



Type: Magazine Article

An Open Question to Dr. Spalding

Author(s): Frederick J. Pack

Source: *Improvement Era*, Vol. 16, No. 7 (May 1913), pp. 702–704

Published by: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints

will have ere many years more. If our traditional sects, hitherto powerless in the premises, have nothing more to offer, let them keep decently silent. The time for evasions and wordy explanations is almost past. If they wish to silence Joseph Smith, or any other heretic, for that matter, let them do so by filling the world with the contagion of a vital and immense faith, and thus striking speechless all deceit and pretence, as well as all that is ineffective. Joseph Smith deserves credit for one thing, and this credit none can take away: he restored in modern times the ancient law, "By their fruits ye shall know them," and by this rule must he be judged, and the rest of us also.

But Smith seems to have made one mistake—at least, it seems somewhat like a mistake at present. He promulgated a theory of marriage that has given his willing enemies a wonderfully convenient leverage against him. They have wallowed in the joyous opportunity of charging him and his people with "impurity," a thing unheard of elsewhere, we may suspect, although some of our foremost scholars in scientific sociology—and at this time the all-sufficiency of scholarship seems to be a fundamental principle with "honest searchers after truth,"—are none too sure but what it was a real and vital message to the world. The assertion of the right of maternity for all honorable women seems very like the promise of divine benediction, in these days of bellicose termagants, who declare, without a blush of shame, that there is a "higher mission for the modern woman than maternity." However, this whole matter is a question proper to statesmen and scientists, not to sundry others of us.

The American people, under the lash of the clergy—and to these persons the world still seems to owe a living—are agitating an amendment to the United States Constitution forbidding polygamy forever. We are told that many state legislatures have already declared in favor of this innovation, and that it is certain to be carried. Well, so be it. Some years ago there was another widespread agitation, this time to place the name of God in this same Constitution, so that our lawmakers and our people would declare themselves directly responsible to the Almighty. Sundry promoters of this cause made themselves conspicuous in the public prints, and had their portraits printed in the magazines and newspapers, generally with poses and expressions denoting great determination and firm conviction of right. But the movement aborted, and we hear little or nothing of it nowadays. Is it possible that the American people, as expressed in their state legislatures, and in congress, actually would rather "smash Joe Smith" than glorify Almighty God? This is certainly a strange situation. Joseph Smith is evidently among the number of those "who have honors thrust upon them."

It might be an excellent and highly creditable performance in our Christian public, if we should hearken to a certain voice which speaks to us across the night of the ages, giving this wise and temperate advice: "Refrain from these men and let them alone; for if this counsel or this work be of men it will come to naught. But if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it, lest haply ye be found to fight against God."

· ROBERT C. WEBB, Ph. D.

An Open Question to Dr. Spalding

BY DR. FREDERICK J. PACK, DESERT PROFESSOR OF GEOLOGY, UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

My Dear Bishop Spalding:

I am forced to confess that the methods you have employed in your recent "inquiry" concerning the Book of Abraham have seriously shattered my faith in your fairness and love of truth. I give below one of the reasons for my loss of confidence in you. The matter is self-explanatory.

A short time ago I sent from my study the following letter:

January 16, 1913.

Dr. John Peters, University of Pennsylvania.

Dear Sir: I have read with great interest your communication to Dr. Spalding which he recently published

in a small pamphlet dealing with the claims of Joseph Smith, the "Mormon" prophet.

The last paragraph of your article closes thus: "The text of this chapter, as also the interpretation of the plates, displays an amusing ignorance. Chaldeans and Egyptians are hopelessly mixed together, although as dissimilar and remote in language, religion and locality as are today American and Chinese. In addition to which the writer knows nothing of either of them."

I confess that I do not know just what you mean by this statement. Perhaps you would be good enough to outline your meaning in greater detail for me.

Kindly permit me to thank you for your courtesy.

Very truly yours,
(Signed) F. J. PACK.

In course of time a reply came, but it was dated St. Michael's church, New York, and not University of Pennsylvania.

For an instant I was paralysed, not by the contents of the letter, but by the fact that it came from New York. Could it be possible that Dr. Peters is not connected with the University of Pennsylvania, but is a rector in one of New York's fashionable churches? No. I could not believe it. In your pamphlet "Joseph Smith, Jr., as a Translator," page 28, you had led the public to believe that Dr. Peters is at the University of Pennsylvania. I could not believe that you had misled the public. I argued to myself that your high standards of right and wrong would not permit you even to be careless in the matter.

In order to set myself right I sent out the following letter:

February 11, 1913.

Secretary, University of Pennsylvania,
Philadelphia, Pa.

Dear Sir—Will you be kind enough to inform me as to whether Dr. John P. Peters has an official connection with your institution. If he is not now connected with the university has he been so in the past? What position did he hold?

Signed, F. J. PACK.

And in time the response came:
University of Pennsylvania, Pa., Feb.
17, 1913.

My Dear Dr. Pack—The Rev. Dr. John P. Peters was at one time professor of Hebrew at the University of Pennsylvania, and was also connected with our department of archaeology. I think that his present address is 225 West Ninety-ninth street, New York City.

Very truly yours,
(Signed) EDWARD ROBINS,
Secretary.

Dr. Frederick J. Pack, University
of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah.

And again I was aparalyzed. No, Dr. Peters is not connected with the University of Pennsylvania, but is now a "Reverend" living at 225 west Ninety-ninth street, New York city. I confess, my dear Dr. Spalding, that I was slow to believe that you were trying to deceive us. I argued to myself that perhaps Dr. Peters had very recently severed his connection with the University of Pennsylvania.

But just at this point business carried me to New York. I had a leisure hour, so I took the elevated cars, got off near Ninety-ninth street and walked over to the west side. And there on the corner of Amsterdam avenue and Ninety-ninth street stood the magnificent St. Michael's church. I walked

around the corner to No. 225. Over the door of the rectory was the following inscription: "To the Service of God and the Memory of Thomas McClure Peters, Rector 1858-1893." I entered but the rector was not in. A pleasant youth answered my questions.

And again, my friend Spalding, my faith in you was sorely shaken. I was informed that St. Michael's church is a Protestant Episcopal church, the same organization in which you prize membership. I thanked the youth and walked slowly away. As I passed the great church building on the corner my eye caught the following inscription:

St. Michael's Church.

Reverend John P. Peters, Rector.
For the Services of the Clergy apply at Parish House, 225 West Ninety-ninth Street.

Below this followed features relative to times at which services are conducted and infants baptized.

Slowly a conviction was dawning upon me—could it be true? I must not yet decide. Further inquiry furnished evidence that Dr. Peters had been rector since 1893 (20 years) at which time he took his father's place.

After coming home I ventured another letter to the secretary of the University of Pennsylvania:

March 5, 1913.

Mr. Edward Robins, Secretary University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia:

Dear Sir—Permit me to thank you for your letter of the 17th ult. I wish that you would be good enough to give me the date of the last connection of Dr. John P. Peters with your institution; also the total length of time he was so connected. Further, what official connection did he have with your department of archaeology and when?

I shall be greatly obliged to you for the information above requested.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) F. J. PACK.

There still existed in my mind a lingering belief that perhaps Dr. Peters might have been rector in New York and professor in the University of Pennsylvania at the same time. But even this was to vanish.

The secretary's answer follows:
University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, March 10, 1913.

My Dear Dr. Pack:

Dr. John P. Peters was professor of Hebrew at the University of Pennsylvania (1886-1893). I find from the minutes that he was elected to this chair Oct. 5, 1886. I understand that Dr. Peters was director of the first and second expeditions to Babylonia, sent out under the auspices of the University of Pennsylvania, and if you want any further details as to these expedi-

tions let me suggest that you write to Miss Jane McHugh, assistant secretary of the department of archaeology.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) EDWARD ROBINS,
Secretary.

Dr. Frederick J. Pack,
University of Utah,
Salt Lake City, Utah.

Now, Dr. Spalding, this looks like plain deceit. Am I mistaken?

Why did you lead the public to believe that Dr. Peters is now at the University of Pennsylvania when you knew that he left there twenty years ago?

Why did you not say, "Formerly of the University of Pennsylvania?"

Why did you hide from the public the fact that Dr. Peters is a rector in your own church and has been for twenty years? Did you think that it would detract from the weight of his testimony?

And now a final question--the Latter-day Saints would like an answer: Do you belong to the same class of ministers who have previously "investigated" "Mormonism," except that you are using the tactics of deceit, or are you so careless in your methods of "inquiry" that you necessarily deceive the public?

Yours for an honest and complete investigation of the claims of "Mormonism,"

FREDERICK J. PACK.

Pfingsten

BY LILLIE E. SHIPP

There is an unusual stir today in the great city of Berlin. At dawn the people were awakened by band music, in neighboring parks, and now the streets and gardens are thronged with men, women and children in holiday attire, on their way to various pleasure resorts.

And what is the occasion for this display, at such an early hour? This is the last public holiday that will be celebrated, until the winter snows bring the Yuletide.

Pfingsten, or day of Pentecost, commemorates the bestowal of that great gift which came like the rushing of mighty winds and cloven tongues of fire in days of old! How little do these people dream that this same power exists today, among the children of men, and that they could be partakers if, as Peter said, they would "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." But alas, they banish those having authority to administer these ordinances, out of their midst, and will not hear their message; they know not what they do.

And we are blessed above all the world in possessing this divine gift, which will lead us into all truth, lead us to understand the mysteries of heaven, to grow in grace and wisdom, to breathe in the pure, fine atmosphere which surrounds our Father's throne, giving life to the spirit, strengthening our desires to do good, increasing our love for all his children, and filling our hearts with peace.

O grant that we who have received this gift, may give it room that it may grow in our hearts.—fed by pure thoughts and loving deeds, watered by earnest prayer. Let the sun of faith shine upon it. Let not the chilling blast of neglect or the poisonous weeds of sin, either delay its blossoming, or hinder its bringing forth the luscious fruits, and, most desirable above all others, the fruits of life eternal.