

Good Citizenship vs. Global Citizenship: The Life and Works of John William  
Corrington by Richard J. Bishirjian, Ph.D.<sup>1</sup>

Eric Voegelin once observed that the “the fish putrefies from the head.” From that I deduce that the disorder in the American body politic we experience today may be traced to the disorder of our intellectual classes.

In the late 1960s and early 1970s, those classes revolted against their government’s war in Vietnam and brought that war home to the streets and campuses of America. I’m certain that in some ways the Vietnam war was a pretext and that ultimately some other event would have triggered a revolt by our intellectual classes. All the same, Presidents, Deans and Provosts of America’s colleges and universities capitulated to the demands of rioting students, many egged on by their professors, and the traditional curriculum of required courses was abandoned throughout academe.

Our colleges and our country suffer from that to this very day. For even though at that point in time the Core Curriculum had not been thought through in many years, and many institutions may have been retaining it without giving it much thought, the Core served an important educational function. And, as a result of its abandonment, contemporary college students no longer are required to study the history of Western civilization, American history and government and the classics of English literature.

Even before the 1960s and 1970s, we can go back as far as the Great Depression when classical liberalism and market economics were wiped out by progressivism and socialism. As a result Economics in most colleges has not been taught from the

---

<sup>1</sup> Richard J. Bishirjian is Professor of Government at Yorktown University.

perspective of markets and the choices of individual actors reacting to price signals for three quarters of a century.

The consequences are a college educated American citizenry that does not understand what creates wealth and has no working knowledge of the principles of Economics.

American presidents from Franklin Roosevelt, Harry Truman, John Kennedy, Lyndon Johnson, Richard Nixon and forward abdicated the first responsibility of statesmen which Aristotle taught is to engender “a certain character in the citizens and to make them good and disposed to perform noble actions.”<sup>2</sup>

Most recently, President George W. Bush, an immanentist apocalyptic president in foreign policy—to use Eric Voegelin’s term—promoted a regime of pseudo scientific testing for learning outcomes called “No Child Left Behind,” not the teaching of good citizenship. Nobody has been paying attention to education as *paideia*, of character education, the pursuit of truth, and love of country gained from familiarity with its history.

Indeed, students today, beginning in elementary school, are taught to bear the burdens of global citizenship, to be good stewards of a global environment, manifest politically correct ideals at home and bring democracy to the world. So when your ten year old returns home from school you can expect him to begin to agitate for the values of global citizenship, not the good citizenship of an American citizen.

On July 24, 2008 in Berlin, Germany, President Barack Obama, then a presidential candidate, revealed that he was a product of this deracinated American education

---

<sup>2</sup> Nichomachean Ethics, 1099b30.

system when he spoke of himself as a citizen of the United States and a proud citizen of the world.

The world is more intertwined than at any time in world history, he said, and the dangers we confront cannot be contained within one country. Carbon emissions are affecting the environment thus requiring global action. “The burdens of global citizenship continue to bind us together.” A not so new secular priesthood led by this President of the United States confuses the American nation and spreads the disorder of deracinated reason throughout the world.

A belief in the future, advancing democracy throughout the world, a New World Order, environmentalism, sustainability and global citizenship are all parts of a modern political religion that has obscured our understanding of good citizenship.

For that reason we are compelled to remember that the classical definition of disorder is to act without limits. Our existence is framed by the fundamental limitation of our mortality, the confines of life within historical communities, and we act with reference to ends, the greatest of which is experienced as transcendent, beyond the world of existing things and is divine (*to theion*).

The modern impulse to strive to break the bonds that define our lives in historical communities and to aspire to a limitless future bound only by the confines of an imaginary global citizenship is a source of disorder that in general afflicts modern Western culture and the United States in particular. Nietzsche best stated that rejection

of limits in his observation that the soul is not the depth in man, it is the future;<sup>3</sup> and his assertion that there is no ultimate end.<sup>4</sup>

John William Corrington instinctively rejected Nietzsche's transvaluation of values and lived an extraordinary life in which he mastered most of the instruments of Western intellectual culture to shape a political and legal philosophy, historical consciousness, works of literature, and poetry of great beauty, and an awareness of danger in the temptation for ersatz immortality that troubles modern life. That he made some money writing scripts for Roger Corman or Procter and Gamble did not diminish his art.<sup>5</sup>

Thirty-five years ago when I first encountered John William Corrington, it was difficult—as it is today—to find educated citizens, particularly in our churches, colleges and universities, who were not infected by some political religion or another. Those of us who were educated at Catholic universities found that Catholic religious orders that had founded and sustained a vast network of American Catholic colleges and universities were turning against classical philosophy and the Magisterium of the Church. Though they cloaked this turning away in terms they thought would make them acceptable to the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations, the smell of rotting fish was everywhere.

So it was my good fortune to have found a soul mate in Bill Corrington.

I naturally took to Corrington and the South that he represented because my growing up in a multi-ethnic community in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania was more European than

---

<sup>3</sup> Thus Spake Zarathustra in Walter Kaufman, *The Portable Nietzsche*, Viking, 1954, p. 405.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid*, *Twilight of the Idols*, p. 500.

<sup>5</sup> At Yorktown University I counsel younger scholars who have no prospects for attaining employment as tenured scholars at traditional institutions to seek employment teaching online. Do whatever is necessary to support your scholarly research. That is an example that Bill Corrington established for our community of traditional scholars.

American. That world was equivalent in experience to growing up in those regions of the American South where people have a sense of limits and of place.<sup>6</sup> .

Discussing my encounter with John William Corrington within the confines of this panel, therefore, is a large and complicated undertaking because it includes the influence of Eric Voegelin's early writings beginning with *Israel and Revelation*, Voegelin's writings on ancient and modern gnosticism, his later exploration of Renaissance hermeticism and his understanding of the use of magic in the philosophy of Hegel. And it includes the analytical and sometime pugilistic use of Voegelin's concept of gnosticism across a range of commentary from Irving Kristol,<sup>7</sup> Gerhart Niemeyer,<sup>8</sup> Bill Corrington, my own writings on this subject<sup>9</sup> not to mention Melvin E. Bradford's.<sup>10</sup>

What is more important, it reflects a complicated clash between literature and philosophy that challenged Corrington to maintain a balance between his literary career and his need to become a philosopher. Flannery O'Connor expressed this well when

---

<sup>6</sup> At a meeting of the Philadelphia Society where Andrew Lytle gave an excellent presentation on the Agrarians, I confronted Mr. Lytle with the observation that growing up in Pittsburgh where loyalties to neighborhood, church, family, the Pirates and Steelers were equivalent to growing up in Agrarian south. He did not agree.

<sup>7</sup> Irving Kristol, *Reflections of A Neo-Conservative*, Basic Books, 1986.

<sup>8</sup> Gerhart Niemeyer, "Loss of Reality: Gnosticism and Modern Nihilism," *Modern Age*, Fall 1978, Vol. 22, No. 4, pp. 338-335.

<sup>9</sup> "Hegel and Classical Philosophy," in *Modern Age* Vol. 35, No. 2 (Winter, 1992), pp. 126—134; "The Problem of Carlyle's Religion," in *The Good Man in Society: Active Contemplation* edited by Gueguen, Henry & Rhodes (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1989), pp. 75-90; "Civil Religion and American Foreign Policy" in *The Hillsdale Review* (spring, 1981), Vol. III, No. 1, pp. 3-11; "Wilson, Croly and the American Civil Religion," in *Modern Age* Vol. 23, No. 1 (Winter, 1979), pp. 33-38; "Modern Political Religions" in *The Development of Political Theory*, Dallas, 1978 (online at <http://dontquitu.com/theorybook/browse.htm>); "Carlyle's Political Religion," *The Journal of Politics* Vol. 38, No. 1 (February 1976), pp. 95-113; "Carlyle's Political Religion and 19<sup>th</sup> Century Gnosticism," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Notre Dame, 1971.

<sup>10</sup> *Dividing the House: The Gnosticism of Lincoln's Political Rhetoric*, *Modern Age*, Winter 1979, pp. 10-24.

she said, “The Southerner knows he can do more justice to reality by telling a story than he can by discussing problems or proposing abstractions.”<sup>11</sup>

After the Civil War, a defeated South lived in isolation from the nation at large for close to a hundred years. During that time (and since) the politics of the South was dominated by schemers, the corrupt, opportunists, poseurs and sociopaths. The elites that survived nourished their received traditions and supported a mythos of literature which became a substitute for political philosophy. The ante bellum South was dominated by Social Contract theories that explained that the nation was a confederation of States, that secession was permissible within the terms of a Social Contract, and which justified slavery and later segregation.

With no avenue for philosophy other than that of Locke (though German idealism had its influence, too), literature became the dominant expression of the deepest spiritual longings of southern intellectuals and from that came a parade of great writers, poets, novelists, and professors of literature culminating in the New Critics.

John William Corrington was a child of that literary culture. As such, he could never be a global citizen. And, as we see in his personal notebooks, his encounter with the philosophy of Eric Voegelin challenged his ability to continue as a novelist.

Corrington writes:

“The problem with knowledge and experience is that, sooner or later, you tend to take it seriously. When you do, it begins to chip away at the mythical structure out of which you create.”

---

<sup>11</sup> Quoted by Marion Montgomery in “Solzhenitsyn as Southerner, “ in Clyde N. Wilson and Andrew Lytle, *Why the South Will Survive by Fifteen Southerners*, University of Georgia Press, 1981, p. 177.

“I can’t write a novel from the kind of hypothesis that I could fifteen years ago. I can withhold my critical faculties, but I can’t shut off my insight—or lack of it—regarding the 20<sup>th</sup> century.”

Somehow, along the line what one picks up intellectually has to seep through and influence one’s most profound emotional life. Thank God I came across the work of Eric Voegelin. It has preserved my faith and my sense of a reality above and beyond the criminal idiocy of the late 20<sup>th</sup> century.”<sup>12</sup>

In this paper, I shall explore the reality of Corrington’s good citizenship as a celebration of our mortality and contrast that with the gnostic variant of global citizenship. And I will relate Montgomery’s examination of Alan Tate’s concept of “provincial” man to the concept of gnosticism implied in the early title of Corrington’s conference paper, “A Way You’ll Never Be.”

Global citizenship is nicely contrasted with the good citizenship embodied in Bill Corrington’s life and works in the same manner that Marion Montgomery’s essay “Solzhenitsyn as Southerner”<sup>13</sup> expands the regional identity of the South to include all humanity. They are all tied together by Thomas Landess’ important essay, “Origin of the Southern Ways,” which speaks of Southern culture as rooted in the Gospels and thus “is characterized by its ontological orthodoxy” which acknowledges the Incarnation as the pivotal event in history and imbues “the concrete particulars of time and place”

---

<sup>12</sup> Lloyd Halliburton, *The Man Who Slept with Women: John William Corrington’s Shad Sentell*, Legal Studies Forum, Vol. 27, p. 642.

<sup>13</sup> Marion Montgomery, “Solzhenitsyn as Southerner,” in Clyde N. Wilson and Andrew Lytle, ed. *Why the South Will Survive by Fifteen Southerners*, University of Georgia Press, 1981, pp. 170-199.

with their importance. Existence in time is “good,” Landess writes, “and hence sacred.”<sup>14</sup>

But let us look more closely at Montgomery’s essay on Solzhenitsyn because it explains the good citizenship of Bill Corrington and defines “global citizenship” as “provincial.”

In that essay, Montgomery reflects upon Alan Tates’ distinction between men who are regional and those who are provincial. “Regionalism is...limited in space but not in time,” he writes. “The provincial attitude is limited in time but not in space.”<sup>15</sup>

Montgomery observes that life “is enlarged by our participation in common humanity in the neighborhood of hills and valleys and streams.... The enemy to this view is that provincial spirit which would gather all men up into an aimless drift, a journey whose only end is the journeying.”<sup>16</sup>

Corrington writes in his personal notebook:

It has been said that I am an apologist for the South. The South does not, and has never, needed an apologist. ...

What my work really represents is the openness, the ambiguity, the vastness of the possibilities of human being in the mode of existence as it realizes itself in the South in my time.

Any work that deals with a certain place intensely is a celebration of that place.<sup>17</sup>

In 1975 Bill Corrington wrote an essay titled “Charles Reich and the Gnostic Vision.”<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> Ibid., Thomas Landess, “Origins of Southern Ways,” p. 166.

<sup>15</sup> Op.Cit., p. 179.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid, p. 180.

<sup>17</sup> Lloyd Halliburton, The Man Who Slept with Women: John William Corrington’s Shad Sentell, Legal Studies Forum, Vol. 27, p. 664

<sup>18</sup> New Orleans Review, Vol. 5, No.3 (1975).

The serial librarian at the College of New Rochelle where I had been teaching since 1972 brought Corrington's essay to my attention and that began a twelve year friendship that lasted until his death on Thanksgiving Day, Nov. 24, 1988.

I was reminded of my obligation to Bill Corrington by Allen Mendenhall, an attorney and graduate student at Auburn University, who contacted me on January 26 of this year to say that he is researching the life of Bill Corrington and is particularly interested in "Corrington's conservatism and the Corrington-Voegelin link." If readers of this essay are not familiar with the works of John William Corrington, they should read this student's essay titled, "John William Corrington: A Literary Conservative."

**<http://www.frontporchrepublic.com/2010/05/john-william-corrington-a-literary-conservative>**

In this paper I want to sketch the broad outlines of my subject by reference to my correspondence with Bill Corrington that began with a reply from Corrington on June 17, 1976 to a letter I sent him on June 15 of that year expressing interest in his essay on Charles Reich and a desire to "co-edit a work on modern gnosticism."

Two years later that correspondence led to a conference titled "Gnosticism and Modernity" conducted at Vanderbilt University on April 27-29, 1978 and, later, my commissioned Bill and Joyce Corrington's development of a script for a made for television film based on Russell Kirk's *Roots of American Order*.

All of us who participated in the Vanderbilt conference were deeply influenced by Eric Voegelin. I have written about that experience in an essay titled "The Education of a

Conservative Intellectual.”<sup>19</sup> From another region of the United States, Bill Corrington was ruminating among the bookshelves in the library at Tulane University where he was earning a law degree. In those shelves he found Volume I of Eric Voegelin’s Order and History, titled Israel and Revelation. When he returned home, he told his wife, “By God, he’s done it.”

What “it” was may not need explaining for intellectuals cast in Bill Corrington’s mold, but someday in some future time someone may come across this paper and wonder what in the hell “it” is.

The country into which Bill and I entered upon reaching maturity had long begun the journey away from the Western Christianitas. In the modern era, that can be traced to the spiritual injury done to Americans by our Civil War (and a series of wars into the 21<sup>st</sup> century) and the acceptance of Darwin’s theory of Evolution that turned the hearts and minds of post Civil War Americans toward science and against the Protestant Christianity that dominated American culture. Colleges that had been solidly Christian became secular in a generational “dying of the light” explained in James Burtchaell’s study of America’s religious colleges of the same title.<sup>20</sup>

And of course, that turning away has deep roots in the Enlightenment philosophy that imbued the American Founding and particularly the work of Thomas Jefferson. Reason and science, understood in the restricted sense those concepts have meaning in modern culture, outline the origins of the cultural, intellectual and “religious” disorder of our times.

---

<sup>19</sup> “The Education of a Conservative Intellectual,” *Modern Age* (Spring 1998), pp. 148-160.

<sup>20</sup> James T. Burtchaell, *The Dying of the Light*, Erdmans, 1998.

I place the word “religious” in quotation marks because religion as Wilfred Cantwell Smith observed is different from “faith.” The passion for religion reflects the perspective of an observer. Faith reflects the experience of transcendent divine reality. Bill Corrington in that context was faithful.<sup>21</sup>

I believe it was in that spirit that Bill and I “connected” immediately and tried to shape a philosophical work that would explore the spiritual disorder of our time.

We began to correspond about a possible volume titled “Gnosticism and Modernity” which led to an invitation on September 1, 1976 to Eric Voegelin. Voegelin responded on September 6:

...when I hit on this problem, that was 25 years ago. In the meanwhile, science in this matter has advanced. And today I would have to say that Gnosticism is one component in the historical structure of modernity but no more than one. Of equal important, it has turned out, are Apocalyptic, Neoplatonism, Hermeticism, Alchemy, and Magic.

Corrington commented on Voegelin’s explanation in a letter dated September 30, 1976:

If I were to define Gnosticism as widely as Voegelin does—including Hegel and Marx in it—it should be no problem to subsume these other symbolisms also. I would hope that new investigations & findings will not tend to create semantic battles in an area which has not yet made nearly enough penetration into political science as a theoretical tool to afford quibblers as to what is Gnosticism, what is hermeticism, & so on.

Voegelin followed upon on this observation in a letter dated October 21, 1976:

The literature on Magic, Neoplatonism, Apocalyptic, Kabbalah, Hermeticism, and Alchemy is growing prodigiously and can be read by anybody who cares to read it. All of these are components in the present intellectual disorder, just as is Gnosticism. On one special point, not treated sufficiently elsewhere, I have

---

<sup>21</sup> His dying words were, “It’s alright.”

dwelled in my Ecumenic Age, that is on the transformation of mythical and revelatory symbols into "doctrines."

On December 6, 1976 Corrington writes:

I've been out of things for two weeks in order to make up for my relative ignorance of Hermetic and Alchemical literature. I've gone through Mead's thrice Greatest Hermes, all of Jung on Alchemy, Scholem's Kaballah, Waite's Holy Kaballah, and have re-read some of Eliade's stuff, including the Two and the one, which leads back to the androgyny of Christ-Lapis, etc. In any case, I have a handle on the materials. I've ordered Yates' Bruno and am passing time with Boehm and Eckhart.

By December 20, 1976, Corrington and I had agreed that we would first hold a symposium on the theme "Gnosticism and Modernity." In a joint letter mailed to prospective participants, we wrote:

The term "Gnosticism" should be understood, we feel, in an extended rather than in a narrow sense. Generally, we take our inspiration from the work of Professor Eric Voegelin whose use of the concept in its generic sense includes those intellectual movements such as Hermeticism, Alchemy, Magic, Kabbalah, Rosicrucian's, Millennialism, and certain strands of Neoplatonism and Scientism. Obviously, we are concerned with patterns of "Second Reality," using Musil's phrase, which tend to contract consciousness of reality.

By August 15, 1977, Corrington was deep into the paper he would present and wrote:

I'm 100 pages into the rough draft of my paper. I think it will show the indisputable nexus between Gnosticism, magic, hermeticism, & alchemy.

An undated hand written letter accompanies the abstract of Corrington's paper titled, "Gnosticism and Modern Thought: A Way You'll Never Be."

The final version of the paper prepared for publication is titled "The Structure of Gnostic Consciousness" and consists of a *tour de force* in which Corrington reaches into his past as a novelist, calling up the "mythical structure" on which great literature depends. This made Corrington's paper quite unique and revealed a sympathy with myth that is very hard to find today.

At Yorktown University I teach a course in the History of Political Theory that begins with artifacts dated to about 40,000 BP and then examines myths of the ancient Near East. We then move to Homer's Iliad. I do this so that my students can fully appreciate what Voegelin calls the "break with the myth" first found in the remaining fragments of the Greek natural philosophers. Students today cannot comprehend the consciousness that dominated human order for tens of thousands of years, so effective has been that philosophic break with mythic consciousness by philosophy and the Gospels.

Somehow not only did Corrington fully comprehend the mythic mode that was challenged by philosophy, he saw in ancient Gnosis an intentional return to myth. That return to myth was driven by a desire to control reality, not express it, and in that way is very similar to the magical realism so common in contemporary literature.

Voegelin was impressed with Corrington's paper and told me that it was "the best paper" in a symposium that he said "was the best I have attended."

Corrington begins by recalling Voegelin's observation in the Ecumenic Age that "the noetic field of consciousness in which the philosophers debate about reality moves, was constituted by Anaximander through the ...dictum: "The origin for things is the Apeiron..."

Corrington immediately moves to a counter thesis:

"...The noetic field originally differentiated by Anaximander is not the only field within the process of consciousness. There is, in addition, the mythopoetic field..."

I would propose that the mythopoetic field, antecedent to the noetic, possesses a structure quite similar to it, and that the two fields are parallel in a number of ways."

Corrington's thesis states that parallel to Anaximander's symbol of the Apeiron is the Uroboros, "the cosmic serpent or dragon often represented with its tail touching its head or in its mouth, or tightly coiled in a circle."

He argues that the mythopoetic field of consciousness has other parallels such as an equivalent Metaxy and potential "loss of balance" visible in the Hero who "rejects the sirens' offer of a dreamlike passage back to the Pleroma 'below,' and the crystalline challenge to become 'son of the sun,' like a god.

The Gnostic personality, he writes, "is unable to maintain the balance in tension" of existence and to "seek release from the disorder and confusion it experiences."

"The result is a speculative return from the noetic field .. to the mythopoetic field."

Corrington could make that observation because he was a novelist shaped by nous who had come to understand the disorder of those creative minds who wove Gnostic myths.

Corrington's sensitivity to mythic imagination allows him to understand that some who cannot traverse the distance between myth and philosophy may choose to return to myth and the control that choice allows: "the dragon can be pacified, the serpent monster can be slain." When the "imbalanced psyche seeks to break free from the disorder of reality...the psyche attempts to slay the Uroboros definitively."

"Such people choose, in Professor Voegelin's phrase, to live in a certain untruth rather than in an uncertain truth," he writes. Corrington then quotes Heraclitus "who characterized the Gnostic personality long before it came into being as such:

To those who are awake, there is one

ordered universe held in common by all, whereas in sleep each man turns from this cosmos to one of his own.”

After this *tour d'horizon*, Corrington examines five common Gnostic symbols which make up the foundation of classical Gnostic speculation:

The first is a symbol of “escape” and represents the “Gnostic world-hatred.” The defective world is an absolute that is “couched in purely mythopoetic terms.” By that I think Corrington means it is an assertion, something grounded solely in will.

A second Gnostic symbol after the defective world is the hidden god, a First Man who “stands beyond the cosmos altogether, within the Uroborotic circle.

The third symbol is that of gnosis itself, “a unique insight not available to the...psychic man, but only to the pneumatic illuminati...”

A “fourth symbol is that of the Escape from the cosmos” and a fifth is the Pleroma. “The Pleromatic Garden, guarded by the Uroboros,” ... “is one, and that one is all.”

Corrington concludes: “these five symbols form the foundation of all classical Gnostic speculation, and that they show ‘escape’ or ‘exodus’ Gnostic thought to be a regression to an archaic mythopoetic mode of thinking in which Gnostic manipulative magic is possible..”

This “reversal constitutes fantasy-construction of the first order....”

Today's global citizenship is related to the gnostic's attempts to escape from a defective world and to return to Eden through knowledge of the future which, as Nietzsche told us, is the depth in man. In that context, we may understand why global citizenship is called "winning the future."<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> The White House, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/winning-the-future>

## **Appendix A.**

### **Bishirjian/Corrington Correspondence**

Corrington to Bishirjian, June 17, 1976

Bishirjian to Corrington, June 29, 1976

Corrington to Bishirjian, July 11, 1976

Bishirjian to Corrington, July 15, 1976

Photocopy of letter from Cleanth Brooks to Corrington, August 15, 1976

Corrington to Bishirjian, August 27, 1976

Eric Voegelin to Bishirjian, September 6, 1976

Handwritten letter Corrington to Bishirjian on legal paper September 20, 1976

Handwritten seven page letter Corrington to Bishirjian October 8, 1976

Eric Voegelin to Bishirjian, October 12, 1976

Handwritten five page letter Corrington to Bishirjian, October 19, 1976

Handwritten four page letter Corrington to Bishirjian, undated

Bishirjian to Corrington, December 2, 1976

Corrington to Bishirjian, December 6, 1976

Corrington to Bishirjian, December 17, 1976

Bishirjian to Corrington, December 20, 1976

Corrington to Bishirjian, January 11, 1977

Corrington to Bishirjian, January 28, 1977

Handwritten letter Corrington to Bishirjian, March 7, 1977

Corrington to Bishirjian March 13, 1977

Handwritten letter Corrington to Bishirjian March 17, 1977

Handwritten letter Corrington to Bishirjian, April 18 1977

Handwritten letter Corrington to Bishirjian, July 10, 1977

Handwritten letter Corrington to Bishirjian August 2, 1977

Handwritten letter Corrington to Bishirjian, August 15, 1977

Handwritten letter Corrington to Bishirjian, August 27, 1977

Handwritten letter Corrington to Bishirjian, September 1, 1977

Handwritten letter Corrington to Bishirjian, September 12 1977

Handwritten letter Corrington to Bishirjian conveying abstract of his paper, "Gnosticism and Modern Thought: A Way You'll Never Be." undated

Eric Voegelin to Bishirjian, July 20, 1977

Bishirjian to Voegelin, March 10, 1978

Undated letter to Bishirjian from Corrington

Undated Postscript from Corrington to Bishirjian