACIAL NORMS,
COMPARED TO PREDICTED FAVORABILITY RANKING

	ELITE MEMBERSHIP						
	Non-Mormon Church	Academic	Legal	Medical	Economic	Governmental	Mormon Church
Median Favorability on Political-Legal Norms	1.2	1.4	1.6	3.9	4.4	3.8	5.0
Actual Favorability Ranking	1	2	3	5	6	4	7
Predicted Favorability Ranking	1 and 2		3 and 4		5 and 6		7

Although there is some discrepancy between predicted and actual ranks, Tables 13 and 14 both yield a Spearman rank order correlation of .85. Using the one-tailed test, this correlation is significant at the .05 level.[8]

---

[8]In the computation of rank order correlations, elites in positions 1 and 2 are each given the rank of $1\frac{1}{2}$, while ranks 3 and 4 are

TABLE 14

MEDIAN AND RANKED FAVORABILITY OF ELITES TOWARD
LIBERALIZATION OF MORMON CHURCH RACIAL POLICY,
COMPARED TO PREDICTED FAVORABILITY RANKING

	ELITE MEMBERSHIP						
	Non-Mormon Church	Academic	Legal	Medical	Economic	Governmental	Mormon Church
Median Favorability on Mormon Church Norms	1.3	1.0	2.8	4.0	3.7	4.0	5.0
Actual Favorability Ranking	1	2	3	$5\frac{1}{2}$	4	$5\frac{1}{2}$	7
Predicted Favorability Ranking	1 and 2		3 and 4		5 and 6		7

The most important ranks are, of course, those expected to fall
at the extremes. (As shown in Table 13 on page 100, and Table 14, these
elites did in fact fall at the extremes.)

Corollary 3a. Members of the academic elite and members of the
non-Mormon church elite will express perspectives significantly more
favorable toward liberalization of political-legal racial norms than
will members of the Mormon church elite.

Corollary 3b. Members of the academic elite and members of the
non-Mormon church elite will express perspectives significantly more

each changed to $3\frac{1}{2}$, 5 and 6 become $5\frac{1}{2}$, and 7 remains 7. This is done
for both predicted and actual rankings in both tables, because the hypo-
thesis requires this degree of flexibility. Since this introduces three
ties into each series, the correction for ties is used in calculations.

favorable toward liberalization of Mormon church racial norms than will members of the Mormon church elite.

The findings for corollaries 3a and 3b are presented in Tables 15 and 16.

| TABLE 15 | TABLE 16 |

| FAVORABILITY OF ACADEMIC ELITE, NON-MORMON CHURCH ELITE, AND MORMON CHURCH ELITE TOWARD LIBERALIZATION OF POLITICAL-LEGAL RACIAL NORMS | FAVORABILITY OF ACADEMIC ELITE, NON-MORMON CHURCH ELITE, AND MORMON CHURCH ELITE TOWARD LIBERALIZATION OF MORMON CHURCH RACIAL NORMS |

Elite Membership	Degree of Favorability		Totals
	High 1.0-2.2	Low 2.3-5.0	
Academic and Non-Mormon Church	13	4	17
Mormon Church	2	11	13
Totals	15	15	30

Elite Membership	Degree of Favorability		Totals
	High 1.0-3.0	Low 3.1-5.0	
Academic and Non-Mormon Church	16	3	19
Mormon Church	2	15	17
Totals	18	18	36

Since Tables 15 and 16 include small frequencies, the test for significance requires a correction factor. Nevertheless, differences are significant beyond the .01 level for Table 15 and the .001 level for Table 16, using the one-tailed test. Chi-square values are 8.68 and 16.06 respectively.

These results further support the idea that racial perspectives are institutionally patterned. They also suggest the likelihood that

resistance to change is especially great with respect to Mormon church racial policy. Whether or not resistance clearly is greater in this area than in the area of Utah political-legal norms is the next important question.

The relative flexibility of institutional norms depends in part upon the predisposition of the elite that controls the norms. The Mormon church leaders and the Utah governmental leaders are referred to as decision makers, when the likelihood of their changing policy is under consideration.

Hypothesis 4. Utah governmental decision makers will tend to express perspectives more favorable toward liberalization of the norms they control (political-legal racial norms), while Mormon church decision makers will tend to express perspectives less favorable toward liberalization of the norms they control (Mormon church Negro policy).

The findings for this hypothesis are presented in Table 17.

Small frequencies again require the use of the correction factor. Nevertheless, differences are significant in the direction predicted at the .01 level, with a chi-square of 6.42, using a one-tailed test. This finding supports the main concept of this research, that the discrepency between the ideal and the actual is experienced differently by different decision makers, and that perspectives within the governmental elite are more favorable to normative change of a "liberal" kind.

The perspectives of decision makers in these two major institutions are undoubtedly subject to some influence from other leaders, however. For this reason, the attempt was made in interviews to ask all

leaders except governmental decision makers concerning the possibility

of influencing Utah governmental leaders, "How accessible to you are those

who make political decisions regarding racial policy in Utah?" Likewise

the attempt was made to ask all leaders except Mormon church decision

makers, "How accessible to you are those who make decisions for the

church?"[9]

TABLE 17

DECISION MAKING ELITES AND THEIR FAVORABILITY TOWARD
LIBERALIZATION OF THE RACIAL NORMS THEY CONTROL

Decision Making Elites and the Norms they Control	Degree of Favorability		Totals
	High 1.0-4.2	Low 4.3-5.0	
Governmental Decision Makers, Political-Legal Norms	10	3	13
Mormon Church Decision Makers, Religious Norms	4	13	17
Totals	14	16	30

Using responses to these questions and other available information,

judges rated each influential from high accessibility (1.0) to low

accessibility (5.0).

The overall distributions on degree of accessibility are pre-

sented in Tables 18 and 19. The governmental leaders are eliminated

from Table 18, and the Mormon church leaders are eliminated from Table

---

[9]When the accessibility of leaders to other leaders is being
considered, the former are designated "influentials," while the latter
are designated "decision makers."

19, because accessibility is being examined in relationship to these decision making elites.

TABLE 18

PERCEIVED ACCESSIBILITY OF INFLUENTIALS TO
THE GOVERNMENTAL DECISION MAKING ELITE

Perceived Accessibility	INFLUENTIAL ELITE MEMBERSHIP*						Totals
	Mormon Church	Non-Mormon Church	Economic	Academic	Medical	Legal	
High 1.0 - 2.0	6	0	10	2(1)	0	5(1)	24
2.1 - 3.0	8	0	5	5(1)	3	1(1)	23
3.1 - 4.0	3	4	1	6	3	0	17
Low 4.1 - 5.0	0	2	0	0	1	1	4
Totals	17	6	16	13(2)	7	7(2)	68

*Parentheses refer to elite membership overlap. See Table 1, p. 83.

These distributions reveal the tendency for elites to differ with regard to perceived accessibility to decision makers. What are the bases for such different tendencies? To what extent are they related to the characteristics of age and religious affiliation?

The extent to which age affects perception of accessibility is tested by eliminating again the Mormon church leaders, because their accessibility might be an artifact of their institutional role rather than their older average age. In addition, the governmental decision

TABLE 19

PERCEIVED ACCESSIBILITY OF INFLUENTIALS TO THE
MORMON CHURCH DECISION MAKING ELITE

Perceived Accessibility	INFLUENTIAL ELITE MEMBERSHIP*						Totals
	Non-Mormon Church	Governmental	Economic	Academic	Medical	Legal	
High 1.0 - 2.0	0	3	3	1(1)	0	2(1)	10
2.1 - 3.0	0	5(2)	6	6	1	4(2)	24
3.1 - 4.0	2	3	6	3(1)	3	(1)	18
Low 4.1 - 5.0	4	1	1	3	3	1	13
Totals	6	12(2)	16	13(2)	7	7(4)	65

*Parentheses refer to elite membership overlap. See Table 1, p. 83.

makers are eliminated from Table 20 since accessibility to them is being examined. Tables 20 and 21 report the findings.

The trend in Table 20 is not significant (chi-square = 2.48) using a two-tailed test. Although such a difference between younger and older influentials might have strategic significance in the community, it is not large enough to meet the conventional criteria of statistical significance.

No tendency is represented in Table 21. The age of influentials seems not to influence their perceived accessibility to Mormon church decision makers.

TABLE 20	TABLE 21
INFLUENTIALS' YEAR OF BIRTH AND PERCEIVED ACCESSIBILITY TO GOVERNMENTAL DECISION MAKERS	INFLUENTIALS' YEAR OF BIRTH AND PERCEIVED ACCESSIBILITY TO MORMON CHURCH DECISION MAKERS

Year of Birth	Perceived Accessibility		Totals
	High 1.0-2.3	Low 2.4-5.0	
1889-1911	8	16	24
1912-1927	16	11	27
Totals	24	27	51

Year of Birth	Perceived Accessibility		Totals
	High 1.0-3.0	Low 3.1-5.0	
1889-1911	17	15	32
1912-1927	17	16	33
Totals	34	31	65

If age has questionable significance for accessibility to governmental decision makers, and no apparent significance for accessibility to Mormon church decision makers, what influence will religious affiliation have? This question is addressed in Tables 22 and 23. Members of the Mormon church elite are not included in Table 23 because accessibility to them is being considered. They are eliminated from Table 22 because accessibility actually due to their positions as church authorities might seem to be due to their church membership. Governmental decision makers are not included in Table 22 because accessibility to them is being examined.

The tendency in Table 22 is not significant (chi-square = 1.44). The idea that such non-significant tendencies may have strategic importance is not dismissed, however.

Table 23 reveals a tendency significant beyond the .01 level, using a two-tailed test (chi-square = 7.13), for members of the Mormon church to perceive greater accessibility than non-Mormons to the Mormon church decision makers. In this instance, church membership is a "manifest identity," in that the perception of greater accessibility is appropriate to the identity from the standpoint of institutional legitimacy.[10]

TABLE 22

INFLUENTIALS' RELIGIOUS
AFFILIATION AND PERCEIVED
ACCESSIBILITY TO GOVERNMENTAL
DECISION MAKERS

| Religious Affiliation | Perceived Accessibility | | Totals |
	High 1.0-2.4	Low 2.5-5.0	
Mormon	19	12	31
Non-Mormon	8	12	20
Totals	27	24	51

TABLE 23

INFLUENTIALS' RELIGIOUS
AFFILIATION AND PERCEIVED
ACCESSIBILITY TO MORMON CHURCH
DECISION MAKERS

| Religious Affiliation | Perceived Accessibility | | Totals |
	High 1.0-3.0	Low 3.1-5.0	
Mormon	29	16	45
Non-Mormon	5	15	20
Totals	34	31	65

In what way may the tendency for these background characteristics to have significance for perceived accessibility help to understand the likelihood of racial normative change?

It was shown earlier in the chapter (Table 5, p. 88) that younger influentials are more favorable than older to liberalization of political-legal norms. Since Table 20, p. 107, suggests a slight tendency for younger

---

[10]See Alvin W. Gouldner, "Cosmopolitan and Locals," in Joseph A. Litterer, Organizations: Structure and Behavior (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1963), p. 362.

influentials to perceive greater accessibility to the governmental decision makers (who control these norms) than older influentials, any inference must be in the direction of greater influence of younger, more liberal influentials upon governmental decision makers. No comparable inference is even remotely possible for influentials relative to Mormon church decision makers, because age seems to affect neither favorability toward liberalization of Mormon church norms nor accessibility to Mormon church decision makers.

Data on religious affiliation seems to add very little to this. An interesting but distinctly marginal tendency for Mormons to perceive greater accessibility than non-Mormons to governmental decision makers is not matched by any tendency for Mormons to differ from non-Mormons in their political-legal racial perspectives. On the other hand, the tendency for Mormons to perceive greater accessibility to Mormon church decision makers than non-Mormons (Table 23, p.108) may have importance in relation to the marginal tendency presented earlier (Table 8, p. 93) for Mormons to be less favorable toward liberalization of Mormon church racial norms. If any inference is possible from this, it must support the same point of view—that there is less likelihood of liberalization of religious racial norms in Utah. If these data on background characteristics in relation to racial perspectives and perceived accessibility do not significantly support the main point of view in this research, at least they do not contradict this point of view. Regardless, they should help in the understanding of identities that affect racial perspectives and perceptions of accessibility.

A more direct test of the possibility that influentials with accessibility to governmental decision makers will be more favorable toward liberalization of norms than those with accessibility to Mormon church decision makers is suggested in the next hypotheses. If governmental decision makers are more favorable toward liberalization of norms than Mormon church leaders, it stands to reason that those who influence them will be similarly disposed. This view is based on the idea, discussed in Chapter III, that individuals interact more with those having similar perspectives.

Hypothesis 5. The ranking of influential elites on perceived accessibility to Utah governmental decision makers will correspond to their ranking on similarity to Utah governmental decision makers in terms of political-legal racial perspectives.

Hypothesis 6. The ranking of influential elites on perceived accessibility to Mormon church decision makers will correspond to their ranking on similarity to Mormon church decision makers in terms of Mormon church racial perspectives.

Tables 24 (p. 111) and 25 (p. 112) present data on these hypotheses.

A cursory examination of these rankings reveals that the rankings fail to correspond, and therefore that the hypotheses are not supported.[11] Similarity of average elite perspectives regarding Utah racial norms seems not to indicate better lines of communication or accessibility.

---

[11]Computation of the Spearman rank order coefficient yields a correlation of .26 for Table 24 and .16 for Table 25. For $\underline{N} = 6$ a correlation of .83 is required for significance.

It is conceivable, however, that the use of average categories of elite racial perspectives may obscure real relationships based on individual leaders' perspectives. In checking this likelihood it is also possible to test for any consistent relationship between racial perspectives and accessibility.

TABLE 24

PERSPECTIVE SIMILARITY OF INFLUENTIALS AND
GOVERNMENTAL DECISION MAKERS, AND
PERCEIVED ACCESSIBILITY OF INFLUENTIALS TO
GOVERNMENTAL DECISION MAKERS

Elite	Differences in Median Perspective*	Similarity Rank	Median Perceived Accessibility	Perceived Accessibility Rank
Medical	− .1	1	3.4	5
Economic	− .6	2	2.0	2
Mormon Church	−1.2	3	2.4	3
Legal	+2.2	4	1.4	1
Academic	+2.4	5	3.0	4
Non-Mormon Church	+2.6	6	3.8	6

*The numbers in this column are calculated by subtracting the median political-legal racial perspective of each influential elite from the median political-legal racial perspective of the governmental elite, and rounding to one decimal.

This dual purpose is achieved by dividing the favorability continua into practicable categories, based on two criteria: (1) One category in each favorability index should have as its mid-point the median racial perspective of the decision making elite to whom accessibility

is being measured. Thus, the median favorability of governmental deci-
sion makers toward liberalization of political-legal norms is 3.8. The
category of influentials of which this is the mid-point. ranges in
favorability from 3.4 to 4.2. And the median favorability of Mormon
church decision makers toward liberalization of Mormon church racial
norms is 5.0. The appropriate category of influentials is therefore
5.0. (2) For the sake of manageability, categories should be as few as
convenient and contain as nearly equal $\underline{N}$'s as possible.

TABLE 25

PERSPECTIVE SIMILARITY OF INFLUENTIALS AND
MORMON CHURCH DECISION MAKERS, AND
PERCEIVED ACCESSIBILITY OF INFLUENTIALS TO
MORMON CHURCH DECISION MAKERS

Elite	Differences in Median Perspective*	Similarity Rank	Median Perceived Accessibility	Perceived Accessibility Rank
Governmental	+1.0	1½	2.9	3
Medical	+1.0	1½	4.0	5
Economic	+1.3	3	2.8	2
Legal	+2.2	4	2.7	1
Non-Mormon Church	+3.7	5	4.5	6
Academic	+3.9	6	3.0	4

*The numbers in this column are calculated by subtracting the med-
ian Mormon church racial perspective of each influential elite from the
median Mormon church racial perspective of the Mormon church decision-
making elite, and rounding to one decimal.

The employment of these criteria resulted in 6 categories of favorability for Table 26 and 5 categories for Table 27.

TABLE 26

INFLUENTIALS' FAVORABILITY TOWARD LIBERALIZATION
OF POLITICAL-LEGAL RACIAL NORMS AND THEIR PERCEIVED
ACCESSIBILITY TO GOVERNMENTAL DECISION MAKERS

Favorability toward Liberalization of Political-Legal Racial Norms	Perceived Accessibility to Governmental Decision Makers		Totals
	High 1.0 - 2.3	Low 2.4 - 5.0	
High 1.0 - 1.2	2	8	10
1.3 - 1.7	7	3	10
1.8 - 3.3	5	3	8
*3.4 - 4.2	4	5	9
4.3 - 4.7	6	6	12
Low 4.8 - 5.0	5	6	11
Totals	29	31	60

*The midpoint of this category corresponds to the median perspective of governmental decision makers. According to hypothesis 5, accessibility should be highest in this category.

Table 26 reveals once more that hypothesis 5 must be rejected. There seems to be no tendency for influentials with perspectives most similar to the median perspective of governmental decision makers to have greater accessibility to them. In addition, there seems to be no consistent relationship between political-legal racial perspectives of influentials and accessibility to governmental decision makers.

TABLE 27

INFLUENTIALS' FAVORABILITY TOWARD LIBERALIZATION
OF MORMON CHURCH RACIAL NORMS AND THEIR
PERCEIVED ACCESSIBILITY TO
MORMON CHURCH DECISION MAKERS

Favorability toward Liberalization of Mormon Church Racial Norms	Perceived Accessibility to Mormon Church Decision Makers		Totals
	High 1.0 - 2.8	Low 2.9 - 5.0	
High 1.0 - 1.1	4	7	11
1.2 - 2.0	3	8	11
2.1 - 3.8	7	3	10
3.9 - 4.9	6	4	10
Low *5.0	5	4	9
Totals	25	26	51

*This category corresponds to the median perspective of Mormon church decision makers. According to hypothesis 6, accessibility should be highest in this category.

There is a slight but statistically insignificant tendency for influentials less favorable to liberalization of Mormon church racial norms to perceive greater accessibility to Mormon church decision makers, according to Table 27. The direction of this tendency may seem to support hypothesis 6, but the tendency is only marginal.[12] Again, it may be that such a statistically non-significant tendency should not be considered strategically non-significant, in that the leaders under

---

[12] The chi-square value is 1.92 for Table 26, p. 113, and 1.93 for Table 27. These compare with the figures of 11.07 and 9.49 respectively which would be necessary for significance at the .05 level.

consideration constitute something approximating the real population of
Utah leaders.

A possible explanation for the failure to support hypotheses 5
and 6 may be that ecological or situational factors were not taken into
account. Although similarity of viewpoint may encourage ties between
individuals, it seems reasonable that participation in common situations
provides the setting in which such homogeneous relationships tend to
develop. This suggests that value similarity per se may be important
but secondary to such conditions as common membership in groups or
participation in common activities. Some possible examples are member-
ship on governing boards of businesses, educational institutions, churches,
community service organizations, and voluntary associations, as well as
other leadership and membership roles in these same groups.

The opposite tendency, for similar perspectives to foster common
participation or common lines of communication, is not necessarily imp-
lied. There may be barriers of geography, lack of information, social
distance, or simple inconvenience that make this contingency less likely.
Unfortunately, statistical data are not available to test such possibili-
ties. In lieu of this, interview data bearing on the question will be
discussed in Chapter VI.

The next question is whether overall perceived accessibility does
vary, depending upon the decision making elite to whom accessibility is
being considered. It was theorized in Chapter III that the accessibility
of influentials in general to the Utah governmental decision-making elite

is greater than their accessibility to the Mormon church decision making
elite, because the government as an institution is more highly different-
iated.

Hypothesis 7. Influentials will tend to perceive greater accessibi-
lity to Utah governmental decision makers than to Mormon church decision
makers.

Governmental and Mormon church decision-making elites are both
eliminated for this comparison because the same influentials' responses
on two different indices are being compared. In addition, since the
comparison is between the same group under two different conditions,
rather than between two separate sub-groups of subjects, the traditional
chi-square statistic is not applicable. Instead, the McNemar test for
the significance of changes is used.[13] In table 28 the expectation is
that the lower-left cell will contain a significantly larger frequency
than the upper-right cell. This means that there will be more influent-
ials who perceive low accessibility to Mormon church decision makers and
high accessibility to governmental decision makers than vice-versa.

The data in Table 28 support the hypothesis. There is a tendency,
significant at the .05 level using the one-tailed test, for influentials
to perceive greater accessibility to governmental decision makers than to
Mormon church decision makers. The chi-square approximation, computed
with correction for continuity, is 2.72.

_____

[13]Siegel, op. cit., pp. 63-67.

An interesting question is whether this tendency exists only for non-Mormons. If so, the overall difference in accessibility could be considered an artifact of religious affiliation. Table 29 was devised to see if Mormons too perceive greater accessibility to governmental decision makers than to Mormon church decision makers.

TABLE 28

INFLUENTIALS' PERCEIVED ACCESSIBILITY TO
GOVERNMENTAL DECISION MAKERS AND
MORMON CHURCH DECISION MAKERS

Perceived Accessibility to Mormon Church Decision Makers	Perceived Accessibility to Governmental Decision Makers	
	High 1.0 - 2.8	Low 2.9 - 5.0
High 1.0 - 2.8	17	5
Low 2.9 - 5.0	13	16

TABLE 29

PERCEIVED ACCESSIBILITY OF MORMON INFLUENTIALS
TO GOVERNMENTAL DECISION MAKERS AND MORMON
CHURCH DECISION MAKERS

Perceived Accessibility to Mormon Church Decision Makers	Perceived Accessibility to Governmental Decision Makers	
	High 1.0 - 2.5	Low 2.6 - 5.0
High 1.0 - 2.5	9	3
Low 2.6 - 5.0	10	9

The tendency revealed here is significant at the .05 level using the one-tailed test, as in Table 28. The McNemar chi-square approximation

is 2.77. This means that Mormons do tend to consider governmental decision makers more accessible than Mormon church decision makers.

Although hypothesis 7 is supported, the importance of this finding for the prediction of normative change is challenged by the failure of hypotheses 5 and 6. If accessibility in general is higher to governmental decision makers, what does this mean in terms of normative liberalization,. since accessibility and favorability toward liberalization are not significantly related?

An alternative way to look at this is to suggest that the accessibility of larger numbers of influentials to governmental decision makers may be liberalizing in and of itself. Although it is not always favorably evaluated, a fairly consistent view among social commentators is that the pluralism inherent in democracy is conducive to institutional change of a "liberal" type.

Thus, a more effective way to examine this question may be to look beyond accessibility per se, and consider how accessibility is used. If conservatism is the tendency to favor existing arrangements, one way to express conservatism may be to avoid or even prevent communication that could lead to controversy. On the other hand, liberalism implies dissatisfaction with present conditions which is likely to be expressed in protest. This suggests that the overall greater accessibility to governmental decision makers may be more important than supposed, simply because protest leads to controversy, which may require broader accomodation.

It may also be that liberals communicate proportionately more with those having more similar views (governmental decision makers), even if accessibility is not greater. As suggested above, this possibility will be examined in Chapter VI.

In summary, the statistical data in this chapter generally support the viewpoint that the likelihood of normative change is greater in Utah political-legal racial norms than in Mormon church racial norms. Although secular and religious perspectives intertwine, religious views seem to act as a more conservative force. If the strain between the "actual" and the "ideal" experienced by the Mormon church decision makers is formulated in more conservative views, the attempted resolution of such strain presumably will tend more toward preservation of the status quo.

In addition, even if influentials with accessibility to governmental decision makers are no more liberal than those with accessibility to Mormon church decision makers, the overall greater accessibility to governmental decision makers probably increases the chances for liberalizing political-legal racial norms. This is suggested in the view that an increase in overall communication encourages broader accommodation.

CHAPTER VI

QUALITATIVE RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Statistical data generally support the point of view that polit-
ical-legal racial norms in Utah are more susceptible to liberalization
than Mormon church racial norms.

But the reporting of statistics is not sufficient to the full
understanding of such a probability. For the individuals concerned, the
racial question is more than categorical; it is complex and personal.
To further illustrate the theorized tendencies, to help illuminate these
tendencies, and to put elite perspectives into their human setting,
representative quotations are therefore presented. These responses are
selected from interview data on the basis of their appropriateness to
the main trends reported in Chapter V. They are offered without evalua-
tion, since the purpose is to describe opinion rather than judge its
accuracy or appropriateness. Care is taken to preserve anonymity.

Hypothesis 1 predicts that leaders will tend to express perspec-
tives regarding secular and sacred racial norms that are consistent.
This hypothesis is statistically supported, as shown in Table 10 of
Chapter V, page 96.

Since these perspectives do tend to vary together, the positive-
consistent response and the negative-consistent response are more typical
than the positive-negative-inconsistent response or the negative-positive-
inconsistent response. These types are shown below.

Response Pattern	Favorability Toward Liberalizing Political-Legal Norms	Favorability Toward Liberalizing Mormon Church Norms
Positive-Consistent	+	+
Negative-Consistent	−	−
Positive-Negative-Inconsistent	+	−
Negative-Positive-Inconsistent	−	+

The positive-consistent response pattern is illustrated by the reaction of a member of the non-Mormon church elite when asked if he understood the policy of the L.D.S. church with regard to the Negro.

> The church teaches that Negroes aren't men and that's why they can't hold the priesthood. God is no respector of persons, and no church ought to be.

Asked if he felt the civil rights movement would affect L.D.S. church policy he stated,

> I don't think they can ignore this trend any longer . . . guys like George Romney are going to be faced with the question of whether they can stay loyal to the church.

The interpenetration of sacred and secular norms in this leader's perspective are quite apparent.

The negative-consistent response is illustrated in the reaction of a Mormon church leader. Asked what issues he considered most important in race relations, he responded,

> You shouldn't be forced to do business with any group that aren't behaving appropriately. I believe in equality, but this has to come gradually. I can understand how the people in the South react as they do. Educated Negroes are wonderful people. They've got to learn to earn their place in society.

Asked about the relation between Mormon church Negro policy and race
relations in civil affairs, he replied,

> I think it involves intermarriage, and we've got to fight that
> to the bitter end. The civil rights leaders want to have inter-
> marriage.

Although inconsistent responses are less prevalent, there are
many individuals who express varying degrees of inconsistency. Positive-
negative inconsistency is often the response of the leader who continues
to hold church office or otherwise identifies strongly with the Mormon
religion, even though he favors civil rights. This type of response is
expressed by a leader who has actively worked for civil rights in com-
mittees and personal contacts with governmental leaders. However, when
asked about the position of the Negro in the church, he replied,

> They can go further than in any other church. I'll leave the
> priesthood issue to President McKay . . . .

Asked about the relationship between church policy and civil
rights, he stated,

> Oh, they make a lot of fuss about it, but there's not much
> effect. Negroes can do most anything they want. . . .I hope the
> membership of the church will be broad-minded enough to eliminate
> prejudice, but I'll leave the policy to David O. McKay.

The fourth category, negative-positive inconsistency, is very
interesting from the standpoint of possible motivation. In the cases
at hand, it seems to involve a moral concern for a rather distant insti-
tution, the Mormon church, among individuals whose occupational roles
make civil rights threatening. For example, a member of the medical
elite took the following position concerning public accommodations.

I don't think that should be legislated. Owners should have the right to decide. . . . I'm opposed to sections that say businessmen can be forced to admit people to their establishments . . . [this] interferes with personal rights.

But, on the subject of the Mormon church policy, he comments,

I think it will . . . change. If Rommey ever expects to run for president, they'll have to change. . . . I feel if anyone is really qualified for anything, regardless of color or race, they should be accepted. Actually, I shouldn't be giving advice on this, since I'm not a Mormon.

Another interesting incongruity is that this individual favors an ultimate solution in terms of

. . . gradual mixing of the races. [I] don't think it can be met any other way. . . . There's no way to prevent it. Intermarriages are common now—doesn't bother me anymore. Eventually there will be a mixing of all the races, I think.

Hypothesis 2 deals with the tendency for perspectives to be institutionally patterned. The pattern of perspectives within each elite is illustrated in Tables 3 and 7 of Chapter V, pages 86 and 92, while the general homogeneity of perspectives is demonstrated in Tables 11 and 12 of Chapter V, pages 98 and 99.

Statements by members of each of the seven elites may be used to show this institutional contingency. Thus the conservative polarization of Mormon church elite perspectives, as influenced by church writings and policy, is illustrated in the views of a leader on the subject of the "curse."

At least in the cases of the Lamanites and Negroes we have the definite word of the Lord Himself that He placed a dark skin upon them as a curse—as a punishment and a sign to all others . . . . It reminds me of the scripture on marriage, 'what God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.' Only here we have the reverse

of the thing—what God hath separated, let not man bring together
again.

The tendency for religious doctrine to provide the frame of reference for
both religious and secular perspectives is obvious in this statement. In
fact the intense sacralization has a polarizing effect, allowing few
Mormon leaders to deviate significantly from opposition to normative
change.

Non-Mormon church leaders' perspectives are somewhat polarized
in the opposite direction. Interview data suggest that this to some
extent involves an institutionalized repudiation of the Mormon church.
A non-Mormon church leader was asked to respond to the 1963 "civil
equality" statement made by a Mormon authority (discussed on page 36,
Chapter II). Never having heard the statement before, he reacted,

> I just don't envision a leading L.D.S. man ever saying that. If
> they did say that, I'd doubt their sincerity. If I heard it, I'd
> like to have a conversation with him about it. What have we seen to
> support such a statement? I haven't seen anything.

The institutionalization of governmental leaders' perspectives
is less clearly homogeneous. This seems reasonable in view of the fact
that democratic government is a kind of institutionalized conflict—a
system of rules for making explicit a wide variety of opinion, and bring-
ing it to bear upon policy. Although political affiliation was not
deliberately discussed in interviews, the available information suggests
that differentiation exists within this elite chiefly on the basis of
party membership.[1] Thus a Democratic governmental leader, asked about

---

[1] The 1965 house vote on S. B. 43, to establish a Utah Citizens
Commission on Civil Rights, illustrates this differentiation. Thirty-one

the main issues he sees in the matter of race relations, responded that

> the primary issue is closing the gap between what we do and
> what we say. Legislation can be an educational instrument, to teach
> people how to close the gap. The issue is one of individual value,
> dignity, and respect.

His views also reveal that he is a "positive consistent." Asked for his

opinion regarding the effect of church policy on race relations in civil

life, he replied,

> Non-discrimination in word, but discrimination in deed.

> On the other hand, a Republican governmental leader, asked about

the main issues he sees in the matter of race relations, answered,

> Whether you are required to associate with people you don't want
> to associate with, whether they're white, yellow, or black; it's a
> matter of individual freedom. One ought to be able to choose one's
> associates.

Asked about his response to the statement on civil equality by a Mormon

official, mentioned above, he replied,

> We all want people to have civil equality. I'm for that. But
> I'm not in favor of the Negroes trying to force their way into the
> temple.

> The institutionalization of economic leaders' perspectives seems

to show up in a conservative polarization, based on resistance to per-

ceived threats to economic freedom, and a keen sense of business indiv-

idualism. One non-Mormon economic leader, asked if he favored civil

rights, responded negatively, saying,

---

of the 33 supporting the bill were Democrats, while 26 of the 33 opposing
it were Republicans. Utah Legislature, House, House Journal of the State
of Utah, 36th Legislature, 1965 (Salt Lake City: Lorraine Press, 1965),
52nd Day.

I think natural laws take care of that, just like they take care of fraternization . . . . I think the courts are going to have a hell of a job. I don't think you can bring a person by law into a station he doesn't fit into. When you upset a natural law you don't help either party. I don't think color has a hell of a lot to do with it.

Asked his views concerning Mormon church race policy, he replied,

I can't comment because I don't know. I don't think things in the church affect things outside.

The institutionalization of perspectives of academic leaders is polarized much as that of the non-Mormon church elite. The meaning expressed seems to involve considerable intellectualism as well as reaction to Mormon values. An academic leader, asked if religion is an issue in race relations, stated,

Any element of racism or discrimination indicates religious blindness. The brotherhood of man is at the heart of the religious ideal. Racism is a great blot on the Mormon church. I don't believe in the fatherhood of God, but in that context racism is a bad doctrine.

Asked if Mormon church policy affects relations in civil life, he replied,

That's what God does. We all use God as the rationalization for whatever we want to do. People can discriminate against the Negro in good conscience.

Perspectives of medical leaders do not seem to represent any consistent institutional qualities. One individual, asked if discussions of racial relations came up on the job, stated,

All the time. While you're doing surgery there's always something going on. You run out of jokes, stories and politics . . . [and then civil rights is discussed]. The main issue [discussed] is, does the Negro have equal opportunity in fact. They do not—there are great areas of inequality. This results in discussion of socio-economic, medical, and psychiatric problems. They are not inherently inferior.

Asked what effect he thinks the civil rights movement is likely to have

on Mormon church policy, he replied,

> None. This is a non-logical, authoritarian view. It has been so stated—not a reasoned position but one based on revelation.

Another member of the medical elite, asked what he considers the main issues in the problem of race relations, replied,

> It took hundreds of years to bring the white race to the civilization attained. By law you can't elevate colored people to the standards of western civilization in a short time. I'm not an environmentalist. I'm not a sociologist either. And nothing I've ever studied in medicine has made me think any different.

Asked whether he favors a liberalization of church policy, he replied,

> When the Lord says to. The law of the land shall make no provision concerning religious worship.

The homogeneity of perspectives within the legal elite is not the result of polarization, as it is with other elites. In fact, most ratings for legal leaders fall some distance from the high and low extremes on both kinds of favorability.[2]

This moderating tendency may be due to an institutionalized sense for compromise. The legal expert must weigh traditional means against such ideals as racial equality, in arriving at legal justification for policy. This kind of ambiguity is well expressed in the responses of a legal leader who was questioned concerning discussions among colleagues.

---

[2]The gross categories used in Tables 3 and 7, pp. 86 and 92, give the impression of greater spread than actually exists for legal leaders' perspectives. Thus, counting as extreme ratings those that fall between 1.0 and 1.3, and between 4.7 and 5.0, there is only one extreme rating for the legal elite on religious perspectives, while there are two for the medical elite, four for the economic elite, eight for the governmental elite, ten for the academic elite, and thirteen for the Mormon church elite. The pattern for political-legal perspectives is similar.

I guess we talk about the constitution and the Civil Rights Act. There is some division. We feel the Supreme Court would uphold the act, although we are not all agreed.

Asked what issues he considers most important he replied,

The main issue is the refusal of whites to recognize the Negroes as an equal. The question is, can or should law force that kind of association on people? Legally can you segregate facilities? Legally, no. But, how far should they go? Some of us feel they went too far. Congress agreed they should force integration. I think we have to do something—but legally I'm not sure. I do think the Supreme Court will uphold the Civil Rights Act, as I think they should . . . . I can understand the Southern view and the view of others. But the interests of minorities transcend that. Private property must give way.

It may be that the role of the legal elite, requiring the use of expertise in adjusting means to ends, more than that of an interest group trying to achieve specific aims, contributes to their strategic position, as technicians of the Utah society.

Hypothesis 3 deals with the ranking of elites on racial perspectives. The most striking contrast, as indicated in Tables 13 and 14, pages 100 and 101, is between the Mormon church elite and the academic and non-Mormon church elites. As indicated earlier, this often seems to involve a polarization of views in which leaders see other groups as negative reference groups. Thus, one academic leader, asked how the problem of inequality should be met, replied,

There is a difference between erasing the race problem on the basis of discrimination and that of erasing feelings of vital differences on the basis of race. The priesthood is taught to be the greatest gift of God, and the Negroes can't hold it. This is damaging to both Negro and white.

The negative reference to Mormon church policy is also expressed by non-Mormon church leaders. One leader described an incident in which a Negro moved into

. . . an L.D.S. neighborhood. He was flooded by reaction from
the neighborhood. Our people are getting together . . . to welcome
the Negroes.

Asked his view of the civil equality statement by an L.D.S.

authority, discussed earlier, he replied,

Why don't they put . . . [action] where their words are, then.
These are high sounding phrases, but if they back them up with defi-
nite action, I'll believe what they say.

The contrast between these views and those of Mormon church leaders

(predicted in hypothesis 3) may be highlighted with the following views

expressed by a Mormon church leader. Asked if he favored public accommoda-

tions legislation, he replied,

A man has a right to limit his clientele . . . . A public rest-
aurant ought to receive patronage of everyone, but I don't think
there ought to be a law. If the Constitution grants it, there
shouldn't be a law.

Asked regarding housing legislation, he replied,

I don't know, but I think it's distasteful to most white people
to have Negroes live among them. It's better that they live within
their own group.

This individual responded in similar vein regarding church policy.

Negroes have their agency, except when it comes to marriage. They
can go into business if they want to, or do what they want to. But
whites should marry whites and Negroes should marry Negroes . . . .
Anybody is entitled to any blessing the church can give, and the fact
that the Negro can't have the priesthood is nothing new.

The reference to antagonistic groups in these views is not explicit,

and seems to be less specific for Mormon church leaders in general than

for those who oppose them, the academic leaders and non-Mormon church

leaders. Instead, their views seem to have their institutional anchor in

church tradition and policy, although some negative reference to civil

rights leaders and professors does occur.

But Mormon church leaders' perspectives also differ from those of governmental leaders, as predicted in hypothesis 4 and verified in Table 17 of Chapter V, page 104. This contrast is especially important because these two groups are the decision-making elites. While the religious institution tends to be sacred, inviolable, and to a large extent fixed, secular government is a kind of institutionalized flexibility. The following views expressed by a governmental decision maker contrast with those of the Mormon church decision maker quoted above. Asked to state the issues he considered most important in race relations, the governmental decision maker replied,

> I believe you can't legislate trade or employment. You've got to have compulsory education so that people can find their level.

Yet this leader gave qualified support to the federal Civil Rights Act.

> It's basically sound. I don't like the part that says just because you're colored you're entitled to employment. Qualification and training are necessary. The law missed on that. The quota system in the federal act is unfair. Besides that you can't legislate morals.[3]

It may be difficult to judge whether this represents flexibility or sheer equivocation, but the availability of a wider range of response seems apparent for this governmental decision maker.

Hypotheses 5 and 6 predict a positive relationship between perspective similarity and lines of communication. The failure of these hypotheses in Chapter V, and the lack of any significant relationship at all between racial perspectives and degree of perceived accessibility,

---

[3]There is no quota system provision in the federal Civil Rights Act of 1964.

suggested another possibility. Perhaps lines of communication between leaders are a function of common participation in various kinds of groups, governing boards, or organizations.

Inspection of interview data does seem to support this point of view. It is true that accessibility was sometimes discussed by leaders in terms of personal friendship. But, when the bases of such friendships were discussed, they usually did not allude to common racial perspectives, or value similarity of any kind. More often, accessibility seems to have been discussed in terms of common activities, as suggested above. Quotes from members of each of the seven elites are presented.

A medical influential commented,

They're quite accessible. I see . . . [a state official] and members of the legislature quite often. Usually this is in connection with health or the . . . [a board of directors]. Race doesn't come up.

A legal influential stated,

But, I have had conversations with legislators. I represent . . . [a prominent individual], head of the . . . [a business firm]. He's a . . . man of much influence in Utah and real understanding on civil rights. I know personally most of the legislators in . . . [a Utah county]. I meet them socially about once a month. Civil rights rarely comes up, although other things do.

An economic influential said,

A number of my friends are in the First Presidency and Apostles. I could have their ear. We've cooperated on many things. We cooperate on various programs to improve the community. But I don't know about influence.

Asked regarding his accessibility to governmental decision makers, an academic influential stated,

I'd say pretty accessible, because I'm politically involved. I don't know how they like what I say.

Concerning accessibility to Mormon church decision makers, a governmental influential commented,

> They'll listen to me. I'm . . . [a Mormon stake official].
> I've been in two . . . [Mormon ward offices].

A non-Mormon church influential commented, concerning accessibility to Mormon church decision makers,

> I've had conferences with . . . [a Mormon official]. Any time
> I want a conference with one of them all I have to do is call
> . . . [a prominent businessman]. As . . . [the businessman's posi-
> tion] he had weekly meetings with church authorities. He's probably
> the most politically influential person in Salt Lake.

Mormon church officials generally hesitated to discuss their accessibility to governmental decision makers, although several said they rarely had contact with them. As one individual put it,

> No, they're political; I'm a church servant.

Another individual described several attempts to influence national congressmen, but did not comment on relations with state legislators. In justifying his activity, he concluded,

> You can't stop a man from talking to his friends. We have our
> friends.

Several of these responses on the subject of accessibility betray a degree of ambiguity. Individuals seem to have difficulty deciding whether even close associates are "accessible." The reason may be related to the fact that relationships between individuals have content as well as structure; perfectly good accessibility may exist precisely because the content of the relationship is limited to areas of agreement and non-controversy. This constriction of permissible communication, even in relatively close relationships, may help explain the failure of

hypotheses 5 and 6. Thus, accessibility of a sort may persist between persons with divergent views simply because areas of disagreement are kept out of the relationship.

But, there is another condition, the "differentiation" of the institutions in which leaders play their roles, that may also influence perceived accessibility. The view expressed in hypothesis 7, and supported in Tables 28 and 29 of Chapter V, both on page 117, concerns the greater overall accessibility to governmental decision makers than to Mormon church decision makers. Some representative interview statements are presented to illustrate this tendency.

A non-Mormon church influential, asked about his accessibility to governmental leaders, stated,

> I know some of them. They're most courteous and kind—willing to listen. But, there's a roadblock, no matter how you pile up facts and impressions. No matter how much information on discrimination you pile on their desk, there is no discrimination. Many are Mormons first and citizens second.

Asked about his accessibility to Mormon church leaders, he said,

> None at all. I have met . . . [a church leader], and have been in large committees where . . . [a church leader] was, but no personal friends.

A medical influential commented,

> They're quite accessible. I see . . . [a state official] and members of the legislature quite often. Usually this is in connection with health or the . . . [a board of directors]. Race doesn't come up.

In relation to Mormon church decision makers it not only doesn't come up, but,

It is not a debatable issue. This is a closed issue. I have close relationships with . . . [a church leader] and . . . [a church leader] but this is not discussed.

A governmental influential described the central dilemma when asked about accessibility to Mormon church decision makers.

I know most of them on a first name basis. But it's not my position to influence them in any way. I only do this in politics.

An academic influential stated,

I used to write every day to the legislature. They thought this was pressure. I engage in activities of the Democratic party. I used to be a member of . . . [a certain committee]. But, now I'm content just to function within the university.

Asked about his accessibility to Mormon church decision makers, he replied,

They're utterly indifferent to me.

If these statements by influentials suggest greater freedom of communication with governmental decision makers, one implication is that governmental leaders respond to a wider range of opinion, as their institutional roles require them to do. This further implies a greater tendency toward liberalization in political-legal norms, even if there is no disproportionate tendency for liberal influentials to find governmental decision makers accessible, since controversy itself probably has a liberalizing effect.

In addition, it may be that liberals are more likely to use their influence relative to governmental decision makers. Since interview statements suggest that relationships are maintained between individuals with opposing perspectives by the avoidance of disagreeable issues, it seems likely that the accessibility of liberals to church decision makers

leads to less communication on the racial issue than does their accessibility to governmental decision makers.

Finally, the tendency of governmental decision makers to express perspectives more favorable to normative liberalization supports this view of greater flexibility of Utah political-legal racial norms than of Mormon church racial norms.

CHAPTER VII

FURTHER CONSIDERATIONS

The survey phase of this study was conducted in July and August, 1964. Interviews were addressed to the prediction that Utah political-legal racial norms would prove more liable to liberalization than Mormon church racial norms.

The analysis of interview data, both quantitative and qualitative, has generally upheld this prediction. From the standpoint of those elites likely to be involved in such events, liberalization of political-legal racial norms would seem more likely.

Since the research began, Utah racial norms have already begun to change. The change has been unexpectedly rapid, and the type and direction of change tend to fulfill the main prediction of this study.

In November, 1964, a predominantly Democratic legislature and the first Democratic governor in twenty years were elected. Several civil rights bills were introduced in early 1965, at the request of the new governor, and two bills were passed by almost unanimous votes.

Senate Bill 44, a public accommodations measure, was passed in the Senate with twenty-five for, zero against, and two absent. It was passed in the house with sixty-two for, three against, and four absent, and was signed by the Governor on February 18, 1965.

House Bill 62, an employment bill, was passed in the House with sixty-four for, zero against, and five absent, and in the Senate with

twenty-one for, two against, and four absent. It was signed by the Governor on March 18, 1965.

Because these two bills, of all those introduced, paralleled the federal Civil Rights Act of 1964, and because they were passed so soon after the federal Act, some caution in the estimation of Utah civil rights sentiments seems appropriate.[1] In one sense, the bills clearly support "states rights" policy, by protecting Utah from federal enforcement. In his first State of the State message, Governor Rampton recognized this possibility. Requesting civil rights bills in housing, public accommodations, and employment, he continued,

"Their passage is recommended, not merely because Utah too long has been reluctant to join hands with the rest of the nation and not merely because Utah is faced with enforcement under the federal Civil Rights Act; but quite simply, because the government of this state owes a solemn, abiding moral obligation to effectively guarantee these rights to all its citizens."[2]

The persistence of considerable conservatism is suggested by the form in which these bills were passed. Attached to both bills were

----

[1]Provisions of these bills correspond in the most important ways with those of Titles II and VII of the federal Act. The accommodations bill enjoins non-discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, ancestry, or national origin in businesses or places of public accommodation. Excluded are establishments containing five or fewer rooms for rent which are also occupied by the proprietor, and private establishments in general. The employment bill requires equitable practices in employment and training selection, regardless of race, color, sex, religion, ancestry, or national origin, by employers, employment agencies, unions, vocational schools, or apprenticeship committees. Excluded are organizations employing fewer than 25 and those types of employment in which religion, sex, or national origin is a bona fide occupational qualification.

[2]Iesert News [Salt Lake City, Utah], January 12, 1965.

amendments specifically restricting their authority to non-church organizations.[3]

Reaction to these amendments was interesting. Before the employment bill was signed by Governor Rampton, Attorney General Phil Hansen wrote as his opinion,

> "It is apparent that the exemption of corporations which are 'wholly owned' by religious institutions and not by other corporations that may engage in the same type of practice, which are not so owned, is unconstitutional."[4]

A response concerning the accommodations bill came from the Utah Council of Churches, of which the Mormon church is not a member.

> "The Utah Council of Churches executive committee does not desire, request, or expect to make use of the exclusion of churches provisions of the Public Accommodation Act.

> "We in the Utah Council do not feel that taking advantage of the exclusion privilege is in keeping with the standards of Christian conduct. Churches should lead rather than be exempted from practicing Christian brotherhood, ..."[5]

---

[3]Amendment of the public accommodations bill consisted in the identification of churches as private organizations and therefore exempt from non-discriminatory provisions, and the addition of a line maintaining the right of a religious organization ". . . to regulate the operations and procedures of its establishments." If the significance of these additions is mainly symbolic, amendment of the employment bill is probably more substantive. Specifically exempt from non-discriminatory provisions is ". . . any corporation or association constituting a wholly-owned subsidiary or agency of any religious organization or association or religious corporation sole . . . ." Utah Legislature, Senate, Senate Journal of the State of Utah, 36th Legislature, 1965 (Salt Lake City: Lorraine Press, 1965), 18th Day; Utah Legislature, House, H. B. No. 62, "Utah Anti-Discrimination Act of 1965," (Engrossed Copy), p. 3.

[4]Deseret News [Salt Lake City, Utah], March 17, 1965.

[5]Salt Lake [Utah] Tribune, March 21, 1965.

The most dramatic reaction occurred when the Ogden and Salt Lake branches of the N.A.A.C.P. organized three days of demonstration and prayer in front of the L.D.S. church offices, under the leadership of Johnie Driver, president of the Salt Lake branch. According to the Salt Lake Tribune,

> Mr. Driver said he was informed Saturday that the First Presidency will remain silent on the question.

> At the prayer meeting N.A.A.C.P. members will discuss "amendments that are being used to cripple the civil rights bills before the Legislature," Mr. Driver said.

> President Tanner confirmed that the church had refused to make a public statement on civil rights but declined further comment.[6]

After three days at the church headquarters, N.A.A.C.P. demonstrators marched to the Utah State Capitol, where their leader made a special appeal in behalf of a third civil rights measure, House Bill 63. Permitted to address the House, Mr. Driver delivered the following thoughts:

> This legislature has, with great foresight and courage, passed into law two measures of great importance to us—the public accommodations act and the fair employment opportunities act . . . .

> Now we ask that you give consideration to one more important matter—the Fair Housing Law . . . .

> . . . .

> Our people do not ask for special privileges. They do not ask for special treatment. We want no favors. All that we ask is that we be given the same opportunity to raise our families in homes of our own choosing, according to our ability to pay . . . just as you do now . . . .

> The story of the Mormon pioneers should be engraved in every Utah citizen's heart with the pledge that never again would this part of

---

[6]Salt Lake [Utah] Tribune, March 7, 1965.

the nation, at least, deprive another human of the full rights and liberties guaranteed by our Constitution.[7]

The legislative session came to a close on the day this address was delivered. House Bill 63 never came to a vote.

The other civil rights bill introduced in the 1965 session was Senate Bill 43, which was to create a Utah Citizens Council on Civil Rights. Like the housing bill, this measure had no counterpart in the federal Civil Rights Act, and like the housing bill, it did not succeed. It was passed in the Senate with eighteen for, six against, and three absent. But in the House it was defeated with thirty-four for, thirty-two against, and three absent. (A majority of the total membership is required for passage.)

The response of the Governor to this failure illustrates the power of the executive arm to influence racial norms. The Governor created essentially the same organization by executive order, and titled it the Utah Executive Commission on Civil Rights.

This organization was empowered to act as a conciliation board in civil rights disputes and to carry out studies on civil rights practices. The Governor immediately requested two studies, of discrimination in real estate transactions and in the employment of women. The Commission began by electing as chairman Adam M. Duncan, veteran champion of civil rights and former chairman of the Utah State Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

---

[7]Utah Legislature, House, House Journal of the State of Utah, 36th Legislature, 1965 (Salt Lake City: Lorraine Press, 1965), 60th Day.

The effect of such an organization upon racial policy is probably less direct, but not necessarily less important. It provides the channels through which norms are made real to individuals in the community, and individual complaints are communicated for further normative adjustment.

Another important organization, the Anti-Discrimination Division of the Utah Industrial Commission, was a product of HouseBill 62, the employment bill discussed above. Chosen to head this group was Phyl Poulson, who had guided much of the legislative struggle for civil rights. The Anti-Discrimination Division operates as a sub-committee empowered to enforce the fair employment practices bill by investigating, holding hearings, making decisions, and enjoining compliance, subject to review of the district courts. The division also functions to communicate, conciliate, persuade, and recommend policy.

Demands for "fair housing" legislation still continue, as do counter pressures against "forced housing." It may be that civil rights groups in Utah will independently gain enough power to achieve state legislation in this area. Judging from past events, however, it seems more likely that federal policy will come first, with state laws following only when necessary to defend against federal enforcement.

It seems significant that the very existence of national forces which impinge directly upon Utah political-legal norms constitutes an important difference between these norms and Mormon church norms. If political-legal norms are more flexible than religious norms, and yet even they fail to yield until it seems expedient, an early change in

Mormon church racial norms seems especially unlikely. Due to the traditional separation of church and state, there is no larger society to which the church must respond.

Nevertheless, interested parties continue their attempts to move the church to change. In July of 1965, an unusual resolution was passed unanimously by delegates to the annual convention of the N.A.A.C.P., meeting in Denver, for consideration by the national board.

> The resolution concerning the Mormons was proposed by N.A.A.C.P. branches at Salt Lake City and Ogden, Utah . . . . The branches charged that the Church has a doctrine of "non-white inferiority" and urged the convention call on South American, Asian and African nations to bar Mormon missionaries.

> The resolution asked the nations "to refuse to grant visas to missionaries and representatives of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. . . . until such time as the doctrine of non-white inferiority is changed and rescinded by that church and a positive policy of support for civil rights is taken . . . .[8]

Whether the powerful national board will accept this resolution in its present form or revise it to diminish the religious aspect, or merely postpone action of this sort indefinitely, is not known. Its fate is uncertain partly because some N.A.A.C.P. leaders are reluctant to take a position which might seem to be more religious than secular, and partly because of the legal complexities involved in relations between private parties and foreign governments.

Even if the opposition of civil rights groups is postponed or limited to minor agitation, the mere possibility of a direct confrontation continues to disturb the Utah community. Especially when semi-annual

---

[8]_Desert News_ [Salt Lake City, Utah], July 2, 1965.

conferences are held on Temple Square, collective fantasy generates some alarming possibilities. This may be related to the symbolic significance of the temple itself, as the most sacred edifice of the church, but the fact that tens of thousands of Mormons attend these conferences is also of consequence. In addition, as mentioned in Chapter II, the 1963 "civil equality" statement by a Mormon authority came when the N.A.A.C.P. threatened to picket Temple Square.

In September, 1965, hysterical rumors swept the Utah community, concerning the imminence of demonstrations and riots. An editorial in the University of Utah's Daily Utah Chronicle included the following comments:

> A surprising number of supposedly intelligent residents of Salt Lake City have been taken in by rumors that a Watts-like riot will take place in Salt Lake City this weekend when the Mormon Church gathers for its general conference.

> How these rumors began is a matter of speculation. Officials of the Utah National Guard claim that their apparent riot control maneuvers started the stories. For the casual observer, an equally realistic conclusion is that the rumors caused the National Guard to begin the riot control practice.

. . . .

> According to different versions, 17 bombs are missing from Hill Air Force base, dynamite has been procured, hotels and motels are booked for the weekend, all plane flights from Los Angeles to Salt Lake are chartered by "Watts Negroes," a Negro man bought 40 rifles from a downtown sporting goods store, and 3500 "transient Negroes" have already arrived in Salt Lake.

. . . .

> In a statement issued late Monday night the N.A.A.C.P. said, "We deplore the malicious and totally irresponsible rumors circulating

in many sections of the state to the effect that Negroes are planning a riot at the L.D.C. [L.D.S.] conference."[9]

There were no racial riots, demonstrations, or pickets at the conference. The significant event was the rumor itself.

The spread of such rumor in Utah suggests there is a growing community awareness that the fixed policy of the Mormon church is an object of concern to racial minorities. Although Utah racial norms have proved flexible to the extent that civil rights bills have been passed and an executive commission has been appointed, rigidity is apparent in the amendments to the bills, the failure to pass housing legislation, and the fixity of Mormon church Negro policy. The contrast between this rigidity and demands of the liberals continues to introduce strains that may fuel other incidents of dramatic proportions.

If the evidence so far suggests that definitions of the situation or "strains" that are basically conservative will persist in major Utah institutions for some time, it may be important to look beyond the mere existence of conservative strains to their complex subjective ramifications. In other words, the very intensity and vitality of such strains between "what is" and "what ought to be" may be better understood by a study of another aspect of the definition of the situation—"why it ought to be." In this regard, the symbolic legitimation of conservative racial perspectives is often achieved by an interpretation of Mormon doctrine.

Mormon theology defines mortality as one stage, but not the first

---

[9]The *Daily* [Salt Lake City] *Utah Chronicle*, September 28, 1965.

one, in the eternal progression of man. Man may progress eternally from stage to stage until he becomes a god, with worlds of his own. This is possible, however, only by adherence to natural laws, which God helps man to understand.

According to an "individualistic" interpretation of this doctrine of eternal progression, each person is born into that mortal condition which he individually deserves, based upon his past obedience to God's laws. Each individual Negro must have been less obedient than non-Negroes in the pre-mortal spirit world, and this is why he deserves to be born a Negro and denied the priesthood.[10] On the other hand, each non-Negro, especially if privileged with birth into a good L.D.S. home, must have been particularly obedient in the spirit world, which explains his worthiness to be born into such a fortunate environment.[11]

---

[10]Individualism might not seem to apply here, in that all Negroes are categorically ostracized—good behavior cannot change their situation. But the idea of a fixed penalty, based on past errors, is not incongruous with the Western concept of individualism. Mormons believe that if individual Negroes behave well in mortality, they will be rewarded —they may receive the priesthood in the next life.

[11]Other aspects of Mormon doctrine further complicate this "definition of the situation." Outside of the doctrinal twist used to explain the Negro's plight, there is an affirmative view of human nature, human relations, and of mortal existence. This particular stance, in combination with certain organizational characteristics of the church, encourages Mormons to believe they should personalize all relationships, even with the "unworthy."

But for individuals with no way to break out of the "unworthy" category, such personalizing has unexpected consequences. According to a prominent civil rights spokesman, "The Mormon almost always treats the non-white with genuine kindness and sympathy, but seldom fully accepts him. There must be, and almost always is, a feeling of condescension ....

It has been my conclusion after the past six years of careful

Obviously, these concepts of individual "worthiness" and "deserving" serve not only to explain existing church policy, but also to justify and defend it. They have been used in just this way in numerous publications by general authorities and other church writers.

Another implication has to do with intermarriage. To be married for time and eternity in a Mormon temple is a highly-regarded privilege in the Mormon community, and one which individuals must deserve. If the priesthood is available only to worthy Mormons, temple marriage requires even greater worthiness. Negroes are completely restricted. To merely think about marriage with a Negro is to imagine the loss of status in general plus defilement and the loss of ultimate worthiness in the eyes of God, for oneself and all of ones descendants. Thus, the dread of intermarriage, already strong in the American culture, is intensified in Mormon society. This seems especially important because leading social scientists have considered the fear of intermarriage a common denominator of the "Negro problem" in America.[12]

---

observation that the Negro is more conscious of being a second-class citizen here, in Utah, than anywhere outside of the South; that he feels no sense of belonging to this community; that he feels few ties to this community." Adam M. Duncan, "Civil Rights in Utah: A Concept of Race And An Attitude" (paper delivered to the Utah Academy of Sciences, Arts and Letters at Utah State University, Logan, Utah, November 9, 1963).

[12]According to Myrdal's classical work, the white man's theory of color caste emphasizes that "the concern for 'race purity' is basic in the whole issue; the primary and essential command is to prevent amalgamation; the whites are determined to utilize every means to this end . . . . Rejection of 'social equality' is to be understood as a precaution to hinder mescegenation and particularly intermarriage." Myrdal also refers to certain meanings in the puritan ethic that are ingredients in the fear of intermarriage. "It is inherent in our type of modern Western

To what extent, then, is intermarriage a subject of dread in Mormon culture, and how may this affect and be affected by Mormon church Negro policy? Some important indicators may be found in statements on this subject volunteered by Mormon church decision makers. The following comments should be considered representative, because interview questionnaires contained no questions specifically dealing with the subject. These statements represent instead the degree to which some of the more concerned individuals are apprehensive concerning intermarriage.

Asked what issues he considered important in the matter of race relations, one Mormon church leader answered, "The most serious issue is intermarriage, which should be discouraged for all people."

Another Mormon church leader, asked if he thought church Negro policy would affect race relations in civil life, remarked,

> It will have little effect on employment or public accommodations. But, it will affect relationships such as courting. No faithful Latter-day Saint wants his children to lose the priesthood. Would you want your children to lost the priesthood?

Commenting upon the history of God's dealings with the races, another leader said,

> When He placed the mark on Cain, He engaged in segregation. When He told Enoch not to preach the gospel to the descendants of Cain, who were black, the Lord engaged in segregation. When He cursed the descendants of Cain as to the priesthood, He engaged in segregation. When He forbade intermarriage as He does in Deuteronomy 7th chapter,

---

civilization that sex and social status are for most individuals the danger points, the directions whence he fears the sinister onslaughts on his personal security. These two factors are more likely than anything else to push a life problem deep down into the subconscious and load it with emotions." Gunnar Myrdal, An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy (New York: Harper and Row, 1962), pp. 58-59.

He established segregation . . . . We must not intermarry with the
Negro. Why? If I were to marry a Negro woman and have children by
her, my children would all be cursed as to the priesthood.

Asked how the challenge of inequality could be met, another leader

answered,

We've got to be patient and tolerant and learn to understand each
other a little better. And, it will take time. What can a Negro
definitely want that I can't give him? He may want to go into the
temple. He'll tell us we're discriminating, and I suppose we are,
aren't we? Any red blooded American doesn't want his children to
marry Negroes. They are outstanding people, many of them, and can
do most anything the whites can.

Asked what issues he considered important in the matter of race

relations, another leader commented,

The result will consist in a great deal of mixture of blood, I
fear, which I doubt will be of very much value. Many whites taking
part will go to the extreme. Racial mixture is the most serious of
the dangers.

Another leader, asked to what extent church policy affected race

relations in civil life, answered, "I think it involves intermarriage,

and we've got to fight that to the bitter end. The civil rights leaders

want to have intermarriage."

Another leader, asked about the L.D.S. Negro policy, commented,

It's a doctrine we can easily defend. In Ezra 10 . . . [The
Israelites] took strange wives. They were denied the privileges of
priesthood and the temple. [Afterwards] they confessed to God and
they put away their wives.

Asked how the challenge of racial inequality should be met, this

same leader answered,

We teach our people not to intermarry—whites with others. The
islanders of the Pacific descend from whites, but I wouldn't advo-
cate intermarriage—or with the Mexicans. Their children are rest-
ricted by society. I don't know if this will help to solve the

racial problem. But, intermarriage is bad, as it says in the Book of Ezra. I don't know what Utah law says on this, but, I think they restrict intermarriage, as they should.[13]

The tendency of these decision makers to see intermarriage prohibition and restriction of Negroes from priesthood as mutually reinforcing values seems apparent in their comments. This tendency further supports the theory that Mormon church racial policy is fixed, and casts additional light upon the difficulty of passing civil rights laws in Utah.

At least one authority on Mormon culture and history has supported this view that the fear of miscegenation is a meaning which serves to maintain the Negro policy. Sterling McMurrin is quoted as stating, "'Within 30 years you'll see a Negro in the temple (something a white man can't do now unless he's a member in good standing). The problem isn't theological, it's intermarriage.'"[14]

The theological explanation which McMurrin rejects in favor of the "intermarriage" explanation is apparently the orthodox belief that only a direct revelation from God to the President of the church can change the policy. Based on the doctrine of continued revelation, this belief implies that the church is open to change, and that present policy continues only because it is God's will.

In an unusually candid statement on the Negro policy, President McKay recently suggested that change is not imminent. Appropriately, this

---

[13]As indicated in Chapter II, Utah legislation repealing anti-miscegenation laws had been enacted in 1963.

[14]Chicago [Illinois] Sun Times, April 5, 1965.

interview took place during dedication ceremonies of the new Oakland
temple in November, 1964.

> McKay, in an opening press conference yesterday, said he did not
> feel the Mormon church's ban against Negroes in its priesthood would
> be lifted "within your lifetime or mine."
>
> He said the ban was traceable to the church's basic writings,
> but that Negroes could join the church as readily as anyone else.
>
> "They just cannot become members of the priesthood," he said.[15]

This news item did not appear in either Salt Lake newspaper,
which suggests that it was not considered by the church to be official.
Nevertheless, there seems to be no question of its validity, since it
has not been challenged.[16] Whether it is considered an expression of
personal preference or merely an estimate of probability, this state-
ment by the church President does not suggest that liberalization is
impending.

The office of church Prophet and President has been invested with
final institutional authority, of course. This means that no predic-
tion of future trends should ignore the question of who holds this
office, and who will hold it in the future. When the church President
dies, he is traditionally succeeded by the senior member of the Council
of the Twelve Apostles. This order of succession makes it unlikely that
a liberal will be President during the present generation. Again, the
reasonable inference is that Mormon church policy is fixed.

---

[15]Oakland [California] Tribune, November 17, 1964.

[16]Personal Interview with Bill Rose, Religious Editor of the
Oakland [California] Tribune, February 28, 1966.

If existing conditions suggest great resistance to the liberaliza-
tion of Mormon church Negro policy, under what conditions would such an
adjustment be more likely?

Major adjustments have occurred several times in Mormon history,
in response to severe crises. When Mormonism was a new and peculiar
religion on the frontier, persecutions often arose. On three separate
occasions, mass exodus was necessary for survival. In each instance,
the organizing genius of its leaders, plus divine revelations, provided
the innovation necessary for a vigorous new Mormon community.[17]

Another crisis, the showdown over polygamy, also tested the
adaptability of the new church. Federal legislation outlawing polygamy
had been passed in 1862 and 1882. The 1882 law was declared constitu-
tional in 1885, but the church did not yield. Further legislation
providing for the disenfranchisement of the church and confiscation of
its property was passed in 1887, but the disavowal of polygamy came only
in 1890, four months after this final legislation was declared constitu-
tional. The surrender came in the form of the "Manifesto," a brief
statement of policy change which Mormon tradition considers divinely
inspired.

The Negro question resembles the polygamy crisis in several ways.
According to Arrington, polygamy

> . . . lacked the force of economic logic and would probably have
> died out except for its function as a symbol of Mormon heterodoxy
> in religious and social affairs generally. As this symbol, it prov-
> ided a focus for uniting the diverse groups opposed to the spread of

---

[17]Thomas F. O'Dea, The Mormons (Chicago: The University of
Chicago Press, 1964), p. 115.

Mormonism, and was thus the inevitable standard around which the
Mormons themselves were forced to rally in defending their faith.[18]

This view that polygamy "would probably have died out," were it not
for opposition, may or may not be valid. But, the fact that polygamy did
become a rallying standard probably holds a lesson for the Negro question.
The civil rights movement has encouraged an awareness of Mormon racial
policy that leads many people to identify the church mainly in terms of
this policy. Under these conditions, it could assume central importance
in defending the church, as did polygamy in early Utah history.

Another significant fact is that in the polygamy showdown, the
federal government itself opposed the church. Persecution imagery had
previously been established by repeated confrontation with local govern-
ments and mob violence in Missouri and Illinois. But with polygamy, the
imagery was transformed, so that the federal government came to be seen
as persecutor.

Anxiety concerning the federal government exists today in relation
to the Negro problem, since pressures for change seem to emanate from the
civil rights movement, which is identified with the extension of federal
power. The economic conservatism of the church, which may itself have
been encouraged by the polygamy showdown, further reinforces this fear
of federal government in relation to the racial question.

A third point of similarity is that both the polygamy crisis and
the Negro question assumed importance during the Utah period, after the

---

[18]Leonard J. Arrington, Great Basin Kingdom (Cambridge: Harvard
University Press, 1958), p. 239.

doctrine of continued revelation had become routinized as a legitimizing dogma, and its usefulness as an instrument of innovation had been curtailed.[19]

These parallels suggest that an early change in racial policy would require a crisis of much greater magnitude than is imminent. Especially significant is the possibility that policy may become an "inevitable standard around which the Mormons rally in defending their faith," thus generating a further increase in the resistance to change.

On the other hand, if Mormon leaders can avoid institutionalization of defensiveness, despite pressures, or even employ them in the softening of dogma, there may be gradual movement to conditions under which policy change can be announced.[20] In either instance, the best estimate is probably the one expressed by President McKay—that a change will not come in the present generation.

---

[19]This transformation of the Mormon church, exemplified in the contrast between the "Manifesto" and Joseph Smith's revelations of the pre-Utah period, corresponds to the "routinization of charisma" in Max Weber's writings. Weber believed this process to be inevitable for successful charismatic movements, including prophetic religions—necessary to the attainment of a permanent community. Max Weber, Social and Economic Organization (New York: The Free Press, 1947), pp. 363-366.

[20]This alternative has proven difficult in the past. The doctrine of continued revelation encourages a belief that general authorities must have immediate access to answers on major church questions, and discourages a relativistic or wait-and-see approach to church policy. Thus, when an article by Wallace Turner in the New York Times quoted President Hugh B. Brown as saying that "'We are in the midst of a survey looking toward the possibility of admitting Negroes,'" there was immediate reaction. It was explained by church authorities, in public and private media, that President Brown had been misquoted. The Times

If, however, Mormon church policy is liberalized in the distant
future, and there is further liberalization of political-legal policy,
what role are Utah elites likely to play? Although the difficulty of
prediction in this regard is increased, the further into the future such
prediction must reach, there are some tendencies in the data that cannot
be ignored.

Of special interest is the finding that the legal elite, consist-
ing of eleven individuals, includes all four of those leaders who belong
to more than one elite. Another indication of strategic influence is
the legal elite's median perceived accessibility of 1.4 in relation to
governmental decision makers and 2.7 in relation to Mormon church deci-
sion makers. This means that the legal elite ranks first on each index,
as revealed in Chapter V, tables 24 and 25, pages 111 and 112.

One reason that legal influentials could be important in influenc-
ing eventual liberalization is that in addition to having such position,

---

correspondent was disappointed by this reaction, however, as he wrote in
a letter to Jerald Tanner.

"'The quotes that appeared in the story were precisely the words
spoken by Mr. Brown. He said them in the presence of one of the public
information specialists retained by the church.

"'He had been asked to comment on the reports that the church was
contemplating a change in its doctrine that would permit Negroes to full
participating membership.

"'I was serious. I assumed Mr. Brown was. There was no contrary
indication.'"

The claim of misrepresentation seems to be generally accepted by
orthodox Mormons. The article, dated June 7, 1963, and the letter, dated
July 9, 1963, are quoted from Jerald Tanner, "What is Going On?" (Salt
Lake City: Modern Microfilm Co., [n.d.], Mimeographed sheet).

they express relatively liberal racial perspectives, with a median of 1.6 on political-legal norms and 2.8 on Mormon church norms. These figures compare to population medians of 3.6 and 3.7 respectively (Tables 13 and 14, pages 100 and 101, and footnotes 2 and 4, pages 86 and 90). The possibility of still greater racial liberalism in the future seems implied in that civil rights has become legal orthodoxy since these perspectives were sampled.

There is further evidence of the importance of the larger legal profession which the legal elite represents. A number of other leaders in this study are attorneys, by training at least. Thus, in addition to the two leaders who are members of both the legal and governmental elites, four other governmental leaders are attorneys, making six of the fourteen. And, besides the two leaders who are members of both the legal and academic elites, two other academic leaders are attorneys, making four of the fifteen. Also, four members of the Mormon church elite are trained in law. And, although none of the economic leaders are attorneys, the strong dependence of business upon legal expertise probably gives the legal profession considerable economic influence.

Although some elites are more liberal, and some have considerable accessibility, the combination with regard to the legal leaders would seem to give them unique significance. Whether this will actually lead to their prominence in initiating change is not certain, of course, because there are many unknowns.

The considerable power of the Mormon church elite cannot be ignored. In addition to the church's direct involvement in the community,

there is the fact that many leaders in other institutions hold positions of importance in the Mormon church, and therefore owe some allegiance to the Mormon church and its leaders. The significance of the church's power, however, is in its interest in maintaining present normative arrangements.

Similar conclusions could be drawn regarding the economic institution. Besides the leaders formally belonging to this elite, a number of others have business roles. Several leaders in the governmental elite are businessmen who serve the government only when the legislature is in session. Also, those physicians and attorneys, members of the professional elite, who have private practices, obviously are operating businesses. Finally, the economic role of the Mormon church itself cannot be ignored. A majority of the Mormon church leaders have had business backgrounds, and virtually all are business leaders now. In addition to the considerable business properties which they manage for the church, leaders accept appointment to boards of directors of non-church businesses.

Thus, business activities constitute an important frame of reference in Utah. The sociological proposition that perspectives are strongly influenced by day-to-day activities suggests that conservatism is encouraged for these other leaders as well as for members of the economic elite. It seems reasonable to assume that the economic institution has considerable power but is disqualified as an initiator of racial normative liberalization.

Members of the governmental elite perform the unique function of resolving conflicting perspectives into concrete policy. But, as representatives of the whims of Utahns, they enjoy relatively short tenure. In fact, the most radical change in the Utah elite structure in recent years came with the 1964 replacement of Republicans by Democrats in important governmental positions.

The governmental elite thus represents one of the major unknowns in the prediction of racial normative change. It can only be speculated that liberalizing forces in the Utah culture are not yet powerful enough to maintain, for long, a governmental elite committed to normative liberalization.

This discussion of the possible participation of elites in normative liberalization must be considered tentative. Prediction of social change always involves uncertainty, especially when prediction reaches into the distant future. The attempt to predict "how" changes will occur, or "who" will have the most influence upon decision makers, must be particularly difficult. The discussion is offered because the data, especially with regard to the legal elite, is suggestive.

Trends appearing in this research seem to suggest many other important questions. For example, if more liberalization does occur, either because federal action makes it expedient, or for other reasons, what will be its significance? What is the significance, in terms of civil equality, of legislation passed so far?

Although this study has focused upon formal norms, an important

and critical consideration is the effect of these norms upon individuals in the community. Will the laws enacted, and any yet to come, encourage individuals to hold secular and sacred perspectives which are incongruent? Will orthodox Mormons thus come to accept a restrictive church policy _and_ civil rights?

On the other hand, will the basic need for consistency be more determinate, causing religious definitions of the Negro's unworthiness to curtail the effectiveness of civil rights? Or if the need for consistency leads individuals in the other direction, will more and more Latter-day Saints come to question their church's Negro policy? If so, what will this mean in light of the intense rigidity of the church policy? What kinds of redefinition are likely to occur, in attempts to defend the policy?

If, finally, the Mormon church Negro policy is eventually liberalized, what effect will this have upon civil equality? What significance will it have for the church as a whole? To what extent will it encourage institutionalization of other kinds of liberal values? These and many other practical questions are suggested by the findings in this study. Important as they are, however, they are beyond the scope of the present research.

This chapter has considered events occurring since the interviews, and the extent to which these events have conformed to the expectations that generated the study. With regard to secular racial norms, change has been more rapid than expected, due partially to the succession of liberals

to governmental positions, and partially to the impact of federal civil rights legislation. By way of contrast, religious policy has maintained its expected rigidity. The lack of fluidity in the Mormon church elite, the lack of contingency of other institutions, and the sacredness of religious policy have contributed to this fixity.

Some subjective aspects of the Utah culture have been discussed, to case more light upon the stability of racial norms. The tendency to define Negroes as unworthy and the tendency to fear intermarriage have been emphasized, as subjective aspects of the sacredness of existing conditions.

The resistance to normative change has further been illustrated by reference to crises faced by the Mormon church in the past; certain similarities to the polygamy crisis have been outlined.

Finally, some characteristics of elites have been considered, with respect to their strategic significance for eventual normative liberalization. In relation to this, the possible instrumentality of the legal elite has been discussed.

CHAPTER VIII

SUMMARY

The purpose of this research has been to investigate Utah's unique racial norms, in terms of their origin, their present status, and their probable future. As events in the modern world have brought greater awareness of the disprivilege often associated with non-Caucasian status, the Utah situation has become significant for two reasons: (1) Before 1964, the year this study began, Utah was the only "Northern" state without civil rights legislation. (2) The Mormon church, which prevails in Utah, does not accord religious equality to Negroes.

Since the understanding of these conditions requires a knowledge of their origin, some historical data were presented and discussed. Special attention was given to the race concept in Mormon scripture and a compromise prompted by racial conditions in Missouri. The view was expressed that norms institutionalized in Utah were made possible by these earlier events.

Abolitionism was ridiculed in early Utah, and some slavery was practiced. The church policy restricting Negroes from the priesthood was apparently established in early Utah history. After slavery was abolished, race did not again become a major issue until the civil rights movement following World War II.

It was theorized, when this study began in early 1964, that religious and secular racial restrictions were mutually supportive, but that

a liberalization of secular norms (creation of civil rights laws) would be more likely than liberalization of religious norms (elimination of the Mormon church policy restricting Negroes).

Since norms are controlled from positions of institutionalized power, members of the institutional elites were identified. These included decision makers (members of the Utah governmental elite and the Mormon church elite), and influentials (members of the non-Mormon church elite, the academic elite, the economic elite, the medical elite, and the legal elite). Altogether, eighty-two members were identified. Sixty-six were interviewed, and their responses were rated numerically by experts, for statistical treatment.

It was found, as predicted, that the two kinds of perspectives, favorability toward civil rights and favorability toward liberalizing church policy, were positively related. Likewise, the prediction that governmental decision makers would express more liberal perspectives than Mormon church decision makers was upheld. Also supported by statistics was the prediction that influential leaders would perceive governmental decision makers as more accessible than Mormon church decision makers. However, the view that liberals would perceive proportionately greater accessibility to governmental decision makers was not supported by the data.

Representative quotations from interviews were presented anonymously, to illustrate the tendencies that had occurred, and to help explain the statistical findings. Interview data seemed to suggest that

liberals were likely to have disproportionate influence upon governmental decision makers, even if, as statistics indicated, their perceived accessibility to governmental decision makers was not disproportionate.

Further considerations included a discussion of the bills actually passing in the 1964 legislature; their occurrence, though more rapid than expected, tended toward the fulfillment of predictions.

Finally, the likelihood of further normative change was discussed. Prominent in this discussion were (1) certain aspects of racial awareness in the Utah culture, including the fear of intermarriage, (2) parallels between the polygamy crisis of early Mormon church history and conditions surrounding the church's Negro policy today, and (3) the tendency for the doctrine of continued revelation to function for policy defense, rather than policy innovation.

It was concluded that restrictive church policy was likely to persist for many years, but that more civil rights legislation might occur, especially if federal pressure made it seem expedient.

Some possibilities regarding the role of Utah elites in eventual liberalization were also discussed.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS AND BOOKLETS

American Jewish Committee. The People Take the Lead, A Record of
    Progress in Civil Rights, 1954 to 1964. New York: American
    Jewish Committee, 1964.

Arrington, Leonard J. Great Basin Kingdom. Cambridge: Harvard
    University Press, 1958.

Bennion, Lowell L. The Religion of the Latter-day Saints. Salt Lake
    City: L.D.S. Department of Education, 1947.

Berrett, William E. "The Church and the Negroid People," Supplement
    in John J. Stewart. Mormonism and the Negro. Orem, Utah:
    Bookmark, A Division of Community Press Publishing Company,
    1963.

Bredemeier, Harry C., and Richard M. Stephenson. The Analysis of
    Social Systems. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.,
    1964.

Brodie, Fawn M. No Man Knows My History: The Life of Joseph Smith,
    The Mormon Prophet. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1960.

Dahl, Robert A. Who Governs? New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961.

Gabel, Norman E. A Racial Study of the Fijians. University of
    California Anthropological Records, Vol. 20, No. 1. Berkeley
    and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1958.

Gouldner, Alvin W. "Cosmopolitans and Locals," Organizations: Structure
    and Behavior, Joseph Litterer, editor. New York: John Wiley &
    Sons, Inc., 1963.

Gouldner, Alvin W., and Helen P. Gouldner. Modern Sociology: An
    Introduction to the Study of Human Interaction. New York:
    Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1963.

Harrington, Michael. The Other America—Poverty in the United States.
    New York: The Macmillan Company, 1963.

Hartman, Paul. Civil Rights and Minorities. New York: Anti-Defamation
    League of B'nai B'rith, 1962; with 1964 addendum.

Hays, William L. Statistics For Psychologists. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1963.

Heywood, Yates. The Negro Question Resolved. Salt Lake City: Paragon Press, Inc., 1964.

Homans, George C. The Human Group. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Company, 1950.

Hunter, Floyd. Community Power Structure: A Study of Decision Makers. New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1963.

Jennings, M. Kent. Community Influentials: The Elites of Atlanta. London: The Free Press of Glencoe, Collier-Macmillan Limited, 1964.

Jenson, Andrew. Latter-day Saint Biographical Encyclopedia, III, 577. Salt Lake City: A. Jenson History Company, 1920.

Martindale, Don. Social Life and Cultural Change. Princeton: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1962.

McMurrin, Sterling M. The Philosophical Foundations of Mormon Theology. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1962.

Mills, C. Wright. The Power Elite. New York: Oxford University Press, 1956.

Moore, Wilbert E. Social Change. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963.

Mott, Paul E. The Organization of Society. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965.

Myrdal, Gunnar. An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy. New York: Harper and Row, 1962.

Neff, Andrew L. History of Utah, 1847-1869. Edited by Leland Hargrave Creer. Salt Lake City: Deseret News Press, 1940.

Newquist, Jerreld L. Prophets, Principles, and National Survival. Salt Lake City: Publishers Press, 1964.

O'Dea, Thomas F. The Mormons. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Oliver, David H. A Negro on Mormonism. Salt Lake City: D. H. Oliver, 1963.

Presthus, Robert. Men at the Top: A Study in Community Power. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.

Richardson, Arthur M. That Ye May Not Be Deceived. Salt Lake City: [n.n.],[n.d.].

Roberts, Brigham Henry. The Seventy's Course in Theology. Salt Lake City: Deseret News Press, 1907.

Siegel, Sidney. Non-Parametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1956.

Smelser, Neil J. Theory of Collective Behavior. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1963.

Smith, Elmer R. The Status of the Negro in Utah. Salt Lake City: National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Salt Lake Branch, 1956.

Smith, Joseph. History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, ed. B. H. Roberts. 6 vols. Salt Lake City: Deseret News, 1949.

Smith, Joseph. The Book of Mormon. Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1950.

Smith, Joseph. The Doctrine and Covenants of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. With some Additions by his Successors in the Presidency of the Church. Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1950.

Smith, Joseph. The Pearl of Great Price. Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1949.

Smith, Joseph Fielding. Answers to Gospel Questions. Vol. II. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Company, 1958.

Smith, Joseph Fielding. "The Seed of Cain," Chapter 15 of The Way to Perfection. Salt Lake City: The Genealogical Society of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1956, 98-102.

Stewart, John J. Mormonism and the Negro. Orem, Utah: Bookmark, A Division of Community Press Publishing Company, 1963.

Tanner, Jerald. The Negro in Mormon Theology. Salt Lake City: Modern Microfilm Company, [n.d.].

Tanner, Jerald, and Sandra Tanner. Joseph Smith's Curse Upon the Negro. Salt Lake City: Modern Microfilm Co., 1965.

Utah Legislature, House. House Journal of the State of Utah, 26th-36th Legislatures, 1945-65. Salt Lake City: Lorraine Press, 1945-65.

Utah Legislature, Senate. Senate Journal of the State of Utah, 26th-36th Legislatures, 1945-65. Salt Lake City: Lorraine Press, 1945-65.

Whalen, William J. The Latter-day Saints in the Modern Day World. New York: The John Day Company, 1964.

Young, Brigham. Sermon of April 19, 1866, Journal of Discourses. Vol. XI of 26 vols. (Liverpool: 1854-1886), 266-272.

Young, Brigham. Sermon of October 9, 1859, Journal of Discourses. Vol. VII of 26 vols. (Liverpool: 1854-1886), 282-291.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1963, 84th Edition. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1963.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1965, 86th Edition. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1965.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. United States Census of Population: 1960. General Population Characteristics, Utah. Final Report PC(1)-46B. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1961.

Weber, Max. Social and Economic Organization. New York: The Free Press, 1947.

PERIODICALS

Abu-Laban, Baha. "The Reputational Approach In the Study of Community Power: A Critical Evaluation," Pacific Sociological Review, VIII, (Spring, 1965), 35-42.

Bennett, Wallace R. "The Negro in Utah," Utah Law Review, III (Spring, 1953), 340-348.

Carter, Kate B. (comp.). "The Negro Pioneer," Our Pioneer Heritage. Salt Lake City: Daughters of Utah Pioneers, 1965. 497-580.

Clelland, Donald A. and William H. Form. "Economic Dominants and Community Power: A Comparative Analysis," The American Journal of Sociology, LXVIX (March, 1964), 511-521.

D'Antonio, William V., Howard J. Ehrlich, and Eugene C. Erickson. "Further Notes on the Study of Community Power," American Sociological Review, XXVII (December, 1962), 848-854.

Danzger, M. Herbert. "Community Power Structure: Problems and Continuities," American Sociological Review, XXIX (October, 1964), 707-717.

Davidson, Glen W. "Mormon Missionaries and the Race Question," The Christian Century, LXXXII (September 29, 1965), 1183-1186.

Ehrlich, Howard J. "The Reputational Approach to the Study of Community Power," American Sociological Review, XXVI (December, 1961), 926-927.

Erickson, Eugene C. and William V. D'Antonio. "The Reputational Technique as a Measure of Community Power: An Evaluation Based on Comparative and Longitudinal Studies," American Sociological Review, XXVII (June, 1962), 362-376.

Form, William H. and William V. D'Antonio. "Integration and Cleavage Among Community Influentials in Two Border Cities," American Sociological Review, XXIV (December, 1959), 804-814.

Foster, Donald L. "Unique Gospel in Utah," The Christian Century, LXXXII (July 14, 1965), 890-892.

Freegood, Seymour. "Mormonism: Rich, Vital, and Unique," Fortune Magazine, LXVIX (April, 1964), 136-139, 166-168, 171-172.

Freeman, Linton C., et al. "Locating Leaders in Local Communities," American Sociological Review, XXVIII (October, 1963), 791-798.

Herson, Lawrence, J. R. "In the Footsteps of Community Power," American Political Science Review, LV (December, 1961), 817-830.

Kirkpatrick, L. H. "The Negro and the L.D.S. Church," Pen Magazine, (Winter, 1954), 12-13, 29.

"Mormons," Time, LXXXII (October 18, 1963), 83.

"Mormons," Time, LXXXV (June 18, 1965), 56.

"Mormons Bar Priesthood to Negroes," The Christian Century, LXXXI
(December 2, 1964), 1485.

Nelson, Lowry. "Mormons and the Negro," The Nation, CLXXIV (May 24, 1952),
488.

Nye, Jeff. "Memo from a Mormon," Look, XXVII (October 22, 1963), 74-78.

Polsby, Nelson W. "Community Power: Some Reflections on the Recent
Literature," American Sociological Review, XXVII (December, 1962),
838-841.

Polsby, Nelson W. "The Sociology of Community Power: A Reassessment,"
Social Forces, XXXVII (March, 1959), 232-236.

Polsby, Nelson W. "Three Problems in the Analysis of Community Power,"
American Sociological Review, XXIV (December, 1959), 796-803.

Shipps, Jan. "Second Class Saints," Colorado Quarterly, X (Autumn,
1962), 183-190.

"The Mormon Issue," Time, LXXIX (March 2, 1962), 21.

Wolfinger, Raymond E. "A Plea for a Decent Burial," American Sociological
Review, XXVII (December, 1962), 841-847.

NEWSPAPERS

Chicago Sun-Times, April 5, 1965.

Church News sections of the Deseret News [Salt Lake City, Utah], October
12, 1963.

Deseret News [Salt Lake City, Utah], October, 1963-July, 1965.

Deseret News and Telegram [Salt Lake City, Utah], January 11, 1963.

New York Times, December, 1965.

Nigerian Outlook, [Enugu, Nigeria], March 5, 1963.

Oakland Tribune, November 17, 1964.

Salt Lake [Utah] Tribune, March, 1965.

The Daily [Salt Lake City] Utah Chronicle, September 28, 1965.

UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

Bennett, Wallace R., et al. "Symposium on the Negro in Utah." Four
    papers read at the Fall Meetings of the Utah Academy of Sciences,
    Arts, and Letters, held at Weber College, Ogden, Utah, November
    20, 1954.

Chapman, James E. "The Mormon Attitude and Practice Concerning the Negro
    in Relation to Church Membership and Priesthood." Salt Lake City:
    [n.n.], [n.d.].

Christensen, James Boyd. "A Social Survey of the Negro Population of
    Salt Lake City, Utah." Unpublished Master's thesis, The
    University of Utah, Salt Lake City, 1948.

Correspondence between Lowry Nelson and the First Presidency. June 26,
    1947 to November 12, 1947.

Documentary Organizational Data Provided by Utah Citizens Organization
    for Civil Rights, January, 1966.

Duncan, Adam M. "Civil Rights in Utah: A Concept of Race and an Atti-
    tude." Paper delivered to the Utah Academy of Sciences, Arts
    and Letters at Utah State University, Logan, Utah, November 9,
    1963.

Mathias, O. Boyd. "The Mormon Church and It's Negro Doctrine." Term
    paper for Graduate Social Science Seminar, University of Kansas
    City, Missouri, 1958.

Mauss, Armand L. "Mormonism and Race Attitudes." Paper read at the
    1965 meetings of the Pacific Sociological Association, Salt
    Lake City, Utah, April 22, 1965.

Meyer, George A. "A Critique of 'Mormonism and the Negro.'" Logan,
    Utah: [n.n.], [n.d.].

Personal Correspondence of the Author, letter from Albert B. Fritz,
    Former President, Salt Lake Branch of the N.A.A.C.P., May 21,
    1966.

Personal Correspondence of the Author, letter from James H. Gillespie,
    President, Ogden Branch of the N.A.A.C.P., January, 1966.

Personal Correspondence of the Author, letter from the Office of President
    Joseph Fielding Smith, February 21, 1966.

Tanner, Jerald. "What is Going On?" Salt Lake City: Modern Microfilm
        Co., [n.d.], (Mimeographed sheet.)

Utah Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights.
        1961 Report. Salt Lake City: 1961.

APPENDIX

RATING SHEET*

Instructions: Rate the subjects below on a scale ranging from

1	2	3	4	5	or	6
High				Low		Can't
						Judge

using the following items:

Item 1: Degree to which informant favors civil rights legislation in
Utah.
Item 2: Degree to which informant favors a change in the L.D.S. Church's
policy with regard to the Negro and the priesthood.
Item 3: Degree of accessibility to Political (Legislative) decision
making elite.
Item 4: Degree of accessibility to Religious (L.D.S.) decision making
elite.

Name	Item 1	Item 2	Item 3	Item 4

*The original rating sheet had 3½ pages. The names of all 82
leaders were listed alphabetically in the "Name" column.

INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE

We are doing some research on the subject of race relations in
Utah, trying to discover what results the civil rights movement is likely
to have. Since this is a controversial subject it may be difficult to
talk about it candidly. Of course it is important to the project that I
know what your honest views are on this subject. You may be sure that
everything pertaining to this interview will be confidential.

1. First of all, what do you think will result from the Negro civil
   rights movement in the U.S.?

   _____

   _____

2. What do you think will result from the Negro civil rights movement in
   Utah?

   _____

   _____

3. How often do discussions of problems concerning racial relations
   come up in your:

	a. Work	b. Friendship Groups	c. Club Groups	d. Religious Groups	e. Family Groups	f. Other ( )
Just about Everyday	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Once or twice a week	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Less than once a week, at least once a month	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Less than once a month	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Not relevant	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

4. What issues are usually brought up in such discussions, and how are they resolved? (Use appropriate letter for each type of response.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

5. How often is religion involved in such discussions?

	a. Work	b. Friendship Groups	c. Club Groups	d. Religious Groups	e. Family Groups	f. Other ( )
Always or usually	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Sometimes	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Rarely or never	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

6. How is the religious issue resolved? (Use appropriate letter for each type.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

7. What are the main issues that you personally see in this matter of race relations, and how do you resolve them?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

8. Do you favor laws guaranteeing that Negroes can

	Work Wherever they are Qualified?	Eat at the better Restaurants?	Register at the better Hotels & Motels?	Buy or Rent in the better Neighborhoods?
Yes	( )	( )	( )	( )
No	( )	( )	( )	( )
Uncertain	( )	( )	( )	( )

9. Why? (Use appropriate letter for each type.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

10. Do you favor the new federal Civil Rights Act?

_____

_____

11. Do you favor a civil rights bill for Utah?

_____

_____

_____

_____

12. Have you taken part in activities to express your views on civil
rights? What about speeches, lectures, teaching, writing letters,
writing books, writing articles, conversations with influential
persons, participation in demonstrations, etc.

_____

_____

_____

_____

13. Where can you make yourself heard on the subject of racial relations?

_____

_____

14. How accessible to you are those who make political decisions regard-
ing racial policy in Utah?

_____

_____

_____

15. Recently an L.D.S. Church authority made the statement: "We call
upon all men everywhere, both within and outside the Church, to
commit themselves to the establishment of full civil equality for
all of God's children. Anything less than this defeats our high
ideal of the brotherhood of man." What was your reaction to that
statement? (What is your reaction?)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

16. To what extent will such a statement by a church authority affect race relations in civil life?

    _____Very Much
    _____Moderately
    _____Little
    _____Not at all

17. As you see it, what is the position of the L.D.S. Church with regard to the Negro? (What about the Priesthood?)

18. To what extent does church policy with regard to the Negro affect race relations in civil life? (Why?)

    _____Very much
    _____Moderately
    _____Little
    _____Not at all

19. To what extent will the civil rights movement affect L.D.S. Church policy? (In what way?)

20. Under what conditions do you feel that Negroes should be allowed full fellowship in the L.D.S. Church?

21. Have you taken part in activities for the purpose of expressing your views on this question? What about speeches, lectures, teaching, writing letters, writing books, writing articles, personal conversations with influential persons, participation in demonstrations, etc.

_____

_____

_____

_____

22. Where can you make yourself heard on this subject?

_____

_____

23. How accessible to you are those who make decisions for the Church?

_____

_____

_____

24. Non-Caucasians are a majority in today's world. These people are demanding more material security, higher status, and greater life opportunities. In some instances this is taking the form of revolutions and civil wars. In your opinion, how should the challenge of racial inequality be met?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____