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Letters

The Journal of Mormon History welcomes comments on articles and book reviews, queries about Mormon history topics, additional information on subjects covered in the Journal, and ideas that will help us make future issues more interesting, stimulating, and valuable to readers. We will consider letters that are one or two typewritten, double-spaced pages; occasionally, a longer letter may be important enough to print as an exception to this policy. Because of limited space, we must reserve the right to select letters to be published and to edit them. Send letters to the Letters Editor, Journal of Mormon History, Box 581068, Salt Lake City, UT 84158-1068.

Hail to the Inaugural Semi Issue!

I would like to give a valentine to Mormon intellectuals who have made my past grouching largely irrelevant.

Way back in the 1964 summer issue of BYU Studies, the 1966 summer issue of Dialogue, during the 1983 Sunstone Symposium, and in the 1985 spring issue of Dialogue, I pontificated on the role and imperative of the Mormon intellectual.

Today most of the desiderata I instanced long ago have pretty much come to pass. What I then advocated was creating a voice, an esprit de corps, an Order for the Learned Defense of the Faith, a judge, jury, and police system to foster, monitor and critique the work of Mormon scholars and artists, a scourge of the eighth deadly sin—complacency—to more fully found and support mature, scholarly journals, to boldly place our gifts on the altar (and not be so intimidated by the "mantle"), to create a culture commensurate with the import of the Restoration, to engender an atmosphere in which the intellectual becomes as necessary and as useful as the pioneer-plowman of the past and the business administrator of the present, to elevate the cryogenically dwarfed popular Mormon culture, to better (as well as build) the kingdom, to bring to pass President Kimball's 1967 gospel vision of the arts, in which he said "We must recognize that excellence and quality are a reflection of how we feel about ourselves, and about life, and about God," but above all to engage more in mind service,

"Ad majorem Dei gloriam."

Readers of the JMH have done well (we had little to lose save our frustration). We have risen to the challenge, as the necessity of this first "semi" issue certifies.

Stanley B. Kimball
Edwardsville, Illinois

Speaking for the Dead

It is welcome news indeed that the Journal of Mormon History, under the excellent editorial eye of recent years, will begin publishing semiannually. Saints, scholars, and Saint-scholars will all benefit from the increased opportunity to learn from honest inquiry into the LDS past.

Many fruits of the new two-fold harvest of studies you can publish will stimulate and inspire. Others no doubt will be unsettling to some readers. But only the few who imagine that spoon-fed fantasy is somehow a better tonic for the human spirit than truth will regret your change. As we try to enhance historical understanding we must always remember that we have been called to the sacred responsibility of speaking for the dead. We must seek to see their world (as nearly as we can) as they saw it, which is to say, perhaps not always as we might wish it to have been. Past Saints, like us, were imperfect people in an imperfect world, and to imagine them otherwise is to rob them of the dignity of having faced life as it was, sometimes with honor and sometimes with equivocation. We must never be silenced by those who would stop the honest and hence only relevant voices from the dust.

Before I drifted into sermonizing, I wanted to say how welcome will be the opportunity for the Journal again to include book reviews and reader commentary on the issues raised in its pages. Dialogue is infinitely more engaging and instructive than monologue.

Congratulations and best wishes as the Journal moves toward the new century.

Dean May
Salt Lake City, Utah

EDITOR'S NOTE Dean L. May, editor of the Journal from 1981-85, innovated several departments, including its first review essays.

Encounter Essays Sought

"Biography," comments Paul M. Edwards, "brings me to the brink of myself." The creation of a biography occurs in the encounter between a historic mind (the subject) and a contemporary mind (the author). To explore the dimensions and dynamics of that encounter, this issue inaugurates an annual Encounter Essay with the publication of Edwards's "The Chief: Discontented Mystic." Another
model is Levi S. Peterson’s “Juanita, My Subject, My Sister,” (*Dialogue* 22 [Spring 1989]: 16-28). We invite other authors of published biographies to share insights from their own encounters.

**Electronic Discussion Group**

MORMON-L is an electronic discussion group for Mormon Studies on the Bitnet network. This group has been created with the intention of providing an open forum for serious discussion of topics relating to the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Topics might include, but not be limited to, history, thought, theology, culture, and arts.

As the primary purpose of MORMON-L is to provide a forum for serious academic discussion, the list is open to all persons inside and outside academia, Mormons and non-Mormons alike, who wish to engage in substantive discussion of topics relating to Mormonism. We ask only that subscribers follow a few simple guidelines:

1. All communications sent to the list pass through an editor. The editor, however, has no desire or intention to dictate topics or approach and will not alter content or style. His or her moderating function will be strictly limited to screening out blatant personal attacks or overtly evangelical postings.

2. MORMON-L may not be used for active evangelism,

**ANNOUNCEMENT**

The *Journal of Mormon History* takes great pride in this, its first semi-annual issue, including, also for the first time, letters to the editor, book reviews, and advertising.

Members of the Mormon History Association are cordially invited to submit letters, submit articles for consideration, and provide a vita and letter describing areas of interest if they would like to be considered to review books.

The *Journal* seeks donations to underwrite these new sections. Both modest gifts with a long-term commitment and one-time larger gifts are very welcome. Interested contributors may consult with a member of the executive committee or board, or write to either the *Journal of Mormon History*, Box 581068, Salt Lake City, UT 84158-1068 or to Lavina Fielding Anderson, 1519 Roberta Street, Salt Lake City, UT 84115, (801) 467-1617.
whether pro- or anti-Mormon. The purpose is discussion and exchange, not conversion or condemnation.

3. To join MORMON-L, you must have access to the Bitnet computer communications network. You can also join through Internet. For information regarding computer communications, contact the computer support personnel at your institution, or your local computer store. If you are affiliated with a university or research institution, chances are good that you already have access to Bitnet. If you are not, you may be able to send and receive MORMON-L postings through such commercial services as CompuServe.

4. To subscribe to MORMON-L, send the following message to LISTSERV@BYUVM.BITNET: “Subscribe Mormon-L your name,” leaving the subject header blank. Your name will then be added to the list.

5. If you wish to communicate directly with the list moderators without having your communication posted to the list itself, contact J. Michael Allen HISJMA@BYUVM, William J. Hamblin HISWJH @BYUVM, or David C. Wright WRIGHT@HUSC3.
In Memoriam
Elizabeth Dutson Gee

On December 17, 1991, Elizabeth D. Gee, a member of the Board of Editors of the *Journal of Mormon History*, succumbed after an extended battle with breast cancer. Active as a researcher and scholar almost to the end, Elizabeth spent the last year of her life completing a book based on her experiences as a cancer patient. This final writing project was closer to ethics, the area of scholarship in which she earned her doctorate and in which she worked, serving as a long-time member of the Board of Directors of the famed Hastings Center for Ethics and Life Sciences in New York and, for a time, as Director of the Center for Human Caring at the University of Colorado’s Health Sciences Center in Denver.

Readers of the *Journal of Mormon History* will remember Elizabeth as a student and scholar of LDS legal history, the area in which she earned her master’s degree at Brigham Young University. Although she moved on to work in another field, she never lost her fascination with the history of the Latter-day Saints, turning her interest and attention in the years after she left Provo particularly to the history and experience of Mormon women. This turn was a reflection of Elizabeth’s admiration of her grandmother Lucy Grant Cannon, a daughter of LDS Church President Heber J. Grant, and concern for young LDS women, of whom the closest and most important to Elizabeth was her beloved daughter, Rebekah.

Earning her baccalaureate from the University of Utah, Elizabeth married E. Gordon Gee in 1968. She worked in New York City and Washington, D.C., while Gordon earned doctorates in law and education at Columbia University and clerked at the Supreme Court. She returned to Utah and to school when Gordon joined the BYU faculty. Although Gordon moved on to become, in succession, president of West Virginia University, the University of Colorado, and Ohio State University, Elizabeth never allowed her responsibilities as the wife of a president of large state universities to overwhelm her scholarship. To the last, Elizabeth gave careful attention to articles she was asked to review for the *Journal*. The world of Mormon history is diminished by the loss of this brave and brilliant colleague and friend.

*Jan Shipps*
*Bloomington, Indiana*
"Almost Too Intolerable A Burthen": The Winter Exodus from Missouri, 1838-39

William G. Hartley

After trudging for several snowy days from Far West, Missouri, the Levi Hancock family stopped at the Mississippi River and camped. "Oh! What a cold night that was!" recalled Mosiah Hancock. Not quite five years old, he had walked the entire 200 miles from Far West with bare feet. That night, fortunately, ice formed on the river, making it passable. Said Mosiah:

The next morning the river was frozen over with ice—great blocks of frozen ice all over the river, and it was slick and clear. That morning we crossed over to Quincy, Illinois. I being barefooted and the ice so rough, I staggered all over. We finally got across, and we were so glad, for before we reached the other side, the river had started to swell and break up. Father said, "Run, Mosiah," and I did run! We all just made it on the opposite bank when the ice started to snap and pile up in great heaps, and the water broke thru!¹

Historians of Mormonism looking at the 1838-39 period have largely concentrated on the Mormon War, the capture of Far West,

WILLIAM G. HARTLEY is an associate research professor of history at Brigham Young University's Joseph Fielding Smith Institute for Church History and is president of the Mormon Trails Association.

¹ The Mosiah Hancock Journal (Salt Lake City: Reprint by Pioneer Press, n.d.), 12. A painting by C. C. A. Christensen, "Exodus of the Saints from Missouri," is the only depiction I have seen of the winter exodus.
the confinement of Joseph Smith and his friends in Liberty Jail, and
the rise of Nauvoo. Lost between these essential subjects, like a valley
between peaks, is the story of the exhausting and heart-trying winter
exodus by most of Missouri's eight thousand Saints between late
October 1838 and late March 1839. Two This essay focuses on that
strenuous human experience of endurance and persistence.

Also helpful for this study were two extensive Missouri news-
paper clipping files, the Snider Collection and the Parkins Collection,
Special Collections, Harold B. Lee Library, Brigham Young University,
Provo, Utah (hereafter cited as Lee Library); published county histo-
ries; and various contemporary Missouri and Illinois newspapers. At
best, the trek was a "great inconvenience." For many it produced
intense suffering, severe illness, even death. As Harvey Olmstead,
who had briefly served in the Adamondi-Ahman Stake high council,
phrased it in his fruitless petition for compensation: "In consequence
of so long an exposure to the inclement weather, it proved Almost
too intolerable a burthen to be borne but our Sufferings we cannot
relate in full."  

Estimates of numbers vary from a contemporary newspaper's guess of 4,000 to
B. H. Roberts's estimates of 12,000 to 15,000. The figure of about 8,000 is close
to Eliza R. Snow's contemporary estimate and is favored by James L. Kimball of
Nauvoo Restoration, Inc., (personal conversation). An estimate of 5,000 was given
Missouri Persecutions (Salt Lake City: George Q. Cannon and Sons, 1900), 264
(This book is Roberts's reworking of statements in History of the Church 3:243.);
Eliza R. Snow, letter to Esqr. [Isaac] Streator, 22 February 1839, in "Eliza R. Snow
Letter from Missouri," Brigham Young University Studies 13 (Summer 1973):
549.

Research assistant Kim Borders and I found some thirty autobiographies and
diaries reporting the winter exodus, and a score of statements in petitions for
Brigham Young University Studies 13 (Summer 1973): 520-43, and Clark V.
Johnson, "The Missouri Redress Petitions: A Reappraisal of Mormon Persecutions
in Missouri," Brigham Young University Studies 26 (Spring 1986): 31-44.
Johnson, whose booklength edition of these petitions is forthcoming, kindly
made his petition typescripts available (hereafter cited as "Petition"). I appreciate
his courtesy in permitting their use.

Osman, Petition; Joseph Smith, Jr., The History of the Church of Jesus Christ of
Latter-day Saints, edited by B. H. Roberts, 7 vols. 2nd ed. rev. (Salt Lake City:
A NEGLECTED CHAPTER OF MORMON HISTORY

Standard histories of Mormonism give the winter exodus slight attention. B. H. Roberts, in *Missouri Persecutions* and the *Comprehensive History of the Church*, said merely that the exodus was "managed with consummate wisdom" so that there was "less suffering than could have been expected" and that "the suffering they endured on this forced march, though great, was soon forgotten in the prosperity of Nauvoo." Joseph Fielding Smith in *Essentials in Church History* was even more dismissive: "During the winter the exodus began, and many of the Saints gathered at Quincy, Illinois." Recent survey histories usually present a selected vignette or two to give readers the flavor of events. Missouri county histories often use a "they deserved it" tone about the LDS departures.

In short, the winter exodus story as participants experienced it has not been fully told before. In this detailed and documentary history, I seek answers to several important questions: Why did these...
Saints leave in winter instead of spring? What routes did they take? How did the Church aid the exodus? How did Missourians along the way treat the refugees? What experiences did the Saints report? What were its short-term and long-term effects on the participants? My conclusion is that this story is a mountain in the range, not an insignificant valley.

**AS THE EXODUS BEGAN**

Mormons did not leave Missouri voluntarily. During seven years of community building in that rough-and-tumble slave state, they were expelled from both Jackson County and Clay County before resettling in 1837 in Caldwell and Daviess counties in northwest Missouri. Religious, economic, and political clashes with locals late in 1838 led to what Missourians called the Mormon War, in which both sides argued, believed false rumors, brawled, sent armed riders out to scare and pillage, and finally killed and maimed. At the bullet-peppered Battle of Crooked River on October 25, both Missourians and Mormons suffered casualties; and Missouri militia vowed to capture and punish Mormon participants. Saints deserted outlying settlements, pouring into Far West in Caldwell County and Adam-ondi-Ahman, or Diahmon, in Daviess County. On 27 October Governor Lilburn W. Boggs ordered the Saints exterminated or removed from the state. Three days after that, Missouri soldiers massacred eighteen Mormons at Haun’s Mill. Two days later, facing an overwhelming military force, Joseph Smith ordered Mormons at Far West and Adam-ondi-Ahman to surrender, ending the conflict.

When Far West surrendered, General Samuel D. Lucas let it be known that men who had fought at Crooked River and LDS raiders in Daviess County would be arrested, tried, and punished. He ordered that Mormons surrender their firearms, that those who had taken up arms surrender property to pay debts and indemnify for damages, that leaders be given up to be tried and punished, and that everyone else leave the state “protected out by the militia” when so ordered. The night Joseph Smith was taken prisoner, LDS authorities warned “Crooked River boys” to flee, and about twenty-five escaped around midnight.10

After Joseph Smith and six other prisoners were taken away, General John B. Clark assumed command at Far West from Lucas. His two-day investigation to identify Mormon “criminals” led to the arrest
on November 5 of about fifty Mormons. He then informed the conquered Saints that, due to bad weather and their suffering condition, he would grant them until spring to leave the state. The men would be allowed to visit their farms and homes outside Far West for supplies in groups of five or fewer. At a court of inquiry at Richmond in late November 1838, the judge found probable cause to try twenty-four out of sixty-four accused; most of those released returned to Far West.11

Meanwhile, on 8 November, General Robert Wilson’s troops accepted the surrender of Mormons at Diahmon, where two weeks before about a thousand Saints had collected, most of them living in tents or wagons. His investigation found only one Mormon to prosecute for plundering and arson. He then imposed a ten-day deadline for the evacuation of Diahmon, with permission to join the rest of the Saints in Caldwell County until spring when they must “then leave the state.”12

On 18 November, Wilson created a committee of twelve Mormons to locate and convey the Mormons’ crops from Daviess to Caldwell. William Huntington, a War of 1812 veteran and former Kirtland high councilor, headed the group. He was told that the Saints “were to have three winter months to collect our stock and grain and get it out” of Daviess County. By 30 November, Wilson reported that the Mormons “have now voluntarily removed from this county.” On 1 December the militia let the Mormon committee employ twenty teamsters to “haul off” LDS property and said the committee could round up Mormon stock, after which a non-LDS committee would escort both stock and the Mormon committee out of the county. These men spent four weeks rounding up LDS cattle, horses, sheep, wagons, and property but were less successful in collecting grain; Huntington calculated that Saints in Daviess County lost 29,465 bushels of corn because of the military takeover. After a month, his men “were ordered out of the county as our lives would not be safe.” He fled when he heard that the militia intended to kill all Mormons who were not out of the county that day.” Later, on 7 January, Anson

---

10 LeSueur, The 1838 Mormon War in Missouri, 169, 174.
11 Ibid., 190, 205.
12 Ibid., 155; History of the Church 3:204.
Call tried to retrieve property near Diahmon but was caught and beaten by some local men; he “gave up all hopes of securing any of his property.”

Homeless Saints flooded into Far West and overcrowded small settlements nearby. Many had “been robbed of our corn, wheat, horses, cattle, cows, hogs, wearing apparel, houses and homes, and indeed, of all that renders life tolerable.” Joseph Holbrook, thirty-two and a Zion’s Camp veteran, said his wife “had very poor health” that fall and winter because of being exposed to “inclement weather by having to remove from place to place as our house had been burned and we were yet left to seek a home whenever our friends could accommodate us and for my safety.” Saints “in flourishing condition but a few months before,” he continued, “were now destitute. I could have commanded some two thousand dollars but now I had only 1 yoke of old oxen and 2 cows left.” James Carroll, formerly a scribe in the Kirtland printing office, described his family’s suffering from exposure:

We were forced from our homes to Remain in an open frame in the Cold weather when the Snow fell in torrents and would Blow upon us in the Night and we with our Little ones would have to Crawl out of our Beds while the[y] were Coverd frequently with Snow that would blow in to the frame from the north and we had to endure it while the Cruel hearted Mob at Beholding our situation would Laugh and Desired in there hearts to put an end to our Existance.

---

13 History of the Church 3:207, 210, 245; Journal History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, microfilm of scrapbook newspaper clippings and typescript (hereafter cited as Journal History), Historical Department Archives of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City (hereafter cited as LDS Church Archives); “Diaries of William Huntington,” typescript copied by the BYU Library, 1953, 6-7, Miscellaneous Mormon Diaries, Vol. 16, Lee Library. Dated 9 November 1838 and signed by Brigadier General Robert Wilson, Huntington’s permit read: “I permit Wm. Huntington to Remove from Davis to Caldwell county there to Remain during the Winter or to pass out of the state.” Huntington identifies the committee members as John Reed, Benjamin S. Wilber, Mayhew Hillman, Z. Wilson, Elijah B. Gaylord, Henry Herriman, Daniel Stanton, Oliver Snow, William Earl, Jonathan H. Hale, and Henry Humphrey.


Tents, covered wagon boxes lifted off their running gear, and makeshift huts provided little protection from winter cold and storms, but many lacked even such meager shelter. Between four and seven thousand people crowded into a town built to house perhaps four hundred families. Lucy Mack Smith, the Prophet's mother, turned her Far West yard into a campground for the needy:

There was an acre of ground in front of our house, completely covered with beds, . . . where families were compelled to sleep, exposed to all kinds of weather; these were the last who came into the city, and as the houses were all full, they could not find a shelter. It was enough to make the heart ache to see the children, sick with colds, and crying around their mothers for food, whilst their parents were destitute of the means of making them comfortable.

During November and December, former Kirtland high councilor Joseph C. Kingsbury and Caroline, his wife of two years, lived in a little cabin near families in covered wagons; all suffered greatly from freezing weather and Far West's food shortage. Caroline was afflicted with dropsy, or painful swellings, intensified by the cold. The Kingsburys became part of the winter exodus, leaving in late January or early February.

Aroet Lucius Hale, who was "past 10 years of age" during the exodus, later penned vivid recollections of his family's experience. While his father, Jonathan H. Hale, was rounding up cattle with William Huntington, his "dear mother was lying sick in a wagon box in a tent." Arouet, who "was about the largest boy in camp . . . had to cut wood, burn it into coals, and take the hot coals into the tent in a bake-kettle to keep my Mother and the children from freezing. .

16 James Carroll, Petition; see his biographical sketch in Donald Q. Cannon and Lyndon W. Cook, eds., Far West Record (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Company, 1983), 252
18 Preston Nibley, History of Joseph Smith by His Mother (Salt Lake City: Stevens & Wallis, 1945), 292 (hereafter cited as Lucy Mack Smith).
We lived in the tent until the ice on Grand River had frozen sufficiently to bear loaded wagons across."\textsuperscript{20}

Refugees were not allowed to go back to their farms to obtain necessities, even in Caldwell County. "Both me and my family Suffered much on account of Could & hunger," recorded William F. Cahoon, a veteran of Zion's Camp, in his petition, "because we was not permitted to go out Side of the guard to obtain wood and provision."

**Meager Gentile Assistance**

Early in December, Representative David R. Atchison presented two letters to the Missouri legislature describing the Saints' "suffering condition." He argued that with sixty LDS men under arrest, forty killed, and about a hundred who had fled, "at least 200 women, nearly every one of whom has a family of small and dependent children, have been left without any one to provide for them, with no means of support, without shelter from the storm, without protection from the cold, or food to satisfy the cravings of appetite."

Atchison helped move a bill through the legislature to send "a small sum of money" for the "relief" of Daviess and Caldwell county residents, LDS or not, but "especially to the Mormons in Caldwell."\textsuperscript{21}

When opponents tried to block the aid bill, General John B. Clark informed the house that the misery of this "wretched, suffering people" could not be conceived by anyone who had not witnessed their condition. The legislature finally approved $2,000 for relief.\textsuperscript{22}

Non-Mormons declined to accept any aid, on which Roberts commented, "Having filled their homes with the household effects of the saints; their yards with the stock they had stolen; their smoke houses with 'Mormon' beef and pork... they concluded they could get along without their portion of the appropriation and allowed the two thousand dollars to be distributed among the 'Mormons' of Caldwell County!"\textsuperscript{23} The distribution process also had a mean side to it. On 25

\textsuperscript{20}Heber Quincy Hale, *Bishop Jonathan H. Hale of Nauvoo: His Life and Ministry* (Salt Lake City: Author, 1938), 64.

\textsuperscript{21} "Letter from the Editor," *Missouri Republican* (St. Louis) 7 December 1838, 2.

\textsuperscript{22} "Letter from the Editor," *Missouri Republican*, 8 December 1838, 2; "Letter from the Editor," 12 December 1838, ibid., 2; and *Sangamo Journal* (Springfield, Illinois) 17 January 1839.

\textsuperscript{23} *The Missouri Persecutions*, 264-69.
January 1839, hogs owned by Saints in Daviess County "were driven down into Caldwell, shot down, and without further bleeding roughly dressed and divided out among the saints at a high price. This and the 'sweepings of some old stores' soon exhausted the legislative appropriation, and amounted to little or nothing in the way of relief to the saints." The $2,000 for relief is paltry compared to the $200,000 appropriated to defray expenses of the Missouri militia, including those of vigilante groups, in driving the Saints from the state and confiscating LDS properties.24

A few weeks earlier on 7 December 1838, the editor of St. Louis's Missouri Republican lamented, "Can we, or will we, permit the bones of their women and children to bleach [on] the prairie? Will we hear their cries for bread, or know that they are perishing in the storm, and give them no succor or relief?" He appealed for city residents, especially the ladies, "to look at the unhappy condition of this people, and especially of these women and children, and do that on their behalf which humanity dictates. Let it not be said, that they perished by exposure and hunger in our state, and no friendly hand was extended for their relief."25 During the next four months, St. Louis newspapers appealed occasionally for citizens to send aid to the Saints. But if St. Louis citizens raised any funds, food, or clothing for the Saints, that fact has not been recorded.26

Such appeals might have been vitiated by the belief in some quarters that the Mormons would not have to leave. The Missouri Argus, published in St. Louis, editorialized incorrectly on December 20:

They cannot be driven beyond the limits of the state—that is certain. To do so, would be to act with extreme cruelty. Public opinion has recoiled from a summary and forcible removal of our negro popu-

24 Comprehensive History 1:514-15. For the date of the relief distribution, see Huntington, "Diaries," 7.
25 "Letter from the Editor," Missouri Republican, 7 December 1838, 2.
26 See "Jefferson City, Dec. 19th, 1838," Missouri Argus (St. Louis), 20 December 1838, 1; Missouri Republican, 26 March 1839, 2 and on 28 March 1838, 2. St. Louis was an "oasis of tolerance" for Mormons; Saints living there felt no fears of being "exterminated," according to Stanley B. Kimball, "The Saints and St. Louis, 1831-1857: A Oasis of Tolerance and Security," Brigham Young University Studies 13 (Summer 1973): 489-519.
lation; —much more likely will it be to revolt at the violent expulsion of two or three thousand souls, who have so many ties to connect them with us in a common brotherhood. If they choose to remain, we must be content. The day has gone by when masses of men can be outlawed, and driven from society to the wilderness, unprotected. . . The refinement, the charity of our age, will not brook it.

. . . Mercy should be the watchword—not blood, not extermination, not misery. . . I cannot see why the Mormons should not now be permitted to pursue in quiet their agricultural occupations.27

In April the Iowa Territorial Gazette mocked Missouri's lack of philanthropy: "Expel by brute force the weak and defenceless portion of the community from their homes and firesides and reduce them to beggary and destitution, and then call a meeting of the pseudo-philanthropic for the purpose of trumpeting forth to the world the beneficence of their charity[!]."28

CHURCH SELF-ASSISTANCE

For a refuge, the Saints left Missouri and headed for the nearest non-Missouri city—Quincy, Illinois, nearly two hundred miles east of Far West. When the exodus started, John P. Greene, Brigham Young's brother-in-law, published a pamphlet designed to arouse national sympathy for the Saints' plight. It observed:

Many were stripped of clothing and bedding. Many sold all their household stuff to pay the immediate expenses of their journey. Many without cattle, horses, or wagons, had no means of conveyance. In this situation it was thought proper to make some general effort for the removal of the helpless families—a contribution was raised from among the Mormons who had means, and a committee appointed for its expenditure. It was through this charity among themselves that the destitute were enabled to remove to the state of Illinois.29

With the Prophet and other leaders in prison and several apostles absent or disaffected, Apostles Brigham Young and Heber C. Kimball were the highest-ranking Church officials in Caldwell County. To strengthen leadership ranks, Young reorganized the Far West Stake high council, then he and Kimball ordained two previously approved apostles, John E. Page and John Taylor.30

28 "Mormons," Iowa Territory Gazette (Burlington), 6 April 1839, 3.
29 Greene, Facts Relative to the Expulsion, 40.
As soon as the legislature refused to cancel the extermination order, Joseph Smith wrote from prison to the senior apostles on 16 January saying that the management of the Church now devolved upon the Twelve. So the apostles took action. In mid-January, Young asked Bishop Edward Partridge, barely released from prison, to supervise the removal of the poor Saints. Partridge, with pressing personal problems, declined. Young then called a public meeting on 26 January where leading men discussed how during the “present emergency” the Saints could depart “immediately.” Due to the “extreme poverty of many,” compliance was a “seeming impossibility.” The meeting approved appointing a research committee of seven, including Young, Taylor, and Kimball, who would draft an appeal to Missourians for assistance, search out families “actually destitute,” and learn what the Saints themselves could contribute. A second priesthood meeting three days later approved two key measures that undergirded the exodus program for the next three months: (1) They created a seven-man Committee on Removal, chaired by William Huntington and manned by Charles Bird, Alanson Ripley, Theodore Turley, Daniel Shearer, Shadrach Roundy, and Jonathan H. Hale, to “superintend the business of our removal, and to provide for those who have not the means of moving”; (2) Brigham Young created and won approval for a members’ covenant, committing them to “stand by and assist one another, to the utmost of our ability.” Signers agreed to donate nonessential properties to the committee to produce means for removing the “worthy” poor. Within a few days, 380 Saints had signed the covenant.31

The Committee on Removal met frequently from January until April. In February, it added four new members—Elias Smith, Erastus Bingham, Stephen Markham, and James Newberry—to help handle the “arduous task before them.” Committee members surveyed settlements to find out who needed help. Taylor went to Log and Upper Goose creeks, Bird into “the several parts of Caldwell County,” Huntington within Far West itself, and Bingham to the northwest part of the county. One survey report on 21 February identified thirty-two

31 History of the Church 3:247, 249-54. Other members of the research committee were Alanson Ripley, Theodore Turley, John Smith, and Don Carlos Smith.
families needing help, another named seven families. The committee received and acted on applications from the needy, gathered donations (furniture, farm implements, and money), and began to move the needy.32

Because many of the Saints "had no teams nor waggons... great exertions therefore had to be made by those who had means."33 The committee gave priority to moving the families of the First Presidency and of other prisoners. On 7 February, they sent Stephen Markham, later one of Joseph Smith's bodyguards and an 1847 pioneer, east with Emma Smith, her children, and a married couple, after which he returned to help another party. On 13 February, the committee appointed Theodore Turley to find and superintend all donated and borrowed teams. Needing vehicles, the committee asked some departing Saints to send back their wagons and teams after they reached the Mississippi. To help needy travelers, the committee created camping spots and deposited corn along the "upper route" (see "Routes of the Exodus" below), and tried to arrange for ferries and security. Lacking enough money and equipment for any large-scale migration, the committee obtained power of attorney to sell properties for many who had moved, including Joseph Smith, Sr. They helped sell Mormon-owned properties in Clay County and, as a last resort, sold all LDS properties in Jackson County. When Brigham Young left for Quincy on 14 February because of threats to his life, he shepherded Saints east by "advancing with one part of the camp as rapidly and as far as possible" and then returning with the teams to move up others. Kimball then became the highest Church authority supervising Far West departures. It is possible that Young's departure accelerated the move by Saints anxious not to be left behind, a phenomena that recurred during the exodus of Nauvoo.34

32 Ibid., 3:255, 261-63; Huntington, "Diaries," 8. The committee met on 29 January, 1, 6, 7, 12, 13, 19, 21 February, 18 March, and 1, 14, and 15 April, and probably at other times.
33 "A History of the Persecution, of the Church of Jesus Christ, of Latter Day Saints in Missouri," Times and Seasons 1 (September 1840): 165.
34 History of the Church 3:252-63; Gentry, "Northern Missouri from 1836 to 1839," 438; Comprehensive History of the Church 1:510-11; David Rogers, "Report, 1839," in William Rogers and Elizabeth Bessie Ritchie with Their Ancestors and Descendants (Salt Lake City: Leo R. Rogers, 1981), 230; Leonard
Meanwhile, Church members in Quincy and beyond tried to aid the desperate refugees crossing the river. John P. Greene reported that, during the months of February and March,

there were at one time 130 families and upwards upon the west back of the Mississippi, unable to cross on account of the running ice, many of them entirely destitute of food and only scantily supplied from the east side of the river, by those who with great difficulty succeeded in conveying them provision. Their only shelter was the bed clothing from which they could make tents, and many had not even this. In this miserable situation many women gave birth to children. The Mormons who were already in Quincy, formed a committee among themselves, to aid to the best of their power the committee of Far West in giving assistance to their suffering brethren. They received them as they came, sent forward all who had means and strength into the interior, [and] provided the poor and sick with lodgings, fuel, food and clothing.35

Joseph Holbrook, waiting in Quincy for his family, had a crippled arm that limited his activity; he canvassed the town lining up work for “the brethren who were continually coming from Missouri,” and he lived on two meals a day to save money.36

Members influenced Quincy residents to help, and they responded with immediate sympathy. Individuals and committees provided lodging, food, money, and employment, and criticized Missouri for its mistreatment of the Mormons.37

**WHY DEPARTURES DURING WINTER?**

Saints made “all possible exertions to get away all winter,” an 1840 Mormon report said, “contrary to the stipulations of Generals Clark and Lucas, granting them the privilege of staying until spring.”38 Why didn’t they wait? Records identify five reasons, and common sense adds two more:

---


37 *History of the Church* 3:263-64, 267-71, 275-76; Quincy’s public square, Washington Park, contains a monument of gratitude for the city’s kindness.

38 “A History of the Persecution,” 165.
1. The refugees were in physical danger and needed to escape. When militiamen searched Far West for Mormons who had fought at Crooked River, scores of the hunted went into hiding. Some went north "into the unsettled stretches of Iowa."39

2. Many Saints had means to move and saw no reason to delay the inevitable. They could see the shortages, crowding, and misery ahead for those forced to winter in Far West. Within a few days of Boggs's 29 October extermination order, some with teams and wagons started toward Illinois. Daniel Stillwell Thomas, taken prisoner at Far West but later released, recalled that "before winter set in a good many of those best able were gone."40 Philo Dibble, one of the rare Saints who was well off, hired someone to bring his family to Quincy before he himself fled in the fall. For this service, "I paid him sixty dollars in gold on their arrival."41

3. Departure seemed to be a condition for Joseph Smith's release. Daniel Stillwell Thomas remembered Joseph Smith sending word to the Far West Saints from Liberty Jail that "there would be no chance for his deliverance untill we were all out of the state." Joseph Holbrook added his understanding that "if the Church would make haste and move as fast as possible it would [do] much to the relieve our brethren who were now in jail as our enemies were determined to hold them as hostages until the church left the state so that every exertion was made in the dead of the winter to remove as fast as possible."42

4. Although the Saints had agreed to a spring move, armed patrols began insisting on the move in late January. "Our case now became alarming," wrote Huntington. "It appeared the inhabitants were determined to strip us of all means of getting out of the state." At a 26 January public meeting the Saints agreed to begin the mass

41 "Philo Dibble's Narrative," Early Scenes in Church History: Eighth Book of the Faith-Promoting Series (Salt Lake City: Juvenile Instructor Office, 1882), reprinted in Four Faith Promoting Classics (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1968), 90.
42 Kirkham, Daniel Stillwell Thomas, 26; "The Life of Joseph Holbrook," 46.
removal immediately. T. Alvord, taken by the militia but not jailed, felt "I had no safety for myself and family in Missouri" and "fled to Illinois for safety." Mob members found Levi Hancock, one of the Seven Presidents of Seventy, and gave him three days to leave. Daniel D. McArthur and Perrigrine Sessions, both wanted men, left in February with several other families.

5. In late February Far West experienced a stretch of calm weather. Eliza R. Snow wrote on 22 February that "the season has been a stormless one—the most favorable for moving that we could wish." Apparently she and others near Far West had not heard about the snowfalls by the Mississippi early in February and knew nothing of the mud and freezing that the Saints camped opposite Quincy were then suffering.

6. As conditions worsened at Far West, the urgency of finding better shelter, food, and medical help outweighed the difficulties of traveling in the winter.

7. The Committee for Removal had so many people to move by

43 Huntington, "Diaries," 46.
44 T. Alvord, Petition.
45 The Mosiah Hancock Journal, 11.
47 Eliza R. Snow to Streator, 549; emphasis Snow's.
spring and so few resources that it needed to use some wagons and teams for more than one trip. Because one round trip took three to four weeks, the Saints could meet the "spring" deadline only by beginning in February.

**ROUTES OF THE EXODUS**

For the winter refugees, the typical trip took ten or eleven days, a slow one three weeks, a fast one eight days. Saints used existing roads as much as possible, although some took detours to avoid local residents or vigilante action. A Missouri map, published in 1840 by L. Augustus Mitchell, shows the probable upper and lower routes that the Saints took.48 (See map.) The upper route ran east with a slight arch to the north. From Far West it passed south of Chillicothe, through Macon and Shelbyville, took a V-shaped bend down to Oakdale and then angled back up to Palmyra. Palmyra, twenty miles southwest of Quincy, was the last main town refugees passed through before crossing the South and North Fabius rivers to reach the Mississippi opposite Quincy. This route was less settled, and Church leaders counseled some, if not most, Saints to take it.49 Martha Pane [sic] Jones Thomas said that she, her husband Daniel, and their children followed the upper road. Along the way they found food, deposited by the Committee for Removal "for those that had money and those that had not." They drew provisions at one station and moved to the next one, most of the way to Quincy.50

The lower roads ran southeast from Far West to Tinney's Grove and Carrollton, east along the Missouri River, then to Keytesville, Huntsville, and Paris, and northeast to meet the upper road near Palmyra. Many Saints preferred this route, hoping Missourians along the way would sell them food and supplies. What percentages of the Saints traveled the upper route, the lower route, or chose their own routes cannot be determined.

48 Cartography Collections, National Archives Annex, Suitland, Maryland.
49 Kate Woodhouse Kirkham, ed., Daniel Stillwell Thomas Family History (N.p.: ca. 1927), 25.
50 Ibid., 23-25.
51 The Knight family, for example, went by Keytesville and Huntsville. See William G. Hartley, "They Are My Friends": A History of the Joseph Knight Family, 1825-1850 (Provo, Utah: Grandin Book Company, 1986), 132.
EXODUS EXPERIENCES

Winter Fugitives

From November through January, men wanted by Missouri authorities escaped in clusters, some going directly east and others going north into Iowa and then east. When General Lucas's forces entered Far West looking for Mormon militiamen and raiders, most of the "wanted" men fled. Dimick Huntington and four others rushed north into Iowa and then east, through timbered and snowy prairies, across the Des Moines River, then across the Mississippi at Fort Madison. From there, they went down to Quincy. Charles C. Rich, later an apostle, led a group from Far West at midnight on 31 October-1 November:

Next morning about sunrise we crossed Grand river about 2 miles above Diommon being the first Day of November we sent some to Diommon to get some provisions the rest of us went up Hicky Creek about ten miles and camped there we organised ourselves into a Company there was about 26 after we all collected and I was appointed Captain of Said Company 2 Day we traveled and Camped on Big Creek Send men Back to get news and provisions 3 Day we moved and camped on Sugar Creek and learned that Diamo was taken and that the forces was in persuit of us 4 Day we Set out for Iowa through the wilderness Snowed that night and turned Cold and Snowy it was eleven Days and a half before we reached the white Settlements on the Desmoine River During our Journey we had but little to eat and our horses nothing only what they Could gather from under the Snow we crossed the mississippi at Quincy where we found friends and was kindly received.

In this group was the Prophet's brother Samuel Smith, who later told his mother that the group soon exhausted its only food, fifty pounds of chopped corn, and became too weak to continue. Samuel supplicated the Lord on the group's behalf and received an assurance "that they might obtain sustenance by traveling a short distance in a certain direction." They soon came to a wigwam where an Indian woman relieved their hunger.

---

53 Charles C. Rich, "A Sketch that I was an eye witness to in the state of Missouri," photocopy of holograph, family copy in my possession.
54 Lucy Mack Smith, History of Joseph Smith, 298-99.
Captain Nehemiah Comestock of a Missouri militia unit gave David Lewis, a Haun's Mill survivor, a permit “to leave and pass through the State of Missouri in an eastward direction unmolested during good behavior.” Lewis felt this was a trap, stayed, was captured, won a release in late November, and quickly fled the state. With him went his Kentucky friend, John Lowe Butler, who had cracked Missourians’ skulls at the Gallatin election fight in August, and Elias Higbee, a Mormon judge who had ordered out the militia who had fought at Crooked River. Philo Dibble, another Crooked River militiaman, was suffering from a wound, but “told my folks if they could dress me and help me on my horse I would undertake to leave for Quincy. A young man named Joel Miles was to go with me to help me off and on my horse. Leaving Far West on my left, I arrived at Quincy unmolested.” Chapman Duncan and Vinson Knight, four miles from Far West, escaped via the Liberty Road toward Jackson County and then eastward. “We had to tell all kinds of stories to keep from being suspected as Mormons,” Duncan said. “My life was in danger all the time, having taken a very active part in defending my brothers.” He went to the town of Louisiana, about thirty miles south of Hannibal, then down to St. Louis and crossed to Illinois.

Joseph Holbrook also said his life “was in constant danger” because of his participation at Crooked River. Once a dissenter named Snodgrass and eight solders “made diligent search for me in every house in the neighborhood from top to bottom and swore they would take me to the battle grounds on the Crooked River and then shoot me.” Counseled that those against whom “our enemies held the greatest Spite” should “leave their families,” Holbrook reluctantly left Far West about January 20. A week later, his wife gave birth to their fourth child. Holbrook had only fifty cents in cash to leave her. Like the other men, Holbrook, who traveled with Nathan Tanner and Ethan Barrows, left at night. He trudged an average of twenty-three


57 The Life of Joseph Holbrook,” 46.
miles a day. On 28 January, "we crossed the Mississippi River at Hannibal and the next day Jany 29 came to Quincy Illinois State and found ourselves in a land of Freedom once more by the help of God and his blessings." When his family finally reached the Mississippi bottoms, Joseph crossed the river and found them, "wading almost through the whole district... in the mud and snow half a leg deep in the camp." He saw his two-month-old daughter, Nancy Jane, for the first time. "She was truly carried and borne in the midst of tribulation by her mother," he wrote thankfully. It was a poignant reunion. He had not dared write to them nor had they known where to reach him.58

Fall fugitive Israel Barlow somehow ended up some distance above the mouth of the Des Moines River. People who assisted him introduced him to Dr. Isaac Galland, who later sold the Church lands at Commerce, Illinois, that became Nauvoo.59

Last Hope in December

Until the end of December, Saints were not convinced that they had to leave Missouri. They had waited to receive back their properties, forfeited at bayonet-point, so they could sell them and raise money to move. And they apparently believed that the Missouri legislature would rescind the extermination order. On 10 December, Brigham Young, John Taylor, Heber C. Kimball, Edward Partridge, and five others signed a Caldwell County Citizens' Memorial to the

---


59 History of the Church 3:265.
legislature. "The destruction of property at and about Far West is very great," the petition stated. "Take us as a body at this time, we are a poor and afflicted people; and if we are compelled to leave the state in the Spring, many, yes a large portion of our society, will have to be removed at the expense of the state." The Saints could not sell their property, the memorial noted, so they could not pay the expenses of their departure. The petitioners asked for a citizen's privilege "to settle and live where we please." David Redfield took the appeal to Jefferson City and presented it to the legislature on 19 December; after heated debate, the lawmakers tabled it until July, leaving the November order in force.60

When news spread that the appeal had been shelved, the exodus began in earnest. Albert Rockwood wrote in mid-January that Saints were leaving Far West daily.61 Eliza R. Snow recorded on February 22 that a man arriving from Illinois had counted 220 wagons between Far West and the Mississippi. If her information was accurate and if a wagon transported an average of four people, then about one thousand Saints had been on the move during February. The Thomas family estimated that more than a hundred families were camped opposite Quincy at the end of February. Joseph Holbrook said a hundred men were there in mid-March. In addition, refugees had moved during November and December. Based on such bits of information, a conservative estimate of numbers of winter refugees is three thousand, or about one-third of the Missouri Saints. It is probable that the majority of Saints had moved by mid-March.62 In the language of one participant, George Washington Gill Averett, those who departed during the winter traveled "in Colde weather thinly clad and poorly furnished with provisions."63 Joseph Smith,

62 Snow to Streator, 549; Martha P. J. Thomas says "several hundred families," in Kate W. Kirkham, ed., Daniel Stillwell Thomas Family History, 26, but her husband says about a hundred families, in E. Kay Kirkham, ed., Daniel Stillwell Thomas, Utah Pioneer of 1849, 26; "The Life of Joseph Holbrook," 49.
63 [Auto]Biographical Sketch of George Washington Gill Averett," typescript, 8,
Sidney Rigdon, and Elias Higbee's petition for redress for the Saints did not exaggerate when it said that "women and children marked their footsteps on the frozen ground with blood." Both men and women documented, in their petitions, their misery caused by "being exposed to the inclemency of the weather." 

Because a number of husbands were fugitives or dead, many women faced the arduous move alone. Mary Ann Hoyt, a widow with five children, was forced from Far West "in distressed circumstances." Prisoner Hyrum Smith's wife, Mary Fielding Smith, who made the exodus with an infant and who was bedridden much of the time, said simply, "I suffered much on my journey." Lyman Wight unsuccessfully sought release from Liberty Jail in late March by citing the plight of his "wife and six helpless children in a tent on the bank of the Mississippi River without food, raiment, and their life depends on my [liberty]." H. M. Alexander, when petitioning for redress, complained on behalf of his family that he "was obliged to Leave the State to save my life and was obliged to Leave my family to suffer for about 4 months."

January Accounts

Albert P. Rockwood's family left Far West January 10 with another family and reached the Mississippi River in twelve days. In a letter written soon after reaching Quincy he said of the journey:

We had snow and rain every day but 2. We had heavy loads, were

in Miscellaneous Mormon Diaries, Vol. 11, Lee Library.

64 "The Saints' Petition to Congress," November 1839, in History of the Church 4:24-38. By custom, people of that period, particularly children, often went shoeless during the warmer months. Apparently the Mormon War interfered with making and obtaining shoes; also, lacking cattle, the refugees concentrated in Far West had difficulty replacing shoes worn out that summer and fall. Hence, many who walked to Illinois that winter lacked footwear.
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69 H. M. Alexander, Petition.
obliged to walk from 2 to 8 miles a day thro mud and water, camped out on the wet ground 3 nights before we arrived at the River[.] A few days before we got to the river it grew cold. The river froze over & we were obliged to camp close to the river 3 days and nights before we could cross in the boat, 6 waggons were with us at the time.—The Saints are leaving Far West daily. 70

Ebenezer Robinson and three other men walked from Far West to Quincy “through the snow” late in January. After they paid for the ferry at Quincy on 1 February, they had one dollar left among them.71

When the mob gave Levi Hancock three days in which to leave, Levi “rigged up a foot lathe and soon had two hubs turned out.” Quickly the family constructed a cart which they filled with corn and set off, their one horse, Old Tom, pulling the cart. Mosiah remembered, “The snow was deep enough to take me to the middle of the thigh, and I was bare footed and in my shirt tail. . . . Father drove the horse and carried the rifle on his shoulder. Mother followed the cart carrying my little brother, Francis Marion in her arms.” Mosiah “tried to follow in her tracks.” His little sister, Amy, rode in the cart, feeling bad that the others had to “tramp through the snow.”

During one of the first days, cold and exhausted, the family stopped to rest and eat. Weeping, Clarissa said she could not stand it much longer. Levi said, ““Cheer up, Clarissa, for I prophesy in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ—you shall have a pair of shoes delivered to you before long, in a remarkable manner!’ After we had made our fire and eaten of our roasted corn on the cob, mother reached down on the side to get her old shoes, and held up a new pair! Father answered, ‘Clarissa, did I not tell you that God would provide you a pair in a remarkable manner?’”

The Hancock family slept nightly on the ground despite the snow. One night, perhaps typically, their bed was leaves covered with a quilt. Levi cut down a basswood tree for the horse to eat from, and the family supplemented their corn with “elmbark and buds.”72

70 Rockwood to “Dear Beloved Father,” 34.
71 Ebenezer Robinson, “Items of Personal History of the Editor, Including Some Items of Church History Not Generally Known. Taken from The Return,” typscript, 243, Lee Library.
72 The Mosiah Hancock Journal, 11.
February Accounts

By February, the danger had increased. “Bodies of armed men were riding through the town of Far West . . . threatening death to them if they were not out in the month of February,” reported an 1840 Mormon history.73 Because of these threats and the brief break in winter storms, February saw heavy traffic. But weather in the Mississippi Valley rapidly worsened—a brutal combination of snow, freezing nights, and icy rains, complicated by swampiness in the bottoms and danger from the freezing-thawing Mississippi.

Luman Shirtliff was in a group of about twenty-four Saints who left for Quincy on 5 February. They slept the first night in beds they made up in a deserted log house. The second night, they slept on the frozen ground; the party included a Sister Durfey and fifteen of her children. The next two nights they camped in the woods around a good bonfire.74 Emma Smith and her children, assisted by Stephen Markham, reached the Mississippi when the ice was precarious. Fearing a break-through, Emma separated the two horses, putting one on her wagon, with the driver walking behind it, and the other behind. Then she walked apart from the wagon, carrying two children, with Julia clinging to her skirt on one side and young Joseph on the other. Tied about her waist were heavy bags containing Joseph Smith’s papers.75

Luck Mack Smith also left during February, a trip hampered by great hardship:

Just as we got our goods into the wagon, a man came to us and said, that Sidney Rigdon’s family were ready to start, and must have the wagon immediately. Accordingly, our goods were taken out, and we were compelled to wait until the team could come after us again. We put our goods into the wagon a second time, but the wagon was wanted for Emma and her family, so our goods were again taken out. However, we succeeded, after a long time, in getting one single wagon to convey beds, clothing, and provisions for our family, Salisbury’s family and Mr. McCleary’s family besides considerable luggage for Don

73 “A History of the Persecution,” 165.
74 “Biographical Sketch of the Life of Luman Andros Shirtliff,” typescript, 138, Archives and Manuscripts Division, Lee Library.
75 Linda King Newell and Valeen Tippett's Avery, Mormon Enigma: Emma Hale Smith (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Company, 1984), 79.
Carlos [her son], who, with his family and the remainder of his baggage, was crowded into a buggy, and went in the same company with us.

Their affliction was intensified by rain, which turned the road to mud; but they pressed on, fearing that the river would rise. Six miles from the river, “the weather grew colder, and, in the place of rain we had snow and hail; and the ground between us and the river was so low and swampy that a person on foot would sink in over his ankles at every step, yet we were all of us forced to walk, or rather wade, the whole six miles.” They camped on the river bank, without so much as a tent, in six inches of snow that was still falling. “The next morning our beds were covered with snow and much of the bedding under which we lay was frozen. We rose and tried to light a fire, but, finding it impossible, we resigned ourselves to our comfortless situation.” Samuel was able to get them across the river that day; gratefully they reached Quincy, where “Samuel had hired a house and we moved into it, with four other families.”

Newel Knight helped his father with money but had no team himself, so he “sold my cook stove and the only cow the mob had not killed” and hired a teamster. Newel and Lydia abandoned their Far West house and farm when they left on February 18, working their way east through snow sometimes up to their wagon hubs. The cold was intense, Lydia recalled. Some nights, they scraped away snow to put their beds on the frozen ground beside the wagon. At Huntsville, the driver said his horses could not go on, leaving the Knights stranded. Newel prayed for help for “I knew not how to extricate myself but as I had never been forsaken by my Heavenly Father I commited myself and family into his care.” A week later, a man asked his son to drive them to the river.

Brigham Young’s family was also stranded at Huntsville, having too many goods for the wagon they had come in. So, Newel said, “Bro. Young put on board some of his goods” into the wagon carrying the Knights, and both families resumed their journeys. A few days later, Newel’s horses ran away. The oxen they had left could not haul all the load, so Newel unloaded part of his and Brigham’s goods and left them in the care of a friendly resident. Finally, Newel and his family reached the Mississippi. There they met Brigham Young who

was heading back into Missouri. Newel borrowed Brigham's wagon, drove it west, and retrieved the goods he had left behind. Newel lodged his family in a house in Worcester, below Hannibal, with a peck of cornmeal and sugar for breakfast, lunch, and dinner, and found a job forty miles down-river at Clarksville.77

Anson Call, a twenty-eight-year-old Vermonter who had been baptized in 1834, was able to complete his wagon team when, "to my great surprise," a mare taken by the mob was returned. They left in mid-February. "The weather was cold and severe with snow to the depth of 1 foot. The first night our wagon tipped over into the creek. The second day we had to cross a long prairie and were not able to reach the settlement. Twas a very cold and blustering night, we raised the wagon tongue put some clothes over it placing our beds underneath." Moving on, they found "camp fires and tent poles already struck nearly all the way after this," probably the hard work of the Committee on Removal.78

Daniel and Martha Thomas left Far West on February 14 with one wagon pulled by "one small pair of stears" and five children with "one pair of shoes amongst them," according to Daniel. Their first twenty miles lay through snow six inches deep. Martha, eight months pregnant, recorded, "To hear them [her children] crying at night with their feet cracked and bleeding was a grievous sight for a mother to bear. I would often grease them and put on clean stockings instead of making them wash them when going to bed."

When the family reached the river bank across from Quincy, ice stalled them for two weeks. With some of the other men, Daniel began building a boat. When a Brother Brunson arrived from Quincy and asked the encamped Saints to donate their teams for return trips to Far West, she and Daniel faithfully complied. "Out went everything by the log," Martha said, "the looking glass by a stump." That night

77 Hartley, "They Are My Friends," 132-33. The John Murdock family also left without transportation. They walked for three days to DeWitt, where by selling a deed, they were able to buy a yoke of steers for $25 and a wagon for $30. They left DeWitt on February 14 and reached the Mississippi 1 March; after waiting in ferry lines for a week, they arrived in Quincy on 9 March. "An Abridged Record of the Life of John Murdock, Taken from His Journal by Himself," typescript, n.p., n.d., Lee Library.

Martha became ill, so Daniel
drove four forked stakes in the ground, the forks up, laid some poles in
each side and then roped them well with bed cord, making a nice bed.
He then drove four upright posts about six feet high, laid poles on them,
hung quilts all around except the foot, which was left open so the heat
of the log fire would shine in and keep me warm.

She had a single night’s rest in this makeshift bedroom. Ice-bound on the river bank, they suffered torments from the extreme
cold. “Our corn bread was frozen so hard I had to take the ax and
break it and give it to the children to gnaw at, the bread looking like
chunks of ice,” recalled Daniel. When the river “opened,” they
divided their few belongings among two boats and rowed across.
Daniel and son Morgan stayed behind to ferry the cow across on a
later trip, while Martha and the four children waited on the Quincy
side. The sun set. Shivering in the darkness and cold, Martha wrapped
the four small children in the bedclothes and they huddled together,
watching for the boat to return with Daniel and Morgan. “For the first
time the tears stole down my face,” she wrote. The children asked if
she were sick? “No,” she said, “the wind is so cold.” An LDS man rode
up and stayed with her until the boat reached the shore, then Daniel
arranged for a man with a mule cart to take the children and bedding
to a “Camp Milwaukee.” “When the settlers came out to see us they
seemed struck with wonder to see us so cheerfull,” recorded Daniel.
The parents rigged up a quilt tent, and then hurried to town and
bought three meals worth of bread. The next day a wagon moved
them to a Brother Wiswanger’s home. A few days later, Martha gave
birth to a son; they named him for the Prophet Joseph.79

Nancy Hammer, widowed at Haun’s Mill, moved her six chil-
dren east with a cluster of other Saints in February, a blind horse
pulling their small wagon. Her son John remembers “scanty provi-
sions,” walking through “the cold and frost,” and not always being
able to find wood for fires. They “were almost barefooted and some
had to wrap their feet in clothes in order to keep them from freezing
and protect them from the sharp points of the frozen ground,” but

79 E. Kay Kirkham. Daniel Stillwell Thomas, Utah Pioneer of 1849, 26; and Kate
Woodhouse Kirkham, ed., Daniel Stillwell Thomas Family History, 25-29. The
shoes were Morgan’s.
“often the blood from our feet marked the frozen earth.” All but the youngest two children “had to walk every step of the entire distance,” and “there was scarcely a day while we were on the road that it did not either snow or rain. The nights and mornings were very cold.”

Caroline Skeen Butler, whose husband, John Lowe Butler, was a fugitive, moved her four children, ages seven to one, through the “bitter cold” of late February without his help. Abraham and Martha Smoot, married only three months, had a wagon but no team. Caroline could not care for her children and drive her wagon at the same time, so Abraham became driver for the Butlers’ light wagon and two-horse team. They started eastward late in February and “suffered fearfully, but by the help of God they were enabled to stand and bear it.” Caroline’s eyes became infected, so Martha led her by the hand for five or six days, then they took turns sitting next to Abraham while the other walked with the children. One bitterly cold night, an elderly lady in one of the refugee camps got her feet wet. Martha gave her dry stockings, saving her feet, and others led the woman to camp where men had built a fire so large that people stood six feet back from it. Caroline and John were reunited after a three-months’ absence, on the Missouri side of the river on 10 or 11 March when John, learning they had arrived, rowed across the ice-blocked river in a canoe to meet them.

**March Accounts**

Mormon traffic east continued heavy during March. On 4 March Bishop Partridge wrote that Quincy “is full of our people.” On about 10 March the Committee for Removal wrote to LDS officers in Quincy requesting teams and money to move fifty poor families. Eliza R.

---


81 Butler, Autobiography, 27. Abraham O. Smoot was born in 1815 in Owen County, Kentucky, and converted to Mormonism, like John and Caroline, in 1835. He had been arrested at Far West and, while a prisoner, married Martha T. McMeans 11 November 1838. See Andrew Jenson, *LDS Biographical Encyclopedia*, 4 vols. (Salt Lake City: Andrew Jenson History Company, 1901-36), 1:485-86.

82 Journal History, 5 March 1839; Woodruff 1:323 (17 March 1839).
Snow and her family wintered seven miles from Far West and started for Illinois on 5 March 1839. Although the cold had moderated somewhat, it was still intense; almost constant rain plagued them:

On our outward journey, after a night of rain, which changed to snow and covered the ground in the morning, we thawed our tent which was stiffly frozen, by holding and turning it alternately before a blazing fire, until it could be folded for packing, and, while we all shivered and shook with cold, we started. As the sun mounted upwards the snow melted and increased the depth of the mud . . . . The teams were puffing and the wagons dragging so heavily that we were all on foot, tugging along as best we could.

Before Zera Pulsipher and his family left in March, he buried his mother near Plum Creek. En route, he and his son-in-law lost horses, and his daughter gave birth, compelling the family “to stop among strangers.”

Elisha Whiting, in his petition for redress, recalled particularly the “storms of snow and rain” that March. Lacking a tent, the family slept nightly “on the cold wet ground,” often waking to find their bedding “drenched with water.” Loading the “wet bedding into the waggon” they would drag through another rainy day and be forced to sleep again on the wet ground in blankets that had never dried from the previous night.

Because of the risky weather, the alternate freezing and breaking-up of the ice in the river, and the shortage of ferries, the plight of the refugees bottlenecked in the Mississippi bottoms was pitiable. About 18 March Wilford Woodruff, in Quincy, looked across to the bottoms “and saw a great many of the Saints, old and young, lying in the mud and water, in a rainstorm, without tent or covering. . . . The sight filled my eyes with tears, while my heart was made glad at the cheerfulness of the Saints in the midst of their affliction.”

83 Biography and Family Record of Lorenzo Snow (Salt Lake City: Deseret News Company Printer, 1884), 45; Eliza R. Snow, An Immortal: Selected Works by Eliza R. Snow (Salt Lake City: Nicholas G. Morgan, Sr., 1957), 10-11.
84" History of Zera Pulsipher As Written by Himself,” typescript by BYU Library, 1958, 15-16, Lee Library.
85" History of Wilford Woodruff. [From His Own Pcn].” Millennial Star 27 (20 May 1865): 311. His contemporary journal account differs slightly: “I visited a number of families that had Camped on the bank of the river. They were in a
The Saints tried to solve the boat problem in a variety of ways, including dodging through the ice in nimble but fragile canoes and building simple crafts. When fugitive Philo Dibble reached Quincy he contracted to rent a ferry at $9 per day for thirty days to help Saints soon to follow. "I ran the boat about ten days and ferried the Saints across on their own terms, and still made money at it," he recorded. When some Mormons arrived and insisted that they be allowed to operate the ferry, Dibble surrendered his lease to the owner on their behalf; but the owner kept the ferry and charged the Mormon traffic full fares. "This caused a great deal of extra and unnecessary expense to our people," Dibble lamented.86

TREATMENT BY MISSOURIANS

During the winter exodus, some local Missourians were kind to the struggling Saints; some were not. Only the aid of friendly Missourians saved Brigham Young's family from severe frostbite and perhaps death before reaching Illinois.87 Joseph Kingsbury's family, stopped twenty-five miles from the Mississippi because "our sufferings were extreme," asked help from an acquaintance named Gardner. This family gave them food and lodging in return for Joseph's labor and "were very kind to us."88 The sole vivid memory that Joseph Smith III, then age six, took from the family's February exodus was a farmer who lodged the family for the night. He recalled the warm food and that "we slept cozily in the warmth of that big fire as it gradually waned to a bed of coals."89

The Butlers and Smoots likewise noted a single act of kindness. Near Keytesville, while Martha Smoot was sitting on the seat holding three-year-old Keziah Butler, one of the horses kicked sharply, striking Sister Smoot on the knees and grazing Keziah on the forehead. Hearing their screams, a woman living nearby ran to see what was

86 Philo Dibble's Narrative," 90.
87 Esplin, "The Emergence of Brigham Young," 370.
88 Cook, Joseph C. Kingsbury, 62; Joseph C. Kingsbury, Petition.
wrong, then hastily fetched camphor, brown paper, and warm water, anxiously helping Caroline Butler care for the wounded. She "said she was right sorry to see the Mormons suffer so much and be drove about from place to place."90

Mother Smith told how her son, Don Carlos, begged shelter from a prosperous farmer, an Esquire Mann, for his aged parents and the party's women and children after they had endured three days of rain. Compassionately, the man helped them into a room where a fire was already lit, "hung up our cloaks and shawls to dry, . . . brought us milk for our children, hauled us water to wash with and furnished us good beds to sleep in."91

However, unkind treatment by Missourians is well documented. Unfriendliness toward Mormon refugees was partly due to worry that they might be diseased, to widespread belief that Mormons were "a poor deluded and miserable set of beings," and concern that so many needy would consume local larders, woodpiles, and forage.92 Anson Call "found the Missourians universally unwilling to receive us into their houses."93 Eliza R. Snow felt that kindnesses from Missourians were so rare that she needed to record the "only expression of sympathy" she witnessed in Missouri, an elderly man who said Governor Boggs ought to be hitched to the Mormons' wagons.94

When Lucy Mack Smith's party stopped and asked shelter on another rainy night, about three days' travel from Far West, the owner "showed us a miserable out-[building], which was filthy enough to sicken the stomach, and told us, if we would clean this place, and haul our own wood and water, we might lodge there. To this we agreed, and, with much trouble, we succeeded in making a place for our beds. For the use of this loathsome hovel, he charged us seventy-five cents."95

One freezing day, Caroline Butler records, they stopped at a nearby house and asked if they could warm the children. The hus-

91 Lucy Mack Smith, History of Joseph Smith, 295-96.
92 Bradford, "Expulsion of a Poor, Deluded and Miserable Set of Villains," 114.
94 Eliza R. Snow, An Immortal, 10.
95 Lucy Mack Smith, History of Joseph Smith, 294-95.
band in the yard said yes, but the wife blocked the doorway. "I am afraid," she said, "that you Mormons are diseased and I don't want it to get into my family." On another equally cold day, they tried to find a place to warm the children, weeping from the cold. The woman of the house was silent at their request and silent when they repeated it. Desperate, they entered. As they stood by the fire, the woman, still unspeaking, went into the next room and stayed until they were gone. The discourtesy hurt almost as much as the earlier refusal.96

When the Smoots and Butlers reached the Mississippi River, they found plenty of timber. Abraham Smoot cut down a dry tree, piled up the branches, and ignited a blazing fire. The owner of the land appeared and accused the group of wasting his wood. "There is plenty of it," Abraham said, "I don't think that you will miss one old dry tree." "You think . . . that I can find no use for such wood?" the owner complained. "I can, so I want you to cut no more."97 Two decades later in Utah, John Lowe Butler was still pained over the hard-heartedness of the Missourians: "The Lord is just and He will punish those that have ill treated His children."98

**EXODUS COMPLETED**

Most Saints had left Far West by late March, but the exodus continued until mid-April. The Committee of Removal remained active during this entire period and aided hundreds of souls altogether. By assignment David Rogers had reached Jackson County on 15 March, sold LDS properties, raised some $2,700, and brought the funds to Far West in mid-April. As a result, according to William Huntington, "We ware able to remove All the poor who had a desire To leave the state" by April 13, the day on which he left Far West.99 Isaac Laney, with seven wounds received at Haun's Mill, said the committee had moved all but thirty or forty families when armed men from Daviess County ordered him and others to be "out of the County by the next Friday night which was giving us Six dayes for to do that that Requird a month."100 So the committee urgently

---

97 Ibid., 26.
98 Ibid.
hired teams and sent families to Tinney's Grove twenty miles southeast "with as little of their affects as they Could get along with." A sudden rain shower caught fifteen families without any shelter. "Sutch a Storm it was," he recalled, "[that] the Creeks Raised so high that they became impasable & the Roads intolerable & in the attemp to obey the Commands of a mob there was one yoke of oxen drownd & then we had to give up & Run the Risk of their threats but the Lord blocked up their way of Coming to us as well as ours." Providentially, several teams arrived from Illinois to help move the last families as the raiders vandalized the committee's meeting place and drove out the last two committee men, Daniel Shearer and Elias Smith.101

Late in April Apostles Wilford Woodruff, Brigham Young, Orson Pratt, John Taylor, and George A. Smith returned to Far West to dedicate the temple site and to fulfill an 8 July 1838 revelation telling them to leave on a European mission on 26 April 1838 from the temple site. On 21 April, passing through Huntsville, they found the roads "full of the Saints that were fleeing from Missouri." After dedicating the temple site, the leaders returned, bringing, according to Woodruff's diary, "the last company of the poor with us that can be removed"—meaning those not in prison. The group included seven of the Twelve, some of the Committee for Removal, and "several" families.102

During the spring of 1839, the exiled Saints, poverty-stricken and weak, struggled northward up the Mississippi from Quincy and founded Nauvoo at Commerce, Illinois. Joseph Smith, Sidney Rigdon, and Elias Higbee's petition for redress described the Saints by then as "broken up, and ruined" and "in want of every necessary of life."103 Nevertheless, they again built several religious communities around a new gathering place.

**LEGACY OF THE WINTER EXODUS**

The winter experiences are only part, but probably the major
part, of the story of the Latter-day Saint exodus from Missouri. Not all who left did so in winter; and not all who moved, winter or spring, suffered. My concern, though, has been to recapture a chapter of hardship and sacrifice that somehow has escaped being part of the pre-Utah LDS heritage. And it is the immediate physical hardship that stands out. Many in good health sickened. Many already in poor health worsened. Some died. Hosea Stout’s wife Samantha Peck Stout, weakened by malnutrition and exposure, died the next fall.¹⁰⁴ Lyman Curtis’s wife, pregnant during the exodus, gave birth in Illinois to “a Son . . . who was taken with fits and Soon died which no doubt was occasioned by the hardship of moving in the midst of winter.”¹⁰⁵ James Galligher claimed he was “exposed to the weather in which sickness followed & the loss of one of my Children [to] other sickness also occasioned by the same.”¹⁰⁶

Thomas Grover’s wife gave birth “on the road, and suffered everything but death itself, my children were all sick for several months and our sufferings were extreme.”¹⁰⁷ Truman Angell, forced away in January without his family, learned seven weeks later that they had reached the bottoms. After “wading five miles in mud and water, through brush and timber, I found those I sought in a tent of blankets” near the North Fabius River: “There lay my poor sick wife, her bed upon the melting snow, very ill. My two little ones, the last one born in Ohio, were by her side, their clothes almost burned off from standing by log campfires. No one to care for them, all the brethren and sisters having cares enough of their own.” Angell’s wife had been “extremely ill” before starting the journey and, through the “cold upon cold,” was “reduced so low that but little hopes were entertained of her living to see me again.” The Mississippi was so high that it had washed away the single ferry, so the Angell family remained in that miserable location for another week. Truman, writing six years later in Nauvoo, noted that his wife’s health had, even at

¹⁰⁵ Lyman Curtis, Petition.
¹⁰⁶ James Galligher, Petition.
¹⁰⁷ Thomas Grover, Petition.
that point, only “partially returned.”

Several petitioners put the debilitating effects on their health in a few evocative words: Seymour Bronson filed a claim against Missouri for “Expense of Sickness and nursing inconsequence of being driven in the inclement Season $400 with a doctors bill total amount $1100.” He died the next year. Josiah Butterfield petitioned for $1,000 for “being driven out of Daviess Co. in the month of November and being thereby exposed to the inclemency of the weather which has caused the sickness of my wife during the winter from which She has not yet recovered.” Jeremiah Curtis “in the winter moved to Illinois through Snow and frost to the great Injury of the health of myself and family.” Aaron Johnson’s family was “exposed to the inclemency of the Season without any Shelter Save a covered waggon and a thin cotton tent from the Six of March untill the 20 of April the loss of health in consequence thereof is verry great.” Henry Jackson, “driven amidst the Stormy blasts of Snow & rain in the month of March,” had suffered from vision so damaged “that I am not able to work which damage I Co-estimate at no less than a maintainance for life.”

Sickly five-year-old Mosiah Hancock, months later in Nauvoo, touched the heart of Squire Daniel H. Wells:

He said to mother, “Mrs. Hancock, do you say that boy walked all the way from Plum Creek in that condition?” (I had walked all the way in my bare feet in the snow;.) . . When mother took off my shirt, I took a look at myself in the Squire’s looking glass; and I must say, I never saw such a scarecrow in all my life! My head, feet, and eyes, had not diminished in size—neither had my knees—but the rest of me! My mother called my legs pipe stems, and my arms straws!

The Saints’ vulnerability to malaria and other diseases that summer stemmed in large part, they believed, from the sufferings of the winter exodus. Benjamin F. Johnson, for example, observed that during 1839 “the people had flocked in [to Nauvoo] from the terrible exposures of the past and Nearly every one was Sick with intemittant

109 History of the Church 4:179.
110 The Mostah Hancock Journal, 12.
or other feavers of which many died—In this time of great Sickness poverty & death."\textsuperscript{111}

Both directly and indirectly, such experiences were mentally and emotionally traumatic. The participants' accounts, even those cast in legal language, reveal powerful feelings of anger, horror, outrage, and persecution. Many felt confirmed in the already bitter feelings they held towards Missourians. The wrongs of Missouri no doubt stiffened the resolve of some to no longer submit peacefully without armed defense.

As these case studies collectively show, the Saints passed through a rather large-scale experience of group and individual trauma, a subject of recent professional concern in our own society. Notice is paid to the psychological damage, whether person-caused or accident-related, of the Nazi holocaust, being a prisoner of war, kidnappings, being held hostage, gang violence and intimidation, rape, physical and sexual abuse, earthquake entrapment, and airplane crashes. Post-trauma stress is a serious concern. The suffering and anguish of those Latter-day Saints who fled Missouri in mid-winter merit assessment by someone skilled in psychological trauma, to help us understand the lasting effects.

Clearly, Missouri experiences, including the helplessness and suffering of the exodus, help explain why Saints formed a self-defensive city state in Nauvoo, why some Saints justified retaliating, why many gladly left the United States to head into Mexican Territory, why many felt such loathing for federal judges, courts, deputies, laws, and military officials, and even why the Mountain Meadows Massacre was in part an act of revenge. For many Saints, their sufferings during the winter exodus wrapped an acrid coating around the already bitter pill which Missouri had forced them to swallow.

\textsuperscript{111} Dean R. Zimmerman, \textit{I Knew the Prophets: An Analysis of the Letters of Benjamin F. Johnson to George F. Gibbs Reporting Doctrinal Views of Joseph Smith and Brigham Young} (Bountiful, Utah: Horizon Publishers, 1976), 10-11. According to Ivan J. Barrett, \textit{Joseph Smith and the Restoration}, 439, "Weakened by the rigorous trek in midwinter after the severe ordeal of persecution in Missouri, the exiles who were camped along the Mississippi River began to feel the effects of the hardships. . . . Almost every family succumbed to the ague and bilious fever."
The Founding of the LDS Church Historical Department, 1972

Leonard J. Arrington

The founding of the Historical Department of the Church in 1972 may be traced to preparatory actions taken by President N. Eldon Tanner and Elder Howard W. Hunter. As a counselor in the First Presidency beginning in 1963, President Tanner sought to acquaint himself with the current research in the field of Church history. He held several meetings to discuss historical literature, acquaint himself with LDS scholarship, and explore how to encourage research with Dr. Lyman Tyler, a historian who was then director of libraries at Brigham Young University. Lyman was a friend of mine; we had known each other as boys in Twin Falls, Idaho. On 28 January 1966, at Lyman’s invitation, I drove to Salt Lake City from Logan, where I was a professor of economics at Utah State University, to attend one of these meetings.

President Tanner was very friendly, asked me many questions, and seemed interested in my answers. I sensed that he had an
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understanding of the frustrations historians felt about obtaining access to materials in the Church Historian's Library and Archives and that he sympathized with my arguments about the need for more openness. But he was a diplomat, reserved in expressing his opinions.

Since 1921 Elder Joseph Fielding Smith, a member of the Council of the Twelve, had served as official Church Historian. Elder Smith was primarily a student of the scriptures and an expounder of doctrine. His principal interest as Church Historian was archival—that is, in acquiring materials and preserving them. The assistant church historians managing the library-archives were A. William Lund and Earl E. Olson. Their objectives were similar—to acquire and preserve historical documents. Building on the work of their predecessors, particularly Andrew Jenson, Elder Smith and his associates had amassed an enormous body of materials, an unbelievably large and complete archive consisting of about two thousand diaries and personal histories, almost every book published by or about the Church throughout its history, a full set of Church periodicals, and thousands of minute books, letters, and historical records. Very little of this collection was readily available to historians. I had some hope, based on President Tanner's response, that changes might be coming that would better meet the Church's historical needs.

To my surprise and delight about six months later, I received a letter from the First Presidency dated 15 June 1966, which President Tanner signed. It was a thank-you note for the helpfulness of the earlier interview but went beyond courtesies to create what amounted to a virtual calling. President Tanner wrote:

We sincerely appreciate your willingness to take the leadership in encouraging Mormon scholars to produce positively written articles and monographic studies on Mormon social and religious institutions. . . . We realize that research is very demanding in time and effort and would suggest that you consider your participating in this program equivalent in importance to other major assignments you have held in the Church. [He knew that I had been a high councilor and a counselor in the presidency of Utah State University Stake]. If you feel that I can be of assistance I shall appreciate having you call on me. May we again commend you for your efforts and for your faithfulness.

Three months later I took my family to Pacific Palisades, California, to spend the academic year 1966-67 as Visiting Professor of
Western History at the University of California at Los Angeles. During the winter of that year I received several letters from Alfred A. Knopf, the "dean" of western publishers, and from Professor Rodman Paul, a distinguished western historian at the California Institute of Technology in Pasadena, urging me to prepare a volume on the role of the Mormons in the settlement and development of the West. Such a work, wrote Knopf, agreeing with a similar pronouncement by Professor Paul, would "fill the biggest gap in Western American history." I was very interested in such a project—a natural companion volume to *Great Basin Kingdom*—but knew the book could not be written without access to primary materials in the Church Historian's Office. On 11 January 1967, I wrote President Tanner, explaining the request and pointing out that this was the first time a leading national publisher had asked an active Latter-day Saint to write a major work on the history of the Mormons. I asked if the First Presidency would grant permission to use the necessary primary materials, including correspondence, the diaries of certain leaders, minutes of specific meetings, pertinent financial records, and other documents. "I regard this opportunity as a splendid chance to demonstrate that Mormon scholars can write responsibly and professionally about their faith, their Church, and their people," I wrote.

Within a week I had a reply from the First Presidency. They enclosed a copy of a record from their meeting of 17 January, which said that "President [Hugh B.] Brown and President Tanner both felt it was an opportunity for us to have a professional writer who is a devoted Church member prepare such a history. It was agreed that authorization may be given to use the materials in the Historian's Office, with the understanding that he could not take any of these materials out of the office." President Tanner's accompanying letter of 18 January stated: "With President Joseph Fielding Smith's approval I am authorized to tell you that it will be quite in order for you to arrange with Earl Olson of the Historian's Office to use material available in that office and library."

I immediately wrote to Earl Olson, who quickly confirmed the approval and promised full cooperation. Knowing the importance of this permission, I turned down an offer to remain permanently at UCLA and, on 1 July 1967, resumed my position at Utah State University where I would be able to commute to the Church Archives. That summer I spent many days examining materials in the
archives and continued this effort, when possible, in the years that followed. During this time I became well acquainted with that devoted and intelligent archivist, Dean Jessee, who introduced me to many documents that had not previously been studied by historians. I also became well acquainted with the cheerful and indefatigable Sister Edyth Jenkins Romney, who worked in the archives with her husband, Thomas Cottam Romney, and after his death continued to make typescript copies of original manuscripts. In the years that followed, unsolicited letters came from the Historian's Office to several Latter-day Saint scholars inviting them to use the facilities of the Library-Archives for their research. President Tanner had taken a major step in opening the archives to earnest and established historians.

The completion of my book had to await many developments. The materials in the archives were so vast, so unbelievably complete and rich, that I could not possibly compass them in a few months. I taught a full load of economics classes at USU during this time period and, at the request of the Research Council of the university, directed several projects that brought in research grants and awards. With the Research Council's encouragement and support, I continued to do articles on Western economic history and, with the help of USU students, wrote monographs on federally financed industrial plants and reclamation projects in Utah, coauthored a biography of Governor William Spry, compiled a history of First Security Corporation, and wrote biographies of David Eccles and Charles C. Rich.

Alfred Knopf, then moving through his eighties, was becoming impatient and complained that he would die before my book appeared. Actually the book was not published until 1979, and then only because of the willingness of Davis Bitton to coauthor it and of fellow staff members and friends to help out. The Mormon Experience: A History of the Latter-day Saints came out when Alfred Knopf was in his eighty-seventh year. He was overjoyed with the publication and wrote one of the most heart-warming letters I have ever received, expressing his approbation and enthusiasm. The book was the choice of the History Book Club and was favorably reviewed in the New York Times. The volume also received an appreciative welcome from Presidents Kimball and Tanner and several members of the Twelve, who voiced their gratitude for a book which, as they stated, they could give to their well-placed non-Mormon friends.
Upon the death of President McKay in January 1970, Joseph Fielding Smith, then president of the Council of the Twelve, became president of the Church. The way was open for the appointment of a new Church Historian; and since the days of Willard Richards, the Church Historian had always been an apostle. Even if tradition had not been a consideration, internal promotion seemed unlikely. A. William Lund, in his eighties, was not a candidate; and Earl Olson, although a grandson of Andrew Jenson, had no college training in history. President Smith and his counselors chose Elder Howard W. Hunter as the new Church Historian.

Elder Hunter, a native of Idaho and a corporate attorney from Southern California, took his appointment seriously. With the approval of President Tanner, he held several conversations with prominent LDS historians. I was one of a “Committee of Historians” called to his office on 24 August 1970, to discuss the organization and function of the Church Historian’s Office. As I recall, the meeting was suggested by Davis Bitton, professor of history at the University of Utah and current president of the Mormon History Association. Also present were James B. Allen, professor of history at BYU and vice president of the Mormon History Association; LaMar Berrett, chairman of church history and doctrine at BYU; and Reed Durham, director of the Institute of Religion at the University of Utah. I think Brother Olson may also have been present for at least part of the meeting. At the request of Elder Hunter I sent him a letter dated 31 August 1970 that summarized this committee meeting. As outlined in the letter, we historians made six suggestions, all important in the later establishment of the Historical Department of the Church:

1. That an advisory Council of LDS historians be appointed to meet quarterly with Elder Hunter. The Council would include representatives from the departments of history and Church history at BYU, departments of history at the University of Utah and USU, the Institutes of Religion of the Church, the Utah State Historical Society, and LDS historians outside the Mountain States area.

2. That the Church appoint a professionally trained person as Assistant Church Historian who would be a coordinator and supervisor of historical research and publications. A budget should be established for a staff of five persons—a secretary, an
editor, a director of research, an investigator who would serve the needs of General Authorities and other Church officials and agencies, and a traveling historian-librarian who would go "into the field" to uncover documents, letters, journals, and diaries in the homes of members, and conduct oral history interviews.

3. That the Historian's Office make available "Fellowship Grants" to established historians to do work in the archives—summer fellowships to Mormon and non-Mormon historians doing work on Mormon history, and internships to promising graduate students.

4. That the Assistant Church Historian maintain close relationships with professional historical associations related to LDS history: American Historical Association, Organization of American Historians, American Society of Church History, Western History Association, and the various historical associations of the states with substantial numbers of Latter-day Saints.

5. That sequels to the seven-volume documentary History of the Church and Andrew Jenson's Biographical Encyclopedia be prepared.

6. That a multivolume sesquicentennial history of the Church be prepared for publication in 1980.

Many of these concepts were apparently on Elder Hunter's agenda as he met with the First Presidency and others in the months that followed.

Less than six months later, on 8 February 1971, A. William Lund died, age eighty-four. Earl Olson remained as the sole Assistant Church Historian, and many LDS historians fervently hoped that Elder Hunter would now appoint a professionally trained person as an assistant to replace Brother Lund. When Elder Hunter again convened the historians' committee in Salt Lake City on 19 November 1971, he confessed that the Church Historian's Office had done almost nothing to compile Church history since B. H. Roberts's multi-volume Comprehensive History of the Church had been completed in 1930, although revelations had clearly required them to do so. They had not published important documents, had not compiled biographies, and had not written narrative or interpretive history. Almost nothing had been done to compile material on Church history in the twentieth
century. Discussing the possible appointment of a professional historian, a Ph.D., as assistant historian in charge of research and publications, Elder Hunter pointed out the limited budget for the Church Historian's Office. Our committee then suggested a dual appointment by BYU and the Church Historian's Office, with the appointee spending half-time at BYU and half-time at the Church Historian's Office. Even a part-time appointment would make possible documentary histories that would satisfy the canons of scholarship and which would open the way for writing interpretive histories that would be simultaneously friendly and intellectually respectable.

Elder Hunter seemed excited by this suggestion. During November and December, he held private conversations with various historians, especially Richard Bushman, then Boston Massachusetts Stake president, in whom he had great confidence, and reported back to President Tanner. I do not know the content of that report; but on 5 January 1972, President Tanner telephoned me in Logan, asking me to come see him at my earliest convenience. I taught my 8:00 A.M. class at Utah State the next morning, then Grace and I drove to Salt Lake City. I suspected that President Tanner might ask for my recommendation for an assistant church historian. I had someone in mind and organized my arguments all the way down to "sell" my candidate.

We parked in the ZCMI Center, and I walked over to 47 East South Temple. When I entered his office, President Tanner smiled warmly and motioned me into the big leather easy chair next to his own. "Brother Arrington," he began, "I'll come straight to the point. We would like to initiate a reorganization of the Church Historian's Office as part of a general reorganization in which members of the Council of the Twelve will cease to occupy staff positions in the various organizations and programs of the Church. We would like Elder Alvin Dyer to be managing director of the Historian's Office, you, Brother Arrington, to be Church Historian, and Brother Earl Olson to be Church Archivist. Will you accept the position of Church Historian?" I was astonished but tried not to show it.

We spent most of the next hour talking about the new post. "We have done very little writing of Church history in the last forty years," President Tanner acknowledged. "We are under obligations to write our history for the benefit of the generations to come, and we want it done in a thoroughly professional way. We have confi-
dence that you can do it. You will occupy an endowed chair at BYU that will pay half your salary, and the Church will pay the other half. You may tell your wife and President [Glenn] Taggart at USU, but otherwise keep it quiet until I contact President Oaks of BYU and we will make a joint announcement.” President Tanner then telephoned Dallin H. Oaks, who suggested they make the announcement a week from that Friday, 14 January. President Tanner said he would announce the change at a meeting of the Historian’s Office staff the afternoon of 14 January, which he hoped I would attend. He wanted me to start immediately, but I pointed out that I had classes at USU and would not be able to leave until the end of winter quarter, about the middle of March. He urged me to come to Salt Lake City as often as possible in the meantime to get things started. He said that Elder Hunter was not a historian and that he, Elder Hunter, would be delighted to have me take his place.

As I left the office about noon, I saw Grace waiting for me in the antechamber. President Tanner asked me to bring her in, shook hands with her, and gave her the news. She was as surprised as I had been and was both delighted and chagrined. While she was pleased for me and for the cause of Church history, she loved Logan, thoroughly enjoyed the home we had built there, and was visibly dismayed at the thought of moving to Salt Lake City. However, her instinctive supportiveness caused her to say, “Yes,” when President Tanner asked if she approved.

President Tanner set another meeting for the afternoon, after he talked with Elder Dyer and Earl Olson. In our afternoon meeting, President Tanner said that Elder Dyer had agreed to serve as my liaison during the organizational phase to ensure that I received the cooperation and help of the apostles and First Presidency. Elder Dyer, a former counselor in the First Presidency and at that time an Assistant to the Council of Twelve, was in a good position to arrange coordinating meetings for Earl Olson and me with key personnel and to obtain clearances for appointments and programs.

I cannot praise highly enough Elder Dyer’s subsequent support. From our first meeting a few days later until his service was curtailed by a stroke on 21 April 1972 (and to a limited extent thereafter until December, when Elder Joseph Anderson was appointed to serve in his stead), Elder Dyer firmly reiterated his desire to give the new historical team “the wheels to run on.” And he did so with enthusiasm.
and eagerness. He arranged for Earl and me to attend a meeting with the Twelve in the upper room of the temple and to meet several times with the First Presidency. He presented me to Church magazine editors for interviews that were later published. Elder Dyer asked over and over what he could do for us that would help the work along.

The weeks between 6 January and the end of the quarter at USU on 15 March were crammed. I was teaching history of economic thought and government regulation of business, and supervising several research projects. My department head, B. Delworth Gardner, was understanding in permitting my frequent absences from the campus, and I was able to travel to Salt Lake City two days a week. We put our Logan house up for sale and purchased a Salt Lake home on 22 February. I stayed in it part of the week and returned to Logan to administer research projects the rest of the week. We made the final move to our Salt Lake City home when school was out in June. A lot of media attention was given to my appointment, and my children and colleagues felt that a great honor had come to me. There were many calls and letters of congratulations. I was fifty-four years old, had published several books and monographs, had contributed many articles to professional journals and Church magazines, and had served as president of the Mormon History Association, Western History Association, and Agricultural History Society. I was now entering upon a new work during which I would have to shift my emphasis from teaching and research to administration and historical entrepreneurship.

Elder Dyer, Earl Olson, and I held our first meeting on 20 January 1972; and at the time, we discussed a possible change in the name and organization of the Church Historian's Office to take account of the fact that it now included more than a Church Historian. In a follow-up meeting on 25 January, we agreed to change the name of the CHO to the Historical Department of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, with an Archives Division headed by Earl Olson, a Library Division to be directed by a trained librarian (Donald T. Schmidt, librarian at BYU, was appointed to this post on 10 March), and a History Division that I would supervise. Later, in 1974, the department created the Arts and Sites Division with Florence S. Jacobsen as Church Curator. Florence had previously served as a consultant to Elder Mark E. Petersen's committee on museums and
visitors' centers. Under her leadership, Arts and Sites collected art and artifacts and planned the magnificent Museum of Church History and Art that opened in 1980.

Also in the 25 January meeting, I requested the appointment of two Assistant Church Historians, James B. Allen and Davis Bitton, each to remain at his university and serve half-time with me. Both had been close personal friends and professional associates for many years. They were in their early forties. I prepared a page on each of the two, and Elder Dyer held conversations with his advisors from the Twelve and First Presidency, Elders Howard W. Hunter and Spencer W. Kimball. The Twelve endorsed the appointments at a meeting in the upper room of the temple on 24 February, to which Elder Dyer, Earl, and I were invited. In this meeting, the First Presidency and Twelve approved the new name for the department and heard oral reports from Earl and me. It was a solemn, even sacred, moment as we watched them raise their hands to sustain us and our plans.

After this meeting, Elder Hunter invited me to his office where he candidly discussed the condition and function of the Historical Department during the two years he had been Church Historian and Recorder. He was very relaxed and friendly. He said that my own appointment had come about because of the strong feeling of some of the brethren that the Church needed a professionally trained historian and that the professionally trained historians they had consulted had recommended me. According to my diary entry, he further said that he felt the Church was mature enough that our history should be honest. He did not believe in suppressing information, hiding documents, or concealing or withholding minutes for possible censorial scrutiny. He thought we should publish the documents of our history. Why should we withhold things that are a part of our history? he asked. He thought it in our best interest to encourage scholars—to help them and cooperate with them in doing honest research.

Shortly after these meetings, Elder Dyer had to leave for conference appointments in Central America and so was unable to make the formal calls to Jim Allen and Davis Bitton until 10 March. I drove down from Logan on that Friday to be present for this important event. Upon learning that all had turned out well, something for which I had fasted and prayed, I called Dean Jessee into the office;
and Dean, Jim, Davis, and I knelt in prayer to express our thanks and to ask blessings upon our endeavors as we were now entering into our work.

In the weeks that followed, I asked for additional historians to do research and writing of benefit to the Church. Among the first of these historical associates whom Elder Dyer interviewed and cleared were Dean Jessee (already a cataloguer in the Church Archives), Michael Quinn, Richard Jensen, Bill Hartley, Gordon Irving, and Maureen Ursenbach (Beecher). Added later were Glen Leonard, Dean May, Rebecca Cornwall (Bartholomew), Gene Sessions, Bruce Blumell, Jill Mulvay (Derr), Ron Esplin, Ronald Walker, and Carol Cornwall Madsen.

Until November 1972 when we moved into the east wing of the recently completed high-rise Church Office Building on North Temple Street, we were housed on the third floor of the Church Administration Building at 47 East South Temple. I was placed in the office previously occupied by A. William Lund, the office occupied for many years by Susa Young Gates, sometimes called the Thirteenth Apostle. Our staff was located along the east end of the third floor in a series of desks that faced toward my office. The library-archives occupied the west end of the third floor and much of the basement.

After the February endorsement by the First Presidency and Twelve, Jim Allen, Davis Bitton, and the staff joined me in mapping out a detailed program for the History Division that was presented to the First Presidency on 8 August and approved, according to a letter they sent us on 13 September, in which they also commended me and my associates “for the excellent way in which you have been fulfilling the assignments given to you.” The program included the following:

1. The preparation of a series of articles for The Ensign and New Era.

2. The commencement of books for a “Heritage Series” to be published by Deseret Book. These would be edited documents like the diaries of Joseph Smith, letters of Brigham Young to his sons, letters of Brigham Young to Indian chiefs, selections from the letters and diaries of women, and so on.

3. The preparation of a sixteen-volume sesquicentennial history of the Church. Although this program was dropped in 1980, each
author was paid for his work and urged to publish a volume on his own auspices. Seven of the books have been published to this date.

4. The preparation of two one-volume histories of the Church—one, to be published by Deseret Book, intended primarily for members of the Church, the other, to be published by Alfred Knopf, intended to reach nonmembers. These were later published as *The Story of the Latter-day Saints* by Allen and Leonard (1976) and *The Mormon Experience* by Arrington and Bitton (1979).

5. The preparation of biographies of Brigham Young, Eliza R. Snow, and other Church leaders.

6. The inauguration of a program of oral history.

7. The awarding of summer research fellowships.

8. The assignment of various trained associates to work on specific topics: Jill Mulvay (later replaced by Susan Staker Oman) and Carol Madsen on a history of the Primary, Bill Hartley on priesthood quorums, Richard Jensen on immigration, Jill Mulvay on women in Church history, Bruce Blumell on the Church Welfare Plan, Dean Jessee on the Prophet Joseph Smith, and others.

During the ten years the History Division remained a part of the Historical Department of the Church, we had reason to believe that we enjoyed the confidence of the presidents of the Church. President Harold B. Lee, who became president upon the death of Joseph Fielding Smith on 2 July 1972, talked with me several times about the work of the division. He told me that he thought *Great Basin Kingdom* was the finest book on the history of the Church since Roberts's *Comprehensive History* appeared in 1930 and favored our doing a similar general history directed at members of the Church. This is the volume that eventually came out in 1976 as *Story of the Latter-day Saints*. President Lee said he thought our history should be written by professionally trained persons and that he supported the programs that we had reported to him. "The best thing that could happen to us," he said, "is to have a history that is so honestly written that it would be equally acceptable to members of the Church and the outside world." Joined by President Marion G. Romney and Elder
Hunter, he pronounced a personal blessing on my head, which, among other things, declared: “Brother Arrington . . . the Lord will bless you and enlarge you and will open new doors to you to enable you to amass material and write histories and prepare necessary documentation for the benefit of generations yet unborn so that [all] will know what has gone on before.”

After President Lee’s premature and unexpected death in December 1973, President Spencer W. Kimball assumed office. He was also very supportive. He asked me to spend an afternoon in his office reading his diary in order to acquaint myself with its nature and to give him suggestions on how to make it more effective. On two different occasions he told me that he was fully aware two or three of the brethren were not entirely pleased with our publications but that he himself had confidence in us and that, more importantly, the Lord was blessing us in our work. He encouraged Davis Bitton and me as we wrote *The Mormon Experience* and was especially pleased that, as a Knopf publication, it would find ready acceptance in most libraries throughout the country. President Kimball later asked me to prepare a biography of Brigham Young that would join *The Mormon Experience* on the shelves of these same libraries and give a clear picture of this prophet and his contribution to Church leadership and the settlement of the American West.

On 24 July 1978, while he was still in good health, President Kimball and I spoke by invitation at the Days of ’47 Banquet in Hotel Utah’s Lafayette Ballroom. Honored guests on that occasion were Bruce Babbitt, governor of Arizona; John Evans, governor of Idaho; Mike O’Callaghan, governor of Nevada; and Scott Matheson, governor of Utah. My talk was a review of Mormon colonization in the West. President Kimball followed with an address on the “spirit” of the pioneers. At the conclusion of the meeting, President Kimball came over to where I was seated. As I rose to greet him and congratulate him on his talk, he put his arms around me, kissed me on the cheek, and said movingly, “I want you to know that I love you very much and that the Lord is pleased that you are the historian of his Church.” How I have cherished that loving blessing!

Two years later, in 1980 during the sesquicentennial year, the First Presidency and Twelve transferred the History Division to Brigham Young University to serve as the Joseph Fielding Smith Institute for Church History. Under the direction of Gordon B.
Hinckley of the First Presidency and G. Homer Durham, who had been managing director of the Historical Department since 1977, nine members of the History Division were transferred, with an agreement that their offices would remain in the Church Office Building in Salt Lake City until 31 August 1982, when they would be relocated in the Knight-Mangum Building at BYU. "This is a forward step," said President Kimball in a news release dated 1 July 1980. "The stature, objectivity, and effectiveness of our fine professional historians will be enhanced by association with the church's university, where they can perform their scholarly tasks in a university atmosphere with increased interchange with professional colleagues and the teaching process." President Kimball sincerely believed he was protecting us and giving professional recognition to our work by moving us to Brigham Young University where we could continue to do research under academic rather than ecclesiastical supervision. I feel sure that this kind, loving, but straight-shooting man of integrity would be pleased with the efforts of present Church Historian Loren Dunn and his advisors to allow responsible historians greater freedom in making use of materials that, for a period at least, were under restriction.

During the ten years our History Division was affiliated with the Historical Department of the Church, 1972-82, we dedicated ourselves to writing important, interesting, and well-prepared papers on many aspects of Church history. In addition to hundreds of talks in sacrament meetings, firesides, historical occasions, professional societies, and study groups, members of the staff published 20 books; completed 8 book-length manuscripts, most of which have since been published; submitted 364 articles for publication in Church magazines, professional journals, and other periodicals; and wrote about 300 other papers, most of which were later published. No one questions that this was a prodigious output of scholarly work. The prizes awarded for some of these publications indicate the high quality of the work. Surely, President Tanner's commission that we research and write our history in a professional way was met during this era.

In addition, our History Division did something else of which we all are proud. We made contributions to a nonprofit entity administered by us called the Mormon History Trust Fund. When Sister Edyth Romney was retired from the Historical Department
because of age, we arranged, with a salary financed by the Mormon History Trust Fund, for her to continue her work of transcribing precious documents in the archives until we left the Historical Department in 1982. She transcribed thousands of letters signed by Brigham Young and the diaries of Willard Richards and other Church officials. In short, she produced one of the most remarkable legacies of our stay in the Historical Department—thousands and thousands of pages of typed transcripts. She is still consecrating her time and energy for the benefit of Church history to this day.

Officers of the Mormon History Association have asked me to evaluate our experience in working those ten years in the Historical Department and to freely employ the well-known historical device of hindsight.

First, I can plainly see that, after the death of Elder Dyer in 1973, we would have done well to have published a regular newsletter or circular letter to inform General Authorities of the work we were doing. This would have given them more information about our efforts and provided a sound basis for decisions about our activities in the years that followed.

Second, in all fairness, the move to BYU had some real benefits. For one thing, the Church was embarrassed about the salaries we were being paid. Even though we received less than we would have earned as university professors, we were, in fact, among the highest paid employees of the Church. This did not bother President Tanner, who believed in paying people what they were worth, but it was a concern to some who believed that the Church should pay modestly—less-than-competitive wages and salaries. I personally never urged the issue of satisfactory pay; but for some of my associates who were buying their homes and raising young families, the issue was an important one. From this standpoint it was logical for the Church to transfer us to BYU where, I might add, administrators immediately raised our salaries. This, of course, pleased the wives and husbands of the research professors in the Joseph Fielding Smith Institute.

Third, our experience demonstrated conclusively that the enormous mass of material in the Church Archives was constructive and faith-promoting, revealing positive and inspiring glimpses of the Church and its officers. As to the few items in the archives that have been viewed as damaging to the Church, copies were made by unfriendly people long before we began our work; the appearance
of these documents is not traceable to our policy of openness but to theft or permissions wrongly given well before our own researches. Although some urged us to spend our time answering the unfavorable accounts that appeared, we were counseled by our advisors to proceed with our own task of telling the Church's history, and this is what we did.

Through the Joseph Fielding Smith Institute, splendid books, articles, and papers will continue to be produced; and I have faith that this work will continue to have the blessing of the Lord. As I continue to research and write and enjoy the companionship of my precious wife, Harriet, I appreciate and benefit from the blessings pronounced on my head by Presidents Lee and Kimball and by my stake president, later a member of the Second Quorum of Seventy, George I. Cannon. On this twentieth anniversary of the establishment of the History Division and the Historical Department, I congratulate those who have been and are associated with it, and I offer my solemn testimony that the Lord will continue to look upon this work with the approval that has been so evident in the past.

DURING THE PAST DECADE, most studies of Mormonism and Masonry have focused on a narrow range of topics: anti-Masonic passages in the Book of Mormon, descriptions of the Nauvoo Lodge, and comparisons of Masonic rites and the Mormon temple ceremony.¹ This

essay takes the Mormon-Mason story into Utah where Masons prohibited the entry of Mormons into their lodges until 1984. It examines the political and social climate in Utah Territory when the first Masonic lodges were chartered, the initial exclusion of Mormons for polygamy, the decision by the Grand Lodge of Utah to continue the exclusionary policy even after the abandonment of polygamy, and the factors that became part of reversing that policy.

**Masons in Utah, 1847-1900**

Although such prominent Mormons as Hyrum Smith, John C. Bennett, Brigham Young, and Heber C. Kimball were Masons before the organization of the LDS Church in 1830, Joseph Smith, Sydney Rigdon, John Taylor, Wilford Woodruff, Lorenzo Snow, Orson Pratt, and Parley P. Pratt, among other leaders, were not initiated into Masonry until the Nauvoo Lodge was organized under a dispensation granted by the Grand Lodge of Illinois on 15 October 1841, and the lodge was installed on 15 March 1842 by Abraham Jonas, Grand Master of Illinois. On 15 March, Joseph Smith and Sydney Rigdon were formally initiated as Entered Apprentices and, the following day, were passed as Fellow Craft Masons and raised as Master Masons.² By 11 August 1842 when the activities of the Nauvoo Lodge were suspended for advancing men faster than the rules allowed, it had initiated 286 candidates and passed and raised 256 Fellow Craft and Master Masons.³

As a result, Mormon Masons in Illinois vastly outnumbered the

---


³ Reynolds, *History of the M. W. Grand Lodge of Illinois*, 166. The history of Mormon lodge activity in Nauvoo which follows is, unless otherwise noted, from this source, pp. 172, 193-94, 199-200, 232, 261.
alarmed non-Mormon Masons, who feared that the Mormons would soon control the Grand Lodge of Illinois. There were three lodges in Nauvoo (Nauvoo, Nye, and Helm), the Eagle Lodge in Keokuk, and the Rising Sun Lodge in Montrose, the only one of the five to operate under a charter. An investigating committee concluded that although some of the alleged irregularities had occurred ("the practice of balloting for more than one applicant at one and the same time"), most charges were "groundless, and without proof to sustain them." The Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of Illinois removed the injunctions suspending the work of the Nauvoo lodge on 2 November 1842 and authorized it to resume under its previously granted dispensation. However, the tensions did not abate. The Nauvoo Lodge petitioned for a charter; but at the next annual communication (or formal business and report meeting), a resolution presented on 3 October 1843 not only denied a charter but suspended the dispensations under which the Nauvoo and Keokuk lodges were operating and cancelled the charter of the Rising Sun Lodge. Although no vote on the resolution is recorded, a messenger was sent to Nauvoo to "demand the dispensation." He returned to report that the Mormon Masons had refused to yield the dispensation and expressed instead "a determination . . . to continue their work."

And continue they did. On 13 May 1844, a Masonic Hall was dedicated in Nauvoo with great fanfare. At the next annual communication on 8 October 1844, more than three months after the assassinations of Joseph and Hyrum Smith, the Grand Lodge severed all relations with Nauvoo, Helm, and Nye lodges, cut off relations with the Keokuk lodge one year later, and apparently never reconsidered its suspension of the Rising Star Lodge. Thereafter, all Mormon lodges in Illinois and Iowa were considered clandestine, both because the Mormons had continued to operate their lodges without dispensation and because a significant number of Latter-day Saints had participated in endowment rites which Masonic observers claimed resembled Masonic initiation rites. Hundreds more would be similarly endowed before the Mormons abandoned their temple in February 1846.

Although the Mormons made no petition for a Masonic lodge after reaching Salt Lake City in 1847, a famous photograph of Brigham Young taken in 1850 clearly shows him wearing a Masonic pin, and "Masonic Schools" were held during the 1852 session of the territo-
Brigham Young, ca. 1850, wearing Masonic pin. Engraving by Frederick Hawkins Piercy Courtesy Utah Historical Society.
rial legislature. These two indications of continued interest in Masonry, however, must be seen in the context of Brigham Young's failure to petition for a Masonic charter and his efforts to distance the Church from Masonry. According to Wilford Woodruff, on 19 August 1860 the possibility of obtaining Masonic charters came up in a meeting of the First Presidency and Quorum of the Twelve. Brigham Young commented, "Joseph & Hyrum were Master Masons and they were put to death by masons or through there instigation and he gave the sign of distress & he was shot by masons while in the act." Young also believed that "the people of the United States had sought our destruction and ... have worked through the Masonic institution to perfect it." 5

Young's suspicions were not without some factual foundation. Shortly after the assassinations of Joseph and Hyrum Smith, the Warsaw Lodge elected Mark Aldrich as Worshipful Master and as members Levi Williams, Thomas C. Sharp, and Jacob C. Davis, all of whom were under indictment for the murders. 6

Just the year before Young's remarks, a group of twenty-three Master Masons stationed with their fellow soldiers at Camp Floyd were issued a dispensation by the Grand Lodge of Missouri on 6 March 1859 and, on 1 June 1860, were granted a charter as Rocky Mountain Lodge No. 205. 7 Brigham Young, not unnaturally, was

---


7 Gustin Gooding, *First 100 Years of Freemasonry in Utah* [also titled *The History*...
suspicious of this Masonic connection in soldiers who were undermining his authority.  

At that August meeting, Young told the others that Lucius N. Scovil "thinks so much of masonry that he might join in with them," even though George A. Smith believed Scovil would not "mingle with our Enemies to the injury of this people." Scovil, a charter member of the Nauvoo Lodge, had been Junior Warden of the Nauvoo Lodge and was asked to halt lodge activities in 1845 by Brigham Young. Obviously, joining the Camp Floyd lodge was not even a possibility for Mormons; but when George A. Smith proposed getting five charters from England to form a grand lodge, an act that would make Utah Masonry independent of all other U.S. grand lodges—and certainly independent of the Camp Floyd group—Young warned that establishing a Mormon grand lodge "would have a tendency to bring down all hell upon us as far as they had the power."  

Less than a year later, the soldiers left Camp Floyd for the Civil War; and in 1862, a French convert who had emigrated to Utah in the 1850s wrote in his memoirs, "There is not even the shadow of a Masonic Lodge in Utah. As a member of both French and Scottish Freemasonry, it is our opinion that that institution has served its purpose and one would hardly dream of founding a lodge of any rite in Utah." Other remarks by Mormon Masons demonstrate their

8 Norman F. Furniss, The Mormon Conflict, 1850-1859 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960), 76, 119-20, 127, 196 comments on Brigham Young's mistrust of the Missouri Masons. He also warned the other General Authorities that these soldiers and "other Masons" had come for the express purpose of murdering him and other Church leaders. Wilford Woodruff's Journal, 5:483. The charter was returned to the Grand Lodge of Missouri in the spring of 1861 when the Civil War closed Camp Floyd. See Harold P. Fabian, Centennial Observance of Freemasonry in Utah (Salt Lake City: n.pub., 1959).  
10 L. A. Bertrand, Memoires d'un Mormon (Paris: E. Dentu, 1862), 171-72; my translation. Hogan mistranslated this statement as: "It is our opinion that the Endowment is becoming obsolete and one would hardly dream of founding a lodge of any rite in Utah." Hogan, "Time and Change," 1956 Proceedings of the Grand Lodge of Utah (Salt Lake City: n.pub., 1956), 80. Bertrand obviously meant
mingled respect for and mistrust of Masonry. Heber C. Kimball, speaking in the tabernacle 7 July 1861, quoted Brigham Young as saying that “they gave us a charter for a Masonic Lodge, and then went to work and killed some of the men to whom the charter was given,” but maintained, “I know that I have been true to my country, to my Masonic brethren, and also to my brethren in this Church.”

John Taylor’s attitude was similarly ambiguous: “Freemasonry is one of the strongest binding contracts that exists between man and man, yet Freemasons are mixed up in those different armies, trying to kill each other, and so they have contended against each other for generations past.” In short, many Mormons still considered themselves Masons; but they remained aloof from any organizational affiliation.

The next year, another military unit under the command of Colonel Patrick Connor arrived in Utah in October 1862. Connor began publishing the *Union Vedette*, a forum for the non-Mormon soldiers, merchants, and miners who sought a greater role in the political and economic development of the territory. Tensions spiraled, reaching a crescendo when Brigham Young, beginning in 1865, encouraged Church members to boycott gentile merchants. During early November 1865, in this unsettling context, several Masonic merchants announced a meeting to organize a Masonic lodge. Despite the ambiguous feelings of Mormon leaders who were Masons and the undeniable animosity between Mormonism and Freemasonry, not the temple endowment, was no longer necessary.


Masonry, several Mormons attended the meeting. The non-Mormons refused to recognize them as Masons and organized a lodge without them. As customary, they petitioned the nearest grand lodge for a charter and received a one-year dispensation from the Grand Lodge of Nevada dated 26 January 1866 to open and hold the Mount Moriah Lodge.¹⁵

The dispensation came with a condition: No Mormons must be admitted either as petitioners or visitors. In a letter of instruction, written in response to an inquiry from the lodge, the Grand Master explained that even though "the laws of the land have declared polygamy a crime," the Mormons "have openly and defiantly declared their intention to resist the enforcement of the law." Moreover, "polygamy is a moral and social sore which it is the duty of Masonry to discountenance."¹⁶

This moral tone was not necessarily discriminatory. Most contemporary Masonic jurisdictions followed "Ancient Landmarks" criteria for membership. These guidelines, established in 1723, required approved candidates to be free, male, of good reputation and strict morals, well recommended and approved, and believers in the Grand Architect of the universe.¹⁷ In addition, a Mason was normally charged to "obey the moral law," be "a peaceable subject to the civil powers,"¹⁸ and not discuss politics or religion in the lodge.¹⁹ Mus-


¹⁹The United Grand Lodge of England did not recognize the grand lodges in
lims, whose religion also permitted polygamy, were at least theoretically considered eligible Freemasons as early as 1723, so this instruction must be seen in the context of Mormon defiance of the Morrill Act (1862).

The Utah petitioners objected, not because they were planning to admit polygamists as members but because they resented dictation on visitors. Furthermore, not all Mormons were polygamists. They therefore agreed to accept the charter “as far as polygamists were concerned” but asked for the right to extend visiting privileges “to Masons who neither adhere nor practice it.” The Grand Lodge of Nevada not only rejected the request but refused to grant a permanent charter in 1866, permitting only another one-year dispensation. The Utah Masons accepted the renewed dispensation but “by direct action of the Lodge, agreed, under our conviction of right and justice, that we could not Masonically exclude a visitor on religious reasons, but would exclude polygamists on general reasons.” The Grand Lodge of Nevada did not budge, refused the 1867 request for a charter, and thus compelled the disbanding of the Mount Moriah Lodge.

At least one Mason outside Utah disagreed with the decision of the Grand Lodge of Nevada. Robert Ramsay of Toronto, Canada, wrote that the “Grand Lodge of Nevada erred . . . in giving a Dispensation, with special edict attached” and “in refusing to grant a Charter to a Lodge of Masons that, in every particular, acted up to several countries, most notably France and Italy, during most of their existence, finding them either atheist or too political. Polk and Knight, The Pocket History of Freemasonry, 269-70, 272-73.


Goodwin, Freemasonry in Utah, 14.

Ibid., 15. This action was an ironic repeat of history, since the Mormon lodges in Nauvoo were also denied chapters because of conflict involving the Mormon Church.

and abided by the principles of the Fraternity." Other Masons agreed, for the most part, with the Nevada condition, particularly in light of the Mormon Church's policy, since arriving in Utah, of discouraging its members from associating with Freemasonry. An editorial in *The Mystic Star*, a Masonic paper, announced its opinion that Mormons were "regular descendants of the expelled Mormons of Nauvoo;" thus, "it is proper and right to refuse them as visitors." Yet "if a Mormon has been made a Mason in a legally constituted Lodge," the writer believed that "he is entitled to all the common courtesies of Masonry, and every Mason is duty bound to obey the demands made when coming from a true brother." But an uninitiated Mormon did not deserve consideration:

> For the honor and safety of Masonry, we should never receive a petition from any party or sect who array themselves against the common laws of the land; or who repudiate the wholesome relations of domestic life. We would, as a Mason, refuse to recommend the petition of a Mormon, or a member of any sect which blockades the way of its members to becoming Masons, unless the individual would first renounce publicly all affiliation with such a sect or party.  

Utah's Masons reorganized Mount Moriah Lodge, unsuccessfully sought a new dispensation from the Grand Lodge of Montana, and then, in 1868, successfully petitioned for a dispensation and charter from the Grand Lodge of Kansas. In the meantime, the Grand Lodge of Montana had issued a dispensation to another group of Masons to open the Wasatch Lodge in October 1866. This lodge included soldiers from Camp Douglas and other non-Mormon residents of Salt Lake City. Although the dispensation did not contain conditions about Mormons, it asked that the lodge call itself "Wasatch" rather than its initially proposed name, "King Solomon,"

---


26 For the reaction of the Grand Lodge of Nevada to the dispensation granted by the Grand Lodge of Kansas, see 1869 *Proceedings of the Grand Lodge of Nevada* (Carson City, Nev.: n.pub., 1869), 508-9.

because Solomon was "identified as a polygamist." The Wasatch Lodge was apparently free to admit Mormons under its dispensation and charter but refused to do so.

Despite Brigham Young's mistrust of Masons in general, he complained about the exclusionary policy in a February 1867 speech in the Tabernacle. "They are afraid of polygamy," he accused, and counterattacked sarcastically: "Who was the founder of Freemasonry? They can go back as far as Solomon, and there they stop... Now was he a polygamist or was he not? If he did believe in monogamy he did not practise it a great deal, for he had seven hundred wives, and that is more than I have."28 But in 1877, after the completion of the St. George Temple, he was happy to report that it was "the first completed temple built to the name of the Most High, in which the ordinances for the living and for the dead can be performed, since the one built by Solomon." He continued with a Masonic version of that temple's history: "In the days of Solomon, in the temple... there was confusion and bickering and strife, even to murder and the very man that they looked to give them the keys of life and salvation, they killed because he refused to administer the ordinances to them when they requested it; and whether they got any of them or not, this history does not say anything about."29

Utah's third group, Argenta Lodge, was organized in 1871 under charter from the Grand Lodge of Colorado. According to one historian, the Argenta Lodge was organized on the pretext to "frustrate the notions of some men, high in power [presumably Mormons] to obtain Dispensations and Charters for Masonic Lodges in Utah, from foreign countries."30 Almost three decades later, the Committee on Jurisprudence of the Grand Lodge of Utah reported that this "young and immature Lodge was in 1871 forcibly torn from the womb as it were of two other Lodges, in order to secure a sufficient number to establish a Grand Lodge, for the avowed purposes of preventing certain persons who were living in open violation of the laws of the land from procuring a Charter to establish a Lodge."31

29 Ibid., 19:220. See also 18:303.
According to accepted U.S. procedure, three lodges were the minimum for establishing a grand lodge; the presence of a grand lodge in a state or territory removed local lodges from the jurisdiction of the out-of-state grand lodges that had granted their charters. \(^{32}\)

The Grand Lodge of Utah was organized 20 January 1872, its membership consisting of the 124 members of the three local lodges. The constitution and bylaws recognized, as standards of membership, the "Ancient Landmarks." \(^{33}\)

Despite the conflict between Mt. Moriah Lodge and the Grand Lodge of Nevada about excluding Mormons, either as visitors or petitioners, whether polygamists or not, the Grand Lodge of Utah's unwritten procedures had the same effect. Some Masons may have feared Mormon domination if they were permitted entry, but their primary rationale was the illegal practice of polygamy. At the organizational meeting, the Worshipful Grand Lecturer, Reuben H. Robertson, congratulated those present in lofty terms: "[We] guarded well the 'inner door' and the 'magic power of the mystic brotherhood' increased in this polygamic community, while none who held his country's authority in defiance or trod its laws beneath their feet entered the portals of our lodges." \(^{34}\) Grand masters expressed similar sentiments at subsequent annual communications for the next three years. \(^{35}\)

In 1878, Grand Master Joseph M. Orr

---


32 Goodwin, Freemasonry in Utah: Mt. Moriah Lodge, 290. British Masons use a significantly different system: one United Grand Lodge and over eight thousand lodges. One British commentator in 1878 called the Grand Lodge of Utah "absurdly small for such a title; and certainly the rapid increase of late in the number of Grand Lodges is to be deplored." A. Woodford, Kenning's Masonic Cyclopaedia (London: Geo. Kenning, 1878), 626.

33 According to its constitution, the "Grand Lodge is the supreme Masonic power and authority in Utah . . . limited only by a strict adherence to the ancient landmarks of the Order, and to the provisions of its own Constitution and Regulations." 1872 Proceedings of the Grand Lodge of Utah (Salt Lake City: Tribune Printing and Publishing Co., 1872), 21.

34 Ibid., 15.
defined the exclusionary policy to include any Mormon, whether polygamist or not:

We say to the priests of the Latter-day Church, you cannot enter our lodge rooms—you surrender all to an unholy priesthood. You have heretofore sacrificed the sacred obligations of our beloved Order, and we believe you would do the same again. Stand aside; we want none of you. Such a wound as you gave Masonry in Nauvoo is not easily healed, and no Latter-day Saint is, or can become a member of our Order in this jurisdiction. 36

Although it is understandable that both polygamy and Nauvoo's irregular lodges were given as reasons for excluding new Mormon applicants and Nauvoo initiates, another reason was practical poli-

35 Grand Master Obed F. Strickland observed, "Our first Great Master in his wisdom, well knowing that cosmopolitan ideas were heresy among those who claimed they were the chosen people of the Lord . . . , devised Masonry, with its secrets and penalties, as a safe depository, where the seeds of progressive human events might find shelter, until the ground was fitted for the sower to go forth and sow broadcast the main facts upon which the foundation of all civilized nations now rest the existence of one God and the universal brotherhood of man." Proceedings of the First Annual Communication of the Most Worshipful Grand Lodge (Salt Lake City: Utah Evening Mining Journal, 1872), 5-6. The next Grand Master, R. H. Robertson, predicted that Freemasonry in Utah "will do much to correct the wrongs now existing, and to redeem our fair Territory from the curse of polygamy and its concomitant evils." 1873 Proceedings of the Grand Lodge of Utah (Salt Lake City: Tribune Printing and Publishing Co., 1873), 11. Finally, Grand Master Louis Cohn, likewise predicted, "Throughout this extensive Territory, Masonic Altars will spring into being and supplant the Temples of superstition, and the humanizing influences of Freemasonry will shine forth as the very counterpart of bigoted Priestcraft." 1874 Proceedings of the Grand Lodge of Utah (Salt Lake City: Tribune Printing and Publishing Co., 1874), 6.

tics. The arrival of the army at Camp Douglas, the discovery of minerals in 1862, and the completion of the transcontinental railroad in 1869 all resulted in an influx of non-Mormons anxious to challenge Mormon exclusivity in economics and politics. Utah Masons, in alliance with other non-Mormon interest groups, including the Salt Lake Tribune, the Liberal Party, merchants, and miners, attempted to guarantee non-Mormons a broader role in territorial government and the economy. Early Utah Masons included a significant number of merchants: the three Walker brothers—Joseph, Samuel, and Mathew, all former Mormons—Louis Cohn, Morris Meyer, Sol Siegel, Samuel Kahn, Theodore Auerbach, and John Cunningham, who competed directly with Mormon merchants. Robert N. Baskin, Reuben H. Robertson, and Obed F. Strickland were lawyers, Joseph M. Orr and Alfred S. Gould were territorial officials, and Charles P. Lyford was a pastor. All wanted to reduce the grip of the Mormon hierarchy and to gain greater economic independence; nearly all saw eliminating polygamy as a means to that end.

Shortly after the organization of the Wasatch and Mount Moriah lodges, Brigham Young organized the School of the Prophets as an economic planning conference. This school organized ZCMI to further discourage trade with non-Mormon merchants. Cooperating Mormon merchants identified their stores with the slogan "Holiness to the Lord" placed above the Masonic all-seeing eye.

The Liberal Party, organized to limit Church influence in politics and force the abandonment of polygamy, held its first meeting in the Masonic Hall. Masons Orr, Joseph Walker, and Kahn were

38 Lyford was a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church who spent a four-year mission in Utah and later wrote The Mormon Problem: An Appeal to the American People (New York: Philips & Hunt, 1886).
39 Complaining about an article in the New York Herald, which referred to the all-seeing eye, Chalmers I. Paton responded in a London Masonic weekly: "Polygamy is a sin of gross turpitude, which destroys marriage and degrades women. Let the Freemasons on the other side of the Atlantic rise en masse and crush this attempt at an unwarranted interference with their symbols."
40 Goodwin, Freemasonry in Utah: Wasatch Lodge, 12.
active liberals. Baskin, later mayor of Salt Lake City and chief justice of Utah's Supreme Court, drafted the Cullom Bill, which would have limited the jurisdiction for the prosecution of plural marriages to the federal courts (where judges were appointed by the president of the United States) and would have required that juries be selected by the federal marshall and United States attorneys.

Although the Cullom Bill was eventually defeated, the activities of these Masons demonstrate that Utah Masonry was much more than a social fraternity. Its members continued to participate in the anti-polygamy crusade throughout the 1870s and 1880s and were vocal opponents of the LDS Church's domination of the Territorial Legislature. Like their fellows in other countries, notably France and Italy, Utah Masons were deeply involved in the legal battles for control of the day-to-day operations of state and local governments to facilitate the social, professional, and political advancement of its members. Since most non-Mormons saw the Church as controlling Utah politics, antagonism between the two groups was inevitable, and the difficulty of joint membership is understandable. Although other groups during this period like the Alta Club, the Chamber of Commerce, and other fraternal organizations had no specific rules prohibiting Mormon membership, they were also organized by non-Mormons and their membership initially consisted of only non-Mormons. Thus, Utah Masonry's refusal to admit Mormons was not unique, and Nauvoo "irregularities" cannot explain it.

Still, polygamy was the most easily defensible reason for justifying Mormon exclusion, not only among fellow craftsmen but among most United States citizens. The first significant test case was that of John P. Sorenson. An inactive, nonpolygamous Mormon, he had joined the Argenta Lodge in 1876, becoming a Master Mason.

41 In 1870, when the Cullom Bill was under consideration, some Masons manifested sympathy for non-polygamous Mormons; Baskin explains the incident bitterly as a manifestation of Mormon influence: "When I was in Washington urging the passage of the Cullom bill, . . . a number of men who should have aided, became frightened at the threats made by the leading Mormons in a meeting convened by Brigham, and having met in the Masonic hall in Salt Lake City, adopted resolutions protesting against the passage of that bill and forwarded the same to the Mormon delegate, to be used by him to defeat it." Reminiscences of Early Utah (Salt Lake City: R. N. Baskin, 1914), 56.
that same year and a trustee of the lodge in 1878. However, when he renewed his commitment to Mormonism in 1879, he was promptly expelled by a 5-1 vote of commissioners elected by Argenta Lodge to try the case. The reasons given were, first, that he was a member in "full fellowship" of the Mormon Church, "whose principles and practices in Utah are in direct violation of the laws of the United States, as well as the laws of morality and common decency." Second, "he had declared himself an advocate of the principle and practice of polygamy and by so doing had brought Masonry into disrepute."  

The lone dissenter, Moses C. Phillips, agreed that Sorenson should have been expelled if he had practiced polygamy but argued that making membership in the Mormon Church a litmus test for disqualification was "a dangerous precedent, as no man should be put on trial as to his religious belief, except he openly declares himself an atheist."  

The Committee on Grievances and Appeals, consisting of Baskin, Alexander G. Southerland, and Herbert W. O'Margary, unanimously affirmed the expulsion: "[Sorenson's] conduct, in this regard, is not different from, or less reprehensible, than if he had joined some other association organized to commit, foster and protect any other crime, for instance, theft, arson or highway robbery. These crimes stand in the same category with polygamy, and are not less obnoxious to law." Indeed, "anyone who joins a conspiracy thereby makes himself an abetter in everything which is afterwards done, in carrying into effect his objects."  

Two years later in 1881, Aaron Goodrich, the Grand Representative of the Grand Lodge of Utah in Minnesota, sent a printed circular to the Grand Lodge of Minnesota in which he incorrectly stated that Utah Masons were "fraternizing with polygamous Mormons and embracing them as Masons before our sacred altar."  

Anxious to disassociate themselves even further, the Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of Utah in 1882 expressed dismay that "some of our representatives and sister Grand Lodges abroad have misunder-

42 Goodwin, Freemasonry in Utah: The Argenta Lodge, 17.
44 Ibid., 32-33.
45 Gooding, First 100 Years of Masonry, 14.
stood the grounds upon which we excluded members of the Mormon Church from membership in, or affiliation with any Lodge, within our jurisdiction and instructed the Grand Secretary, Christopher Diehl, to draft an explanatory communication to all grand lodges worldwide “to prevent any further misunderstanding.” Diehl’s circular reminded Masons that a Freemason must

admit the theological belief taught on the threshold of our sacred Temple and further, that he must be loyal to the Government under which he lives, and yield a willing obedience to all of its laws, the Masons in Utah contend that the latter important prerequisite is wanting in the Mormons, because one of their chief tenets of their Church in Utah is Polygamy, which a United States Statute has declared to be a crime, and which all civilized nations considered a relic of barbarism.

Answers from “9-10ths of the Grand Lodges” returned “in a half a dozen different languages.” Opinion was unanimously “with us,” Diehl concluded triumphantly. In fact, many of the grand lodges published this communication with short, approving responses in their yearly proceedings.

In addition to identifying polygamy as the sole cause for the exclusion, this communication is also important for what it does not say. It makes no reference to “anti-Masonic” passages in the Book of Mormon, the history of Masonry in Nauvoo, or reported similarities between the Mormon endowment and the Masonic rite.

Utah Masonry grew very slowly between 1880, when it numbered 392 Master Masons, and 1890, when the number had risen to 486, however, individual Masons figured prominently in local politics and legal battles during that decade. Baskin lobbied against the various petitions for statehood, lobbied for the passage of anti-polygamy legislation, prosecuted polygamists, and participated in cases disenfranchising polygamous Mormons under the provisions of the Edmunds-Tucker Act (1887). After the passage of that act, non-Mormons were, for the first time, elected to the Territorial Legislature. Most of the non-Mormon merchants survived the Mor-

\[46\] 1882-3 Proceedings, 18, 24-25; emphasis Diehl’s.


mon boycott, which ended, for all practical purposes, in 1882. Masonic influence also extended to the Salt Lake City school system in an informal power-sharing relationship with the Mormons. After the virtual abandonment of polygamy in 1890 and statehood in 1896, the non-Mormon coalition had obviously achieved its goals of greater economic and governmental participation and the enforcement of anti-polygamy legislation.

**Finding a New Rationale, 1900-50**

After Mormonism's abandonment of polygamy, Utah Masonry's prime public reason for excluding Mormons no longer existed, but no era of inclusiveness followed. Nine years after the Manifesto, correspondence published in the annual proceedings of the Grand Lodge of Utah reveals continuing wariness: A representative of the Grand Lodge of Delaware wrote sympathetically: "[Utah Masonry] has not the number of Lodges and membership that other jurisdictions have, but this is due to circumstances over which the Craft have no control... Her purpose is... to... preserve true Masonry pure and undefiled." Diehl, reprinting this letter, hinted darkly: "There was a time when we all thought a change for the better had to come, but recent occurrences have convinced us that the thought, and if you please, the wish was too previous." To another letter from the Grand Lodge of New Jersey, he reiterated: "We are proud of our small number of Lodges and membership. The Masons of Utah are true to the core and law-abiding citizens. The celebrated Manifesto has not yet captured us and never will." Five years later, a Past Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of Washington criticized Utah's "unwritten" exclusionary policy and drew a defiant reply:

[The Past Grand Master] touches a subject of which he knows nothing. The pioneers of Utah Masonry knew what they were doing when they taught the Unwritten Law of Utah Masonry, and the present

49 Ibid., 203.
50 Jonathan Bliss, Merchants and Miners in Utah: The Walker Brothers and Their Bank (Salt Lake City: Western Epics, 1983), 229-78.
A generation has experience enough to teach that law to the next one. He better not mention that subject again; it will do him no good and every line he writes about it is wasted. Utah Masons will stand ‘pat’ on that line forever and a day.53

Then, one year later in 1905, an article entitled "Mormonism and Its Connection with Freemasonry 1842-3-4 Nauvoo, Illinois," appeared in Utah Lodge’s proceedings, describing the history of the Mormon lodges and the 1844 resolution which declared them "clandestine."54 In short, although the generation of Nauvoo Masons had died, the issue of Nauvoo Masonry was being resurrected from the grave of Mormon polygamy.

Despite the political, religious, and social gulf that had deepened steadily for three decades, the Mormon hierarchy still put Freemasonry in a category of its own. According to Apostle Rudger Clawson, at a quarterly meeting of the Quorum of the Twelve on 4 April 1899, Franklin D. Richards, president of the quorum and a Nauvoo-initiated Mason, stated that Joseph Smith recognized Freemasonry as containing truths "which had come down from the beginning and he desired to know what they were, hence the Lodge." Joseph’s subsequent actions were consistent with other cases involving lost scripture. He “inquired of the Lord” who “revealed to the Prophet true Masonry as we have it in the temples,” Richards conti-

53 “Report on Correspondence,” 1904 Proceedings of the Grand Lodge of Utah (Salt Lake City: n. pub., 1904), 103-4; see also pp. 49-50, 87.
54 1905 Proceedings of the Grand Lodge of Utah (Salt Lake City: n. pub., 1905), 113-20. The article originally appeared as John Corson Smith, “Mormonism and Its Connection with Freemasonry,” The American Tyler (1 February 1905). Baskin’s Reminiscences of Early Utah (Salt Lake City, 1914) gives a good idea of the tension and differences which continued to exist between Mormons and non-Mormons in Utah almost thirty years after the Manifesto. See also R. N. Baskin, Reply to Certain Statements by O. F. Whitney (Salt Lake City: n. pub., 1916). Many fellow craftsmen, particularly from Great Britain, where there were few Mormons, apparently were unaware not only that polygamy had been abandoned but that Utah Masonry prevented Mormons from joining their lodges. In 1907, John T. Lawrence, a London Freemason observed (perhaps tongue-in-cheek): “We might congratulate the Mormons upon possession of a jurisdiction at all, for the average Brother finds it sufficiently hard work to defend his secrets from one wife, and can only surmise and envy the Masonic steadfastness which keeps half-a-dozen at bay.” Sidelights on Freemasonry (London: A. Lewis, 1909), 227.
ued. "Owing to the superior knowledge Joseph had received, the Masons became jealous and cut off the Mormon Lodge."\(^{55}\) He added as proof the Masonic admission that "some keys of knowledge appertaining to Masonry were lost," apparently a literal interpretation of a portion of the ritual in which some of the secrets shared by King Solomon, King Hiram of Tyre, and Hiram Abiff "were lost by the murder of Hiram Abiff—a result of his refusal to divulge the secrets—and that certain substituted secrets were adopted 'until time or circumstance should restore the former.'"\(^{56}\)

One year later, President Richards was dead, but his ideas were not. The First Presidency and Quorum of the Twelve discussed "the attitude of the Church in relation to secret societies" at a meeting on 12 April 1900. "The mind of the brethren," summarized Apostle Rudger Clawson, was that Church members "should not have the consent or approval of the Church in connecting themselves with secret societies, and that those who already belong should be encouraged to withdraw as soon as they reasonably can." Nevertheless, the "society of free Masonry was in some degree excepted, as it was thought that in some instances it might be advisable to join that body." The personal experience of such apostles apparently accounted for Masonry's special status; but at the end of the meeting, President Lorenzo Snow authorized a statement that the Church leadership was "opposed to secret societies" and that their members would be "denied admission to the Temple for ordinance work."\(^{57}\)

---

\(^{55}\) Rudger Clawson, Diary, 4 April 1899, Papers of Rudger Clawson, Special Collections, Marriott Library, University of Utah, Salt Lake City.


\(^{57}\) Clawson, Diary, 12 April 1900. This Church policy was published in the Church's official magazine, *Improvement Era* 6 (February 1903): 305: "The counsel of the First Presidency of the Church in all cases, has been and is against our brethren joining secret organizations for any purpose whatsoever, and that wherever any of them have already joined, they have been and are counseled to withdraw themselves from such organizations." See also Joseph F. Smith, *Gospel Doctrine* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Company, 1919), 110, quoting his conference talk of April 1901, in which he identifies the reason for this policy as conflicting allegiance. He called secret organizations "snares that are set to entrap our feet and to win our affections from the Kingdom of God." Still Masonry maintained its special status. On 15 October 1911, the LDS First Presidency,
Even without expanding its membership base to include Mormons, Utah Masonry achieved unprecedented growth in the three decades following the Manifesto. From 1890 to 1920 the number of Master Masons in Utah increased from 486 in seven lodges, to 3,690 in twenty-one lodges. In 1920 alone, 669 new Masons entered the lodges.\(^58\) Meanwhile, the exclusion of Mormons opened the door for the establishment of an irregularly constituted and unrecognized form of Masonry.\(^59\) By allowing Mormons as members, this irregular group, the American Masonic Federation, not only embroiled Utah’s Freemasons in a fairly sensational court case but also provided the catalyst for a new and improved rationale for continuing the exclusion policy—a connection between the Masonic rite and the Mormon endowment.

In 1881, Matthew McBlain Thomson, a Mormon convert from Scotland who claimed a “patent from the Grand Council of the Rites of Scotland,” immigrated to Idaho where he became a member of the King Solomon Lodge in Montpelier, Idaho. Eventually lodge members refused to accept his degrees and, furthermore, claimed that “Mormons were clandestine Masons.” By this they apparently meant that, because of reported resemblances between the temple endowment and the Masonic rite, Mormonism incorporated an unrecognized variant of Masonry. As a result, Thomson “took his demit,” created an organization called the American Masonic Federation (AMF), and began practicing what he called “Universal Masonry.”\(^60\) In 1908, he organized a lodge in Helper, Utah, triggering a protest by the Grand Lodge of Utah, which sent a letter to all Utah Masons informing them that AMF lodges were clandestine, spurious, and fraudulent. Dominic Bergera, the local master of the AMF lodge in Helper, asked Diehl to headed by Smith, issued a statement: “Because of their Masonic characters, the ceremonies of the Temple are sacred and not for the public.” Messages of the First Presidency of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, edited by James R. Clark, 6 vols. (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1965-75): 4:250. See Buerger, “The Development of the Mormon Temple Endowment Ceremony,” 45-46, for nineteenth-century comparisons.

\(^{58}\) 1921 Proceedings of the Grand Lodge of Utah (Salt Lake City: n.pub., 1921).

\(^{59}\) For a discussion of irregular or clandestine Masonry, see Polk and Knight, The Pocket History of Freemasonry, 326-29.

\(^{60}\) Salt Lake Telegram, 12 May 1922.
come to Helper to discuss the matter with Thomson; Diehl did not answer the letter. Later Bergera, a Catholic, talked with Diehl and reported that Diehl told him, "The organization is all right but . . . the lodge could not be cured so long as they had a Mormon for its Grand Master. . . . They did accept Catholics in some cases, but . . . they absolutely could not meet with a Mormon and . . . they would not allow them to visit or to join their lodge."\(^{61}\)

Undaunted, in 1909, Thomson moved the AMF headquarters to Salt Lake City and began organizing a series of AMF lodges in the state. He also sold Masonic degrees by mail, dedicated an AMF temple in 1918, and published a periodical entitled the *Universal Freemason* that challenged the Grand Lodge of Utah's exclusionary policy.\(^{62}\) In 1915, the United States Post Office Department began a protracted investigation of Thomson. In 1921 he, Bergera, and others were indicted for mail fraud on charges of misrepresenting "the standing and character of the organization fostered" by the American Masonic Federation. The indictment claimed that Thomson had represented his organization as "the only regular, legitimate, and true Scottish Rite bodies in America"; because he mailed out his periodical, degrees, and other publications, he had, the government claimed, defrauded the public.\(^{63}\)

The case came to trial in U.S. District Court before a jury. The original judge, Tillman D. Johnson, disqualified himself since he was a Mason, and Judge Martin J. Wade of Iowa was assigned to preside. Although Wade advised the jury that the case was not a dispute between any two alleged Masonic bodies, it is difficult to read the trial transcript without observing that one issue was the definition of clandestine Masonry. The government introduced evidence that

---

\(^{61}\) Transcript of Record, United States Court of Appeals, Eighth Circuit, *Dominic Bergera v. United States of America*, 418-20; hereafter cited as "Transcript."


\(^{63}\) *Salt Lake Telegram*, 23 November 1921.
Thomson's Masonic organizations were clandestine; Thomson and Bergera referred to Idaho Masonic accusations that "Mormons were clandestine Masons"; Thomson and witnesses for him compared the practices of the AMF, identified as Universal Masonry, with the "regular" Masonic lodges; and Thomson claimed his own groups had "charters from a superior source" than those of his opponents. While instructing the jury, Judge Wade acknowledged that "there is no dispute" that Thomson had "planned to organize and maintain a new organization, claiming for it ancient origin." 

Mormonism was a side issue. In his opening statement, M. E. Wilson, Thomson's attorney, pinpointed a difference between the two organizations as religious discrimination. (At this point, according to Wilson, "regular" Masonry had two million adherents; Thomson had ten thousand.) "The Universal Masonry practiced by the defendants admits all persons who believe in a supreme being," he explained. "They draw no religious bars, a distinction which distinguishes the Universal Masons from the American organizations with which they are in conflict." Thomson also claimed, "None of the Grand Lodges other than his own body, have charters from a superior source, and . . . a lodge was originally established in Utah as an anti-Mormon organization. He said that his organization was not religious and that Mormons and Catholics belong. He said he was a Mormon himself and he thought in good standing." The jury, after just two hours of deliberation, unanimously convicted Thomson of using the United States mail to defraud; and Wade sentenced the defendants to two years in the federal penitentiary in Leavenworth, Kansas, and fined them $5,000 each.

Although there is little doubt that Thomson was primarily interested in making money by selling degrees, it is less clear that his organization was clandestine. The question of "irregular," "regular," and "clandestine" Freemasonry is an enormously complicated one and certainly beyond the scope of this paper. There has always been some tension between Masonic groups in continental Europe and

64 "Transcript," 484-86, 488.
65 Salt Lake Telegram, 12 May 1922.
66 Ibid. Evans, The Thomson Masonic Fraud, 149, paraphrases this quotation, converting part of it from third to first person and altering some words.
England. In France the body recognized by the United Grand Lodge of England represents only a small percentage of all French Freemasons. It is thus not surprising that Thomson was able to find acceptance in Europe by some Masonic bodies who were "irregular" by American-British standards and were "clandestine" only in the sense that they were not recognized by Anglo-American Masonic bodies. Thus, when the attorney who prosecuted the case to the grand jury wrote a book in which he indignantly compared Thomson to Cagliostro, Balsamo, and Cerneau, he was on thin ice. Cerneau was a schismatic whose rite is deemed legitimate by some Latin bodies but disreputable to U.S. Freemasonry, while Cagliostro and Balsamo were the same person.

Although Utah Masons were pleased that the U.S. government had removed Thomson from the scene, the incident apparently hardened their resolve to continue excluding Mormons and began to focus on Mormonism as "clandestine" Masonry to justify the policy of exclusion. Samuel H. Goodwin, who became Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of Utah in 1912, took the lead in shifting the argument from polygamy to secret rites. A witness in the Thomson trial, Goodwin was an ordained Congregational pastor who had served in various church functions in Utah since 1898 and had been superintendent of the Congregational Home Missions for Utah. He recognized that the polygamy rationale advanced by Christopher Diehl in 1882 was not only out of date but that Mormonism was well on its way to respectability and international prominence. The generation of men initiated as Mormons in Nauvoo had passed away. Furthermore, as the LDS Church continued to grow, it was inevitable that Masons outside Utah who became Mormons (or Mormons who became Masons) would be denied visiting privileges by Utah Masonic Lodges when they visited the state. The choices for Utah Masonry were broadening its rationale or broadening its membership policy.

It is therefore not surprising that, in 1921, the year of Thomson's indictment, Goodwin wrote a two-part article in The Builder, a

---

Masonic monthly, to explain why “Latter-day Saints are not received into Masonic Lodges in Utah, either as visitors or members” and then published an expanded version in pamphlet form entitled *Mormonism and Masonry*, which gave the first published rationale for excluding Mormons since Diehle’s 1882 circular.

The pamphlet detailed the formation of the Masonic lodges in Nauvoo, discussed the symbols and language of the Mormon temple ceremony, and responded to claims made by the Mormon hierarchy concerning the origins of the ceremony. Goodwin also discussed some of the “significant teachings of Mormonism” including “absolute obedience to the Priesthood,” the discontinued practice of polygamy, belief in continuing revelation, belief in “a plurality of gods,” and Mormon sanctions against joining Masonry or any other fraternal organization. He concluded: “It must follow that a member of that organization who would join the fraternity ... in direct opposition to the positive declarations of Church officials ... would necessarily be a ‘bad’ Mormon, and Masons may be excused for seriously doubting if a ‘bad Mormon’ can be a good Mason.”

Goodwin then listed nine reasons for continuing to exclude Mormons from Utah Masonry. Although Goodwin admitted that polygamy did not “have the importance for the Mason and citizen that it had when Grand Secretary Diehl sent out his circular,” three

---


of the nine reasons still focused on the continuing "declarations of belief" concerning the original revelation on plural marriage and Mormon resistance to anti-polygamy laws in the nineteenth century. Two additional reasons dealt with the "attitude of the Nauvoo Masons toward Masonic customs and law" and "clandestinism: Temple ceremonies and use of language and symbols." For the first time since the formation of the Grand Lodge of Utah, the claim that Mormonism sponsored a form of clandestine Freemasonry became an official rationale for excluding Mormon visitors and petitioners. The remaining reasons given by Goodwin included his belief that the Mormon "conception of male and female deity [is] out of harmony with that of Anglo-Saxon Masonry" and three related to the influence of priesthood authority over rank-and-file Mormons, including "Substitution of 'living oracles' (Priesthood) for the Bible"; the "unlimited power and right [of the Priesthood] to direct and dictate in all things temporal and spiritual"; and the fact that the Mormon hierarchy "holds Masonry to be 'of the evil one' and is opposed to members having any connection therewith."  

In 1922, the year after this new rationale was published, the Grand Lodge of Utah had 4,036 Master Masons, an increase of 348 from the previous year. Masonry was on the rise in other states, too. Utah Mormons living out of state were among these new members. The Grand Lodge of Utah passed a resolution in 1923 which was "sent to each Grand Master of the United States," suggesting "the desirability of investigating Utah-born material through Masonic Brethren or Lodges nearest the birthplace or home of such applicants" and including Goodwin's pamphlet.  

71 Mormomism and Masonry, 38. Additional editions appeared in 1922, 1924, 1925, and 1927.
73 Ibid., 65-66. The Grand Lodge of Utah had long favored this procedure. See 1904 Proceedings of the Grand Lodge of Utah (Salt Lake City: n.pub., 1904), Appendix, 19. The 1924 Proceedings of the Grand Lodge of Utah (Salt Lake City: n.pub., 1924), 24, reported that the pamphlet had "gone into practically every part of the world," and the quasi-official publisher issued it as S. H. Goodwin, Mormomism and Masonry (Washington, D.C.: The Masonic Service Association of the United States, 1924), Vol. 8 of a twenty-volume library, and in Book II of
In 1922, an Entered Apprentice in the Argenta Lodge, referred to only as “H.B.W.,” was discovered to be a Latter-day Saint. At a Masonic trial, he was found guilty and expelled even though he had not committed any Masonic offense. The 1924 proceedings of the Grand Lodge give an overview of the case, acknowledging various objections to the expulsion but focusing on whether Masonry should exclude a man who “denies real adherence” to Mormonism and “asserts that he is not one of them.” Representing the hard-liners, W. I. Snyder of Argenta Lodge moved that “[a] member of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, commonly called the ‘Mormon’ Church, is not eligible to become a member of any lodge ... in this State.” The group agreed to discuss both the resolution and the expulsion at the 1925 annual communication of the grand lodge.

There, the Jurisprudence Committee ruled that the lodge had acted improperly in expelling H.B.W.; but it became a moot point when, after a heated discussion, the members adopted a standing resolution amending the Code of the Grand Lodge of Utah to prohibit all Mormons, including inactive ones, from becoming Masons in Utah. The vote formalized in writing the unwritten policy, practiced in Utah since 1866. It also made the Utah lodge the only Masonic jurisdiction in the United States to adopt written rules precluding members of a named religion from becoming Masons or visiting the lodges. Thereafter, it became common practice to require nominal Mormons to provide evidence of excommunication or to
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sign a letter requesting excommunication, which the lodge mailed to the applicant’s ecclesiastical authority.

In 1926, the Grand Lodge of Utah reported that there were 4,937 Master Masons in Utah, 119 more than the previous year. That same year, the prohibition concerning Mormons was interpreted by Grand Master Benjamin R. Howell to include members of the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints (RLDS), even though that church had never practiced polygamy, did not have a temple ceremony, and its then-current president, Frederick M. Smith, was a Freemason who would become Worshipful Master of Orient Lodge 546 in Kansas City, Missouri (1934), and Grand Chaplain of the Grand Lodge of Missouri (1940, 1942-45). This interpretation was subsequently attached to (but not made a part of) the Code of the Grand Lodge of Utah, and a 1927 attempt to repeal the 1925 amendment failed. As 1928 opened, Master Masons in Utah numbered five thousand for the first time.

Yet some Utah Masons were troubled by the continued exclusion policy. Among these was recently elected Governor George H. Dern, a past Grand Master who had voted against the amendment in 1925. Speaking at the dedication of Salt Lake City's new Masonic Temple on 20 November 1927, he observed: “The chief battles of our Masonic forebears in this State were for the eradication of polygamy and church interference in politics. How well they succeeded, we all know. Polygamy is as dead as slavery, and, in the opinion of many, church interference in politics is no worse in Utah today than it is in many other states. However, eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.” He then warned:

Our present danger is that we will go on fighting dead issues, and neglecting live issues. . . . We are the enemies of mental slavery, but are prone to scream ourselves black in the face about the poor, deluded member who follows the dictates of churchly authority, and then we go right out and blindly, meekly and supinely follow the dictates of our
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political party, no matter how corrupt its leadership may be. Is it any more intelligent or any more American to follow a political boss than to follow a religious boss?  

Another sign of the changing times occurred two years later. The Grand Lodge of Nevada, which had strangled Mount Moriah Lodge rather than allow it the possibility of admitting Mormons, reversed its own "unwritten rule" in 1929. Responding to a query from a lodge in Carson City whether Mormons could be accepted, the Grand Master "found nothing in the Code that prevented any man because of religious convictions, making application to a Masonic Lodge in the jurisdiction."  

The first significant Mormon reaction to the new rationale was a 1921 article by B. H. Roberts in the Improvement Era, apparently prompted by Goodwin's original articles in The Builder. The Mormon General Authority stated that "the evidence, to my mind, is very clear that [Joseph Smith's] knowledge of the endowment ceremonies preceded his contact with Masonry" and that the temple ceremony "resulted from the revelations of God to Joseph Smith, and not from the prophet's incidental and brief connection with Masonry." It was a spirited counterattack, and like later Mormon apologetics, was directed only to the claim that the temple ceremony was a form of "clandestine Masonry."

A more detailed response was written by Anthony W. Ivins, a counselor in the LDS First Presidency in 1934, whose book, The Relationship of "Mormonism" and Freemasonry, was distributed free to all Mormon stake presidents, ward bishops, mission presidents, and faculty members at LDS institutes. The next year, E. Cecil McGavin, a respected instructor and author in the Church Education System followed with another book on the same subject.  
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Roberts, neither Ivins nor McGavin argued for a more inclusionary policy. In fact, all acknowledged that the Church discouraged Mormons from affiliating with "any secret, oath-bound society" since such organizations "tend to draw people away from the performance of Church duties." Instead, they defended the temple ceremony from Goodwin's claim that it was borrowed from Masonry, argued that any similarities could be explained by their common origin in the Temple of Solomon, and described the Mormon temple ceremony as an inspired restoration of the original ceremony. They also believed that Joseph Smith had "received the temple ceremony long before he learned the secrets, symbols and signs of Masonry."

No significant Mormon statements appear on the subject after that time, but voices from outside Utah joined the dialogue. Calvin H. Rich, a member of the RLDS Church and a Master Mason, tackled both sides of the issue. In a first pamphlet, he apparently criticized the "intolerance" of the Grand Lodge of Utah; in a second, he agreed that the "ceremonies used in the Mormon temples... are adopted largely, if not altogether, from the Masonic Lodge." Joseph E. Morcombe, Grand Historian of the Grand Lodge of Iowa and a Master Mason, wrote an article in 1936 criticizing both the Utah policy and Goodwin's rationale. A friend of Frederick M. Smith, Morcombe was particularly upset when the RLDS Church President visited a Utah lodge and its secretary pointedly told Smith: "If the examining committee had done what it should[.,] it would have asked me my church affiliations, and if I had told them I would have been denied the privilege of fraternal visitation." Such groundless exclusions

"Extract of Sermon Delivered on January 28, 1922," Americana Collection, Harold B. Lee Library, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah.
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could, in Morcombe's opinion, result in a "severance of fraternal relations" with the Utah lodges; he also predicted considerable controversy in Iowa, Missouri, and California where there were large numbers of LDS and RLDS Masons.  

During the Great Depression of the 1930s, the number of Master Masons in Utah declined because many members could not pay dues, but the 1940s saw renewed growth coupled with a new commitment to the exclusion policy. In 1945, there were 4,470 Master Masons in twenty-seven lodges. Fawn Brodie's controversial *No Man Knows My History: The Life of Joseph Smith, the Mormon Prophet*, appeared (1945; 2nd ed. rev., New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1971). Utah Masons found in it factual support for several of their nine reasons and, in 1949, approved the Grand Master's recommendation to reprint Goodwin's "Mormonism and Masonry." Simultaneously, however, pressure against denying visiting privileges to Mormon Masons from other jurisdictions (both LDS and RLDS) had become a more serious issue, since it pitted Mason against Mason and challenged the brotherhood of the fraternity. By 1949, Grand Master Ortis C. Skaite felt compelled to restate the rule in his address of office: "Teachings and regulations as would make one ineligible to become a member of a Masonic lodge in Utah, would also make one ineligible to visit a lodge in this jurisdiction even though he might be a Master Mason in good-standing in some other jurisdiction." This interpretation, like the previous interpretation prohibiting RLDS applicants or visitors, was attached to the *Code of the Grand Lodge of Utah*.  

REAPPRAISALS AND A NEW DECISION, 1950-84

Utah Masons numbered nearly 7,000 during the 1950s, but
concern over the "Mormon question" intensified. Mormonism was experiencing phenomenal growth; Apostle Ezra Taft Benson had been appointed to the cabinet of the president of the United States. Mormons, rather than being "lawbreakers" had the public image of impeccable patriots. In 1954, Utah's Grand Orator Calvin A. Behle explored the possibilities for change in a speech entitled "Mormonism and Masonry: A Look Today at an Old Utah Problem." Quoting liberally from Brodie, he pointed out ostensibly anti-Masonic passages in the Book of Mormon and detailed similarities between the Masonic rite and the Mormon temple ceremony. Appraising Goodwin's reasons for the exclusion policy, he pointed out that, since polygamy was no longer practiced by the Mormon Church and "there is no real possibility . . . for its revival," the prohibition was harder to defend:

Today our Fraternity in Utah is practically alone in the official maintenance of our "Iron Curtain", in sharp contrast with conditions before and at the turn of the century. Nor does membership in the Mormon Church stand as a barrier to Masonic membership in states other than our own. Thus, despite considerable official effort to place before our sister jurisdictions our reasons for the barrier in Utah, the plain, hard fact is that our reasoning by and large has simply failed to appeal to our Masonic brethren, in the face of other basic tenets of the Fraternity. California and Iowa are at least two jurisdictions which have been openly critical of the Utah position.

Each of us knows of instances where the rejection of a visiting brother solely upon religious grounds has proven embarrassing, to say the least. Elaboration is hardly necessary.

He made a two-part proposal: First, the grand lodge should "withdraw the blanket prohibition against the visiting Mason because of L.D.S. Church membership per se; and . . . leave the matter to the sound discretion of the individual Lodge," second, reconsider its membership exclusion policy. Tactfully, he said:

Your Grand Orator is . . . persuaded that eventually Time will bring us an affirmative answer in Utah for the worthy resident member of the dominant Church who may care to apply for membership in our brotherhood. . . . [But] it would seem improvident now to change the principle to which Masons in Utah have adhered for many, many years. With the possible exception of the modification in the case of the individual visiting brother, sound practical reasons still seem to exist for the barrier here between Mormon and Mason.91

That same year, Mervin B. Hogan, a Utah-born Master Mason and a Mormon, began publishing articles on Mormonism and Ma-
sony. His earliest articles criticized neither Masonry nor Mormonism but clearly suggested that the barrier between the two organizations was artificial. For example, in a 1956 presentation to the Utah Grand Lodge, Hogan, then Grand Orator, surveyed the various charges that Masonic rites were part of the Mormon temple ceremony and concluded that the temple ceremony “cannot be referred to as a ‘masonic’ ceremony in the sense that that word is used by Masons” and that, whatever the historical connection, numerous alterations had rendered the endowment unlike the Masonic rite.92 In later works, he openly challenged the barrier: “Freemasonry has no incompatibilities as to principles or philosophies with Mormonism.” The continued exclusion of Mormons was “invalid Masonically and without any justification whatsoever except for unbridled emotional bias and prejudice.”93

Clearly, deeply held convictions were at work on both sides. In 1958, an amendment to allow Mormons to become Masons in Utah failed. But when a group of traditionalists countered with a resolution to incorporate Skaite’s 1949 ban on visiting rights for Mormon Masons into the code, it also failed, leaving each lodge in
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Utah free to admit or exclude Mormon visitors. The Jurisprudence Committee, which had approved the amendment, noted that "any individual Mason feeling as the proponents of the amendment feel can accomplish the exclusion of any visitor objectionable to him by a simple objection made to the Worshipful Master at the time that application to visit is made. It follows that legislation is wholly unnecessary to protect our members from contacts objectionable to them." Most lodges did, in fact, continue to exclude Mormon visitors.

Seven years later, a second attempt to amend the Code of the Grand Lodge of Utah to allow Mormons to become Masons in Utah failed, an indication of the strength of the traditionalists. By the mid-sixties, Utah Masonry had lost some of its political clout though it remained an important social connection for many non-Mormons. Then, beginning in 1964, Masonic membership, both in Utah and in other states, began to decline, part of a nationwide slippage in affiliation experienced by most fraternal organizations. In 1966, Masonry's centennial in Utah, it could number only 6,315 Master Masons, down from its all-time peak of 6,968 in 1963. By 1979, the number had dwindled to 5,124. At the 1981 annual communication of the Utah Grand Lodge, W. Thuren Odendahl, the Grand Orator, ignored the "Mormon Question" to focus on the crisis of declining membership. Comparing the 1963 and 1979 memberships, he pointed out: "This loss of 1,844 Masons over a 16 year period represents a loss of 26.5% of our members, which averages out to a loss of approximately 115 members per year. The R. W. Grand Secretary informs me our loss for 1980 is 119 members. Should this trend continue for another 13 years, Utah would lose one half of its membership." 

During the early 1980s, some of the Utah lodges began to exercise their prerogative of allowing Mormon Masons from other

---


jurisdictions to visit. The traditional practice of not allowing already initiated Mormons to visit a Utah lodge had become extremely uncomfortable—and perhaps politically impossible—after the Grand Lodge of California, much larger and more powerful group elected a Mormon as Grand Master in 1980. A third amendment, proposed in 1983, to remove the ban on Latter-day Saints failed, but it was the final victory for the traditional point of view. On 31 January 1984, a resolution virtually identical to the defeated 1983 amendment, was passed.

**Analysis of the Change**

In 1984, Utah Masonry had fewer members than at any other time since the 1920s. Yet the fuller reasons for the change were historically and socially complex. When the resolution was presented, the Committee on Jurisprudence asked the Grand Lodge to consider a series of pointed questions:

Would abolishing the Standing Resolution have any impact on membership, for good or for ill? Could members of the LDS Church become active and valuable members, thereby strengthening the Craft, and at the same time remain loyal to their faith? Would such Church members fully respect our Ancient Landmark which prohibits any discussion of religion in a Masonic Lodge? Would such members apply individual pressure on our devotees to join their Church? Is the aim of abolishing the Resolution and Decision solely for the purpose of enlarging our membership? Is there any point in our taking a unilateral action, without any change in the position presently held by the leadership of the LDS Church? Are you willing to continue this deviation from Masonic law by retaining this restriction?

97 Ralph A. Herbold of the Southern California Research Lodge in 1966 reviewed the relationship between Mormonism and Masonry in Illinois and concluded, “I respect the decision of Utah in continuing the ban on Mormons in Utah Masonry because of the ever present danger, as they probably see it, of a Mormon domination of Masonry.” “Masonry and Mormonism,” 8. Other Masons in California had been more critical of the Utah policy and had evidently forged a new synthesis in the intervening fifteen years.
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These questions gave direction to five key factors Grand Lodge representatives had to consider in their vote:

First, could members of the LDS Church become active and valuable members, thereby strengthening the Craft, and at the same time remain loyal to their faith?

Obviously, some members of the Grand Lodge of Utah were still concerned about whether it was even possible for an active member of the LDS Church to become a Mason. Were inherent differences in belief between Mormonism and Masonry so strong that it was impossible for them to associate officially with one another? Since Masonry's only "religious" requirement is belief in the "Grand Architect of the Universe," the belief issue involved what Goodwin had characterized as the "plurality of Gods," or the Mormon belief that human beings may achieve godhood themselves while still acknowledging their relationship to God the Father and Jesus Christ. Many fundamentalist Christian organizations use the same Mormon doctrine to argue that Mormonism is not a "Christian" religion.

Although there were Masons who believed, and in fact continue to believe, that such a conflict is serious, the fact that the Utah Grand Lodge was the only grand lodge in the world which excluded Mormons demonstrated that it was only an academic exercise. Furthermore, since Buddhists, Hindus, and members of other religions which believe in plural gods have been allowed to join Freemasonry for at least two centuries through interpretations that the deist requirement was designed to exclude atheists, not polytheists—this rationale hardly seems convincing.

Second, would such Church members fully respect the ancient
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landmark which prohibits any discussion of religion in the Masonic lodge? Would such members apply individual pressure on lodge devotees to join their Church?

A hallmark of Freemasonry since the early 1700s has been a flat prohibition on political or religious discussions in the lodge to prevent the development of a “Masonic theology” and to keep the organization nondenominational. Mormonism’s ardent proselyting had alienated many Utah Masons (and other non-Mormons as well) who had been repeatedly approached at work and at their homes. Their concern that the lodge might become yet another arena for Mormon missionary activities is a natural response from persons aligned with Utah “minority” religions. A second source of pressure was history: the threat of Mormon control of the Grand Lodge of Illinois and the perception that Mormonism borrowed essential elements of the endowment from Masonic rites. Some obviously felt that, if given a chance, Mormonism would eventually control Utah Masonry as well.

Third, is the aim of abolishing the Resolution and Decision solely for the purpose of enlarging lodge membership?

Although most fraternal organizations had experienced similar declines since the 1960s, the exclusion policy limited the potential membership base of Utah Masonry to less than 30 percent of the male population. A significant number of the 70 percent Mormon majority is inactive and presumably feels little allegiance to the Mormon Church; but even nominal Mormons were ineligible for membership. The lodge could reasonably hope to attract new members among this group; nevertheless, this factor was apparently not the prime factor in motivating the change.

Fourth, is there any point in Utah Masons taking unilateral action to change their policy, without any change in the position presently held by the leadership of the LDS Church?

The strongest statements made by the Church discouraging membership in “secret organizations” occurred before World War II, although as recently as 1983, the General Handbook of Instructions for Mormon ecclesiastical leaders contained these instructions under the heading, “Secret Organizations”: The “Church advises its mem-
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bers strongly not to join any organization that . . . is secret and oath-bound" and further advised that "local leaders decide whether Church members who belong to secret, oath-bound organizations may be ordained or advanced in the priesthood or may receive a temple recommend." The removal of this policy from the 1989 edition apparently makes the Church officially silent on the topic of dual Mormon/Mason membership, and a number of "active" Mormons outside Utah have become Masons, apparently with no consequent Church discipline.

Many other churches—Presbyterians, Methodists, Lutherans, the Church of England, and the Roman Catholic Church—in various places and at various times have condemned Freemasonry and have prohibited their members from joining the Craft. The most aggressive and consistent opposition has come from the Roman Catholic Church which, since the eighteenth century, has not only discouraged, but at times even excommunicated, parishioners who joined the fraternity.

104 General Handbook of Instructions (Salt Lake City: Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saint, 1983), 77. The 1989 General Handbook of Instructions prohibits only affiliation with "apostate cults," which it defines as "such as those that advocate plural marriage." General Handbook of Instructions (Salt Lake City: Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saint, 1989), Section 10-3. In this context, it is possible that the Church’s recent encouragement toward greater participation in civic affairs could be interpreted by some Mormons as permission to become involved with Masonry. Glenn L. Pace, "A Thousand Times," Ensign 20:11 (November 1990): 8-10; Dcriin Head Rodriguez, "Reaching Out," Ensign 22:1 (January 1992): 66-71.


Still, the influence of the Mormon hierarchy over Church membership, historically a question of great importance, was a serious consideration with other ramifications besides those explicated in this question. Even though Utah Masonry provided an exclusive club wherein non-Mormons could meet, form alliances, and exercise political clout in a region dominated by the LDS Church, by 1984 the economic rationale for exclusion was becoming irrelevant. Masonic influence and membership were declining. Most non-Mormons who participated in Utah’s politics and economy did so without aligning themselves with Utah Masonry. As the rationale for exclusion became less meaningful, the price being paid for that exclusion—criticism by fellow Masonic lodges—became less acceptable, until it made no sense to perpetrate the policy.

Fifth, is the lodge willing to continue its deviation from Masonic law by retaining the restriction against Mormons? According to most Masonic observers, this question was the main catalyst toward change. Significantly, the question itself recognized that the Utah policy was a “deviation from Masonic law.” The Utah lodge had grown weary of defending its policy against criticism from other lodges and uncomfortable with its conspicuousness as the only Masonic lodge in the United States which prohibited those of a named religious faith from becoming Masons. Mormons were no longer polygamists or lawbreakers. Some Mormons were Masons in other jurisdictions. The possibility of offending other jurisdictions by refusing visitation rights to Mormons had been partially resolved by the 1958 decision letting each lodge make its own policy, but in actual practice many lodges continued the old prohibition. Thus, the loss of credibility and the possibility of losing recognition because of the visitation policy had become a serious concern. In a period when discrimination suits against clubs and fraternal organizations were not unusual, the threat, real or imagined, of litigation in Utah would have been unwelcome.

be regarded as anachronistic in the twentieth century, slowly giving way to social and fraternal functions.107 Unlike some groups which truncated or abandoned their ritual, Freemasonry retained its, but by mid-century there was rarely any discussion of clandestine Masonry in international circles. Thus, even if Utah Freemasonry still "officially" regarded the Mormon temple ceremony as a clandestine Masonic rite, such an objection to Mormon membership was clearly less meaningful than it would have been a century before.

CONCLUSION

W. Thuren Odendahl’s fears have been realized: As of 31 December 1990, there were just 3,784 Master Mosans in Utah, a 25 percent decline since 1979.108 The change in policy had not, in the intervening six years, reversed that downward trend; nor does it seem likely to. First, the amendment to the Code of the Grand Lodge of Utah does not change the reality that the balloting for every petitioner must be unanimous for admission. Second, although nominal LDS members and RLDS members may apply for membership in Utah’s Masonic lodges, it seems unlikely that many active Latter-day Saint men will be drawn toward Masonry.

Nevertheless, the 1984 amendment brought Utah Masonry into the mainstream of Masonic practice. When the grand masters of the grand lodges of North America met in Salt Lake City in 1990, there was no criticism concerning Utah Masonry’s "unwritten rule."

THE CHIEF: DISCONTENTED MYSTIC

Paul M. Edwards

FRANCIS HENRY EDWARDS II, my paternal grandfather, was a window washer and a maker of oil lamps. He was a man interested in life whose simple inquiry opened the world to him, a man of integrity and pride who believed in himself, in his family, in the essential dignity of men and women, and in the ever-present love of God. He saw life as a testing place where persons were called upon to meet the challenges sent their way—a place for significance as well as joy, for love as well as accumulation, for hope as well as preparation.

He lived most of his life in the industrial heart of Birmingham, England, in a narrow, three-story house that long since has been replaced by a machine shop. He often roamed the dirty streets of that sprawling city in search of work at the factories and windows to

wash, or walked several miles to an uncle's funeral home for piece work as a casket maker or professional mourner. He hated the poverty and the grime in which he lived, but he dearly loved their home (they paid the rent weekly) and the soot-black soil of the small garden he tended.

In my only photograph of him, he is standing in front of the Birmingham RLDS Church with my father, who looked surprisingly ill at ease in a suit much too small for him. Short and stocky, Grandfather looked kindly and wise like the old miner in *How Green Was My Valley*.

My grandmother, Ellen Smith Edwards, looked like all grandmother pictures from that Victorian age. From my father's brief descriptions of her, I knew her most memorable feature was her "sparkling" eyes. Small to the point of inconvenience, she was surprisingly tough and managed to keep their family of five children alive and happy on what was at best a chancy income. True victims of the merciless economics of the Industrial Revolution, their financial survival depended on the questionable kindness of absentee landlords and profit-haggard superintendents. But the soul of the family rested on the powerful convictions of this lady with the sparkling eyes.

Their was a faraway world of dark streets, coal fires, candles, factory labor, heartbreaking debts, eighteen-hour days, private schools, demands of the Empire, and colonial and international wars. But it was also an age of bed warmers (I used one until I was nearly twelve), of new penny libraries, of hot potatoes sold with a pinch of salt by a corner vendor for a farthing, of awakening democracy and social reform, and of unrelenting pride in an empire on which the sun never set. Then toward the end for them, it became a world of danger, bombing raids, rationing, and censorship—a place to which we sent canned meat, boxed crackers, and warm woolen sweaters.

Every year my father would use the Christmas occasion to recall his family to us with long stories, English breakfasts of fried green tomatoes and steamed mushrooms, toasts to the king drunk in grape juice and ginger ale, and tears springing to his eyes at the static-crackling voice of the new king who had, in pure royal tradition, stood firm in the face of his brother's abdication. We listened as the "girls" (Elizabeth and Margaret) said a hearty "cheerio" to the children of the
Empire and the Commonwealth, counting ourselves, just for the occasion, as their loyal subjects.

I never met my English grandparents and memories of them are disconnected myth, a distant encounter. I did not know my maternal grandmother either, for Ruth Lyman Cobb Smith was killed in an automobile accident as a comparatively young woman; and her death cut so deeply into her children that they could not discuss her easily. But there were many oblique references to her literary talents, her love for ideas, her mysterious friends in high places, her dislike of housework, her unexplained “illness” that seemed to require frequent winter trips to California and, in the summer, to the coast of Maine. Apparently a frail lady with a tough literary mind, she played an as-yet-unexplained role in the life of that family.

All of this left my two siblings and me with only one grandparent—a stern and somewhat distanced one at that—and with a collection of myths about who and whose we were. We were left without role models of what a grandparent or a grandchild should be. I was thirteen when Frederick Madison Smith, prophetic successor to his father, Joseph Smith III, died in 1946; but I have no memories of him as grandfather. He saw to that. Interestingly, I remember him instead as my mother’s father. I always called my mother, Alice Myrmida Smith Edwards, by her first name, Alice. Everyone else did, and I saw her more as a friend than a mother. But this was her father, and fathers had a special identity. My own father, Francis Henry Edwards, was “Sir” until I was drafted.

As I remember him, Fred M. was powerful of mind and body, caustic in his communications, arrogant beyond explanation, and shy beyond belief. He was demanding in his love of silence and aggressive in his approach to difficulties, a lonely and passionate man who loved the limelight but was uncomfortable in small groups. Fred M. was male in a way my intellectual father never seemed to be, male in that he told and retold great tales of heroic pioneers, felt comfortable around machinery and tools, took pride in strength, and respected precision. This was a man who taught peace but who loved guns and swords. The only gift I remember receiving from him was a hunting knife he had personally beaten out of an old plow-share at his own forge. He was male in his presence: in his blacksmith shop where he fixed farm equipment, in his study where he had ship models, and in
the clutter of "things" which recalled people and places from lands far away.

He was, I remember, a brilliant man. But if he did an intellectual's work, like my father, spending long nights and early mornings in study and writing, I never knew it. When we asked what he was doing, we were told, reprovingly, that he was working; and when we were bored enough, we would stick our noses against his study window to watch him. He always seemed to be stacking papers or moving books, cleaning a .32 automatic he kept in the top desk drawer, rubbing leather, putting things away, reading from the huge dictionary that rested upon a stand not far from his desk, or, staring into space, his massive hand trying to rub relief into his pain-pulled face.

I hear his firm voice in memory, though not the words, the power of lungs magnificent over those of my mother and her sister or even more than of my uncle, whose instructions to me were more commentary than orders. Fred M. did not normally enter into the sounds and furies of that farmland home, made more so by the presence of ten grandchildren. Although he lived on my aunt's farm, he retreated, as was his habit, to his small cabin and reserved himself to respond to the desperate request of a daughter unable to locate her brood. Thus stirred, he would call out, his carefully structured vowels rolling across the neatly trimmed lawn and out over the pastures and orchard where we played, seeking us from behind hay bales, or catching us as we ran through the grape arbor, to direct us to the supper table or to a mother waiting to take us home.

That is how I remembered him. But I remembered him differently than I discovered him. For unknowingly I have made him more than he was, remembering strengths and power from the perspective of a small boy. I suppose I remembered him so because he had been less than the male friend and loving parent I wanted him to be. I remember his powerful arms beating a General Conference into order rather than the petty arguments that drove him into isolation and despair. I recall the constant stream of visitors who came to the cabin, set back from the farmhouse, seeking counsel, rather than the hundreds of members who left the fellowship in response to his behavior. And as I came to know him a little better through writing an administrative biography of how he ran—and was run by—the
Reorganized Church from 1915 to 1946, I found both a man I did not know very well and a myth I can no longer believe.

Frederick Madison Smith—almost universally known as Fred M.—was born to Joseph Smith III and Bertha Madison Smith at Plano, Illinois, on 21 January 1874. He grew up in Lamoni, Iowa, attended school at Iowa University and Graceland College, married his local sweetheart in August 1897, after entering church work for the RLDS Church in 1896. He served in a variety of responsibilities, finally in 1902 as first counselor to his father. On his father's death in 1915, he became president of the Reorganization. A strong and determined leader, he was concerned with directing the Church's thought toward a limited social gospel, pushed education and professionalism, and sought what he was to call an “industrial Zion.”

These are the facts and the public image of my grandfather. But who was he? I think of a poem by William Butler Yeats, cast as a dialogue between a lover and a beautiful woman. I love the rhythm and am lured by its words to think again:

“Never shall a young man
Thrown into despair
By those great honey-coloured
Ramparts at your ear,
Love you for yourself alone
And not your yellow hair.”

“But I can get a hair-dye
And set such colour there
Brown, or black, or carrot,
That young men in despair,
May love me for myself alone
And not for my yellow hair.”

“I heard an old religious man
But yesternight declare
That he had found a text to prove
That only God, my dear,
Could love you for yourself alone
And not for your lovely hair.”

1
As is so often the case in our memories of a significant other, in our recall of our leaders, our heroines and heroes, we tend to love them for their yellow hair and not for themselves alone. And in our infatuation with the myth, we hide not only the meaning and purpose of their lives but its effect on our own as well. Biography lures me to the brink of myself. The history of a life is not the history of a bridge or a war.

A surprising number of folks believe in the fringe science called Radiaesthesia—the notion that everything that has happened in the past has left a recording, very much like a Krillian photograph, imprinted on the surroundings. In such a belief, biography is little other than attaching yourself to the proper surroundings so that you can see or feel the impressions.

Because I cannot buy this, I am left with the realization that biography, unlike any other craft, is really an attempt to know someone from his or her tracks and somehow to introduce him or her to others in a manner that will preserve the integrity of that life as it was lived. It is a task perhaps better suited to a poet than to a historian, a psychologist rather than a philosopher.

I undertook the task of writing my grandfather's administrative biography thinking that it would be more manageable, less impressionistic than, say, a biography of my parents, which I planned to call Alice and Sir. As I worked on Fred M.'s biography, however, I became increasingly disturbed by the assigned limitations. The politics of his life were fascinating in themselves, but I wanted to look beyond his admittedly dramatic actions to the man—about what he knew, what he felt, whom he loved, and what sort of person he saw himself as being. I wanted to see his life through his personal relationships, not through his performances and his work.

And so, swimming upstream against the current of my own interest in this incompletely remembered grandfather and dominating presence on my young horizon, I thrashed through waves of successive discovery. Many people spend a good portion of their time covering their real identities. I do myself. Both Fred M. and I are

descendants of a man who proclaimed, "No man knows my history." I wonder if he spoke those words defiantly, regretfully, reproachfully, triumphantly? I wonder if a woman, sitting quietly many rows away, smiled a little to herself as he said it? In any case, he articulated only what all of us usually keep locked behind our lips—the irreducible mystery of identity.

As long as we are alive, we can and do give the lie to much of what others discover about us. We project ourselves toward other ends. We redirect or sidestep inquiries. This is not because of some hideous skeleton hidden in our closet but simply a necessary act of self-preservation, because the person we are for ourselves is not always the person we are for others.

It is the ego that has the concrete biography; it is the ego that has a continuous experience and a specific orientation. The self that is projected to seize public attention and become public property is but the ego clothed with those awesome garments of society, respectability and acceptance. The only relaxation of the iron grip of ego comes in those momentary clearings that love makes in the wilderness of being, and it is only the great relief of death that removes us from this battle over self-acknowledgement. It allows biographers to make inquiries, to provide comparison and analysis. In effect, it allows them the final word, the resolution of the question, the solution to the mystery—which is why any living person resists the biographer’s art, at least subconsciously, with such subtle and unremitting ferocity. But the biographer’s triumph is a Janus victory; the ego remains unknown, and thus the self becomes an artifact of time, subject to constant evaluation and reevaluation.

If someone is important enough to warrant a biography (or self-important enough to get an autobiography published), the public wants to know about his or her achievements. Now, granted, most folks also like a scandalous look at the private lives of the Greats—witness the massive sales of the National Enquirer—but they soon tire of that. And, in the long run, they are more interested in their hero’s creative achievements than in personal struggles or interpersonal relationships. If the heroine behaved badly, or did unkind or even immoral things, or if the hero hated ordinary folks or engaged in strange practices, we are more likely to be indulgent and generally disinterested than with ordinary folks.
This is true also with a person’s own story. Two of the most significant intellectual autobiographies written during the modern era—Freud’s *An Autobiographical Study* and Adam’s *The Education of Henry Adams*—are totally uninformative about them as persons in a world of relationships. They let us see a more public person than we might imagine, ignoring the person we might well have liked or at least wanted to know. Thus, it is with the public person that we must begin.

People who knew him well have told me Fred M. was a genius, and there certainly are reasons to believe this is true. On the other hand, we have Larry Hunt’s very able description of him as an ordinary man of his times. My inclination is to suggest he was more a unique individual than he was a genius, that his individuality was—as true individualism must always be—truly unique. Such uniqueness, of course, causes folks to see you as genius or fool, as a visionary or an outsider, as a prophetic leader or scoundrel, depending on their point of view.

Fred M.’s individualism was one that gave ego to unity, a unity that sought to reunite the human characteristics so drastically fragmented, both in American culture and in Fred M.’s life, by the arbitrary academic classifications of scientist, social scientist, and humanist. Selfhood, for Fred M., was seen as a unity; and he sought that wholeness both in himself and in his visions of the people for whom he had assumed responsibility. Thus, dallying on the edge of freedom from such diversity, he was simultaneously determined to push against the restrictions which intolerably hemmed him in.

The key to his particular individualism was his discontent. The history of humankind is, of course, the history of great discontents. And it is from this state—what Samuel Johnson called the “hunger of imagination”—that humanity’s extraordinary successes as a species have sprung. It was my perception of Fred M.’s uniqueness and discontent that began luring me deeper into what I saw as a more complete story of Fred M. In my inquiry and in the intelligently conceived interviews conducted by Bruce Koehler which I inherited, I conceptualized that untold, perhaps untellable, story as one of the power and the isolation of a hungering imagination. Both the imagination and human discontent are distinctively human and human-making. Our species is more flexible than others, for humans are as much a product of reason and experience as they are of instinct and
environment. Growth in a hostile environment—such as the desolate lands and frozen spaces where men and women have managed to live successfully—always results from the success of imagination and reason over innate patterns and inherited responses. Simply put, people, unlike animals, are able to choose behavior which seems contrary to instinct and thus are able to survive where other animals cannot adapt so well.

But this flexibility has a terrible price. Such creatures cannot long be satisfied nor more than briefly happy. The value of completion, the exaltation of new love, the joy of new discovery, the warm pleasure of breakthrough are always tempered by the grieving realization that each pleasure is temporary and that discontent with the status quo will drive us on, seeking different—if not always new—happinesses. Anthony Storr, in his profoundly vital exploration entitled *Solitude: A Return to the Self*, makes this comment: "Discontent, therefore, may be considered adaptive because it encourages the use of imagination, and thus spurs men on to further conquests and to ever-increasing mastery of the environment."²

The state of progressive discontent is codependent with the hunger of imagination. When considering those persons whose ideas and exploits account for much of our growth and expansion, we concentrate on the imagination. But when considering the more ordinary of us, we tend to remember the discontent. The discontent of the biographer's subject becomes some metaphysical melancholy that accompanies genius. But our failure to envision the discontent is why we fail to know and to love someone for himself alone and not for his yellow hair.

Part of this discontent consists of what I identify as "useless significance," a term which conveys something of the irony I feel about it. I mean by this the mass of information, insights, materials, ideas, and questions that seem to accumulate in each life but for which there is no outlet, no opportunity to expound or express. Most important, that life includes no set of persons for whom this mass—the raw material of identity—has any particular interest or value. It leaves the individual immersed in the unsettling paradox of feeling

that something is important, while receiving constant feedback that it is not, plagued ironically with an obsessive inquiry into matters that play so little a part in the day-to-day living we all are involved in, frustrated at discovering that the much-touted “bottom line” reflects a reality uncommon to and uncomfortable for him.

These are my own obsessions and frustrations, yet I cannot dismiss them by saying I have seen my problems in Fred M.’s dreams. Rather, it was in the study of his life that many of these became articulated for me. Living as I do in my mind, a mind awhirl with characters and ideas for whom I have discovered no language of concourse, time-tripping through generations past and unborn, writing with the clouds, and listening to the chorale of the collective mind, I find that what I consider important is often of little interest to those about me. What arises within me, desiring expression and consideration, ceases to exist under an uncomprehending regard. Tone-deaf congregations seem willing to hear explanations of the music they are about to sing but seem proud of their inability to understand the most basic of theological concepts.

Admittedly, I am poor at responding as others seem to want and as I feel the need to do. I have spent a lifetime studying, but I cannot fix the faucet dripping water; I read daily among the great minds of the Western world, and still I have no insights into why the furnace keeps cutting out on windy winter nights; years of struggle with module logic never prepared me to change the ribbon on my printer. This is not just a difference in temperament; it has to do with what you hear and see. The reason I do not always remember whom I had lunch with is that I have been a thousand miles, through nine generations, and into a dozen minds since lunch.

But such behavior is not very productive in a busy world of things to do. In thirty years of such contemplation, the only urgent requests I receive are about leaky faucets; the real crises of my days have to do with printers. No one nags me for a cosmic description; no one at a party demands that I “tell again” the story about the place of nothing in a space plenum; no one pleads for me to get the universe in order over lunch. And rare indeed is it to be awakened by someone seeking a twenty-four-hour philosopher to fix his leaking reality.

This surely must sound like a complaint; it most certainly is not. I would not trade the voyages of my mind or the acquaintances of my time travels for an MBA or even to understand how the wild card
works in professional football. But I do wonder about the place and meaning of significant but apparently useless knowledge, and I am beginning to understand why I often feel authentically me only when I am alone.

This is but a minor example of the "useless significance" which identified Fred M.'s consideration, but it is why I think I understand at least this much about Frederick Madison Smith. He was ceaselessly gnawed by the hunger of the imagination, and he lived in a world in which he was both dreamer and fixer. Unlike so many, Fred M. was not really angry with anyone, nor was he an egotistical "intellectual" as often accused, nor was he "unconcerned" about such realities of life as money. Rather, he was terribly occupied with things that others did not see as being serious enough for the expenditure of time and effort. Thus, he often found it difficult to be authentically himself under public conditions. This was true, I believe, even with close friends and loved ones. He did not, as others have done under the circumstances, create some sort of false self to display when necessary to appear as himself for others. But he did balance this discontent, this difficulty with public authenticity, this constant reminder of the unexpressed presence of significant but seemingly useless thought, through a terrible need to be alone. Alone, he was free to ask the questions that emerged from his soul and where solitude provided the friendly environment for his renewal.3

But he, as well as the Church, paid a terrible price. For it was from these journeys of solitude that he emerged speaking, as if in the middle of a sentence, and expecting others to understand him. They generally did not. It is from this silence that he emerged with understanding and rationality painfully uncovered during his individual wanderings, forgetting he was alone and wondering why others seemed so far behind. And they were, most naturally, struggling. It was in this solitude that he called upon his God to speak and from these long voyages of inquiry that he brought back answers, weighed heavily in the style of his solitary questions. And often they failed to reach his people.

Surprisingly few persons ever bothered to read Fred M.'s Ph.D. dissertation or the book when it was published by Herald House

3Ibid., 95.
under the title *The Higher Powers of Man* (Lamoni, Iowa: Herald Publishing House, 1918; reprinted Independence: Herald House, 1968). Admittedly, it was not a uniquely original piece of research, nor was it all that well written. But it was a unique revelation of Fred M.—about his own mystical assurances as the key to how this hard-headed scientist could also be a sensitive social scientist and a passionate humanist.

It was his belief that on occasion reasonable persons were able to tap a more universal source of understanding and achievement. This phenomenon occurred in that brief moment when one moved—primarily through the meditative powers of one’s own mind but possibly through some mind-releasing drug like peyote—from the egocentric and self-involved consciousness of routine thought to the higher aspects of personality. Such experience began at that point when an individual was able to allow his or her entire structure as a person to be undone. Saint John of the Cross called it the “dark night of the soul,” a period of isolation and separation, yet a moment of powerful self-unity that allowed all other human experience to be subjugated and where awareness and presence reigned supreme. In this manner, then, mysticism unites and joins by moving beyond reason which so often divides and separates. It captures us in those moments of discontent, in those moments of hungry imagination and of useless significance, and allows what had been diversified to be whole.

We should not make too much of this. Such mysticism is a very gentle form, not to be confused with the kind found either in television versions of angels or in the themes of Eastern heroes. Rather, it is an understanding that from the silence and simplicity of the human mind, tuned to the understanding of one thing, one can learn to listen to the persistent voice of discontent, voiding worldly distractions, and developing new connections with the inner strength available to all persons.

Put all this into our community’s context for a moment. Remember that the founder of any religious movement is the person who tells us how to undo the existing spells, who shows us how to break free of the dogmas of belief and disbelief. But the organization which emerges from his beliefs and leaps into being from his understandings will necessarily devote itself to the preservations of the new spells, the new dogmas. In this process the original knowledge becomes
affirmations, and the revolutionary nature of the original followers resolves into the calming assurances of the next generation.

The true prophet—historically as well as immediately—has been the one who calls us back to those secrets which emerged from risk, from exposure, and from revolutionary renewal. Fred M. was prophetic as he sought to call us to the task identified by his father, as founder of the spiritual reorganization. But he was prophetic as well in his expectation that we maintain the cutting progression of first-generation believers. He was a mystic in the sense that his authenticity promoted a conceptual unity, that he sought to link the present with both the past and the future, and that he tried to demand this unity from the Church.

His discontent arose from his failures—ours as well as his—to take full advantage of our heritage; it arose from our insistence on the bifurcation of the material and idea worlds in which we live; it was spawned by the consistent violation of being, as he understood it, and by the seeming unacceptance—or, more honestly, misunderstanding—of his dreams and visions.

Somewhere along the way and certainly after the General Conference of 1919 but before 1932, Fred M. lost his belief in a general (cosmic) understanding and sought a more pragmatic one; in so doing he began to trade his authentic public self for harmony. As he did, his need for solitude expanded. Somewhere the vision which marked his early years of preparation and controversial leadership was replaced by a more public self, a self more in tune with the institution than with the earlier vision. It was as if he had decided he could no longer pursue the unity coherent in his own mind, a unity of mystic balances, and gave his public self to the management of forces, the balance of powers, the harmony of necessity.

It would be easy to speculate about what caused this change, and such speculation would almost certainly fall short of the mark. Perhaps it was one too many battles—succession, education, supreme directional control, the Great Depression, the Auditorium, World War II. All ate up his energies. Under different circumstances, those energies might have translated his vision into our language. Perhaps it was his own personal struggles with those higher powers to which he was so vibrantly alive and the fact that, like electricity in our lives, it becomes powerful only if it has an outlet. Perhaps it was his sense of useless significance in a time disinterested.
But we now have a public self that we can record, a self Fred M. can no longer correct, a self frozen in time, reflecting Fred M. not for himself alone but for his lovely yellow hair. We have an administrative biography with which others will find fault and improve. We have the Larry Hunt volumes that deal with Fred M. as a minor character in the American reform movement. But these are, admittedly, only public accounts. How much of what that tells us remains to be seen. How much we really want to know is yet another question.

While I believe we can never recapture the authentic self that accompanied Fred M. on his journeys of solitude, I do think there is considerably more for us to discover and to understand than we may think or desire. In the process we may understand ourselves better. For me this process was an important one, perhaps even an essential one. For the RLDS Church this private knowledge could be essential as well. Much of who and what we are today follows from those who responded to Fred M.'s isolated and authentic self, to his coherent vision, to the diverse realities of their own legitimate, but perhaps less considered, individualism.

When such a biographer arises, the opportunity awaits, nearly untouched, for a remarkable journey with a unique mind. The results will, I hope, deal with the self about which Alan Duncan writes:

To my essential self I sing
not to the I
Man of hat, coat, tie:
But to the me
coffee, muddle, and misery.
OPPOSING BASKETBALL TEAMS faced each other across center court, in Prague, Czechoslovakia, 1929. The YMCA team had been undefeated for three years. Their opponents, wearing red uniforms bearing the cryptic word “UTAH,” were six American missionaries, newly arrived in Czechoslovakia. The Czech captain stepped forward and, in English, presented his nation’s flag. The Utah captain responded with an American flag, speaking Czech. The crowd roared approval. The Utah team won, thirty-two to eighteen. At the after-game dance, suited and tied, they entertained with English songs and repeated encores. This was not the usual way they preached, but it was consistent with their mission motto, “Join in and be one with them.”¹

For sixty years before the demise of Communism in 1989, the
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Czechoslovak Mission was the backbone of the Church in Slavic Europe, which also includes Poland, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and the states of the former Soviet Union. Missionaries had open access for only fourteen years, 1929-39 and 1946-50, baptized 277 new members (128 before and 149 after World War II), and organized several branches, the strongest in Prague and Brno. They gave the gospel into the keeping of a small group, isolated but enduring, deprived of a public voice but silently believing. They endured forty years of Communism and, in 1990, welcomed back the missionaries, grandchildren of the generation that first preached the LDS gospel in a Slavic land.

In the 1930s, Czechoslovakia was a young republic, created from the Austro-Hungarian provinces of Bohemia, Moravia, and Slovakia in the Versailles Treaty of 1919. Because U.S. President Woodrow Wilson had been crucial in negotiating that treaty, Czechoslovakians thought well of Americans and were interested in the young Mormon missionaries. Under President Thomas Masaryk (Moss-ahr-ik), the country enjoyed both political and economic stability. A nation of approximately 15 million people, it stretched in a six-hundred-mile oblong from the southeastern corner of Germany, past Austria, Hungary, and Romania on the south and Poland on the north, to the western borders of the Ukraine. Two-thirds Roman Catholic, Czechoslovakia nevertheless had a tradition of religious dissent, dating back to Jan Hus, who was burned at the stake in 1415 for denouncing Catholicism.

The First Missionaries

The Mormon presence in Czechoslovakia had begun in the nineteenth century. German-born Thomas Biesinger of Lehi, Utah, emigrated to Utah in 1865, then left two wives and five children at age twenty-nine to serve in the European Mission in 1883 under President John Henry Smith. In March 1884, he and Elder Paul Hammer of Salt Lake City reached Prague. Though forbidden by law from proselyting openly in the Austro-Hungarian Empire, they would

---

2 Statistics compiled from Czechoslovak Mission annual genealogical reports (Form E), 1930-50, Family History Library, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City, Utah.
strike up casual conversations that they would bring around to the subject of their new religion. A month later, Biesinger was arrested, held for thirty-eight days before his trial, convicted, and sentenced to another thirty days. Undiscouraged, after his release, he converted and baptized Antonín Just [Antoneen Yoost], the Prague furrier whose accusation had prompted the arrest.3

Eighteen years later, in 1902, Biesinger and his former president, now Apostle John Henry Smith, met on a street in Salt Lake City. Smith asked if Biesinger would like to return to Europe and, when Biesinger said yes, promised, “You shall have the privilege.”4 That year, the European mission president, Apostle Francis M. Lyman, gave German mission president Hugh J. Cannon permission to “experiment by sending two wise elders into Prague, in Bohemia but I would not hurry out any others, till we feel quite sure that our feet are secure in Germany.”5 But in 1903, two German kingdoms, Prussia and Mecklenburg, banished their missionaries, cooling plans to proselyte in Bohemia. Further south in Hungary, a little over a hundred new members joined the Church between 1901 and 1914. But even before World War I broke out, this effort had faltered due to disinterest in the Mormon message.6

The Brodil Women

The fate of Antonín Just, the first convert, is unrecorded in Church records. The first permanent converts were a mother and her two daughters. Their story grew indirectly from the wrenching dislocations of World War I. In 1919, Frantiska Brodilova7 [Frahn-tish-ka Bro-dyee-low-vah], her non-LDS husband, and their two daughters were jobless and penniless Czechs in Vienna, the Austrian
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4 Thomas Biesinger, “Experiences of Missionary Life,” typescript, ca. 1929, 5, LDS Church Archives.
5 Francis Lyman to Hugh J. Cannon, 13 September 1902, in Francis Lyman Letterpress Copybooks, LDS Church Archives. Bohemia was the western portion of modern Czechoslovakia.
7 The family name was Brodil; ová is a feminine suffix.
capital. Frantiska, born in Southern Bohemia in 1881, moved to Vienna at eighteen to live with an older sister and married there in 1904. She read the Bible assiduously and regularly attended mass, even when she began questioning her faith. She continued to pray even when she stopped attending mass and felt that her desire to know the truth was answered when the missionaries knocked on her door. She was baptized in 1913 on the eve of the war. The family nearly starved during the last two years of war, and returned to Czechoslovakia, where Frantiska’s husband died. She and her two daughters, fourteen-year-old Frantiska and thirteen-year-old Jana (Yah-na) (they later adopted the English names of Frances and Jane), eked out a meager living with the assistance of Frantiska’s brother, who lived in South America. In Frantiska’s own words, “Several years passed, and though we heard little of the Church, we continued to live according to its teachings. Finally, we were visited by President Serge F. Ballif and Brother Niederhauser of the Vienna Branch; and on June 3rd, 1921, my two daughters . . . were baptized in the Vltava [Vul-tah-va], thus becoming the first two members to be baptized on Czech soil.” Though Church representatives visited her from time to time, Frantiska prayed for missionaries, faithfully sent her tithing to the Church in Vienna every six months, and endured a decade of disappointment that the Church was still absent from her homeland.

The Church did not act for the same reasons which limited its expansion elsewhere in Slavic Europe. The few missionaries were concentrated in the most fruitful fields: the British Isles, Western Europe, and Germany. Slavic languages were perceived as difficult to learn, and Church leaders may have generalized Hungary’s pre-war indifference to other countries in Eastern Europe. Furthermore, Czech authorities were no more welcoming than they had been thirty years earlier. A Czech consul in Hamburg informed Apostle John A. Widtsoe in the early 1920s that “no Mormons are going to take Czech girls away.”

8 Frances Brodilová McOmber, “Memories,” typescript, 1983; 2; photocopy in my possession.
In far-off Salt Lake City, eighty-four-year-old Thomas Biesinger had not forgotten John Henry Smith’s promise and confided his twenty-six-year-old hopes to his friend Charles Nibley, second counselor in the Church’s First Presidency. At Nibley’s suggestion, Biesinger took his case to President George Albert Smith and was called to open the Czechoslovakia Mission. Arriving alone in Prague in February 1928, he was lovingly welcomed by the Brodil family. He immediately requested “permission to preach the gospel of Jesus Christ” from police and government officials who, to his immense satisfaction, did not object.\footnote{Biesinger, “Experiences of Missionary Life,” 6-7.} He reported this good news to German-Austrian Mission president Hyrum Valentine, and Frantiska Brodilová’s hopes soared. But after two and a half months, the aging Biesinger was released without a replacement. Frantiska, knowing that missionaries could come, despairingly told her daughters, “I’m going to write to the President of the Church, and then I’ll give up because Satan is after me.”\footnote{McOmber, “Memories,” 4.}

This bold move from the humble sister in Prague turned the key, and the door creaked open. The First Presidency instructed newly appointed European Mission president John A. Widtsoe to investigate. He corresponded with Frantiska about conditions in the country, then chose his messenger, Arthur Gaeth.

**Establishing the Mission**

On 19 May 1929, Gaeth, a tall, gangly twenty-four-year-old, was enjoying the last day of his three-year German mission at a gathering in Leipzig. Though surprised at President Widtsoe’s request, he welcomed it. Arthur’s mother was Czech, and her patriarchal blessing had promised that her posterity would take the gospel to her native land.\footnote{Arthur Gaeth, “Relating Czechoslovak Mission History at the German-Austrian Missionary Reunion, October 2, 1981,” typescript, p. 6, LDS Church Archives.} Gaeth arrived at Prague’s Wilson Station, named for the American president, alone in the early morning hours of 8 June 1929. He walked along Hoover Street, named after the War Relief Commis-
sioner who aided thousands of Czechs in the post-war period, and within a half hour, had roused the Brodil women from sleep. Frantiska's stubborn vigil since her baptism sixteen years earlier had been rewarded.

Pro-American sentiment flourished. Though poised for opposition and suspicion, Gaeth encountered friendly curiosity or, at worst, apathy. The Brodil women delightedly helped Gaeth settle in. With some help from her brother and government aid, Frantiska had sent her daughters to business college. Twenty-four-year-old Frances was business correspondent for a fertilizer company and twenty-three-year-old Jane was secretary to the head manager of a printing company.\(^{14}\)

Gaeth promptly started learning Czech but meanwhile used German, also widely spoken in Czechoslovakia. Government officials were helpful and encouraging. "It warmed my heart and lighted a flame of gratitude in me," Gaeth later wrote. "After all, I was a stranger among a strange people. I knew not one word of their language. I represented a religious institution which was anything but popular in Europe. I made no pretense to hide the purpose of my coming and yet, not one of these men [had] been unkind, [but] had only been helpful to me."\(^{15}\)

These officials were, no doubt, also responding to Gaeth's friendliness and optimism. In time he established friendships with three of President Masaryk's four secretaries.\(^{16}\) Energetic and engaging with a resonant voice, Gaeth boldly announced the Church's arrival. Skilled at using the media and public speaking, he wrote an article for a German-language newspaper, arranged for two ten-minute radio talks in Czech and another in German, and prepared a lecture in German at Urania, a German adult education institution—all within ten days.\(^{17}\)

Equally important was Gaeth's association with the Czechos-
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\(^{14}\) McOmber, "Memories," 5.


\(^{16}\) Arthur Gaeth, interviewed by Ronald G. Watt, 1976, Denver, Colorado, typescript, 5, LDS Church Archives.

\(^{17}\) Gaeth, "Relating Cze choslovak Mission History," 8.
lovak YMCA, a post-war organization by the Czechoslovak Legionnaires\textsuperscript{18} that promoted sports, cultural, and social programs. In Prague it operated a five-story building with three hundred rentable rooms and many English-speaking employees. Gaeth lodged there, as did the early missionaries while they were finding apartments or rooms in private residences. Under YMCA auspices, the missionaries demonstrated and taught basketball and baseball.

Five missionaries from the German-Austrian and Swiss-German missions, President Widtsoe, and other Church leaders in Europe arrived in Prague to dedicate Czechoslovakia for missionary work. On the morning of 24 July, they awoke to thunder and rain but with the Brodil family headed resolutely for Karlstejn [Karl-shtine], a six-hundred-year-old castle built by Charles IV. Gaeth had found the location while returning from a tour of other cities that had included Plzen [Pul-zeyn], approximately fifty miles southwest of Prague.

As they clustered on a wooded knoll near the castle, the sun pierced the clouds as they sang, "The Morning Breaks." Frances and Jane sang the "Hus Song," commemorating the Czech religious martyr; and Widtsoe pointed out the ancestral heritage of the six missionaries present—Alvin Carlson, Scandinavian; Wallace Toronto, Italian and Scottish; Charles Josie, Hungarian and Mongolian; Willis Hayward, Jewish; Joseph Hart, British; and Arthur Gaeth, Germanic and Slavic. They thrilled to the idea that they were opening the door to the great family of Slavic peoples.\textsuperscript{19} Widtsoe formally announced the establishment of the mission, appointed Gaeth president, and offered the dedicatory prayer. The Brodil women served a picnic lunch. This event would be commemorated in an annual pilgrimage by members and missionaries for at least the next twenty years.

\textsuperscript{18} The Legionnaires were survivors from the fifty thousand Czech and Slovak soldiers who were taken prisoner or who deserted to the Russians during World War I and who were permitted to organize themselves into a fighting force for the Allies. When the Communists made peace with the Germans, they ordered the Legionnaires to lay down their arms. The soldiers refused and fought their way across Siberia to Vladivostok. Many returned home by way of the United States and Canada, there becoming acquainted with the YMCA.

\textsuperscript{19} Arthur Gaeth, "What a Day to Open a Mission!" \textit{Church News}, 7 March 1936, 8.
THE MISSIONARIES, 1929-31

With the mission established, Gaeth and his five colleagues set to work. Gaeth's philosophy, consistent with the approach in most missions, was to make "friends" first, then try to interest them in the gospel. ("Friends" was the term for those who were not interested but who were not antagonistic.) There were no standard discussions or baptismal challenges, and gospel "conversations" could continue for months or even years. In the case of Czechoslovakia, the first converts would be baptized a year and a half later.

Gaeth actively encouraged missionaries to make friendships by participating in community organizations. For example, in addition to teaching basketball at the YMCA, Gaeth, Ivan Zundel (who arrived in May 1930), and Victor Olson taught English and leatherwork at YMCA boys' summer camps in July 1930, while four missionaries assisted in 1931 camps.20

At the YMCA, the missionaries also learned about Sokol, a nonpolitical, international organization founded in Prague in 1862 to promote physical fitness, morality, and good citizenship. In the early 1930s, it boasted 650,000 members—both adult and teen men and women. At its annual Sokol Slet, thousands performed gymnastics in unison at Prague's Sokol Arena. As part of their proselyting effort, the missionaries organized a basketball league with the Sokols; Gaeth, Joseph Hart, and Paul Tolton (who arrived in April 1930) eventually played on the Czech national team. Gaeth also refereed international matches with Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Italy, and France.21 In Gaeth's view, these sports activities were preaching the gospel in the "modern way, through channels which reach[ed] the lives of the people."22

The missionaries also engaged in more traditional labors: learning the language, writing tracts, publishing newspaper articles, and holding meetings. The Brodil women assisted them enthusiastically.

22 W. Toronto, "Champion 'Mormon Utes,'" 326.
Frantiska "mothered" the missionaries, the daughters helped translate missionary literature, and all three taught Sunday School and coached the missionaries as they struggled to learn Czech from out-of-print English-Czech grammars in the YMCA library. They worked with a hired instructor for six weeks in 1929, and traded English for Czech lessons with other YMCA lodgers.23

Newspapers were eager to print American material and published 250 articles, most of them by the missionaries, between 1929 and 1931.24 This favorable press reflected a general and much-welcomed easing of anti-Mormonism in Europe as the image of the Church began to improve worldwide.25

The mission published two tracts in Czech in October 1929 and obtained permission from the police to distribute them, thus presenting the Church's doctrines even without being able to speak the language. These were the first of twenty-five tracts published during the mission's first three years, most of them translations of John A. Widtsoe's work.26

The missionaries promptly began holding regular Sunday Schools and testimony meetings (usually in English), with an average attendance of nine or ten. The first public Mormon lecture (also in English) occurred 20 September 1929, drawing an audience of 106. A regular series of public lectures through the end of 1929 averaged fifty-two in attendance.27 By early 1930, the missionaries began teaching English classes and holding Sunday School in Czech, reading lessons which friends had translated into Czech for them.28 Another sign of fluency was an all-Czech program in April 1930, commemorating the centennial of the Church's organization; but it was not until 1931 that the missionaries were sufficiently fluent to

23 Mission History, 29 December 1929.
27 Mission History, 20 December 1929.
hold home conversations about the gospel with friends. Late in 1931 some missionaries began to deliver ten-minute talks without a Czech script.

From the beginning, Gaeth had established himself as a lecturer. In the fall of 1929, he spoke to Prague English clubs, whose members were prominent citizens, about Utah and the Book of Mormon, mixing topics of general and religious interest. It was a relationship that endured for the seven years of Gaeth's presidency and took him throughout the country. For example, in November 1929, five hundred listened to his lecture on "Utah and Mormonism" in Prague. In December he lectured at Prague's Charles University, enriching his presentations with slides of Utah landmarks and with a missionary quartet. In April 1930 he delivered a national broadcast in German entitled "One Hundred Years of Mormonism." By the end of 1930, he could also lecture in Czech.

In early 1930, two missionaries opened Brno [Bur-no] in Moravia (central Czechoslovakia) and another team went to Hradec Králové [Hrah-dets Krah-low-veh], about seventy miles northeast of Prague. Later that year, Gaeth sent four missionaries to Pardubice [Par-doo-beets-ch], seventy miles east of Prague, and Mladá Boleslav [Mlah-dah Bowl-es-loff], thirty miles north.

Gaeth, now thirty-one, had been a missionary for five years. Widtsoe, aware that his young mission president needed a wife, came to Prague in November 1929. While his wife, Leah Eudora Dunford Widtsoe, addressed the Prague English clubs, Widstoe introduced Gaeth to twenty-nine-year-old Martha Kralickova [Krah-leech-ko-vah], a Chicago schoolteacher. Martha's father, a university professor and a close associate of Masaryk, had earlier visited Salt Lake, met Church officials, and become friends with Apostle James Talmage, who later visited Králíček [Krah-lee-check] in Prague. Martha was in Czechoslovakia to settle her father's estate. She was not a member of the Church; but with Widtsoe's encouragement, Gaeth began to court her. Like Gaeth, she was well educated, politically aware, and socially polished. Before she left in the summer of 1930, he had

29 Mission History, 20 June and 20 March 1931.
30 Ibid., 20 December 1929.
31 Ibid., 20 December 1930.
proposed and she had accepted. Their relationship continued by correspondence; and in January 1931, Gaeth took a three-months leave of absence, baptized Martha in Salt Lake City, and married her.\textsuperscript{32} When they returned to Czechoslovakia, Sister Gaeth’s social connections moved the Mormon couple into Prague’s best circles. They obtained a fashionable villa/mission home in a new section of Prague, where they entertained many of the country’s influential people, for example, hosting teas for members of the Foreign Ministry and professors from Charles University in the spring and fall of 1935. She also provided valuable cultural information, instructing missionaries in etiquette and proper apparel.\textsuperscript{33}

Gaeth capitalized on the Mormons’ sports reputation to display newly acquired materials on Utah athletes and the Word of Wisdom at the National Sport and Health Exhibition in Pardubice during the summer of 1931. This display, attended by two missionaries, took up a whole wall in the main building and was seen by approximately 200,000 visitors, including the revered Czech president, Thomas Masaryk.\textsuperscript{34}

\textbf{THE MEMBERS, 1929-31}

Despite these impressive efforts and positive publicity, conversions occurred sparsely. Although people responded cordially to these amiable young men, they were not interested in changing to a different mode of thinking and living. Without functioning congregations or a Czech Book of Mormon, there was little beyond a spiritual witness to transform friends into converts.

When the mission was organized, it had ten members, all of whom had moved into the area after being baptized elsewhere;\textsuperscript{35} however, they were scattered, most were inactive, and only the

\textsuperscript{32} Mission History, 20 March 1930; Gaeth, “Relating Czechoslovak Mission History,” 1; Beesley, Interview, 1990.

\textsuperscript{33} Spencer Taggart, “Becoming a Missionary, 1931-1934,” typescript compilation of journal entries and letters, 1989, 5; photocopy in my possession.

\textsuperscript{34} Arthur Gaeth, “Million Persons Visit Show at Pardubice City,” \textit{Church News}, 8 August 1931, 3.

\textsuperscript{35} One of them was Adelheid Passinger, baptized in Germany before World War I; in June 1933, she was living at Nové Sedlo on the western border. Mission History, 20 June 1933.
Brodilová women contributed to mission development. Eighteen months after opening the mission, four new members were baptized. Ironically, the first baptism occurred outside the country, in Romania. Etelka von Haragos [Har-a-gosh] had learned about the Church from a conference announcement and had written to Gaeth when he was president of the Vienna Conference. Gaeth, after spending Christmas 1930 with relatives in Romania, baptized Etelka. A Hungarian, she later translated the Book of Mormon into her native tongue.36

Also baptized in 1931 were two women and a man: nineteen-year-old Bohumila Moravcová [Bow-hoo-mee-la More-ahft-so-vah] of Celákovic [Tsel-ahk-oh-vec-tseh], about ten miles outside Prague; seventy-eight-year-old Emilie Hromatko [Hro-mot-ko], a German in Pardubice; and thirty-one-year-old Jaroslav Kotulan [Yar-o-slav Kote-oolahn], a well-educated Czech in Brno who had helped translate tracts and had gone door-to-door with the missionaries.

In April 1931 the persevering Frantiska Brodilová became Czechoslovakia’s first Relief Society president. Her service was ended by death in November 1931, but her two daughters, Frances and Jane, continued to sustain the Church. They helped translate Church texts into Czech, taught investigators, and led Prague’s auxiliaries, Frances in the Sunday School and Jane in the Mutual Improvement Association.

The desire to establish permanent branches in other cities came true in 1932 with thirteen new converts. The country’s second Sunday School was begun in Brno, and “amusement committees” were formed in Prague and Mladá Boleslav. A welfare effort helped the poverty-stricken Sebek [She-bek] family in Cercany [Chert-sane], south of Prague, to get a more suitable cottage, some clothing, and a little money; and Martha Gaeth organized a Beehive group for young girls in Prague.37

36 Ibid., 20 March 1931.
37 The Sebeks, baptized in Germany in 1918, were so poor that they ate only one meal daily. The wife had borne twenty-eight children, four living. In her sixties, she worked daily in the fields. Prague Branch’s youth visited the Sebek family in the isolated village of Novy Vestec [No-vee Vest-ets] in the summer of 1933; but they disappear from mission records after that point. Ibid., 20 December 1929, 20 September 1932; 20 December 1933.
Undeterred by lack of members, Gaeth encouraged the full participation of nonmembers. The Relief Societies and Beehive groups both consisted mainly of nonmembers, some of whom held leadership positions. At annual branch conferences, all Czechoslovak missionaries preached, participated in branch meetings, sang in quartets, and performed violin and piano solos. Martha Gaeth also played the piano.

During the summers, Church activity halted in most branches as cities emptied for vacations and weekend excursions. During the summer of 1932, the missionaries innovated the practice of holding some branch meetings in the forest, but the practice did not continue.

The Church in Czechoslovakia was now a reality, though its membership was still sparse, a small showing for so much effort. Though aspirations remained high, people warmed slowly to this new religion while, at the same time, annual conversions in Germany rose into the hundreds and membership into the thousands.

THE 1932 MISSION PRESIDENTS' CONFERENCE

In summer 1932, mission presidents from all over Europe gathered in Prague for an annual conference. Newspaper articles, handbills, and large posters advertised the sessions. A banquet held on 8 July included prominent Czechoslovak editors, publishers, and other professionals and leaders as well as the mission presidents and Czechoslovak missionaries. Gaeth, keenly aware of the value of positive publicity, commented that this session permitted the Church to break the "crust of higher society."

The worship service on Sunday, 10 July, was, in Gaeth's words, "one of the greatest spiritual feasts held by a group of people." During the conference, Widtsoe predicted that thousands of members would one day meet in Prague and that the gospel door would be opened to all Slavic peoples. "When Russia has prepared herself for

38 Gaeth, Interview, 1976, 18.
39 Taggart, "Becoming a Missionary, 1931-1934," 6.
40 Mission History, 20 September 1932.
41 Ibid., 20 June 1932.
42 Ibid., 20 September 1932.
the Gospel, think how great the harvest will be.³⁴³

Gaeth shared Widstoe’s expansive vision of the gospel and was delighted when publicity about the conference yielded several inquiries from Yugoslavia. Gaeth visited one man, Mateja Spacek [Matye-ya Spa-check], in Belgrade, later that year; and in 1933 he became the first convert baptized in Yugoslavia.

During the conference, the nation celebrated the sextennial Sokol Slet, a reaffirmation of Czech national identity. The missionar-ies watched as thousands of Czechs, in an impressive display of coordinated calisthenics, honored their heritage at the Sokol stadium in Prage. On the last day of the conference, a young Jewish woman who had been investigating the Church told Elder Spencer Taggart that she had decided to join. Two days later, Elfrieda (Frieda) Glasnerová [Glass-ner-o-vah], four missionaries, and three Church members took the train for a village on the Vltava, then the ferry to a small island. Frieda was baptized as the sun set brilliantly in the west and confirmed during, in Taggart’s words, “the subdued colors of a summer twilight and silhouette of the rolling Bohemian hills.”⁴⁴ One of eight children, she was baptized against the will of her father, who felt that she disgraced her family heritage.⁴⁵

THE PRE-WAR PERIOD, 1933-38

Even as Frieda’s baptism was occurring, the ominous ravings of a new German political figure, Adolf Hitler, had begun to reverberate throughout Europe. He became chancellor of Germany in January 1933. The next month, the Nazis burned the Reichstag and accused the Communists of arson. By July, Hitler’s Gestapo were systematically hunting down Hitler’s opponents, freedom of the press had been abolished, and all labor unions and parties except the Nazis had been banned. In August, Hitler gave himself the title of Fürher and settled down to prepare his nation for the conquest of Europe.

³⁴³Joseph Y. Toronto, letter to family, 17 July 1932, LDS Church Archives; Mission History, 20 September 1932. President Widtsoe allegedly prophesied the collapse of Communism during the conference but contemporary documents do not support these claims. See Dennis L. Lythgoe, “Widtsoe Prophecy makes the Mormon Folklore Circuit,” Sunstone 14 (February 1990): 54-55.

⁴⁴Taggart, “Becoming a Missionary, 1931-1934,” 16.

⁴⁵Beesley, Interview, 1990.
The Saints in Czechoslovakia had the same amount of time to prepare themselves for resistance. They succeeded. Despite few missionaries, internal disputes, social opposition, and limited facilities and funds, the small band of Saints established a foothold so firm that they endured war and almost sixty years of repression as stubborn believers.

The Czechoslovak Book of Mormon was published in February in an edition of three thousand copies. The mission sent a hundred to libraries throughout the country and presented others as Christmas gifts to the country's leaders. In 1934 Gaeth also sought to market it in bookstores, but with little success. He corresponded with and visited Church members and prospective members in Yugoslavia, Hungary, and Romania throughout the course of his service as Czechoslovak Mission president.

Unfortunately, there were always too few missionaries. By the end of 1933, missionaries stood at eight. The mission had its maximum in January 1931—fourteen. Then the first six missionaries left, but few replacements arrived. The second group began to leave in December 1932. In the United States, the Great Depression created many family hardships. During the 1920s, the Church had sent out approximately a thousand missionaries each year. In 1932 it averaged 399. In Czechoslovakia, Thurlburn Holt and Ivan Zundel had to leave six months early, in December 1932. Even though three new missionaries arrived the same month, three more left early in 1933 without replacements. In December 1933, Glen Taggart, newly

46 Gaeth had hired a translator in November 1929 but soon fired him for incompetence and unreliability. In 1930, Gaeth employed Edward Havránck [Ha-vrah-neck], thirty-seven years old and a reporter for a Czechoslovak magazine. The Brodilová sisters reviewed his translation for conceptual accuracy. Ibid., 31 December 1930; McOmber, "Memories," 4. In January 1933, Etelka von Haragos completed her manuscript translation of the Book of Mormon in Hungarian and sent it to Gaeth. After Gaeth's visit to her in 1935, attempting to relieve the depression that lingered after the deaths of her daughter and husband two years earlier, she disappeared from the mission records. Mission History, 26 July 1933, 20 December 1935.

47 Richard O. Cowan, The Church in the Twentieth Century (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1985), 163-64.

48 Mission History, 20 December 1932.
appointed to the German-Austrian Mission, visited his brother, Spencer. The creative Gaeth promptly and successfully requested that Glen's assignment be changed. Missionary numbers reached their nadir when two arrived in March 1934, but four left in November. Seven was only one more than the mission had started with; but it gradually built back to its prewar high of twenty-four in 1938.

Gaeth compensated for the missionary shortage by bringing twenty-one-year-old Olga Komárková [Ko-mark-o-va] into the mission office to work half-days in November 1933. The Gaeths had befriended the English-speaking Olga, asking her to translate Talmage's *Articles of Faith*. "Engrossed" after twenty pages, she asked for baptism after finishing the manuscript and continued to assist at the mission home for nearly two years. Gaeth also called local members on part-time missions. The first, appointed in February 1935, were twenty-year-old Karel [Car-el] Mueller and twenty-eight-year-old Lidmila Pichová [Lid-mee-la Peek-ho-vah], both of Kosmonosy near Mladá Boleslav, and thirty-six-year-old Jaroslav Kotulan of Brno.50

During 1933 and 1934, twenty-six of the mission's total of thirty-six baptisms occurred in Mladá Boleslav and Kosmonosy, northeast of Prague. Twenty-one of them were women, and a second Relief Society was organized there in March 1933. In early 1934, from 60 to 140 members and investigators attended services in Mladá Boleslav, and in Kosmonosy, from 30 to 60.51

Even though these baptisms constituted the first concentrated missionary success in the country, they also engendered the first crisis. In late 1933, the Relief Society president and a counselor, who had jointly purchased a winter coat, quarreled over their agreement to share it. The counselor was released in January 1934, and Sister Gaeth circulated "Rules of Order" to the Relief Societies; but the woman bitterly denounced the Church, distributed anti-Mormon literature, and attempted to stop people from attending meetings. In October she was excommunicated, but good feelings in the branch

49 Olga Komárková Miller, Interviewed by Bruce Blumell, 1976, Salt Lake City, Utah; 1-2, LDS Church Archives.
50 Mission History, 20 June 1935.
51 Ibid., 20 June 1934.
were blighted, and further missionary work stymied.\textsuperscript{52}

Simultaneously, Catholic priests in Mladá Boleslav and Kosmonosy filed police complaints against the missionaries in January 1934. Though these were quickly dismissed because of insufficient evidence, new complaints in May accused the missionaries of being “immoral and undesirable” aliens and charged that “Mormons are a sect forbidden in every state outside of Utah because of polygamy.” The local Catholic press threatened that those attending LDS Church meetings would be excommunicated. At the suggestion of his friends in Masaryk’s office, Gaeth sued for libel, hoping to protect the missionaries from legal harassment and squelch rumors that might hinder proselyting.\textsuperscript{53}

The trial was conducted in three sessions between July and October. The prosecution could provide no witnesses to immorality, relying rather lamely on complaints from parishioners “forced” to take LDS literature or angered by the doorbell being rung “severely.” At Gaeth’s request, J. Reuben Clark of the First Presidency transmitted a statement contradicting the inaccurate information about the status of the Church in the United States to the Czechoslovak consul in Prague through the U.S. State Department. The priest finally signed a retraction. Then in February 1935, “Queer Missionary Activities of Mormon Preachers” appeared in \textit{Lidové Listy [Peoples’ Pages]}, a Prague Catholic paper. It claimed that the missionaries were German espionage agents. A sequel two days later accused missionaries of exploiting rich Czech women. Fearing any connection between the Church and the rising specter of Nazi Germany, Gaeth sued and obtained a favorable judgement. The paper published retractions, paid court costs, and contributed a small sum to charity.\textsuperscript{54}

Like most European missions, the Church often had to make do with less-than-ideal facilities. Early meetings in Pardubice were held in a hotel, and sometimes its bar. Spencer Taggart complained, “This evening we were wedged in among a ping pong tournament, a club dinner, a violin concert, and a dancing class. I had spent about thirty hours preparing my talk but I could hardly be heard.”\textsuperscript{55} In 1935 the

\textsuperscript{52} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{53} Ibid.; Gaeth, Interview, 1976, 5.

\textsuperscript{54} Mission History, 20 June and 20 December 1935.
Prague Branch had to find new quarters; its building had begun to accommodate prostitutes.56

Fifteen converts were baptized in 1935, thirty in 1936, the highest annual total before World War II. With fresh arrivals of missionaries, Gaeth opened Bakov [Bok-oaf], north of Prague, Tábor [Ta-boar], and Sobeslav [So-byeh-sloff], both south of Prague, in 1935. He organized branches in Brno and Mladá Boleslav.

Impressive signs of vigor were manifest in 1933-35. In May, Josef Roháček [Yo-sef Row-ha-chek], became the first male Czech called to a leadership position—first counselor in the Prague Branch presidency; Gaeth published an officers’ manual for branch leaders in September; Spencer Taggart taught basic genealogical techniques and record keeping; Relief Societies held their first bazaars, offering entertainment and homemade goods and donating the proceeds to the poor; and eighteen teenage Beehive girls participated in the first “swarm day.” In 1935 twenty-six young women participated in three swarms.57 There were too few young men for a YMMIA program; but they participated in the monthly branch socials. For example, activities in early 1934 included a surprise birthday party for Martha Gaeth, a masquerade party, the first mission dance, excursions to the countryside, and a Relief Society party.58

Meanwhile, Gaeth, a public figure throughout his presidency, pursued an intensive schedule of public lectures, dealing indirectly with Mormonism through such topics as “New America,” “Utah, Wonderland of America,” and “Modern Education.”59 In 1933, he became secretary of the national English Club Union, an association of clubs in thirty-three communities.60 This contact led to additional lecture invitations. In March 1935, he delivered “The First Hundred

55 Taggart, “Becoming a Missionary, 1931-1934,” 29.
56 Mission History, 20 June 1935.
58 Mission History, 20 December 1933, 20 June 1934. The first Gold and Green Ball, a Churchwide annual MIA formal dance, was held in February 1936.
59 Ibid., 20 June 1932.
60 Ibid., 20 December 1933; also Gaeth, “Relating Czechoslovak Mission History,” 2.
Years of Mormonism” on national radio, and in 1936 he delivered two more entitled the “Mormon Exodus” and the “Mormon Paradise in Utah.” He wrote a significant number of articles for the *Church News* back in Utah describing mission activities. (Broadcasting and journalism were later his profession.) Martha Gaeth joined the Czechoslovak National Council of Women and served as one of eleven delegates to the International Convention of Women’s Clubs in Paris in 1934.

In 1935, Gaeth began a unique program of intensive “spiritual rejuvenation” in the branches. Meetings with preaching, worship, and singing for members and nonmembers were scheduled daily for an entire week in each branch. Gaeth preached on such subjects as “Is Religion a Dead Issue?” and “What Constitutes Evil?” Average attendance ranged from 108 per meeting in Prague to 34 per meeting in Pardubice. Perhaps he sensed the intensifying threat from Germany.

**MISSIONARY LIFE**

The normal missionary routine included tracting, visiting “friends” who might become investigators, holding gospel conversations, teaching highly popular English classes, and helping manage branch activities. Summarizing one day’s experiences, Spencer Taggart wrote, “Today I made forty-nine personal contacts, gave away sixty-three tracts, and twelve people shut the door in my face.” He had more success with the English classes he taught. They led directly to the baptisms of a woman studying law, her sister, and her son.

Senior missionaries indulged in mild teasing of newcomers. William Rigby wrote home, “I surely get a kick out of eating with these new missionaries. They think every thing isn’t fit to eat, so particular. About all they need to do is get good and hungry then it tastes good to them. I am so now that I can drink sour milk and eat most any thing they give me.”

---

62 Ibid., 20 December 1935.
63 Gaeth, Interview, 1976, 22.
64 “Becoming a Missionary, 1931-1934,” 6, 40.
Missionaries learned Czech from senior companions and Berlitz classes. In 1933, Elder Sterling Beesley wrote a Czech language study key of gospel terms, needed in proselyting. Because Gaeth’s philosophy urged the missionaries to “be one with the people,” he looked for creative “modern” ways to introduce the gospel. Spencer Taggart remembered one appearance at an orphanage; Gaeth spoke and the missionaries sang in quartets, double quartets, and solos. Gaeth also encouraged cultural experiences like travel, advising missionary pairs to follow the people from the cities in the summers, often going without “purse or scrip,” like nineteenth-century Mormon missionaries. He hoped this plan would increase their language skills and also teach them humility. Sometimes the missionaries carried supplies in knapsacks, buying food from farmers, sometimes sleeping in the open air, and enjoying Czech views, forests, lush valleys, colorful villages, and provincial metropolises. Such travel was permitted by mission rules, as well as excursions outside the mission. In August 1930, for example, all of the missionaries attended the world-famous Oberammergau passion play in Bavaria. Later Sterling Beesley received permission to sightsee with a friend, Elder Robert Toronto, from the German-Austrian Mission.

The inevitable attractions between the American young men and young Czech sisters stayed within acceptable limits. Gaeth established the rule that an elder had to wait six months after his mission before pursuing amorous interests. Three Czech sisters

65 William Rigby, Letter to Crystle Keller, 20 February 1931, photocopy in my possession. “Sour milk” is kvasne mleko, fermented milk. When Taggart and Milton Smith were awaiting the arrival of Leland Murdock and William South, they posted themselves apart from each other in William Station behind slouched hats and newspapers. First the new arrivals headed for Taggart, then spied Smith and changed directions, then, confused, stopped to counsel. “That one over there looks something like a Mormon missionary,” remarked one dubiously of Taggart, who could not keep a straight face when they approached him. Taggart, “Becoming a Missionary, 1931-1934,” 39.
66 Mission History, 20 June 1933.
67 “Becoming a Missionary, 1931-1934,” 12.
68 Gaeth, Interview, 1976, 17.
69 Taggart, “Becoming a Missionary, 1931-34,” 17-19.
70 Beesley, Interview, 1990.
received proposals under this system. Olga Komarková left for Provo, Utah, to wed Dresden Miller in September 1935. Frances Brodilová, who secretly admired Calvin McOmber, willingly corresponded with him and accepted his proposal in the fall of 1936. In April 1937, she arrived in Pocatello and embraced her future husband for the first time. Jane left for Salt Lake City in May 1938 to marry William South. Both Brodil sisters realized the 1932 blessing of European Mission patriarch James H. Wallis and were married in the Salt Lake Temple.

WAL Wallace and Martha Toronto

In 1936, after three years of missionary service in Germany and seven in Czechoslovakia, Arthur Gaeth was released. Ten years was not an entirely uncommon term; in 1934 Samuel Bennion completed twenty-eight years and Charles Callis twenty-six years as presidents over the Central States and Southern States missions respectively. In 1935 Karl Stoof was released after nine years over the South American Mission, and in 1936 Willard Smith was released after serving for nine years in Samoa. Gaeth was replaced by twenty-eight-year-old Wallace Toronto, one of the first Czechoslovak missionaries, who would be president under unusual circumstances for the next thirty-four years, a record for Mormon mission presidents. Devoted, sincere, and friendly, Wallace Toronto deeply loved Czechoslovakia and its people. More reserved than Gaeth, Toronto continued to serve as the secretary for the English Club Union and to lecture but spent less time in social activities and more time nurturing the growing membership.

Martha Sharp Toronto, Wallace’s wife, was pregnant with their second child and, at twenty-four, was younger than some of the missionaries she “mothered.” Resolutely, she overcame her provincial fears of this strange place and, enrolled at Prague’s Berlitz school to learn Czech. She still needed an interpreter when she gave birth six months later.

71 Ibid.
72 McOmber, “Memories,” pp. 5-6.
73 Beesley, Interview, 1990.
74 Mission History, 20 June 1938.
75 Martha Toronto Anderson, A Cherry Tree Behind the Iron Curtain: The
Toronto energetically visited every branch each month. He found turmoil in Mladá Boleslav, was encouraged with stability in Brno and Prague, and opened two cities in 1936: Mnichovo Hradiste [Mnyee-kho-vo Hrah-dyee-stye], north of Prague, and Kolín [Ko-leen], east of Prague. Removing missionaries from Pardubice in 1936 and Mladá Boleslav in 1937, he opened Prostejov [Pro-styay-oak], twenty-five miles northeast of Brno, Královo Pole [Krah-lo-vo Po-leh], a suburb of Brno, Olomouc [O-lo-mowts], thirty-five miles northeast of Brno, and Benesov [Ben-esh-oaf], south of Prague in 1937.

Also in 1937, eighty-one-year-old Church President Heber J. Grant visited the mission, pursuing a fatiguing schedule with no signs of weariness, conversing untiringly, and mixing humor with his serious guidance and instruction. On 11 July, he consoled the missionaries about the slow progress by telling them of his own mission to Japan, where only three had been baptized while he was there. All were eventually excommunicated. A public service drew 250 people, only a fifth of them members, resulted in forty articles in the local press, and gave the Church much-needed visibility in the nation.76

By 1938 the number of missionaries had risen to twenty-four, and Toronto opened Plzen, its neighbor Rokycany [Row-keats-ahny], Kladno, west of Prague, Prerov [Pshair-oaf], thirty-five miles northeast of Brno, and Mladá Boleslav (again). The branches in Prague and Brno continued to be well organized and active. Prague even opened a Junior Sunday School in 1938, its ten children all nonmembers. In May, the branch presented a play and an evening of singing and dance, brightened by Czechoslovak national costumes.

When the missionaries gathered in Prague for their July 1938 conference, unbeknownst to them, it was to be the last for almost a decade. Unsuspectingly, they attended the activities of the tenth Sokol Slet, celebrating Czech national feeling and being "one with the people."

**CZECHOSLOVAKIA IN WORLD WAR II**

Signs of World War II were visible long before Hitler actually

---

seized the Sudetenland, or German-speaking area of western Czechoslovakia, in September 1939. Spencer Taggart recorded on 31 January 1933, "Tracting was very difficult today. No one cared to listen to my message. Everyone wanted to talk about a man named Hitler who became Chancellor of Germany yesterday. They all seem to be extremely apprehensive of how this may affect Czechoslovakia." 77 As political tensions intensified, mission work suffered.

As Toronto wrote the mission's historical report in December 1936, he noted: "Despite that fact that one of the Olympic runners, carrying the torch of peace and good will from Athens to Berlin, passed through Prague on the evening of July 30th, the war clouds still seem to hover over Europe with mocking uncertainty." After the Olympic visit, August 1936, three elders were arrested and held briefly for carrying cameras in a restricted military area close to the German border. 78

Baptisms dwindled from a high of thirty in 1936, to seventeen in 1937, to six in both 1938 and 1939. Attendance, tithes, and fast offerings diminished. 79 In September 1939 when Hitler demanded the Sudetenland, the First Presidency ordered the missionaries and the Torontos to leave immediately for Switzerland. Simultaneously, the Czech government banned all public meetings. The mission temporarily ceased to function.

The Munich Pact, signed at the end of September 1938, was engineered by the British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain to appease German aggression and avoid a war. To avoid Hitler's invasion of the Sudetenland, Chamberlain offered the territory in exchange for a pledge of peace. The French concurred, and the Soviets remained silent, leaving the Czechoslovak government without political allies. This loss deprived Czechoslovakia of its western mountains, the major geographical obstacle to German invasion. Under the circumstances, eight of the senior missionaries waiting in Switzerland were released; and the eight junior missionaries were reassigned to England.

In December 1938, Toronto received word that Josef Roháček,

77 Taggart, "Becoming a Missionary, 1931-34," 31.
78 Mission History, 20 December 1936.
79 Ibid., 20 December 1938.
a prominent member in Prague for many years, had died. Without knowing what might happen to them, Toronto and Elder Asael Moulton headed back to Czechoslovakia. Their train stopped at the new frontier, and the two men had to walk an hour before reaching the Czech railhead. They missed the funeral but found members grateful for their return. It was a foretaste of a much longer separation.

Toronto immediately called local branch presidents, Jaroslav Kotulan in Brno and Josef Roubícek [Row-bee-check] in Prague. In November Toronto brought Martha and the children back from Switzerland, and the eight missionaries returned from England. Seeking publicity, Toronto revived a basketball team and a male quartet, then worked hard to make gospel curriculum available. In February 1939, the mission published Talmage's *Articles of Faith*. The translation, begun by Olga Komarková in 1933, was finished by her mother, Josefa Komarková, and missionary Alan Pettit in 1938. Mimeograph versions of the Doctrine and Covenants and Pearl of Great Price followed.

The nation, only two decades old, was socially and politically divided. In addition to the Germans in the Sudetenland, there was political disharmony between the country's two major ethnic groups, the Czechs and the Slovaks. Germany would deftly take advantage of these conditions. In early 1939 Hitler urged the Slovaks and Ruthenians in the eastern portion of Czechoslovakia to declare their independence, then "offered" German intervention to safeguard against civil war. In March, the German army occupied the country, swiftly and without any resistance. Toronto observed, "Their reception was as cold and hateful as the rain and the sleet which accompanied them."81

Within two weeks of the occupation, most missionary activity had ceased. Tracting was not considered advisable. German troops used the gymnasiums as dorms, ending basketball games. A ban on public gatherings canceled all engagements for the missionary quartet and Toronto's lectures.82 Martha had just given birth to their third

---

80 Ibid., 20 September 1937.
81 Ibid., 20 June 1939.
82 Ibid.
child, and being responsible for three preschoolers was a great strain. She was appalled one day to see her three-year-old son goosestepping with some passing soldiers.

Under these circumstances, the Prague Branch met to celebrate Mother's Day in May 1939. The service was drawing to a close when a young German in naval uniform opened the back door. Anticipating the worst, the congregation froze in their seats. Hesitating but a moment, the officer smiled and walked down the center aisle. Toronto left the stand to meet him. They conferred in German, everyone else sitting in stunned silence. The two walked to the podium. Speaking then in Czech, Toronto announced that the officer had something to say. The officer then addressed the group, saying among other things, "You and I have something in common, something which oversteps the boundaries of race, language, and color. Despite the fact that I speak German and you Czech, yet because of the Gospel we still speak in common terms." The congregation all knew enough German to understand. The women wept in relief while the men nodded approval. Then the officer bore his testimony to the enemies of his country but the friends of his religion.

THE NAZI EXPULSION

In July 1939 the German Gestapo arrested four missionaries. Early the next morning, a Gestapo agent escorted Asael Moulton, one of the detained missionaries, to the mission home and commanded Toronto to open the mission strongbox. Moulton distracted the agent, allowing Toronto to slip a large bundle of bills out of the box and into a desk drawer. The Germans confiscated the rest. The salvaged money would prove essential during the mission evacuation.

The agent informed Toronto that Elder Robert Lee had been caught exchanging money on the black market, a practice prohibited by mission policy and a crime under German occupation. While the Gestapo searched Lee and Moulton's apartment, Verdell Bishop and Rulon Payne unsuspectingly walked in and were also arrested. The

---

84 Ibid., 19-21.
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Gestapo demanded a ransom of ten thousand dollars. Toronto refused and insisted on an audience. Outside the Gestapo office, he joined a long line of petitioners. His first prayer was answered when a guard eliminated those who would not be given an audience but left him in line. When he requested the release of the missionaries, the Gestapo commandant casually told him that his rich American church could afford the ransom. In a moment of inspiration, Toronto reminded them that there were still a hundred and fifty missionaries in Germany, each pumping fifty to seventy-five dollars into the German economy every month; if they did not release the Czech missionaries, Toronto would order the withdrawal of all German missionaries. The ruse worked. For a thousand dollars, the commandant released the missionaries, who had spent forty-four days in confinement.

During this crisis, Apostle Joseph Fielding Smith, in Europe to appraise the Church's situation, visited Czechoslovakia. On Saturday, 24 July, the anniversary of the annual pilgrimage to Karlstejn, sixty-eight people traveled by bus and taxicab to the wooded knoll where, because of the ban on open-air meetings, they could only bow their heads for a few moments of silence.86 The strain was hard on the members as well. Toronto excommunicated three members, one of whom had been secretly baptizing, holding unauthorized meetings, and claiming to be an apostle. Five others requested that their names be removed from the membership rolls in October 1939.87

Smith and Toronto finalized arrangements for the evacuation, which was ordered on 24 August. Martha Toronto and the three children left first with three thousand dollars to buy boat tickets for the missionaries who would follow. Martha had to travel alone through hostile territory with her three small children and a ransom, but the Gestapo would more likely search men than women. In Berlin people screamed, pushed, and crowded aboard the train to assure their own escape; however, an elder from the East German Mission helped her get seats on a train to Denmark where she waited, trusting in Joseph Fielding Smith's promise that the war would not begin until her husband and the missionaries escaped.

86 Mission History, 31 December 1939.
87 Mission History, 31 December 1939.
On 27 August, Toronto set apart twenty-one-year-old Josef Roubicek to preside in his absence. On 30 August, he sent the missionaries to Denmark while he remained behind to negotiate the release of Elder Rulon Payne, arrested again because his name was purportedly the same as that of a British spy. They left the next day and reached Denmark on a special train carrying the British legation out of Berlin, the last to leave before war engulfed Europe.

An epoch had ended. Fifty-seven missionaries had baptized 137 converts, preached in nineteen cities, published 350 articles in the Czechoslovak press, and publicized Mormonism widely through sports, public displays, concerts, and lectures. Certainly the nation was much better informed about Mormonism but clearly not disposed to accept it in significant numbers. It was still an American novelty. Yet those who chose this new and demanding religion found richer meaning in life.

Bohdan Tarnavski, a thirty-two-year-old Ukrainian studying for the ministry in the Greek Catholic Church, chanced by the mission home in Prague in November 1937 and entered to see what they had to offer. He stayed and studied. Within a few weeks, he was baptized. He wrote excitedly to his family of his conversion and was shattered when they asked him to renounce his faith. As a foreigner, he could not work in Czechoslovakia and went to the Ruthenian portion of the newly declared independent state of Slovakia. When Ruthenia was invaded by the Hungarian army, Bohdan was imprisoned with nine Ukrainian companions and interrogated by a Hungarian officer who could either release them or impose the death penalty. He asked each man how long he had been there and his religion. Bohdan honestly revealed his faith, not knowing how this would influence his fate. The officer said, "I have read of you in the newspapers of Budapest. I hear your people have done some good in this world."

88 Joseph Roubicek had been converted through the encouragement of Frances Brodilová, who worked in his office. She introduced him to the missionaries who later challenged him to speak at a Church meeting. He did and was baptized two months later in June 1936. In 1938 he was sustained as the second counselor in the Prague branch presidency, serving with the missionaries, and married Marta Tcitzová [Tights-o-vah] in January 1939.

89 Anderson, A Cherry Tree Behind the Iron Curtain, 27-32.

Bohdan was freed, and his nine compatriots were shot. He later wrote Toronto, "The Gospel is the most precious thing I have in the world. I know that the Lord has preserved my life to be a beacon to my fellow men." 91

Although Mormonism's converts may have joined the Church for many reasons, only a profound spiritual connection sustained those who remained in the Church during the next sixty years.

THE LONG-AWAITED REUNION

Six years passed. On 27 October 1945, a tall, gangly man joined a crowd of 400,000 on Wenceslas Square listening raptly to their newly installed president. Later, President Eduard Benes [Ben-esh] and the country's foreign minister, Jan Masaryk, received their old acquaintance, Arthur Gaeth. He was in Europe to cover the Nuremberg war trials but spent an evening with Church members, learning how they had fared through six years of war. More than 250,000 Czechs had died in uprisings, and everyone had suffered privation; but the only fighting on Czech soil had come in 1945 when American troops freed parts of western Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Army freed the rest.

Mission membership had been thinned by death, by apostasy (it was dangerous to belong to an "American" organization), and by the extradition of members of German extraction.92 Josef Roubíček still knew the whereabouts of eighty-six members in the country.93 "Their testimonies of the truthfulness of the gospel have not wavered," he had written at the war's end, "even in the worst moments of this great conflict."94

During the war, Roubíček tirelessly sustained members' faith and courage despite privation, destruction, and fear. He conducted meetings regularly for most of the war, sent a mimeographed letter to each member every ten days, and led an annual excursion to the
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nine-stone monument, mutely announcing their intention to endure.95

In March 1946, Apostle Ezra Taft Benson arrived, depressed from the devastation of Germany, to evaluate Church members' needs in Czechoslovakia. He was impressed to find a people cheerfully at work, with factories operating, and shop windows decorated. Church members were serving each other and teaching friends. Indeed, ten baptisms had been performed since 1939. With Roubíček and twenty-eight members, he held a stirring testimony meeting. When he inquired at government offices about reopening the mission, he discovered that the Church had an excellent reputation and would be welcomed back.96

On 28 June 1946, three missionaries reentered Czechoslovakia: Wallace Toronto, still mission president, Victor Bell, and Heber Jacobs. The members had waited seven long years for this reunion. Roubíček turned over $1,160, the excess of the tithes and fast offerings that had not been expended during the war.97 Toronto immediately began to reestablish the mission and distribute gifts from America.

Church members had survived every hardship endured by their countrymen. Frieda (Glasnerová) Vanecková [Von-yech-ko-vah], the Jewish convert of 1932, had spent two years in a concentration camp with her husband and two sons. She was scheduled for execution on the day she was freed by the Americans.98 When Toronto found her recuperating in the hospital, she wept with joy. Her father, mother, and seven siblings had all died at Auschwitz. When she was released from the hospital, she faithfully saved a tenth of her meager income to pay tithing and had her two sons baptized.99

It took a year for Toronto to obtain a suitable mission home, a rented four-story villa. The Church gave the mission a new Ford. Four
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rented four-story villa. The Church gave the mission a new Ford. Four missionaries accompanied Martha Toronto and her five children, ages two to thirteen, across the ocean. Wallace met them in LeHavre.

En route to Czechoslovakia, the family traversed a devastated continent. Many skylines had been leveled, rubble replacing once beautiful homes, buildings, and transportation facilities. In Prague, Martha coped with the challenges of a rationing system that allowed each person two eggs per month, one pound of meat, and a quarter pound of sugar. Martha shopped daily, going from the butcher to the vegetable market to the baker and then to the dairy for the small milk ration allowed the children. Beyond these pressing duties, Martha also oversaw the Relief Societies, carrying out programs as nearly as possible according to outlines in the *Relief Society Magazine* and supervising lesson translations. She added lessons about Czech authors and other local material.100

Because of a housing shortage, many missionaries stayed at the mission home for months, studying the language.101 By October 1948, the proselyting force totaled thirty-nine, the largest group of U.S. citizens in Czechoslovakia except for the American embassy staff.102 An active Mutual Improvement Association and students from English classes also congregated in the mission home. Most converts were youthful;103 the average age of prewar converts was thirty-six, twenty-nine after the war. For example, forty-three—or two-thirds—of the 1949 converts were under thirty, five were between thirty and forty, ten were between forty and fifty, and twelve converts, half of them single, were between fifty and seventy.104

A NEW TYRANNY

Free Czechoslovakia survived less than three years. In 1945, under Soviet pressure, the Czechoslovak government had been

100 Ibid., 40-46, 48.
101 Ibid., 43.
104 Compiled from the annual membership reports (Form E) of the Czechoslovak Mission.
forced to appoint some Communists to high rank. After a Communist coup in February 1948, the government took over all businesses, industries, churches, and schools. The secret police began watching missionaries. The mission magazine, *Nový Hlas* (New Voice), was banned; its three thousand copies had circulated mostly to nonmembers. Authorities insisted on checking Church sermons and lessons six weeks before they were delivered, then attended meetings to be sure that only the approved texts were used. Police threatened members about coming to meetings and ordered others to spy. If they refused, they would lose their jobs or have their rations reduced. They came to Toronto in tears asking his advice. He strengthened their faith and counseled them to do nothing that endangered their lives.

Ironically, the government permitted the British Mission basketball team, national champions in England, to visit Czechoslovakia from February to March 1949. In four weeks, the team played nineteen games in seventeen cities, losing just once. The missionaries in Czechoslovakia passed out tracts during half time, gave short talks in connection with the game, and held special meetings to explain the religion of the players. The visit generated more than a hundred newspaper articles. But the Communist government then refused to grant or renew missionary permits, making their presence in the country illegal. In May 1949, it expelled three. Between October 1948 and 1949, the missionary strength was cut in half. More expulsions followed, sometimes giving the missionaries only a day to be out of the country. Toronto protested but was ignored. Members as well as missionaries suffered under the new regime. In 1949, Otakar Vojkuvka [O-ta-car Voy-koof-kah] was taken to a forced labor camp at Trinec [Tshee-nets] near the Polish border for the crime of being a successful businessman.

108 Fortunately, his two-year sentence was commuted to six months. Mission History, June 1950. Born in 1911, Otakar Vojkuvka was an active nonmember in the Mutual Improvement Association of the Brno Branch when he married Terezie.
However, as government opposition increased, so did the rate of conversions. Baptisms rose from twenty-eight in 1948 to seventy in 1949 and thirty-seven in the first three months of 1950. Among the new converts was seventeen-year-old Jiri Snederfler [Year-shee Shned-er-fler], later a major mission leader. Attendance at meetings was unprecedently high. Tithes and offerings increased, a majority of the members paying a full tithe. Toronto's lectures drew crowds from seventy to nine hundred. At one lecture two hundred people were turned away due to lack of space.\textsuperscript{109} Opposition engendered a greater commitment among members and increased interest among friends.

Realizing that expulsion was inevitable, Toronto inaugurated a rigorous course of training and study for Czech priesthood holders and prepared priesthood and auxiliary courses of study for the next three and a half years.\textsuperscript{110}

Late in January 1950, Elders Stanley Abbott and Alden Johnson disappeared in a remote area. Eleven days later, Toronto learned that they had been arrested for entering a restricted border zone. They were trying to visit a member, but their written directions and their nationality resulted in an accusation of espionage. At the same time, the government passed a new law requiring that all clergy be native Czechs\textsuperscript{111} and informed the U.S. State Department that the two missionaries would be released if all of them were evacuated.\textsuperscript{112} Toronto, left with no alternative, asked the missionaries to start packing.

Abbott and Johnson languished in prison for twenty-seven days without a change of clothing or a bath. They were interrogated, not brutally but severely, during the first three days. Isolated from each other, they suffered long hours of loneliness and uncertainty. Break-
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Kudelová [Koo-del-o-va] in 1939. Baptized in July 1939, he served as Brno Branch president during World War II. His publishing firm was confiscated by the Communists when he was imprisoned. He played a significant role in the restoration of the Church to Czechoslovakia in the 1980s.
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\textsuperscript{111} \textit{New York Times}, 18 February 1950, 4.

fast was Postum and black bread; supper was soup with a floating meatball.\textsuperscript{113}

Eleven missionaries had departed when word came that the imprisoned missionaries would be released if Toronto could get them passage within two hours. The president raced to the airport and purchased tickets. Plainclothes guards whisked the prisoners by train from Olomouc to the Prague airport and allowed Toronto a few minutes with them before they boarded a flight to Switzerland. Martha arrived in time to wave good-bye.

Besides its members, the mission now consisted of Toronto, his family, and two missionaries. The secret police arrived at the mission home the last day of February. Martha, bedridden with illness and frayed nerves, watched as they escorted her husband past a barely budding cherry tree, ironic harbinger of hope. After seven hours, he was back. Martha and the children left by train the next day. Grieving Czechoslovak members gathered to bid them farewell and offer little packages of food—sandwiches, baked goods, apples—which they really could ill afford. Latecomers pushed their packages through the train window and ran alongside as the train departed, weeping and blowing kisses. Once the train was underway, customs agents broke open the sandwiches, rolls, cakes, and cookies, even cutting into the apples. The family numbly watched this desecration of loving gifts.\textsuperscript{114}

In New York, reporters barraged Martha with questions, taking countless photographs. She refused to comment, afraid for her husband. It was not until she reached Salt Lake City that she learned he was safe in Switzerland. Overstrained from the sleepless delirium of the journey home, she suffered a serious illness.

Meanwhile, the last two missionaries had been expelled, but police unexpectedly granted Toronto seven days to conclude mission affairs. He set apart Rudolf Kubiska [Koo-bee-ska]\textsuperscript{115} as mission president and branch president in Prague, Miroslav Dekanovsky [Mee-ro-sloff Dyek-an-oaf-ski], and Jií Vesel [Ves-el-ee] as his counsel-

\textsuperscript{113}Ibid., 4; also Stanley Abbott and Alden Johnson, interview by Kahlile Mehr, Salt Lake City, 31 March 1990; notes in my possession.
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\textsuperscript{115}Rudolf Kubiska was born in 1903 and baptized in 1948. Roubiek had emigrated to Canada in September 1949.
ors in Prague, and Cenk Vrba [Tsen-yek Verb-a] as the branch president in Brno. He drove the mission's Ford to Basel, where he lingered for a month, hoping fruitlessly for affairs to change. Then the government terminated the Church as a legal entity. Ironically, the date was 6 April 1950.

The next day, at the Czech mission reunion in Salt Lake City, John A. Widtsoe, Arthur Gaeth, and Ezra Taft Benson affirmed that the decree was only a delay. But the Church in Czechoslovakia was now in the hearts of its stubborn believers.

**ENDURING IN SILENCE**

For nearly fourteen years, the Czech members endured in silence, unable to worship publicly or have any regular contact with the larger Church. Though Church authorities were greatly concerned about these isolated members, by theology and policy the Church was committed to comply with civil authority. Wallace Toronto, still mission president, wrote and sent financial aid, clothing, medicine, and Church publications when possible; applied unsuccessfully nine times for a Czech visa over the next fifteen years; and, with fifteen to twenty former missionaries and their wives, formed a study group that preserved the mission in memory.¹¹⁶

Members in Prague and Plzen held illegal branch meetings for at least two years, then continued to visit each other secretly in their homes. Occasionally, they attended conferences in Dresden. Occasionally the Church's materials would reach Miloslava Krejci [Kray-chee] of Prague, who translated and circulated them among the faithful.¹¹⁷

Neighbors observed their daily activities and reported any signs of disloyalty to the Communist party. These unsolicited guardians would visit, much like home teachers, preaching Communist doctrine. The indomitable Kucera [Koo-chair-a] family made a joke of the fact that their "guardian" was named Angel [An-gail]. Interrogations

¹¹⁷ Jiri Snederfler, Interviewed by Kahlile Mehr, 25 July 1990, Salt Lake City, Utah; Zdenka Kucrová, telephone interviewed by Kahlile Mehr, 12 January 1992; Spencer Taggart, telephone interviewed by Kahlile Mehr, 12 July 1992; notes of all three in my possession.
Western spies, unintimidated, she retorted that there was nothing in Czechoslovakia worth the attention of spies.\textsuperscript{118} Ljuba Durdáková's [Lyoo-ba Dure-dak-o-vah] was interrogated with a glaring light and denied bathroom facilities.\textsuperscript{119} There was an inevitable attrition; but those who remained bonded together, their faith toughening under testing.

Occasionally former missionaries traveling through the country for personal or professional reasons could visit. Some members were allowed to correspond with members in Utah to perform genealogical research. In 1964, the Young Men's Mutual Improvement Association sent Wallace Toronto to Switzerland. Toronto sent his passport ahead to the mission president, John Russon, hoping Russon could obtain a Czech visa for him. Russon failed, but the European Mission president, Ezra Taft Benson, suggested that Russon find a Czech interpreter and go instead. Coincidentally, Lynn Pettit, an acquaintance and early Czech missionary, had just informed Russon that he would be passing through Switzerland en route from Libya, where he and his family had completed a U.N. assignment.\textsuperscript{120}

On 30 July 1964, Pettit and Russon arrived in Prague with phone numbers and addresses stuffed inside their socks. Over a pay phone, Pettit began to try out a language he had not spoken for thirty years. The acting mission president, Rudolf Kubiska, was out of town and his wife was, naturally, suspicious and frightened. Pettit and Russon called Miroslav Dekanovsky, Kubiska's counselor. His daughter explained that he also was out of town but arranged for them to see a sister who had known Pettit's brother, also a former Czech missionary and Marie Veselá [Ves-el-ah], who had been Toronto's secretary. They met outside a hotel and, under guise of sightseeing, strolled up a hill to Hradcany [Hrahd-chan-ee] Castle, at the north end of Prague.

Sister Veselá unfolded the story of their stubborn endurance during those years of isolation and oppression. Their main meeting

\textsuperscript{118} Zdenka Kucerová, interviewed by Kahlile Mehr, 14 February 1990, Salt Lake City, Utah; notes in my possession.

\textsuperscript{119} Bronja Janousková Nibley, telephone interviewed by Kahlile Mehr, 25 March 1991; notes in my possession.

\textsuperscript{120} John Marshall Russon, interviewed by Richard L. Jensen, California and Utah, 1975, 26-32; typescript in LDS Church Archives.
place was the home of the Relief Society president, Emilie dárská [Zhdyahr-skah], near the railroad station. Anyone desiring news would go there. Meetings were infrequent, unpatterned; members spaced arrival times randomly, so as not to raise suspicion. Most Church activity consisted of personal visits. Members kept personal tithing and fast offering accounts upon which Miroslav drew when he identified a need.

Miroslav Dekanovsky returned to town on Saturday and greeted the unexpected visitors. Knowledge of the visitors spread; and on Sunday, twenty people, spacing their arrivals over an hour, slipped into Sister Zdárská's home. There they shared their testimonies, celebrating their first official Church visitors in fourteen years. One sister asked for a blessing for a heart condition and later reported that she was completely healed. Pettit felt that he spoke with unexpected fluency.

The group held another meeting at 2:00 p.m., attended by Rudolf Kubiska. This visit was an anxious one. He was a Communist, a position he felt was valuable in keeping the members advised of relevant party activities; but which also obligated him to keep the party informed about the Church. The members kept their distance from this leader, burdened by two competing loyalties.121

In Brno, Cenek Vrba, the branch president, welcomed them to another testimony meeting attended by a dozen members. He showed the visitors a baptismal font in his yard; a veterinarian, he passed it off to the authorities with straight-faced humor as the place where he "dipped his sheep."

The visit was exhilarating and affirming, not only for the members but for Russon and Pettit. They had entered the unknown and found the familiar—a spiritual fellowship. A comparison with East Germany is instructive. In 1945 the Communists banned the Church, then relegalized it in 1949. Membership was an enormous commitment, jeopardizing education, jobs, and housing. The German members had to rely heavily on each other, becoming, in effect, an extended clan.122 Though never popular, legality meant that they did

121 Russon, Interview, 31.
not put themselves at constant risk through clandestine meetings and fellowship. Furthermore, because there were thousands of German members, they could intermarry, raising a new generation of faithful. And finally, they received frequent visits from former mission presidents Joel Tate and Percy Fetzer.

The isolation of the Czech Saints was profound and grinding by comparison. There were few members, and contact to sustain their faith was limited. The European Mission president, Apostle Ezra Taft Benson, maintained a personal concern for the members in Czechoslovakia, some of whom he had met in 1946. Heartened by Russon's success, in December 1964, he sent J. Peter Loscher, president of the Austrian Mission to visit families in Brno, Prague, and Plzen. Loscher embraced them with kisses, and they shared testimonies of their mutual joy in reestablishing contact.123

A third visit came at a prophet's behest. Marie Veselá, sister to Marta Roubíčková, wife of Josef Roubíček, was granted permission in 1964 to leave Czechoslovakia and visit the Roubíčeks in Salt Lake City. Wallace Toronto arranged for her to visit President David O. McKay, who asked why, if Marie could leave Czechoslovakia, Toronto could not get in. Toronto explained that he was still considered a threat. President McKay advised him to apply again: "[The members] have been carrying on underground long enough. They need the authority of their mission president." Within a week the Torontos had received their visas.124

They drove through deep December snows from Austria to the Czechoslovak border, a barbed wire barrier guarded by dogs and soldiers. Admitted without difficulty, they went straight to the Vrba home in Brno where ten members, notified by Marie Veselá, smothered them hugs, kisses, and greetings, everyone speaking at once. Calmer, they settled down to eat and share the memories of the

124 Anderson, A Cherry Tree Behind the Iron Curtain, 76-77. Toronto had worked at Hill Air Field near Ogden, Utah, during World War II, then been executive secretary for the Utah chapter of the American Cancer Society.
fourteen years. Martha found herself speaking Czech with unantici-
pated fluency. An older sister, unapprised of the guests, arrived
during the meal and was astonished to find the Torontos, materialized
out of the past.125

The next fifteen days were filled with similar experiences as
they visited quietly from home to home. In Prague, the overjoyed
members insisted on serving tea and cookies. After fifteen or so
homes, the Torontos would return to their hotel, unable to sleep
from overfilled stomachs. The president blessed many who were
sick. They visited Martha's Beehive girls, now married, and the young
men, some ready for ordination. They learned that on Sundays,
priesthood leaders would visit members in their homes, delivering
the sacrament and gospel teachings to one family at a time. Ca-
tiously, they altered their visits frequently and stayed only twenty to
thirty minutes.

Despite their wonder and joy, the Torontos sorrowed for the
country's drabness and disrepair. Sidewalk tiles were broken; loose
cobblestones rattled under traffic; buildings rose stark and un-
adorned by window displays. The sparkle was gone. Inefficient
centralized control had left the once-industrious nation weighted by
lethargy and apathy.

Loscher returned with his wife, Frieda, in May 1965 and met
about ten Prague members that Marie Veselá assembled at a down-
town cafe. From there the party traveled to Karlstejn in pilgrimage
to the site of the Widtsoe's 1929 dedicatory prayer and the twenty-
nine-stone shrine. But Kubiska had reported their presence to the
police, and the Loschers were followed. In Brno, the Loschers spent
a good part of one Sunday trying to shake the "tails." They zigzagged
through the city, attended a Greek-Orthodox service lasting more
than two hours, and visited a castle. Finally, Frieda suggested that
they walk directly toward the bushes where their "tails" were sequester-
ted. Caught off-guard, the two decamped down the hill, pretending
to smell flowers along the way.126

125 Ibid., 83-95.
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In July, Toronto returned alone, preoccupied with how to relegalize the Church. He arrived in Prague amid the celebration of the Sokol Slet. When a Czech cameraman singled him out from a crowd of thousands and asked for his impressions as an American, he replied in perfect Czech that he loved the people and their land and was glad to be back after a fifteen-year absence. 127

The government officials he visited the next day recognized him from the broadcast, but the secret police arrested him, accusing him of stirring people against the regime and trying to establish the Church illegally. In a quirk of fate, Toronto was interrogated by the very man he had hoped to see. He gave an impassioned history of the mission, concluding that the government had expelled the best friends the country ever had. In answer, the secret police escorted Toronto to the German border at midnight. 128

THE LONGEST WAIT

The visits of 1964 and 1965 were a temporary respite in the mission's fifteen-year trial by silence that would endure for another twenty-five. Toronto's visit rekindled active persecution. All leaders were called in for questioning, some for several days. Members' activities were severely restricted. Genealogical research was banned. 129

Yet the Church stubbornly persisted. Bronja Janousková [Bron-yah Yon-os-ko-vah] was unbaptized at fourteen in 1965. Her member mother, Ljuba Durdáková Janousková, told her little so that she would be honestly innocent if interrogated. At a youth camp abroad, Bronja learned more about her mother's Church and was baptized at another youth camp in 1966 in Germany. She was the only teenage member in Prague. 130

After Czechoslovakia's economy continued to falter, Alexander Dubcek became leader of the Communist party in 1968 and instituted a series of liberal reforms, including more freedom of the press and

127 Anderson, A Cherry Tree Behind the Iron Curtain, 100-5.
128 Ibid., 102-5.
129 Austrian Mission Manuscript History, 27 August and 22 September 1965, LDS Church Archives.
increased contact with non-Communist countries. Encouraged, Cenek Vrba, Jiri Snederfler, and Miroslav Dekanovsky, three stalwarts of the Church, petitioned for recognition. But an invasion by troops from five Communist countries crushed the brief "Prague Spring" under Soviet tanks, quelling hopes of formally reviving the Church. \textsuperscript{131} Despairing of religious liberty in their land, the Vrba family from Brno and the Kucera and Janousek families from Prague escaped with what few belongings they could carry, not knowing what to expect in the non-Communist world but hopeful that their situation could be no worse. That same year in far-off Salt Lake, Wallace Toronto died of cancer.

The Austrian Mission assumed the responsibility of retaining contact with Czechoslovakia's enduring Saints. In 1970 mission leaders visited on weekends and were permitted to conduct sacrament services in homes of members. \textsuperscript{132} Later the Germany Dresden Mission, the only mission operating behind the iron curtain, assumed responsibility for the Czech members. President Henry Burkhardt appointed forty-year-old Jiri Snederfler in 1972 to begin reestablishing contact with all members throughout the country and to begin holding meetings. A water resource engineer, Snederfler had remained faithful since his baptism in 1949. He started to find members in Plzen, Brno, Prague, and elsewhere, assuring them that they had not been forgotten. In 1974 he organized a conference for all members in the country. Eleven came; the rest were afraid to attend. Snederfler describes it as "a very dark time for us." \textsuperscript{133} But it was the darkness before the dawn.

In August 1975 the first of the Helsinki Accords was signed, heralding a new era of cooperation between the nations of Eastern and Western Europe. The signers, including the government of Czechoslovakia, promised to respect human rights, including freedom of thought and religion. Apostle Thomas S. Monson rededicated East Germany for the preaching of the gospel and promised members

\textsuperscript{131} Snederfler, Interview, 1990.

\textsuperscript{132} Ruediger Tillman, interviewed by Kahlilie Mehr, 9 March 1991, Draper, Utah; notes in my possession. Tillman was an Austrian missionary during this period.

\textsuperscript{133} In Gerry Avant, "He Was Paul before Agrippa," \textit{Church News}, 31 August 1991, 10.
there all of the blessings of the Church, including a temple.  

In September 1975, Russell M. Nelson, then the general president of the Sunday School, visited Prague privately and blessed Snederfler to fulfill his calling. By the next month, Snederfler had contacted about ninety members; and Burkhardt set him apart as the group leader of the Czech Saints. In Prague and Brno, Burkhardt reassured members that the Church would return to their country again. He discovered to his satisfaction that “the members in Czechoslovakia have overcome their fear. They have self-confidence, and this feeling has rubbed off on others. . . . There is love and unity among the brothers and sisters.” Sensing the new spirit of freedom, members began holding regular meetings in Prague. The government took no action. Heartened, Czech Saints began to teach the gospel to their friends, baptizing one or two new members yearly.

Also in 1975, William South and Jane Brodilová South were appointed to replace Toronto in sustaining Czechoslovak members and began annual visits to Czechoslovakia. In 1977 when South’s health began to fail, this responsibility passed to the second Brodilová sister and her husband: Frances and Calvin McOmber. By McOmber’s death in 1980, an even more significant policy change had occurred. In 1979 the Czechoslovak government had permitted Snederfler to attend the general conference of the Church in Salt Lake City. In 1980 Boyd K. Packer became the first apostle to visit Czechoslovakia since Joseph Fielding Smith in 1938. In January 1981, the Church, without publicity, created an East European Mission, headquartered in Vienna, Austria, and appointed Edwin Morrell, a former Czech missionary, as its president. Morrell supervised all Church activity in Greece, Poland, Hungary, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia, visiting each country every three months. Czechoslovakia was the only

134 Tobler, “Before the Wall Fell,” 16.
137 Ibid.
138 Edwin Morrell, interview by Kahlile Mehr, 7 July 1990, Provo, Utah; notes in my possession. After six months, Morrell also assumed the presidency of the
country where members had endured from an earlier period. Morrell republished the Czech Book of Mormon in 1984 and personally brought the first volumes into the country. 139

In Prague and Brno, Snederfler organized branches, appointed leaders, and kept the Church functioning de facto if not de jure. Plzen was added in 1983, Uherske Hradiste in 1986, and Jicín in 1987. 140 The renewed energy of the long-suppressed Church began to manifest itself.

In Brno, a seventy-one-year-old Mormon yoga teacher, Otakar Vojkuvka, slipped in gospel principles without being detected by the authorities. When young Olga Kovárová [Ko-vash-o-vah] met him in 1982, she wanted to understand why he seemed to have such a clear understanding of life’s purpose. She later observed, “He had the ability to make me feel happy, truly happy.” When she visited a second time, he revealed that some of his ideas were based on the teachings the LDS Church. He offered her some Church literature, which she read all night, returning the next day to ask where she could find a member of the Church and a copy of the Book of Mormon. Otakar introduced her to his son, Gad [God] Vojkuvka, the branch president in Brno. Converted to the new faith, she was baptized in a reservoir after dark in July 1982. In the tradition of Otakar, she began to teach gospel principles disguised as yoga, both at the university where she worked and at summer camps for Czechoslovak youth. 141 When the authorities learned of Olga’s faith, they interrogated her regularly. She spoke movingly of praying for strength as she confronted her inquisitors alone, wondering if her next answer might lead to six years in prison, the standard term for an ideological “offense.” 142

After the temple in Freiberg, Germany, was dedicated in 1985, Austria Vienna Mission. Spencer Condie assumed this dual responsibility in 1984. When his term ended in 1987, the East European Mission was redesignated as the Austria Vienna East Mission, Dennis Neuenschwander presiding.

139 Ibid., 1990.
140 Snederfler, Interview, 1990.
the baptismal rate in Czechoslovakia jumped to twenty a year.\textsuperscript{143} This first temple in Eastern Europe symbolized the reemergence of the gospel in a world controlled by Communism for forty years. Sister Kovárová was particularly active, assisting in the conversion of forty-seven people during the 1980s.

In 1985 the Church appointed Apostle Russell M. Nelson to oversee missionary activity in Eastern Europe. With Hans B. Ringger, president of the Europe area, he visited Czechoslovakia annually, each time requesting recognition for the Church; each time, he was told the request was still being "studied."\textsuperscript{144} Even with renewed confidence, the members struggled with fear. Forty who attended a conference at the Snederfler home in Prague in November 1986 sang in hushed tones so as not to attract attention.\textsuperscript{145}

In 1987 Czechoslovak officials told Nelson and Ringger that only a Czechoslovak Mormon could petition for recognition. When they told Snederfler, he paused only briefly, then responded, "I will go. I will do it. This is for the Lord, and His work is more important than our freedom or life." After forty years of remaining in the shadows, he well knew what he risked by publicly announcing his allegiance to the Church. The members fasted and prayed every third Sunday for six months before he carried the petition to the authorities in December 1988. The response was not encouraging. Snederfler was interrogated every month until the revolution in November 1989.\textsuperscript{146} Nevertheless, he remained free and able to perform his duties.

In November, the petition was resubmitted to a new government, and religious freedom was proclaimed for all faiths in January 1990. The document specifically recognizing the LDS Church was received the following month. On 6 February 1990, Russell Nelson ascended the wooded knoll by Karlstejn and offered a new prayer of

\textsuperscript{143} Snederfler, Interview, 1990.
\textsuperscript{144} Russell M. Nelson, "Drama on the European Stage," typescript of address delivered at Rick's College, Rexburg, Idaho, 13 November 1990; photocopy in my possession.
\textsuperscript{145} Spencer Condic, interviewed by Kahlile Mehr, 5 August 1991, Frankfurt, Germany; notes in my possession.
\textsuperscript{146} Avant, "He Was Paul before Agrippa," 6, 10.
dedication, reconfirming the blessing of Apostle Widtsoe delivered six decades earlier.147

In April 1990 former Czechoslovak missionaries, Czechoslovak emigrés, their families, and friends gathered in Salt Lake City to attend the annual Czechoslovak Mission Reunion. Twelve missionaries were present from the pre-World War I period and thirteen from the period between the wars. Frances Brodilová McOmber was there, dressed in Czech costume, and surrounded by many of her descendants similarly dressed. On the stand sat a newly called mission president, Richard Winder, a former Czechoslovak missionary, and his wife Barbara, previously the Church's General Relief Society President, along with four new missionaries. The meeting was a celebration that had been forty years in the making.

Missionaries again entered Czechoslovakia in May 1990, transferred to the Austria Vienna East Mission from missions in Austria and Portugal. They had studied Czech in Vienna before entering the country; and when the elders arrived in Brno, the excited members greeted them with tears of joy, kisses, and ten converts ready for baptism.148

The Church formally reestablished the Czechoslovak Mission on 1 July 1990. At the end of its first year, membership exceeded three hundred, a majority of them young, well-educated, and vibrant in their new faith. Linking them to a past of honor was a generation of older members, enduring believers who had resolutely lived the gospel at the edge of the Slavic world through decades of isolation.

147 Snederfler, Interview, 1990.
148 Olga Kovárová, Speech at the Czech Mission Reunion, 6 April 1991, Salt Lake City, Utah; notes in my possession.
Stereographs and Stereotypes: A 1904 View of Mormonism

Richard Neitzel Holzapfel

Introduction

At the turn of the twentieth century, media images of the Mormon Church were usually negative. However, the largest collection of surviving American stereoscopic images includes a 1904 set of Mormon historic sites surprisingly free of slander and scorn, "The Latter Day Saints' Tour from Palmyra, New York to Salt Lake City, Utah through the Stereoscope." In fact, through their selection of subjects and details, the firm of Underwood & Underwood subtly reshaped the Mormon image to place it squarely in the mainstream of middle-class American values.

Richard Neitzel Holzapfel is Director of the LDS Institute of Religion, Irvine, California, and the author or coauthor of three photographic travel and guidebooks to LDS historic sites. Recent works are a history of the Salt Lake Temple, Every Stone a Sermon (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1992), and the forthcoming Women of Nauvoo, coauthored with Jeni Broberg Holzapfel (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, forthcoming). An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Mormon History Association annual meeting in Claremont, California, May 1991, accompanied by numerous stereograph images and 3-D glasses for the audience. He expresses appreciation to B. Carmon Hardy, Dana Roper, and Ted Stoddard for reading the original manuscript and making several helpful suggestions. Sources from the Archives Division, Historical Department of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (hereafter cited as LDS Church Archives) are used with permission.
An Underwood & Underwood boxed set, the "Latter Day Saints' Tour," with representative views. The Salt Lake Temple is in the stereoscopic holder. Photographs and stereo views courtesy of the California Museum of Photography Archives, Riverside, California.

Stereoscopic images are two slightly different views of the same scene which, when viewed, side by side through a stereoscope, an instrument with two eyepieces, gives a three-dimensional effect to photographs seen as a single image. Scenes that appeared flat and uninteresting as simple photographs assumed three-dimensional reality in stereo.¹ Millions of armchair travelers enjoyed countless hours of entertainment, taking their first look at the world beyond their own neighborhood. Underwood & Underwood's advertising promised "travel of the truest kind, not of the body, but of the mind" from "the armchair in [a] comfortable corner... To be within arm's reach

of distant countries," it exhorted, "it is only necessary to be within arm's reach of the Underwood Stereograph Travel System."

Stereo photography, which achieved great popularity in England and Europe during the early nineteenth century, had seized the United States by the 1850s. Physician and essayist Oliver Wendell Holmes was America's leading promoter of the process, applauding it in newspaper and magazine articles. He coined the name "stereograph" for the stereo cards and invented a simple hand-held viewer that eventually could be found in almost every household in America. The stereographs, better known as stereo views, were published and mass-marketed by several large companies during the latter half of the nineteenth century; more than a fad, stereo photography retained its popularity until well after the turn of the nineteenth century.

The California Museum of Photography, located at Riverside, California, houses the most famous collection of travel stereographs, the Keystone-Mast Photographic Collection. Within this collection is Underwood & Underwood's "Latter Day Saints' Tour," a boxed set of twenty-nine views that were photographed and marketed three years before Utah photographer George Edward Anderson's celebrated pilgrimage to Church sites in 1907.

2 Catalogue Number Twenty-four (New York: Underwood & Underwood, 1904), 3; all Underwood & Underwood material courtesy of the California Museum of Photography Archives, Riverside, California, unless otherwise noted.

3 This collection was created when the Keystone View Company, a successful producer, also began purchasing the negative files of another successful stereographic firm, Underwood & Underwood, in 1912. Eight years later, it had acquired the holdings of virtually all its former rivals—a collection of some 250,000 stereoscopic negatives and 100,000 prints documenting a century of world history from 1860 to 1960. Except for some twenty or thirty thousand negatives located in the Smithsonian, the mammoth Keystone archive is located in the California Museum of Photography. Guide to Collections (Riverside: California Museum of Photography, University of California Riverside, 1989), 62. Edward Earl and Roy McJukin were most helpful during my research at the CMP in providing source material and reviewing the history of stereo photography.

4 Anderson passed through these sites on his way to a mission in England. See Richard Neitzel Holzapfel and T. Jeff Cottle, Old Mormon Palmyra and New England: Historic Photographs and Guide (Santa Ana, California: Fieldbrook Productions, Inc., 1991), 3-19. A later and very rare set of thirty-eight views was
In light of Mormonism’s changing status in America, both the creation and the content of these stereographs are historically important. The “Latter Day Saints’ Tour” is the first attempt by a professional photographer to document the Latter-day Saint movement from New York to the Great Basin. Even more important, Mormonism is also “the only religious group . . . to have a pictorial history in stereo.”

THE MORMON IMAGE IN THE EARLY TWENTIETH CENTURY

As sociologist Gary Bunker noted, the popular images of the Saints which dominated the whole nineteenth century “were largely pejorative and relatively uniform.” These stereotypes—inflexible, conventional impressions—emphasized the viewers’ attitudes rather than the real characteristics of the viewed item. Newspaper cartoons, the usual visual image in America of Mormons before these stereographs, flaunted the negative. As a result of polygamy, Mormons endured years of stereotypes: the lustful and aging elder, the harem of down-trodden and constantly pregnant women, ignorant and uncouth frontier people enslaved by religious oppression, zealots, fanatics, lower-class converts who were superstitious dupes, and leaders who were scheming frauds.

Underwood & Underwood’s traditional approach to exotic locations would predict a similar parading of Utah’s peculiarities. It consistently chose travel and anthropological views emphasizing the strange, odd, and bizarre in their world-wide tours. In the “India Tour” set, for example, Underwood & Underwood’s photographer James Ricalton provided several views contrasting the splendor of the Maharajah’s palaces and the squalor of the poor. Another view shows a “holy man” in a loin cloth lying on a bed of nails. The “China Tour” features graphic examples of barbarism: a display of decapi-
tated heads and the naked "lily feet," grotesquely misshapen by binding, of a young girl. However, in Utah Underwood & Underwood selected images that reinforced traditional American middle-class values—small-town peacefulness, neighborliness, appropriate recreational activities, democratic institutions, and technological progress. Whatever the artistic merits of these views, they reinforced positive stereotypes of Mormons as members of white middle-class American society, a stereotype relayed to the viewer on several levels.

Gary Bunker and Mormon historian Davis Bitton, in a study of newspaper cartoons about Mormons, trace the gradual shift from totally negative views to more realistic ones. Between 1890 and 1893, Mormons gave up communitarianism, their own political party, and polygamy in return for statehood in 1896. During the years of "uneasy accommodation" (1890-1914), some image-makers were unable or unwilling "to abandon all the previous stereotypes" but "tensions were reduced." 7

In 1902, the Church established its first Bureau of Information at Temple Square to tell its own story to tourists, replaced in 1904 by a new $9,000 building. Also in 1904, just as Underwood & Underwood produced the "Latter Day Saints' Tour," the U.S. Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections began two and a half years of hearings on whether Reed Smoot's apostleship constituted sufficient grounds to unseat him from the Senate. 8 The event, though politically fraught with trauma, revived relatively few of the pejorative stereotypes. More typical, according to Bunker and Bitton, "was the spoofing of a polygamy now seen as more amusing than threatening." 9

James Ricalton's Mormon photographs for Underwood & Underwood in 1904 were part of this gradual shift.

---


9 The Mormon Graphic Image, 139. After the initial interest, "national newspaper cartooning of Smoot and the Mormons declined." Ibid., 68.
In 1882, Elmer and Ben Underwood set up an office in Ottawa, Kansas to distribute Eastern photographers’ stereographs to the Western market with door-to-door salesmen. By 1891, they had established a plant in Ottawa to manufacture stereo photographic cameras, stereo views, and stereoscopes; moved their headquarters to New York City, opened branch offices in Baltimore, New York, and Liverpool, and employed up to three thousand college student/salesmen each summer. By 1901, Underwood & Underwood was manufacturing packaged sets of stereo views—25,000 a day (more than seven million a year), and 300,000 stereoscopes a year.

Part of its popularity was the educational appeal and unique marketing of boxed sets in its “Travel System” series. The Underwood & Underwood concept, according to photographic historian William Cupp Darrah, “was carefully integrated sequence[s] of views that would show cities, government buildings, industry, topography, natural resources, agriculture and people. . . . Nothing like it had appeared before.” Through centralizing planning, Underwood & Underwood could get considerable use from a single photograph. A view of Yosemite, for instance, might be found in several sets including “World Tour,” “United States,” “National Parks,” “California,” and “Physical Geography.”

Between 1902 and 1910, Underwood & Underwood produced more than three hundred different travel sets, including the “Latter

---

11 The stereoscopic camera uses two lenses two and a half inches apart on the same horizontal plane, the approximate distance between the centers of human eyes. A partition inside the camera divides the image on the negative right and left, creating in effect a double camera. Before this invention, ingenious photographers achieved the same effect by making two exposures, shifting the camera horizontally two or three inches.
12 “Interpretive Chronology,” 73.
13 The World of Stereographs, 48.
Day Saints’ Tour.” These images—prints and photographs—were among the first “mass-produced” commodities of an emerging consumer society.14

Between the end of the Civil War and World War I, the United States emerged as the world’s leading industrial and agricultural producer. New technologies proliferated. Manufacturing muscle and imagination allowed the U.S. to project its influence, both politically and economically, world-wide.15 Americans, intoxicated with military victories in Cuba and the Philippines during the Spanish-American War, willingly accepted an expansionist view of American greatness—merchant ships dominating trade with the boundless Asian markets, naval vessels protecting the Pacific, and missionaries enlightening the heathens. With equal willingness, they accepted the “duty,” in Rudyard Kipling’s phrase, to “take up the white man’s burden.” President Theodore Roosevelt, who seemed quintessentially American in his energy, optimism, and unquestioning faith in Anglo-Saxon superiority, received the Nobel Peace Prize for mediating the agreement that ended the Russo-Japanese War in 1905.

Provincialism gave way to a sturdy middle-class curiosity. Increasing numbers of newly wealthy Americans sailed on opulent ocean liners to visit London, Paris, Rome, and other citadels of European culture. A bold few—Mark Twain’s “innocents abroad”—ventured on to the exotic Middle East and India. Their solidly middle-class attitudes merged curiosity with distrust, admiration with self-righteousness, wonder with disgust, and respect with nativism.16

Another group of Americans, Christian missionaries in many third world countries, took not only new religious ideas to Africa, Asia, the Middle East, and the Pacific Islands, but also Western education, modern technology and science, commercial ventures, and racist concepts of white supremacy. Their reports back home only reinforced the middle-class views of these cultures and societies.

Magic-lantern slide shows proliferated in churches, clubs, and lecture halls. At the turn of the twentieth century, few homes were without a stereoscope and an assortment of cards and boxed sets that combined entertainment and enlightenment in packages about geography, history, humor, religion, sentiment, and travel. They were the equivalent of television and ruled popular culture until they were gradually displaced by movies and radio in the late 1920s.

American photographic companies like Underwood & Underwood helped create stereotypes of foreign peoples and cultures as bizarre, odd, and strange while holding up the shibboleths of the American middle-class as normative. However, the highly personalized perspectives were presented as an objective view of the world. As one of Underwood & Underwood’s advertising brochures proclaimed, “The Underwood stereographs are produced by the greatest expert skill, from original negatives, and are scientifically accurate.” The subject of the views “are seen standing out in natural perspective, natural size and at natural distances. Color alone excepted, the object is seen exactly as it would appear looked at through a window at the same distance from it as the actual distance of the camera.”

Albert E. Osborne, a prominent educator at the beginning of the twentieth century, emphasized the “truth” of the stereo medium:

I remember well the first time I saw a stereoscope and stereographs. It was at the home of an uncle in northeastern Pennsylvania, when I was less than ten years of age. The experiences I then had I have never forgotten. I seemed let out to the ends of the earth. . . Now something that had happened only in fairy story or by Arabian magic seemed a real possibility. For this clearly was not magic nor mere make-believe. I was taken out to no world of fancy, but to the world of fact.

Underwood & Underwood had no difficulty obtaining enthusiastic testimonials from other well-known educators including Nicholas M. Butler, president of Columbia University, Abbott L. Lowell, president of Harvard, and James H. Breasted of the University of Chicago; and these men may also have believed Underwood &

Underwood's insistence that their unique "Travel System" series were "absolutely necessary, if the fundamental conditions for intellectual development and the possession of truth are to be provided for the millions." 19

In actuality, Underwood & Underwood presented a point of view. Certainly they brought the world to America, but they also revealed how middle-class, turn-of-the-century Americans viewed themselves and the world. Energetic and aggressive, the firm, like most stereographic companies of the period, bought views from competing companies and photographers to include in their own series but also hired its own photographers to scour the world for items of interest to an American middle-class audience. And one of the firm's most prominent and prolific photographers was James Ricalton, the photographer who may have been most responsible for the images in the "Latter Day Saints' Tour." 20

**MIDDLE-CLASS PHOTOGRAPHER OF THE EXOTIC**

James Ricalton, a retired New Jersey schoolteacher, was one of the dozens of professional photographers hired by Underwood & Underwood. 21 Like them, he often made his own itinerary and did his own research. A compulsive reader of newspapers, journals, and books, he traveled over 500,000 miles between 1879 and 1914, lugging heavy photographic equipment, visited thirty-five nations at least once, and created more than 100,000 photographs and thirty miles of motion picture film. His indefatigable curiosity and enormous productivity make him unique among his colleagues.

Ricalton was born 13 May 1844, the year of Joseph Smith's

---

19 Ibid., 212.

20 For biographical information I have relied heavily on Susan Kempler, "America 'Discovers' the World: James Ricalton's 'Travel on Next to Nothing'" (Ph.D. diss., Rutgers University, 1991); and Susan Kempler and Doreen Rappaport, "Travels on Next to Nothing: A 3-D Illustrated Travelogue Starring Underwood & Underwood's James Ricalton," *Stereo World* 7 (September-October 1980): 4-6. I particularly appreciate Susan's extremely helpful discussions on Ricalton's life on several occasions.

21 The firms of Scott & Van Altena, Charles A. Beseler & Moor, and Hubblell & Co. also mass-produced Ricalton's photographs as stereographs, magic lantern slides, and textbook photographs.
death. Sometime before 1871, he and his wife, Christian Rutherford Ricalton, moved from their home in Waddington, New York, to Maplewood, New Jersey, where Ricalton was a teacher and principal for several years. Following his wife’s death in 1879, Ricalton left his three children at home and went abroad for the first time, meeting Barbara Campbell while visiting his ancestral land, Scotland. They married in 1885, but Ricalton was incurably afflicted with wanderlust and a desire to document what he saw photographically for the entire seventeen years of their marriage.

Ricalton visited Russia during the summer of 1886 and Belgium, France, Italy, and North Africa in the summer of 1887. Thomas Edison engaged Ricalton to go to Asia (Burma, Ceylon, China, India, and Malaysia) in search of bamboo for the filament in the incandescent light bulb in 1888. This trip began Ricalton's lifelong fascination with the “exotic East.”

During the summer of 1890, Ricalton traveled to Greece and the Middle East. In 1891, he resigned his positions in the Maplewood Schools to devote himself to travel and photography. From 1891 to 1911, he photographed the world under contract to Underwood & Underwood, by then the nation's leading producer of stereo views.

Ricalton traveled to Europe and the Middle East in 1891-92, France and Switzerland in 1894; the Middle East in 1896; the Philippines and China in 1899-1900; India, Ceylon, and Burma in 1901-03; Japan, China, and Korea 1904-06; Java, Australia, and New Zealand in 1907-08; and South Africa, East Africa, and Egypt in 1909-10. As a war photographer, Ricalton covered the Spanish-American War (1899), the Boxer Rebellion (1900), and the Russo-Japanese War (1904). In 1911, Edison sent him around the world with his newest invention, Edison’s movie camera.

For all his enormous breadth of travel and unusual resourcefulness, Ricalton subscribed uncritically to the American values of hard work, public education, and democracy. Typical of many Americans during this period, Ricalton equated technology with progress and exalted hygiene, standards that few of the places he visited could meet.22

22 For Ricalton's critique of "primitive" India, see Brij Bhushan Sharma, "James Ricalton: An American Photographer in India," History of Photography: An
For example, Ricalton found Indians "importunate and dull" and, what was worse, superstitious in venerating cows while millions suffered for want of food. "Superstition may be a bad thing for people," he remarked caustically, "but it is a good thing for cows!" He was equally offended by China's barbarism, represented by the institution of Canton's "Dying Field" where thousands of sick, maimed, and poor came to end their days. He marveled at the "incongruities between amazing barbarism and remarkable civilization, between splendor, art and beauty, and poverty, filth, and ignorance" in the Far East. Ricalton fervently urged the expansion of Christianity, Anglo-Saxon education, capitalism, and cultural imperialism. Patriotically, he saw the United States as offering even better imperial rule than Great Britain and unhesitatingly supported the nation's late nineteenth-century overseas expansion as a boon for less fortunate societies.

In short, Ricalton's identification with his middle-class audience was very close. It is probably because Mormons proclaimed a similar platform of values—hard work, universal education, and technological progressivism, that Ricalton created a sympathetic portrait, rather than his more usual judgmental view of foreign cultures. Ricalton believed that America was becoming de-Americanized by the "new" immigrants from southern and eastern Europe; but in Utah, he was among the Anglo-Saxon population whose virtues he often praised in his work.

Furthermore, there is no question that he saw eye to eye with his employer. Underwood & Underwood presented the United States

---

25 As noted in "James Ricalton's Travels on Next to Nothing: A 3-D Sound Slide Show," Produced by New Jersey State Museum, Trenton, 1980.
26 Ibid.
proudly as educated, industrious, and prosperous. Against the American standard, all foreign cultures were judged. As the twentieth century closes, such simple nationalism seems parochial; but there is no question that Underwood & Underwood stereo views are a primary source of visual information on American social history at the turn of the century.

"THE LATTER DAY SAINTS' TOUR"

Ricalton photographed Mormon historic sites in 1903 as he returned to New Jersey after a visit to the Far East, and in 1904 as he crossed the continent again. From the foliage in these views, it is obvious that the photographs were taken in all four seasons, most probably between summer 1903 and spring 1904.

The set contains at least one view by another photographer. Number 29 in the series, "The LDS First Presidency," was taken on 27 August 1903 by Henry A. Strohmeyer, vice-president of Underwood & Underwood, when he accompanied President Theodore Roosevelt through Utah on a Western states tour.

The photographs were then manufactured and packaged, probably during the summer of 1904, and marketed as part of the Underwood & Underwood Stereoscopic Tours series "in neat Volume Cases, or Underwood Extension Cabinets." The recommended ""Twentieth Century' Aluminum Mahogany Stereoscope" for viewing the slides was extra.

Like other Underwood & Underwood travel sets, the Mormon "stereographs [were] arranged in the order in which a tourist would

27 How he identified and selected particular sites is not known. It is clear that he discussed the project with several individuals. For example, see Journal History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, (chronology of typed entries and newspaper clippings, 1830-present), 21 June 1904, 3, LDS Church Archives; hereafter cited as Journal History. A record book at the CMP, "Underwood & Underwood Photographers 1896-1914," identifies Ricalton as photographer of Mormon sites in New York, Ohio, Missouri, Illinois, and Utah.

28 Ibid., 27 August 1903, p. 3, LDS Church Archives. My particular appreciation to Randall Dixon, who read the month and year of a calendar in the background of this stereo view with a special photographic magnifying glass and then located the reference.

29 Catalogue Number Twenty-four, 73.
visit the actual place"—beginning with the Hill Cumorah in New York, and continuing with the Kirtland Temple in Ohio, Liberty Jail in Missouri, and the Salt Lake Temple, then ending with views of Salt Lake City itself. (See Appendix for a list of the views and their captions.)

The "Latter Day Saints' Tour" usually has captions printed on the front of the card, underneath the views, though a few have long captions printed on the backs. Furthermore, a year later in 1905, Underwood & Underwood published an accompanying tour booklet by Seventy and Assistant Church Historian B. H. Roberts.

The relationship between photograph and caption is not always a simple one. The viewer's initial experience of the image is easily influenced by a persuasive caption. Cultural historian Roland Barthes, in discussing the relationship between newspaper images and texts, calls the text "a parasitic message designed to connote the image . . . . This is an important historical reversal. The image no longer illustrates the words, it is now the words which, structurally, are parasitic on the image." The "parasite" text is not powerless, according to Barthes. It can amplify a set of connotations in the photograph or produce an entirely new meaning that the viewer then retroactively projects, seeing this new meaning denoted there.

This view/text relationship is clearly at work in the "Latter Day Saints' Tour." For example, No. 18 shows a man seated in a rocker in a room decorated in 1904 style, including a portrait of Abraham Lincoln. It could be any living room in America at the turn of the century. The caption, however, interjects great significance: "Jailor's Parlor where mob slew Joseph and Hyrum Smith—bullet hole in door—old Jail, Carthage, Ill." Suddenly the room becomes an artifact charged with both intellectual and emotional associations, thanks

---

30 The Latter-day Saints' Tour (Ottawa, Kansas: Underwood & Underwood, 1905), 100.
31 Ibid. The Latter-day Saints' Tour is the reprint of a 132-page booklet authored by Roberts and published by Deseret News Press shortly after the boxed set's appearance in 1904. Roberts may have received permission to change some of the captions on later issuings of the boxed set. Larry Draper has identified some of Roberts's corrections in characteristic orange crayon on the set in the LDS Church Archives.
mainly to the caption. The combination of ideological content, visual image, and the viewer's cultural associations imbues the perceived image with extrinsic meaning—exactly as Underwood & Underwood intended.33

For example, in the 1905 booklet accompanying the "Latter Day Saints' Tour," Underwood & Underwood included a section on "How to see stereoscopic photographs." It urged the viewer to "study each stereograph long and thoughtfully" and contemplate the "thoughts which they suggest."34 The booklet also recommended "read[ing] the description of the particular stereograph, referring again and again to the stereograph to see the facts brought out in the description."35 Ultimately, one would be "surprised to find how many new objects are seen and new ideas brought to mind."36

Why was Underwood & Underwood willing to present Mormonism as American rather than as exotic and bizarre? Certainly, Underwood & Underwood saw the Mormon market as financially significant, as seen by its willingness to republish B. H. Roberts's caption-by-caption explanatory booklet; and Roberts, in turn, probably would not have written the booklet if Mormons as well as non-Mormons were not purchasing the set in significant quantities. Furthermore, the company's Temporary Negative Register titles the Carthage Jail view "Jailor's Parlor where mob slew Joseph and Hyrum Smith" (no. X76516), suggesting that this sympathetic labeling was Underwood & Underwood's editorial policy.37 And finally, some views from this set were published with titles in French, German, Spanish, Swedish and Russian, indicating that they reached an international audience through being included in the larger "American

---

33 This model of interpretation was suggested by Edward Earl. See his "The Stereograph in America: Pictorial Antecedents and Cultural Perspective" in Points of View, 9-21.
35 Ibid.
36 Ibid., 11-12.
View 23. Its caption reads: “Pioneer Monument—in honor of Brigham Young and the Pioneers July 24, 1847, Salt Lake City, Utah.”

Tour Set,” marketed in Europe.\textsuperscript{38} Obviously, this audience would have been largely non-Mormon, but the captions are again sympathetically phrased. In short, Underwood & Underwood approvingly interpreted modern Mormonism as a religion transformed by American democratic and educational institutions.

For example, No. 22, the Salt Lake Temple, which appears in several different Underwood & Underwood sets, has a long printed caption on the back of the card, praising Utah’s technology, commerce, and progressivism: “The city has excellent modern equipment in the way of water, gas and electricity, it is an important trading center, and its own manufacturing enterprises produce annually almost $4,000,000 worth of goods.”\textsuperscript{39} All are features of American progress and growth. In contrast, Bunker and Bitton note that the typical nineteenth-century view of Utah emphasizes “aridity, bleakness, and a kind of ominous threat, not a complete invention, of course,” which subtly “allowed the same qualities to rub off on the people and religious group located in that environment.”\textsuperscript{40} The

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext[38]{Original Stereographs: Catalogue No. 26 (New York: Underwood & Underwood, 1907), 102.}
\footnotetext[39]{From Descriptive Bulletin No. One (Ottawa, Kansas: Underwood & Underwood, 1901) printed on view number 60-6200, “The Pride of the Mormons, the Temple in Salt Lake City, Utah,” LDS Church Archives.}
\end{footnotes}
Underwood & Underwood views, showing parklike mature trees, lawns, and shrubs, affirm that the desert had been redeemed by modern technology. No longer a forbidding wilderness, the Mormon capital possessed all the modern advantages of any Eastern city.

As a second example, No. 23, the Brigham Young Monument, located at the intersection of South Temple and East Temple streets in downtown Salt Lake City, includes a modern electric street car in the foreground, sporting a banner that announces, “Base Ball To Day Spokane vs Salt Lake.” The combination of technology and this all-American sport powerfully mediates the exclusively Mormon message of the Brigham Young monument and the temple in the background for middle-class American viewers.

No. 24, the Mormon Tabernacle, is also reinterpreted with sympathetic democratic symbols. During the 1870s and 1880s, political cartoonists caricatured the Tabernacle as a turtle to represent the Church negatively. In one typical illustration, the Mormon “turtle” crawled beside the Catholic “alligator” over the U.S. Capitol building. “Religious liberty is guaranteed,” political cartoonist Thomas Nash sneered, “but can we allow foreign reptiles to crawl over US?”

View 24. Its caption reads: “The Interior of the Tabernacle (seating 8,000) and the Great Organ, Salt Lake City, Utah.”

41 In ibid., 85.
interior displaying a great star and the word "Utah" on the organ pipes, both symbols of the statehood that had been achieved eight years earlier. An exterior shot would not have made such an explicit statement of political inclusiveness.

No. 25 looks south and east along Salt Lake City's Main Street, an urban scene any American city of the time could be proud of. The view shows such modern features as electric street cars, multi-storied commercial buildings, telephone and electric poles, paved streets, men in business suits, women in contemporary fashions, and the Salt Lake Herald building with its explicitly international slogan, "All the news of the world every morning." The street is unusually clean. One man, wearing a suit and a straw boater, pedals a bicycle.

This detail may contain an explicit comment. Seven years earlier, writer Gilbert Patten had published a popular serial satire, "Frank Merriwell Among the Mormons or the Lost Tribe of Israel," in New York City's Tip Top Magazine. The 19 June 1897 installment showed the arch villain, Elder Asaph Holdfast, ordering two young men dressed in Yale uniforms and standing by their bicycles: "Remove from my sight those inventions of Satan!" As Bunker and Bitton point out, the article, in which Holdfast speaks in "thees" and "thous," reinforced the anti-progressive stereotype of Mormons.42

42 Ibid., 58-59.
No. 26 shows Salt Lake City's City and County Building, an architecturally impressive and expensive structure built at a reported cost of $800,000 between 1891 and 1894 in anticipation of statehood. There is nothing unusual about including it in the Mormon set, except that the set omits any ecclesiastical buildings except for the Tabernacle and the temple and also omits residences of Church leaders. In other words, Underwood & Underwood chose a symbol of American democracy and pluralism instead of Church wealth and power.

No. 27 is a panoramic view of Salt Lake City looking north and west from atop the City and County Building. Although the Mormon temple is visible in the distance, the scene could be of any large American city of the period. Clean streets lined with small manuf actories, shops, and simple, well-kept homes dominate the foreground. Large business buildings rise in the center portion, while even larger commercial buildings create a view of prosperity and progressivism in the background.

No. 28 shows individuals in fashionable beach attire in the Great Salt Lake. The photograph, taken facing the shore, shows Saltair, a popular and architecturally fanciful resort, in the background. This view subtly conveys another middle-class message: Mormons participate in healthful recreation and can no longer be seen as a fanatical religious group enslaved by patriarchal priesthood power.
These particular views do not, technically speaking, belong in a set of Mormon historic sites and serve no clear aesthetic purposes. Rather, they demonstrate the Americanization of Utah. The Mormon capital was a thriving city—demonstrably modern, obviously progressive, overwhelmingly Caucasian, and politically predictable—in a word, a bastion of white, middle-class values.

**CONCLUSION**

Gary Bunker and Davis Bitton's important 1983 work analyzing the visual images of the Saints in "cartoons, caricatures, and illustrate-

---

43The state's population stood at about 268,000 in 1900 and would reach 373,000 by 1910. Salt Lake City numbered 54,000 in 1900 and 93,000 in 1910. In 1910, Asians, blacks, American Indians, and Hispanics constituted a fractional 1.36 percent of the population, perhaps comforting to the middle-class majority who had approved the extension of the Chinese Exclusion Act in 1902 even while the immigrant slums in some parts of New York had exceeded the population density of Bombay. See Alan M. Kraut, *The Huddled Masses: The Immigrant in American Society, 1880-1921* (Arlington Heights, Illinois: Harlan Davidson, 1982). Utah presidential election results reflected the national outcome. William McKinley, Theodore Roosevelt, and William Howard Taft all received a majority of votes in the presidential elections of 1900, 1904, and 1908 respectively, further evidence that Utah was no longer a theocratic state but a solidly "American" one. Wayne L. Wahlquist, ed. *Atlas of Utah* (Provo: Brigham Young University Press, 1981), 121-22, 169-71.
tions" has been reinforced by James D'Arc's initial study of the Mormon image in film, beginning with the 1905 silent film, *A Trip to Salt Lake.* Equally widespread artifacts of popular culture are the vast world of stereo views, seen by millions over a forty-year span between the 1880s and 1920s. Cultural historian Nathan Lyons points out, "The photographer's response, his point of view, is preconditioned by a number of factors that affect not only what he chooses to photograph but it also reveals how he has articulated that response." Underwood & Underwood's stereo views, therefore, tell as much about American white, middle-class values as about Mormon history.

It is significant that millions of Americans who knew the Mormons as a politically despised minority associated with the scandals of polygamy now saw them as good citizens, unexceptionally enfranchised in two-party politics, integrated into a market economy, fashionably up-to-date in clothes, transportation, and recreation, and consumers of international news. The Brigham Young Monument and the electric streetcar with the "Base Ball" sign symbolically reconcile Mormon religious separatism with the larger nation. Saints are supporters of American values, at least in subconscious contrast to the highly reproductive urban immigrants from eastern and southern Europe living in the East.

The captions praise Joseph Smith and the Church by relating the rise of Mormonism from a believer's point of view, and the photographs progressively naturalize Mormons for the middle-class Americans who were buying Underwood & Underwood boxed sets. Abraham Lincoln's portrait hangs on a modernly furnished room that historically had been the scene of martyrdom. It is the modern, democratic message that the viewer sees first, even as he or she absorbs the historic information. Gone are the "sly, dark, and seduc-

---

tive" missionaries who slunk "around the cities of America and Europe, stealing wives and daughters," or the "fat, boorish old bishops, plodding around Salt Lake City arranging for a new wife."\textsuperscript{47} Gone also are secret rites, priestly orders, blood atonement, and white slavery. Replacing them instead are the stereotypes and shibboleths of middle-class America.

APPENDIX

Captions for "The Latter Day Saints' Tour from Palmyra, New York to Salt Lake City, Utah through the Stereoscope," published by Underwood & Underwood in 1904.

(1) Joseph Smith, the Mormon Prophet and Founder of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints.

(2) The Old Smith Homestead—Scene of Joseph Smith's first revelations and visions—near Palmyra, New York.

(3) Cumorah Hill, where the Prophet received the golden plates or records of [the] Book of Mormon near Palmyra.

(4) The Mormon Temple at Kirtland, Ohio—(59 x 79 feet), cost $70,000, dedicated March 27, 1836.

(5) North over temple lot, site marked by Mormon prophecy for world's greatest temple, Independence, Mo.

(6) Ruins of Jail where Joseph Smith, Hyrum Smith, and other Mormon leaders were imprisoned, Liberty, Missouri.

(7) Apostle Lyman White's House at Adam-ondi-Ahman, near Gallatin, Daviess County, Missouri.

(8) Looking east along Mullholland Street, from south side of temple block, Nauvoo, Illinois.

(9) The temple of Nauvoo, Illinois (88 x 128 feet), corner stone laid April 6, 1841; burned November 10, 1848.

(10) Home of President Wilford Woodruff, Nauvoo, Illinois (facing east).

(11) Home of President Lorenzo Snow, Nauvoo, Illinois.

(12) Nauvoo Mansion, home of Joseph Smith, from which murdered brothers were buried, Nauvoo, Illinois.

(13) Old Smith Homestead, Emma Smith's grave, and lot where martyred brothers were buried, Nauvoo, Illinois.

(14) Home of President Brigham Young, Nauvoo, Illinois (facing

(15) Home of President John Taylor, Nauvoo, Illinois, (facing east).

(16) The Old Jail where the Prophet Joseph Smith and his brother Hyrum were murdered (south front), Carthage, Illinois.

(17) Hall, Door to debtor's prison, stairway ascended by mob, and door to main prison, jail, Carthage, Illinois.


(19) East side of Jail, showing window where Joseph Smith was shot from which he fell, Carthage, Illinois.

(20) Court House, scene of trial of the murders of Joseph and Hyrum Smith, Carthage, Illinois.

(21) Brigham Young, the great leader of the Nauvoo Exodus, and Colonizer of the American Desert.

(22) The Great Temple and Tabernacle (cost of temple $4,000,000; 210 feet), Salt Lake City, Utah. 48

(23) Pioneer Monument—in honor of Brigham Young and the Pioneers July 24, 1847, Salt Lake City, Utah.

(24) The Interior of the Tabernacle (seating 8,000) and the Great Organ, Salt Lake City, Utah.

(25) Looking southeast along Main Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.

(26) Court House—City and County Buildings—height 256 ft., cost $800,000—Salt Lake City, Utah.

(27) Salt Lake City, Northwest from the northwest—the Temple at distant left—Utah.

(28) Great Salt Lake and the Pavilion—bathing scene, showing density of water in Great Salt Lake.


48 In some sets, this view has a 350-word expanded caption on the reverse, emphasizing the numerical growth of the Mormons, current religious pluralism in Salt Lake City, technological advances in power and water distribution in the city, and the doctrinal shift of the Church to acceptable American practices. "Pride of the Mormons," Photographic Collection, LDS Church Archives.
FATHER OF JOSEPH’S DAUGHTER:
JOHN MURDOCK

Marjorie Newton

JOHN MURDOCK’S NAME IS perpetuated today by the travel agency founded by his great-grandson and by a seldom-read revelation in Doctrine and Covenants 99. Most Latter-day Saints are vaguely aware of him as the widowed father of the infant twins named Joseph and Julia whom Joseph and Emma Smith adopted. The Smiths’ own twins, Thaddeus and Louisa, had been born the same day as the Murdock twins but had died at birth. The male Murdock twin, Joseph, died at eleven months under sorrowful circumstances in March 1832 in Hiram, Ohio. The adopted twins had caught measles, and Joseph Smith was sleeping with his little namesake on a trundle bed when a mob broke into the home, dragged him outside, and tarred and feathered him. Left uncovered, the feverish baby caught a chill from which he never recovered; but his twin, Julia, survived to become an integral part of the Smith family, older sister to Joseph and Emma’s four surviving sons: Joseph Jr., Alexander, Frederick, and David.

Less well-known are other elements of John Murdock’s life—his

MARJORIE NEWTON of Sydney, Australia, is the author of Southern Cross Saints: The Mormons in Australia (Laie: BYU–Hawaii/The Institute for Polynesian Studies, 1991). She is currently researching a history of the Church in New Zealand. Sources from the Historical Department Archives of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (hereafter cited as LDS Church Archives) are copyright by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints; courtesy of the Church Historical Department; used by permission.
dauntless missionary spirit, his experience with plural marriage, his pioneering efforts in Utah, and, finally, his one known attempt to persuade the surviving twin, Julia, to leave Emma Smith Bidamon in Nauvoo and join him in the Salt Lake Valley.¹ In outline, John Murdock is a first-generation Mormon of heroic dimensions. In more detail, his is a poignant, even troubling, human story.

Great-grandson of a Scottish Presbyterian immigrant who settled in New York State, Murdock was born in 1792. His mother died when John, the fourth of seven children, was four.² His father married a woman who favoured her own children and treated John and his three surviving brothers harshly. After moving between relatives’ homes, young John eventually made his way west into Ohio, married Julia Clapp in 1823 at the age of twenty-five, and settled in Orange township, Cuyahoga County.

Like many of his generation, John Murdock became a seeker. His mother, Eleanor Riggs Murdock, had been well educated, “much given to reading and Prayer: and was much noted for piety, and was very ready to teach and instruct her children.”³ The spiritual seed sown in these infant years was cultivated by an aunt and uncle with whom Murdock lived from the age of ten to his early teens; they taught him to pray and to read the Bible, and fostered his faith in God. From an early age, he trusted in divine guidance and experienced reassuring spiritual manifestations. In his early manhood, Murdock experimented with membership in the Dutch Lutheran, Presbyterian Seceder, and Free Baptist denominations but at last withdrew from organized religion, concluding that he wanted “to find a people whos [sic] walk was according to [the scriptures] but could find no such people and began to conclude there was none such on the earth.”⁴

¹My thanks to Linda King Newell for drawing to my attention the fact that Buddy Youngreen has also told this story, though briefly, in a footnote to his Reflections of Emma (Orem, Utah: Keepsake Paperbacks, 1982), 80, note 27.
²John Murdock, Sr., was left with four sons when his wife died in 1796. Another son and a daughter predeceased their mother; and a seventh child, wrote Murdock, “was buried in the grave with my mother.” Abridged Record of the Life of John Murdock, taken from his Journals by himself, LDS Church Archives, microfilm of holograph, 1.
³John Murdock, Autobiography, LDS Church Archives, microfilm of holograph, 1.
However, he became associated with Sidney Rigdon's Campbellite congregation in Kirtland; it was here that he met and was baptized by Parley P. Pratt in November 1830, just seven months after the organization of the LDS Church.

Ordained an elder by Oliver Cowdery a few days after his baptism, Murdock immediately began to preach the restored gospel, baptizing some seventy of his neighbours in the Orange-Warrensville area during the next four months. One of the first group of high priests ordained by Joseph Smith in June 1831, Murdock journeyed east with Hyrum Smith, Lyman Wight, and John Corrill on a mission designated by revelation (D&C 52:7-8). His subsequent missionary journeys for the restored Church would take him from the eastern coast of the United States to the western shores of the Pacific Ocean.

Murdock's integrity was total and his testimony unwavering from the moment of his conversion. With something of Scottish dourness in his character, fostered, no doubt, by the rigors of his childhood, he early showed determination and perseverance. At seventeen, after temporarily losing the use of his right hand in an accident, he would strap a scythe or hoe to his arm and do his share of work on the family farm. The same grit and determination, coupled with implicit faith in the Lord, pulled him through a long illness on his mission to the East. "The Brethren thought I could not live," he wrote later, "but tho I was so weak that I could not keep the flies out of my mouth my faith was fixed that I could not die for the Lord had something more for me to do."6

This spirit sustained him through persecution, missionary labours, and a life of hardship and personal tragedy. After his wife's death left him with the six-hour-old twins and three older children, he continued his full-time missionary labours for the Church. By the time he returned to Ohio eleven months later, baby Joseph was dead; six-year-old Phebe died of cholera in Missouri three years later. In

4 Ibid., 11.
5 Ibid., 5. He recovered the use of his hand after some months.
6 John Murdock, Journal [ca. 1830-59], LDS Church Archives, microfilm of holograph, 10.
7 The older children were Orrice Clapp Murdock (b. 1824), John Riggs Murdock (b. 1826), and Phebe Murdock (b. 1828).
1836, Murdock married Amoranda Turner, who died after just eighteen months. His third wife, Electa Allen, whom he married in Far West in 1838, died in Nauvoo, along with two of their three children.

For a few months during the winter of 1832-33, Murdock boarded in the Smith home at Kirtland. Here he must have had daily contact with his two-year-old daughter, Julia, but he made no attempt to claim her affection as her father. Instead, he attended the elders' "school" and enjoyed the close companionship and teachings of the Prophet, participating in many spiritual sessions in Joseph's own chamber.

It was during one of these meetings that the Prophet promised the brethren in attendance that if they had sufficient faith and humility, they should see the face of the Lord. In later years, Murdock recorded what followed:

And about midday the visions of my mind were opened, and the eyes of my understanding were enlightened, and I saw the form of a man, most lovely, the visage of his face was round and fair as the sun. His hair a bright silver grey, curled in most majestic form, His eyes a keen penetratring blue, and the skin of his neck a most beautiful white and he was Covered from the neck to the feet with a loose garment pure white. Whiter than any garment I had ever before seen. His countenance was most penetratring, and yet most lovely. And while I was endeavoring to comprehend the whole personage from head to feet it slipped from me, and the vision was closed up. But it left on my mind the impression of love, for months, that I never felt before to that degree.9

Murdock was a member of the epic Zion's Camp expedition from Ohio to Missouri in 1834, and, as senior high councilor, played a leading part in the high council's "rebellion" at Far West when two members of the stake presidency (William Wine Phelps and John Whitmer) were called to account for actions they had taken without consulting with the Twelve or with the high council. Both Phelps and Whitmer were later excommunicated for misappropriation of funds.10 In Illinois, Murdock served as bishop of Nauvoo's Fifth

---

8 Murdock, Autobiography, 142-49.
9 Abridged Record, 26.
10 Donald Q. Cannon and Lyndon W. Cook, eds., Far West Record: Minutes of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1830-1844 (Salt Lake City:
married a fourth time (widowed Sarah Zufelt Weire) in March 1846, and faithfully followed Brigham Young out of Nauvoo. After enduring the trek westward across the plains, Murdock, Sarah, and three children—Sarah's six-year-old son (George Weire, whom Murdock adopted), seven-year-old Gideon A. Murdock (the surviving child of Murdock's third marriage), and a two-year-old foster child, Mary Cooper—arrived in the Salt Lake Valley with the Abraham O. Smoot company in late September 1847. There is no record that Murdock had any contact with his sixteen-year-old daughter Julia Murdock Smith before leaving Nauvoo, where she remained with Emma Hale Smith. At the October conference in 1847, only days after Murdock’s arrival, he was appointed to the first Salt Lake Stake high council. In 1849, he became the first bishop of the Fourteenth Ward, an area bounded by Main Street, Second West, South Temple and Third South. It was in the Fourteenth Ward that same year that Richard Ballantyne organized the first LDS Sunday School. Also in 1849, Murdock was appointed to the House of Representatives of the provisional state of Deseret. Two years later, at the age of fifty-nine, he left home on his last missionary journey—called to serve under Parley P. Pratt on a mission to the “isles and coasts of the Pacific.” Murdock’s health was bad. There is some indication that he had volunteered, perhaps hoping that the milder Pacific climate would benefit his condition. Once in California, Pratt designated Murdock as president of a mission to Australia and assigned as his companion a newly reactivated and rebaptized member, Charles Wesley Wandell.

Murdock and Wandell arrived in the thriving city of Sydney on 31 October 1851. Two days later, Murdock made his first approach to the public among the Sunday afternoon crowds in Hyde Park. On 18


12 Murdock’s sons from his first marriage, Orrice, twenty-two, and John, twenty, marched with the Mormon Battalion; there was no issue from his marriage with Amoranda Turner.

13 In 1851, Hyde Park was still familiarly known to the inhabitants of Sydney as “the old racecourse,” although horse-racing in the park had been discontinued in
November, he travelled twelve miles upriver by steamer to Parramatta and, after spending a couple of fruitless days there, walked to Liverpool, twelve miles to the southwest, preaching as he went. Such was Murdock's disillusionment with the people of Parramatta that, on leaving the town, he symbolically wiped its dust from his feet, little knowing that, 133 years later, the first Australian temple would be built within the boundaries of the Parramatta Stake.

As he walked the long dusty miles back to Sydney from Liverpool, Murdock fell in with a Methodist preacher. "He said he wondered that as good looking a man as I should be a follower of a man that died as untimely a death as John Smith (meaning Josep [sic] the Prophet)," Murdock recorded in his journal. "He said he was Shot in prison being put in for getting drunk & Stealing . . . I said but little til his Storm was over & he began to get cool." Then, after pointing out the similarities between what was said of Jesus and of Joseph Smith, and the "untimely end" of each, Murdock bore humble and touching testimony of the Prophet: "I told him I would rather he would condemn me than to condemn my Prophet for I know him to be a man of God that is Joseph Smith & a lovely man & he reared up one of my children."15

Before Christmas, Murdock made a second journey out of Sydney. Sailing down the coast to the colony of Port Phillip, some five hundred miles south, he found the population of Melbourne in the throes of the gold rush. Unable to find hospitality or interest in his message, he tried to work; but the heat of the Australian summer made him so ill that he was forced to return to Sydney after only ten days in the southern colony. His counsellor, Charles W. Wandell, wrote with relief to Pratt: "I was glad to see his face again; for he is too old a man to contend against all the difficulties of opening new ground, where the obstacles to be overcome are so many and so great as they are in these gold-mad colonies."16

As the months passed, Murdock's health deteriorated further.

14 Murdock, Journal, 146.
15 Ibid., 150-51.
and he found himself relying more and more heavily on his young and able companion. By now Murdock was nearly sixty years of age, frail and weakened by twenty years of hardship, privation, and missionary journeys. He was not equal to the task he faced; and by his own admission, most of the work fell on Wandell's willing shoulders. It was Wandell who edited their numerous publications and preached all but two of their open-air sermons, plus many in their rented rooms. It was Wandell who baptized all the converts, and Wandell who wrote answers to critics of the Church.

It was, perhaps, inevitable that the younger, more personable, and better-educated Wandell should be a greater favourite with the members than the elderly, ailing, and somewhat touchy, though always dedicated, mission president. Murdock himself admitted that "he did not wonder at the brethren's esteeming Brother Wandell for it was natural for he had done the principal labor of this mission." It was probably also inevitable that Wandell's youthful zeal should lead him to offend his mission president. At a conference meeting in Sydney early in April 1852, Wandell gave the members liberty to vote on proposals—not just a sustaining vote, but a deciding vote. When he proposed that he himself should undertake a mission to Melbourne, several of the local brethren voted against the proposal because this would leave only Murdock in the Sydney Branch. News of Lorenzo Snow's efforts to establish the work in India had reached Sydney. Mistakenly assuming that Snow was himself in India, Wandell tactlessly proposed that, as the members did not want only Murdock as a preacher, Snow should be invited to Sydney. Pratt was virtually out of communication in Valparaiso, Chile. It would take many months for letters to be exchanged with the First Presidency in Salt Lake City, but India was only six weeks away. Hurt, Murdock summarized the situation in his diary:

Brother Wandell . . . said if they were not satisfied with Bro. Murdock as a preacher, they could write to Calcutta for bro. Lorenzo Snow, which was only six weeks sail; and he was a great preacher, who

18 In Australasian Mission Minutes, 46-47.
had been to Italy and built up a branch of the Church, right under the Pope's nose. . . . I told them if you want to write to bro. Snow . . . or any other leading man, in this Church that you want a great preacher; that bro. Murdock is not a great preacher enough for you: I would like to see you write such a letter. Bro. Wandell said, I stand corrected.

Murdock brooded over the perceived slight all night, and next morning addressed the brethren more in sorrow than in anger, explaining the difference between a democracy and a theocracy. Wandell was submissive and apologetic.19

Both missionaries had been surprised by the size and diversity of the population of the Australian colonies, staggered by the distances between settlements, and dismayed by the difficulties of transportation. Murdock and Wandell pleaded with Parley P. Pratt and Brigham Young for more missionaries. Murdock specified the need for missionaries of the calibre of those sent to Great Britain. "Bro. Pratt placed me here to preside over the mission," he wrote to the First Presidency, "but considering the weakness of my body, the affection [sic] and trembling of my nervs, and the badness of my eyesigth [sic] I am not fit. . . . And it kneed as good tallented business me[n] to preside here as on the Isle of Great Britain, and more than one or two . . . There is labor for many . . . & it requieres experienced hands to do that."20 In June 1852, after just seven months in Australia, Murdock sailed for home, leaving Wandell to preside over the mission and to answer the growing rumours of polygamy.

Arriving back in Utah in January 1853, Murdock found that his three-year-old son, Brigham Young Murdock, had died just nineteen days earlier. His wife and the older children were in Dry Creek (Lehi) where his adult sons from his first marriage, Orrice C. Murdock and John R. Murdock, were living. The city had been settled during the fall of 1851, and the community built its fort during the fall of 1853. Murdock decided to stay, rather than return to Salt Lake City; and

Orrice and John built for him one of sixty cabins, which, aligned end to end, formed the fort square.21 Here he was elected one of the first aldermen and also served as assistant to David Evans, who for a time combined the roles of bishop and mayor. Murdock taught school for a dollar a day but resigned after an altercation with the local amateur theatrical group over the intrusion of properties into the schoolhouse.22

On 1 April 1854, he was called as patriarch for Iron County in Southern Utah. Because of his waning health, Murdock never filled this calling or a later one to serve in the Endowment House in Salt Lake City. Anxious about not doing his duty, he consulted Brigham Young in the spring of 1856 and recorded: "He said all was right that it was my privilege to stay at home & preside over my own family for I had travled enough & hereafter when I might want a mission I must tel him what it was & where and he would give it me."23 Instead, Murdock was appointed to preside over the high priests in Lehi. Before long, he was again teaching school and also giving patriarchal blessings in Lehi but, after six months, resigned from the presidency of the high priests’ group and from the school because of ill health. In December 1856, he consecrated his total property to the Church—three lots, a yoke of oxen, two cows and some furniture, a total value of $295.24

But instead of spending his declining years in peace, a series of events brought the elderly Murdock into a violent two-year conflict with Bishop David Evans.25 The initial impetus to the conflict came

---

22 Murdock, Journal, 1 March 1854, [230].
23 Murdock, Abridged Record, 178-79.
24 Murdock, Autobiography, 141.
25 Evans, one of the original settlers of Lehi and bishop from 1854 to 1879, provided vigorous leadership but was unable to maintain harmony. "An undercurrent of discord, much of it related to United Order problems, was slowly eroding the town's morale," records historian Richard Van Wagoner of the 1870s. "There has been a very contentious spirit manifested in our ward for some time past," wrote William Yates of the strife. "Several of our leading men and the Bishop David Evans were on the [w]range all the time, and I am sorry to say the Bishop is rather a stoubern & contain[t]ious man who is led by his son [Israel] who is by
over plural marriage, which also sparked a second confrontation. In January 1857, the sixty-five-year-old Murdock took Marjory McEwan, a widow, as a plural wife. Despite his four monogamous marriages, Murdock had steadfastly avoided plural marriage until this time, suggesting that he now yielded to pressure from ecclesiastical leaders. As the story unfolds in his journal, Murdock's marriage to Marjory was a disaster, both ludicrous and pathetic, as the humourless, elderly, but obedient Murdock tried to fulfil his marriage vows. Humiliatingly, this marriage resulted in censure from Bishop David Evans and what appears to be overzealous Church disciplinary action.

After being sealed in Salt Lake City by Brigham Young, the newly wedded couple returned to Lehi the same evening. However, Marjory refused to stay with her bridegroom and his fourth (monogamous) wife Sarah, instead insisting on returning to her own home to sleep with her children. Each day Marjory came to the Murdock home to help Sarah with the housework; each night, she manufactured a new excuse to return home. Murdock and Sarah invited Marjory's children to move into their home with their mother; Marjory refused. The situation was exacerbated by tension between the two wives—Marjory later testified that no other woman could live comfortably with Sarah.26

Marjory's refusal to move into the Murdock home was not completely unreasonable. Because of the approach of Johnston's army and the threat of war, the Murdock home was still unfinished and apparently crowded. Murdock offered Marjory a place in the connubial bed, suggesting that Sarah lie between them if Marjory did not care to lie beside him. Again, Marjory declined. Other solutions—such as making a new tick—also failed. In desperation Murdock offered the two women the bedstead and volunteered to sleep on the floor, but to no avail. Three weeks after the marriage, Murdock delicately offered to "bed with her" but Marjory refused. She said "she did not marry for sake of a man in this mortal world but exaltation in the resurrection & I desisted," wrote Murdock.27 By the end of

no means a truthful honest man." In Van Wagoner, Lehi, 12.

26 From Murdock's account of the trial before Bishop David Evans and the high priests' quorum in Lehi, 6 December 1857, in Murdock, Abridged Record, 183.
27 Ibid.
summer, Marjory’s daily visits to the Murdock home had ceased.

On 6 December 1857, some ten months after the marriage, Bishop Evans called both Murdock and Marjory to a Church court. After discussing Murdock’s failure to provide a proper home for Marjory, Evans charged him with failure to consummate the marriage. Murdock pleaded age and infirmity: “Moses at 120 years the force of his body had not abated, but mine has very much at 65 years,” he explained, confessing himself incapable of having more than one wife. Nevertheless, he was annoyed when the court found him guilty of a “crime” for not cohabiting with Marjory. Recalling his earlier offer and her unequivocal refusal, he felt “it would have been a singler kind of doings when the woman utterly refused and she an old woman past barring children. I could look upon it but little better than committing a rape.” Marjory expressed a wish to be free, and the couple were eventually granted a divorce.

Meanwhile, according to Murdock’s journal, Evans, speaking to Lehi Ward on 4 April 1858, instructed the members to lie should they ever be questioned about polygamous families in the town. Evans quoted as precedents the scriptural stories of Abram and Sarah before Abimelech, Rahab concealing the spies, Ahab seduced by false prophets, and also the words of the apostle Paul in Romans 3:7. Murdock objected to lying. Given the opportunity to speak, he replied that it was one thing for the Saints to screen their brethren but another for the bishop to publicly preach lying, which, if known by the “Gentiles,” would destroy the Church’s credibility. Instead, he suggested, “the best way, is to know but little and every one mind their own business and hold their tongues still. There is but very few men that I know to have wives I did not see them married. I do not know that Bishop Evans has any wife neither do I care. The course I have always taken in the world was to give no heed to mob threats or mob appearances but hold up my head keep my tongue still and attend to my own business.”

---

28 Murdock, Journal, [243].
29 Murdock, Abridged Record, 184.
30 Copy of legal separation dated 18 July 1859, ibid., 201.
31 Ibid., 188. Murdock’s position strongly echoes the “Mormon Creed,” a saying first published in 1842 by William Smith that found increased popularity among
Evans was incensed with Murdock’s criticism. All attempts to effect a reconciliation failed. At a meeting of the high priests the same afternoon and at three subsequent meetings, opinion favoured the bishop. Murdock apologised for making his criticism in public but would not change his stance. Caught between his scrupulous honesty and his lifelong habit of obedience to presiding officers, he eventually acknowledged that “the High Priests desided that what the Bishop taught was right and what I taught was wrong and I was willing to let it stand so and I would try all I could to believe it was so.”

In the meantime, Evans slightingly referred to Murdock in ward meetings as “old Dad Murdock.” Murdock, deeply offended, stopped attending church. By May 1859, when members of the high priests’ group questioned him about his nonattendance, Murdock was heartily tired of it all and wanted nothing more than to let the matter drop. After his perfunctory excuses of ill-health were not accepted, he recorded, “I told them I was dissatisfied and had been for more than a year with the treatment I had received from the authorities in Lehi but I wished for no further investigation of the matters here, but was willing to let it rest five years or ten years till the priesthood was completely untrammelled.”

On 5 June 1859, after some wrangling about the legality of the proceedings, Murdock was “cut off” from the Lehi branch of the high priests’ quorum. Stung by what he perceived as injustice, Murdock told Brigham Young the whole story a few days later, giving him a copy of the minutes of the relevant priesthood meetings. Young

Mormons in the mid-nineteenth century: “Mormon Creed—To mind their own business, and let everybody else, do likewise.” Michael Hicks points out that “in the weeks preceding William Smith’s publication of the Creed, the elite of Nauvoo were introduced by Joseph Smith to a new order of marriage, the rituals of Freemasonry, and the Mormon temple endowment ordinance—all of which were to be concealed from the public. Amid the whispering about these matters at Nauvoo in the early 1840s, a growing spirit of privacy took hold of the Saints.” “Minding Business: A Note on The Mormon Creed,” Brigham Young University Studies 26, no. 4 (Fall 1986): 126; emphasis William Smith’s.

32 Abridged Record, 189.
33 Ibid.
34 Ibid.
promptly investigated and ordered Murdock's immediate reinstatement in the quorum: "As near as I can learn from statements made by the parties, Br. John Murdock has been dropped from your Quorum for a matter that is not and never was of any moment, and should never have been deemed worthy a mention, much less such action as was taken," he wrote with vigorous common sense. "... Bishops and elders in Israel will learn the truth of the old adage that molasses will catch more flies than vinegar."

It was during this period of turmoil that Murdock's first known contact with his daughter Julia in over a decade occurred. Murdock's second son by his first wife, John Riggs Murdock, was one of the teamsters annually sent back east to meet immigrant companies and bring them to the Salt Lake Valley. In June 1858, John R., after reaching Florence, Nebraska, wrote to his younger sister Julia, now a married woman of twenty-seven, obviously hoping for an invitation to visit.

Julia, aged fourteen at the martyrdom of Joseph Smith and sixteen when the Mormons left Illinois two years later, had grown up in Nauvoo and appears to have been a high-spirited, intelligent girl. At eighteen she married Elisha Dixon, a penniless entertainer twice her age. After attempting to run the Mansion House hotel, Dixon's health became impaired; and the couple left for the South. In 1852 they were living in Galveston, Texas. Julia was very homesick and missed her adoptive family desperately. When Dixon was fatally burned after a steamship boiler exploded, Julia returned to Nauvoo where she soon joined in the community's social activities again and married John Jackson Middleton, a Roman Catholic and, unfortunately, an alcoholic. Middleton, who had studied for the priesthood but was never ordained, tried law and farming without success before obtaining a position in St. Louis as a clerk.

Julia, ill when she received her brother's letter, delayed answer-

35 Brigham Young, Letter to the President of the High Priest Quorum, Lehi, Utah Co., Utah, datelined G.S.L. City, 12 July 1859. Copy in Murdock, Abridged Record, inserted between pages 188-89.
37 Ibid., 253, 261, 264-65.
ing it for some months, dating her reply “Near Nauvoo, November 2nd, 1858.” John Riggs Murdock received it on 12 January 1859 and shared it with his father, who carefully copied it into his own journal. More than a century later, it still evokes the sorrow, bewilderment, and pain of the adopted child of an assassinated prophet, torn between her need to know her roots and her love for her foster mother.

Emma’s wish had been that the twins not be told of their adoption, and Murdock had reluctantly agreed. However, according to Julia, malice intervened. “Until I was a child of five years old I was happy,” she wrote to her brother. “It was then I was first told I was not a Smith. . . and [it was] done . . . through spite. . . . From that hour I was changed. I was bitter even as a child. Oh! how it has stung me, when persons have inquired Is that your adopted Daughter? of my foster Mother. John you little know what I suffered in my early life and even since I was grown on this account.”

Julia found her situation hard to accept. “Why was it, I have often said to myself that I could not have been raised with my own blood and kin and not with strangers; and bear a name I had no claim to?” She was bewildered and resentful, knowing that her older brothers, Orrice and John, were reunited with their biological father, while she longed for her father’s affection, yet was bound by ties of love to the Smiths. In her early teens, she apparently showed her insecurity by avoiding, if not actually cutting, her Murdock relations: “I shunned you and my own Father, and why? Because I had a dread of being taken from those I was raised with and loved, with the same love that should have been yours. Many a sleepless night have I spent thinking of this when I was a child: But I was a woman in thought, even then. After seeing some one of you and I have almost cursed the day I was born. I was wicked,” she continued, “But I was unhappy and I could not help it. . . Who was at fault if anyone?”

Perhaps the hardest thing young Julia had to bear was repeated insinuations about her parentage. “John did you have any idea of the opinion of people here, in regard to my birth? if you had not I can tell you, it has been a received opinion that Joseph Smith was my Father

---

38Julia Murdock Smith Dixon Middleton, Letter to John Riggs Murdock, datelined Near Nauvoo, 2 November 1858; copy in Murdock, Abridged Record, 189-91. The following quotations from Julia are from this document.
but that Mother was some unfortunate girl, that was betrayed by him." In the light of the rumours in Nauvoo about Joseph Smith and polygamy, such conjecture can scarcely be wondered at, but must have been no less wounding to the young Julia. "Is not that enough to make me miserable?" she demanded of her brother so many years later. "To have such a stain on my Mother's name as that is."

Julia had received a letter from their mother's relative, Henry C. Moore, in the fall of 1849 or 1850. Moore had visited Nauvoo and enquired for Julia, who was then in St. Louis with Dixon. Unsure of Emma's reaction, he did not call on her. "But he could rest assured of one thing, she would have received him kindly on my account for she has been more than a mother to me and loves me as one of her own and anyone connected to me would always be received by her with kindness," affirmed Julia to John.

Murdock's joy spills over in the reply he wrote to his daughter, only a week later. "I could truly say the dead is alive and the lost is found," he wrote, "for my Dear Julia, you have been a lost child to me all your days. And I feel like Jacob of old when his sons brought him word of Joseph in Egypt; and like him I can say, shall I live to see my Daughter."39

Murdock must have felt great relief in telling Julia the circumstances of her adoption. After recounting the story of his conversion to Mormonism, of the birth of the twins and their mother's death, he continued:

I was now left with five small children; and the question was what shall I do with them? is it duty to place them in the hands of those who oppose light and truth and the authority of God, and the Spirit of God (for this is what your mothers relatives did) or shall I place them where they can be taught in the faith and principals of salvation . . .? . . . This is the reason why you were placed where you were to be raised. Sister Smith your foster Mother had two children born about the same time that you were and they both died, and bro Joseph, hearing of the death of my wife and the two children left, sent word to me that he would take the children and raise them; and also sent a man and woman for them and I sent them to him. . . . And when I after wards went to Kirtland, Sister Smith requested me not to make my self known

39John Murdock, Letter to Mrs. Julia Middleton, datelined Lehi, Utah County, Utah, 28 January 1859; copy in Murdock, Journal, 142-49. The following quotations from John Murdock are from this document.
to the Children as being their Father. It was a hard request and I said
but little on the subject. She wanted to bring the children up as her
own, and never have them know anything to the contrary: that they
might be perfectly happy with her as their mother. This was a good
thought, yet selfish: And I was sensible it could not always remain so.
Bro: Joseph told me it would one day all come to light, which it appears
has taken place without my divulging it: For I have always held my
peace upon the subject knowing there was no freedom of access
between me or my family; and you and Bro. Joseph's family upon the
subject.

Ardently, Murdock pleaded with Julia and her husband to come
to Utah: "I want you to come to me, for I am almost 67 years old and
my nerves so affected I cannot [ride]; consequently it would be hard
for me to travel so far. . . . I want you both to prepare yourselves that
you can stay with us if you please when you get here. I want you both
to come and see us before I lay my body down, that I may talk with
you and bless you, before I die." Julia had expressed what she felt
must be her namesake mother's sorrow at seeing her family scattered.
Murdock acknowledged that this must be so but added, "I will tell
you what would be a greater trial to us all, that is to have us separated
in faith, and in the principals of salvation, and estranged entirely from
each other in the kingdom of God in the world to come and the only
way I know . . . will be for you to come here that we may all be taught
together in the principals of salvation, and attend to the ordinances
of the house of God; that we may be one in very deed."

Sadly, the longed-for visit did not occur. Neither Murdock nor
the Middletons were well off. Murdock's health was failing, and
Julia's husband was also apparently not well. The depth of Julia's
commitment to Roman Catholicism cannot be judged. Her conver-
sion may have been one of expediency to facilitate her marriage to a
Catholic; but conditioned by both her upbringing and her religious
affiliation, she was unlikely to welcome Murdock's proposal of
temple sealings. And finally, although Murdock's letter breathes joy
and concern for his daughter, nowhere did he write actual words of
love that may have turned the scale.

No record of any further correspondence between father and
daughter has been found. John Murdock remained quietly in Lehi
until 1867, when he and Sarah agreed to separate. She remained with
her son George in Lehi, and Murdock, ill and feeble, went to Beaver
where his sons had now settled. Here he remained until his death in
1871. Julia died of cancer nine years later on 12 September 1880, just sixteen months after the death of her beloved foster mother, Emma Hale Smith Bidamon.\textsuperscript{40}

Emma Smith Bidamon may never have known of Murdock's desire to be reunited with his daughter; even if she did, it is hard to imagine that she would have encouraged this daughter in all but blood to leave her. In turn, Julia was bound to Emma by ties of love and filial duty. She was the only daughter Emma had raised, and the only child whose memory would have reached back to the Missouri years; her letter to her brother reveals strong bonds between the two women. In the light of modern studies of identity problems frequently suffered by adoptive children, Julia's pain and bewilderment demand our sympathy, especially when we add to this her adoptive father's notoriety, his enormous importance in Nauvoo during her late childhood and early teens, and the trauma of his assassination.

But John Murdock also deserves a sympathetic appraisal as we ponder his life of sacrifice for the restored gospel. Upright to the point of rigidity, over-sensitive, totally committed to both Joseph Smith and Brigham Young, Murdock found personal relationships difficult when those with whom he came in contact failed to live up to his own high standards; and perhaps those of lesser commitment found him an uncomfortable companion. His best epitaph can be found in his own words, in his testimony and report to the 1853 April general conference when he was newly returned from Australia. Although his actual words referred to the 25,000 miles he travelled by sea and land on this mission, they would equally summarise his attitude to his life's journey. What he had done was, he felt, nothing remarkable: "[I have] done my duty and no more... I went as far as I could, preached all I could, and when I could go no farther, I sent others... I feel my skirts are clear from the blood of this generation."\textsuperscript{41}

\textsuperscript{40} Newell and Avery, \textit{Emma Smith}, 304, 306.

\textsuperscript{41} Murdock, Autobiography, 113.
Reviews


Over the years, readers have come to expect from Thomas Alexander writing that is sound and straightforward. Happily, *Things in Heaven and Earth*, winner of the Mormon History Association’s best book prize for 1991, meets such criteria. Hewing closely to his sources, Alexander avoids the speculative reconstructions and literary embellishments which bedevil many biographies. Informative more than eloquence is his concern. Over eighty years ago and little more than a decade after the death of Wilford Woodruff, Matthias Cowley produced his well-known biography of the man. The book’s chief virtue was that Cowley quoted freely from the Woodruff diaries, treating generations of Latter-day Saints firsthand to the faith of one of Mormonism’s spiritual giants.

Though the Woodruff journals likewise serve as the foundation for *Things in Heaven and Earth*, Alexander enriches his book by consulting extensive family correspondence and the personal papers of other Church leaders with whom Woodruff was closely associated. The end result is the most comprehensive and complete treatment of Wilford Woodruff’s life available.

As the book’s title suggests, *Things in Heaven and Earth* sees Woodruff’s life as a blend of things temporal and spiritual. Woodruff’s spirituality is legendary; and for those who wish to plumb its richness, nothing surpasses the published diaries (*Wilford Woodruff’s Journal, 1833-1898*, typescript, edited by Scott G. Kenney, 9 vols. [Midvale, Utah: Signature Books, 1983-85]). But Alexander also demonstrates that Woodruff had his feet firmly planted on the earth as well. Woodruff was a progressive farmer and gardener who exhibited regularly at the territorial fair, an education activist, rancher, fisher, hunter, and theater enthusiast. One of the best educated Latter-day Saints in the nineteenth century, Woodruff favored applied over theoretical science. He was a staunch supporter of Utah’s Universal Scientific Society, a leader of the Deseret Agricultural and Manufacturing Society, and generally interested in any technology that might help
The desert "blossom as a rose." His diary is dedicated to both the practical and the prophetic.

Things in Heaven and Earth also provides important refinements to the standard accounts of Mormon history. Despite all that has been written about the cessation of plural marriage, Alexander offers the fresh assessment that it was an Official Declaration of the First Presidency and Twelve in December 1889 rather than the Manifesto of September 1890 that was "the basis for the restructuring of Mormonism and its relationship with American society" (p. 259). This document explicitly rejected "blood atonement" as a doctrine of the Church, repudiated the charge that the Church sought to be an imperium in imperio, and loyal affirmed that antagonistic federal officials rather than the federal government itself were the object of Mormon opposition. Like the judicial ruling to which it was crafted as a response, the declaration was "a selective reading of the Mormon past" (p. 258). Nonetheless, by clearly and forcefully articulating its views, the document "laid the groundwork for accommodation with the people of the United States in large part by fashioning a doctrinal basis for the separation of the already divided holistic temporal and spiritual spheres and by constructing a version of the Mormon past that looked forward to future accommodation with American society" (p. 259).

Alexander does not shy away from controversy. Readers are thus provided a view of Woodruff under pressure, another important contribution. What emerges is an inspiring picture of a man who was conciliatory and accommodating rather than confrontative and uncompromising, who seemed to care at least as much about people as he did about principles. During the Mormon Reformation of the 1850s, it was Woodruff who introduced a tempering element. With the untimely death of Jedediah M. Grant, Woodruff "led out in recasting the Reformation in terms of personal improvement, love, and kindness" (p. 185). Following the passing of John Taylor, Woodruff patiently, though, in his own words, painfully, allowed apostles unhappy with his desire to retain George Q. Cannon as counselor to raise objections hour after hour for days on end. When unanimity was not immediately reached, he delayed acting for months until harmony prevailed. In the 1890s, Woodruff labored with apostle Moses Thatcher for years despite his outspoken op-
position to the First Presidency on certain political and economic matters and offered "a blessing for Thatcher's health" as "the first prayer . . . in the newly appointed apostles' room in the [just-dedicated Salt Lake] temple" (p. 295). Some might like to sweep under the carpet tensions in the leading quorums of the Church; but in the case of Wilford Woodruff, Alexander salvages a powerful, flesh-and-blood model for conflict resolution and interpersonal reconciliation.

Nor is Alexander inattentive to the everyday realities of marital and family relationships, though I found myself desiring to know more. Woodruff seems caring and concerned, but not sentimental. Particularly interesting are the glimpses provided of the changing nature over time of his relationships with his wives, children, and grandchildren. Alexander's treatment reminds readers that polygamy was not a static monolith. In terms of evolution, the book also makes clear how Woodruff's service as the first president of the St. George Temple paved the way for developments that have become central to Mormonism in the twentieth century. Chief among these was his emphasis on vicarious work for the dead. His special concern to perform the ordinances for his own ancestral line prepared him for a revelation in the 1890s supplanting the old practice of adoption by lineage. He also expanded the practice of performing the vicarious work for unrelated dead.

Because the published diaries are readily available, readers can easily compare personal interpretations of Woodruff's account with Alexander's. Generally I agreed with Alexander's interpretations, though occasionally his explanation of Woodruff's meaning or motive did not ring true for me. I also missed the passion of the original. For instance, though Alexander says Woodruff "cringed" (p. 53) when he heard former missionary companion Warren Parrish denounce the Prophet Joseph Smith, Woodruff's own description reads: "Alas, one arose, once a friend, (not now) in the blackness of his face & corruption of his heart stretched out his puny arm and proclaimed against Joseph" (28 May 1835). Several years later when Woodruff was to lead the Fox Islands faithful to Far West and receive his ordination as an apostle, Alexander describes him as "especially eager to emigrate" (p. 75). Woodruff himself declared, "I say in the name of Jesus Christ that I will stand in the land where God has com-
manded me to gather unto before another spring rolls over my head if it is on foot & alone & I beg my bread by the way” (25 Sept 1838).

Alexander argues that Woodruff and other early Saints “lived in a psychically undifferentiated temporal and religious world in which no effective separation existed between religious and temporal duties” (p. 51). Choosing le mot juste to describe this mentality is tricky, though I was never entirely satisfied with Alexander’s choice of “holistic.” In any case, while the notion is a commonplace in Mormon studies, what does it really mean? Because “temporal” and “spiritual” were both widely used from the beginning, almost certainly the Saints, including Wilford Woodruff, could distinguish between the two, at least semantically. Perhaps what they intended with their talk of unity was to affirm that the secular could be sacralized, that all temporal activities could be brought within the compass of the kingdom. Perhaps it reflected their commitment to a society in which there would be written even “upon the bells of the horses, HOLINESS UNTO THE LORD” (Zech. 14:20). As the gentile presence in Zion expanded and political pressures from the outside intensified, so the argument goes, “that ideology . . . began to unravel” and the Saints “began increasingly to see [temporal and spiritual affairs] as separate” (p. 200).

If such a profound transformation of consciousness actually occurred in the nineteenth century, however, the process—and especially Woodruff’s role in it—have not been sufficiently documented. It seems that what changed was not so much their conception of the ideal society as their opportunity to implement it. Developments during the final decades of the 1800s might better be interpreted as tactical concessions rather than fundamental changes in worldview. Doctrinally, Mormonism would still prefer a society suffused with the spiritual; but in the United States, it has had to get along in a nation committed to the separation of church and state. With this subtle qualifier in place, I can still agree with Alexander’s overall conclusion that “the church leadership under Woodruff’s direction had begun the long journey of accepting the implications of separating temporal from spiritual and reuniting with traditional American pluralism” (p. 320).

A related interpretation is Alexander’s claim that by 1889, though Woodruff “continued to believe in God’s eventual
judgments, he had come to think that those events lay in the distant future," that he "no longer expected imminent fulfillment of these prophecies" (p. 268). In fact, he was distinguished from previous presidents in part because of his sense of the "temporal distance from the Millennium" (p. 304). No evidence supports these assertions; in fact, the sources seem to suggest otherwise. In November 1889, Woodruff received a revelation in which he was told that "the wicked are fast ripening in iniquity, and they will be cut off by the judgments of God. Great events await you and this generation, and are nigh at your doors" (Journal, 24 Nov. 1889). In 1894, Woodruff referred to a revelation received by Joseph Smith that the angels in heaven were waiting to "Reap down the fields" after "the wheat [was] gathered and the tares bound in Bundles" and declared, "I now bear testimony to this Assembly that that day has Come" (24 June 1894). And just months before his death, Woodruff gathered his family to hear his apocalyptic Wilderness Revelation because "many things in it were now transpiring & coming to pass in our day" and he "requested all to try and remember these things" (7 March 1898). Apocalypticism, or Woodruff's hope of an imminent "great reversal," was something from which he never wavered.

These are interpretive quibbles, however, merely questions of window dressing on an otherwise sound structure, and they do not materially affect the quality of the book. Things in Heaven and Earth is, after all, a straightforward rather than a highly interpretive biography of Wilford Woodruff. The facts of his life are accurately told and the relevant sources thoroughly probed. The picture presented of Woodruff's life is unretouched, and his relatively few blemishes retained. What is more, not only is the "life" of Wilford Woodruff recounted well, but so are the "times." Thus, the book also succeeds as a sure-footed, if selective, history of nineteenth-century Mormonism in general. In short, it is a volume that should stand the test of time. Like Cowley's biography, it will likely be serviceable for the next eighty years. At least.

Grant Underwood


In writing *Our Legacy of Faith,* the first one-volume history of the RLDS Church since Inez Smith Davis's 1934 *The Story of the Church,* Paul Edwards grappled with some enormous challenges. He was required to compress more than 150 years' worth of records and experiences into fewer than 290 pages of text; to tell oft-told stories in an interesting way while at the same time introducing new interpretations to a nonprofessional audience in an unshocking way; to make the book both enlightening for an inside audience and intelligible for an outside audience; and, most important of all, "to meet the questions and issues of the past head on; and to do so with faith, but also with integrity" (p. 8).

These same challenges face all authors who attempt to present short histories of the particular faiths to which they are committed; and in this case, Paul Edwards has done a credible and a creditable job. One may quibble about the organization (which, in places, becomes slightly confusing because the chronological development is not always clarified), or about the numerous familiar incidents left out (the choice of which, of course, only reflects the broader interpretive framework of a particular historian); but in general one must conclude that the book flows well, deals with substantive issues, and is well balanced.

Paul Edwards approached his task with impressive credentials. For over twenty years he was professor of history and philosophy at Graceland College, where he was also dean of faculty and academic vice president. Since 1982 he has been director of the RLDS Temple School Division, which is responsible for the in-service education of the Church's priesthood, and dean of the Park College Graduate School of Religion. He is a past president of the Mormon History Association, and his numerous historical writings include *The Chief: An Administrative Biography of Fred M. Smith* (Independence, Mo.: Herald House, 1988).

RLDS readers have, of course, a proprietary interest in their own history; but speaking from my own LDS tradition, I suggest that it will be rewarding for LDS readers to keep two questions in mind as they pe-
ruse this volume: "How did the RLDS Church become what it is?" and "Why do LDS and RLDS scholars report some aspects of their common heritage so differently?" The last question is related to my own continuing hope that, as we encounter differences in religious and historical perspectives, we may approach them in the spirit of understanding rather than criticism.

Like most LDS histories, Our Legacy of Faith is heavily weighted toward the founding era: 126 of its 287 text pages are devoted to Joseph Smith's lifetime and the first few years after his death. It provides an excellent though brief discussion of the Restoration's historical setting and such founding events as the First Vision, the coming forth of the Book of Mormon, and the organization of the Church. An example of different emphases is seen in the fact that Edwards treats the First Vision much more briefly than any similar "in-house" LDS history would, which suggests nothing more than the fact that the vision itself has played a much more significant role in the development of LDS theology since Joseph Smith's death than it did during the prophet's lifetime or than it has in RLDS theology. Edwards also tells of the restoration of both priesthoods but without, as LDS historians invariably do, mentioning John the Baptist and Peter, James, and John as actors in those events. The section dealing with the Kirtland Temple omits any discussion of appearances by the Savior, Moses, and Elijah. Such differences in approach are obviously accounted for by the different views within the two religious traditions about the necessity of apostolic authority, genealogy, and the role of temples, and demonstrate how even a shared tradition is read differently from divergent perspectives.

Perhaps the most telling example of differences in historical perspective lies in Edwards's treatment of the divisive topic of Nauvoo polygamy. He states, "There can be little doubt that Joseph Smith, Jr., was aware of the existence and practice of polygamy in Nauvoo" (p. 110; italics mine). This neutral statement falls far short of accounting for the overwhelming evidence that Joseph Smith began to teach and practice plural marriage even before Nauvoo and that he actively promoted its practice among other Church authorities. But I suspect that Edwards was rather bold in saying as much as he did, given the unflinching efforts of Joseph Smith III to disassociate the founding prophet from the
practice. Only in the past two decades has that reality been openly, though warily, recognized by RLDS scholars.

Following the seven chapters on the Joseph Smith period come five chapters on Joseph Smith III, a skilled and "moderate" administrator who successfully used nonconfrontational tactics to shape the doctrine and practices of the RLDS Church during his long (1860-1914) administration. An additional five chapters are shared among the next four presidents: the fiery and controversial Frederick M. Smith (1915-46), who assumed "supreme directional control" for the Church against considerable opposition; Israel A. Smith (1946-58), a gentler and more pastoral leader; and W. Wallace Smith (1958-78). Although Edwards summarizes main events during the presidency of the incumbent, Wallace B. Smith (especially the construction of the temple and the ordination of women), he wisely reserves historical analysis of this period for future historians.

Among the significant contributions in these sections is the illuminating discussion of the confusion, discontinuities, and shifting allegiances of numerous members immediately after Joseph Smith's death. It is a helpful corrective to the often-monolithic LDS view that the succession question had, or should have had, an obvious answer and that nearly all of Nauvoo packed up and followed Brigham Young to Utah. As Edwards notes: "The majority of church members, with a long history of following the leadership, chose to accept Brigham Young as their leader and in time moved west with him. But this was not unanimous" (pp. 115-16).

Edwards provides some frank and interesting assessments of the problems Joseph III faced in establishing and propagating the Reorganized Church. The continuing debates over organizational principles, especially the relationship between the First Presidency and the Twelve, are especially candid. While Utah Mormons stressed such distinctive doctrines as the Book of Abraham, the plurality of gods, the view of God as an exalted man, eternal marriage, temple doctrines, and work for the dead, Joseph III gently encouraged their gradual abandonment. As Edwards put it, "The Reorganization accepted the inheritance of 'early' [ca. 1831] Mormonism and thus identified itself with a more orthodox Christian position of God, Christ, and Holy Spirit as an infinite, almighty, and all-powerful Godhead" (p. 144).

I was particularly interested
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in how Edwards explained some RLDS perspectives by comparing them to their LDS counterparts. Chapter 10, for example, is largely a discussion of doctrinal issues that needed to be dealt with as the RLDS Church attempted to find its own identity after its founding, reacting against a practice or teaching that had roots in Nauvoo and was continued by the Utah Mormons. In dealing with the issues historically, Edwards explains something about both churches. As a result, RLDS readers of Edwards's history will be much better informed about the LDS Church than LDS members who read only their own histories will be about the RLDS tradition.

Compelled in its search for identity to emphasize and defend differences between the two groups, the Reorganization, Edwards candidly observes, "often allowed that defense to become a submessage replacing its gospel message" (p. 149). Edwards returns to this point in his conclusion, illustrating in a way that is both graceful and gracious that "the struggles to differentiate between the LDS and the RLDS are to a large extent over" (p. 285).

The history of the Reorganization in the early twentieth century is interesting; and Edwards keeps the narrative moving quickly, even when he pauses to devote a separate chapter to the Church's educational, charitable, and publishing institutions. I was especially interested in the analysis of more contemporary history—history which Edwards has not only lived through but helped to shape. For example, Chapter 16, "The World Church," is a vital and intelligent synthesis that gives an image of how the modern RLDS Church sees itself. "The church [in internationalizing itself] needed to identify its objectives in light of who and what it was, not in reaction to an institutional history," comments Edwards, and he identifies four consequences of this effort: (1) a greater attention to essential Christian beliefs because "the non-Christian community was not interested in how the church was different from other Christians but what the church as Christians believed"; (2) a more ecumenical attitude based on cooperation; (3) the discovery of "the great abilities of the indigenous persons to whom [the Church] witnessed" and helping them "recognize they could do for themselves what never could be done for them. The church also discovered it had a great deal to learn from them"; and (4) the decentralization of "church administration in response to the
legal demands of other countries” and in deemphasizing “its Americanness” (pp. 259-61).

Edwards portrays the spirit of what has been happening in the twentieth century in his discussion of the new religious curriculum developed in the 1960s. Its central theme was “to develop adequacy of expression for the beliefs of the movement designed to put discipleship above belief and to truly subject belief to the service of discipleship” (p. 267). A sign of new perspectives was the 1970 committee report on basic beliefs, Exploring the Faith. The committee “no longer saw the church as a duplicate of the first-century church. Rather, it recognized the primary mission to be a fellowship of those who acknowledged Jesus Christ as their Lord.” It understood “the word of God incarnate in Jesus Christ . . . not so much as a set of propositions but as a call to reflect Jesus Christ in all relations,” and it “reaffirmed [that] the ‘real genius’ of the Restoration lay not so much in recapturing the church of the past but in responding to the vital, contemporary revelation of the divine” (pp. 265-66).

Another development of the 1970s was the Restoration’s encounter with the civil rights movement, which Edwards characterizes as “significant, as all such social questions are, because of the razor-thin edge the church constantly walks between its duty to speak prophetically to its people and the varied beliefs of the people themselves” (p. 261).

The idea of a general conference where revelatory documents are freely debated in open forum should be fascinating to LDS readers, but the history of the Reorganization includes a greater tradition of dissent than members of the Utah-based church are used to. The Reorganization is now dealing with the internal dissent generated by its bold new curriculum, ordination of women (more than 3,000 by early 1991), and construction of a temple “committed to the pursuit of peace at personal, family, congregational, community, national, and international levels” (p. 283). Edwards does not deny that these changes have created some discontinuities: “Dissent is a powerful emotional conviction. The presence of organized disagreement pushes the institution to reaffirm its authority and to stand, sometimes harshly, as a rock against such encroachment. The response is often to close ranks, or to reaffirm basics, and for the sake of positioning to acknowledge views or characteristics only assumed before” (p. 284). As a result, it
is clear that the RLDS story will continue to be a fascinating one.

Despite its strengths, *Our Legacy of Faith* is not problem free. Understandably, Edwards relied heavily on secondary sources, and the list is impressive; but it was odd to find no reference in the discussion of the Council of Fifty in Chapter 6 to Klaus Hansen’s important and pathbreaking book, *Quest for Empire: The Political Kingdom of God and the Council of Fifty in Mormon History* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1967). A few other significant secondary sources were also seemingly overlooked, among them Dallin H. Oaks and Marvin S. Hill’s *Carthage Conspiracy: The Trial of the Accused Assassins of Joseph Smith* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1975), which provides the best treatment to date on the events and context surrounding the martyrdom; any of the leading histories dealing with the origin and practice of polygamy in Nauvoo, such as Richard S. Van Wagoner’s *Mormon Polygamy: A History* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1986) or the chapter on plural marriage in my own *Trials of Discipleship: The Story of William Clayton, a Mormon* (Urbana: University of Illinois, 1986); or any of the works dealing with the cooperative activities of the Mormons in Missouri under the Law of Consecration.

There are also a few minor areas where a factual statement may be open to different interpretations. For example, Edwards attributes the name of the Missouri Danites to the Genesis 49 allusion to the tribe of Dan "as a serpent" (p. 88). Joseph Smith in 1844 said that the name "grew out of an expression I made use of when the brethren were preparing to defend themselves from the Missouri mob, in reference to the stealing of Macaiah’s images (Judges chapter 18)—If the enemy comes, the Danites will be after them, meaning the brethren in self-defense."

Others have said that the term is related to a militant reference to the “Daughters of Zion” in Isaiah 3:16, while Dean Jessee and David Whittaker offer still another interpretation by showing that Albert Perry Rockwood, a Danite, believed the term was derived from Daniel 2:44: “because the Prophet Daniel has Said the Saints Shall take the Kingdom and possess it for ever.”

A number of statements tend to mislead. For example, the comment that Joseph owned and operated a boarding house “attached to his residence, the Mansion House” (p. 99), might make the reader think that
there were two buildings when, in fact, there was only one. Also, it does not clarify that Joseph Smith did not occupy that house for most of the Nauvoo period. He moved in at the end of August, 1843, scarcely ten months before his death.

Such observations are of only minor importance. Most readers will have their own list of favorite items Edwards should not have left out; but in a book so deliberately brief, the dilemma is inescapable. Far more important is the fact that this new history of the Reorganization is worthy reading for members of both the RLDS and LDS churches. Reorganized Latter Day Saints will find in it a faithful and concise summary of their religious heritage. Latter-day Saints will find it informative and insightful about a tradition with which they should probably be more familiar.

James B. Allen

JAMES B. ALLEN, a past president of the Mormon History Association, is Professor of History Emeritus, Brigham Young University. He is co-author, with Glen M. Leonard, of The Story of the Latter-day Saints (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1976; 2d edition, 1992), and author of several additional books, including the recently published Men with a Mission (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1992).


In its substance and in the process of its creation, the handsome multivolume Encyclopedia of Mormonism epitomizes its subject. Responding to an unexpected opportunity, the leaders of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints and Brigham Young University mobilized a small army of Saints and gentiles to produce a million well-organized words, in 1,128 clearly written articles, in a time span so short as to strike the publisher as a small miracle. The two objectives of the pro-
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The subject were to inform without gratuitously offending non-Mormon readers and to expand the understanding without unnecessarily challenging the faith of believers. Despite its flaws, the *Encyclopedia* achieves both.

The first four volumes (pp. 1-1,629) are in conventional alphabetical format, each article credited to one or two of the 738 contributors. "User-friendly" features include introductory paragraphs cross-referencing related articles, suggested readings, and highlighting the titles of related articles when they occur in the text of any subject entry. A helpful "Synoptic Outline" (pp. lxv-lxxxvi) lists every article and Appendix entry at least once under this outline: (1) History of the Church, (2) Scriptures, (3) Doctrines, (4) Organization and government, and (5) "Procedures and practices of the Church and its members as they relate to themselves and to society in general." Thirteen appendices include "A Chronology of Church History" (pp. 1652-58), a useful list of "Church periodicals" (pp. 1659-64), "A Selection of LDS Hymns" (pp. 1686-1708), "Church Membership Figures as of January 1, 1991" (pp. 1756-63), and a number of illustrative documents. Interestingly, the "Glossary" of words frequently encountered in Mormon discourse includes "Iron Rod" but not "Liahona" (pp. 1764-73).

Volume 5 contains the current versions of the Book of Mormon, Doctrine and Covenants, and Pearl of Great Price, with brief introductions but without footnotes or indices. This compilation permits articles in the other volumes to reference these LDS scriptures rather than include lengthy quotations. It also gives the non-Mormon reader access to the sacred books unique to Mormonism.

The "golden question" was never asked in a more unusual context than when Jerry Kaplan, chief executive officer of Macmillan Publishing Company, asked Charles E. Smith, the head of Macmillan’s Reference Division, "What do you know about the Mormons?" It was 1984, and the BYU Jerusalem Center and the Hofmann documents were both receiving media attention. Smith found specialized titles but no basic reference materials in the New York City Public Library. Kaplan then proposed that Macmillan add an encyclopedia about Mormonism to its library-oriented publications and asked Smith if he knew any Mormons. Having met BYU Professor S. Kent Brown at an author/publisher conference on Macmillan’s Coptic encyclo-
pedia, Smith wrote a letter that somehow miscarried, so it was not until Smith and Brown "took a walk in the woods" at another Coptic conference in Switzerland in 1985 that the Mormon project began to move. Brown, a professor of ancient scriptures, and Robert J. Matthews, his dean, took Smith's proposal to BYU's president, Jeffrey R. Holland, who recommended it to the Board of Trustees, which includes the LDS First Presidency and Quorum of the Twelve. After some initial hesitance, the board authorized Holland to go ahead. By the time the contracts were executed and Daniel H. Ludlow, a former BYU Dean of Religious Education who was then executive secretary of the Church's Correlation Committee, was appointed editor-in-chief, it was March 1987.

About two years were consumed in recruiting an editorial board, establishing editorial criteria and procedures, and preparing and revising lists of possible topics and contributors before the first serious text writing began. The initial editorial board, announced in August 1988, included Ludlow, Robert J. Matthews, Charles D. Tate, Jr., Robert K. Thomas, Stan L. Albrecht, S. Kent Brown, Richard L. Bushman, Truman G. Madsen, Noel B. Reynolds, and John W. Welch. Bushman was the only non-BYU person, and the only woman listed was project coordinator (secretary) Doris Bayly Brower. As the magnitude of the task unfolded, Matthews, Tate, and Thomas were designated senior editors, with second-round review functions, while the others, plus Ronald K. Esplin, Terrance D. Olson and Larry C. Porter, became supervising editors, working directly with authors and manuscripts. Macmillan early noted the absence of women and suggested Jan Shipps. Several BYU faculty women who had been helping some of the editors by suggesting topics, recommending female authors, and reviewing early materials for gender bias added their voices; a few of Mormonism's more radical feminists suggested that libraries might be urged to boycott the encyclopedia. University of Utah professor Addie Fuhriman and Provo attorney Jeanne B. Inouye were added to the board in February 1990.

All project negotiations and formal agreements were between BYU and Macmillan, and authors received contracts from the publisher. However, oversight by the Board of Trustees was close and comprehensive. Elders Neal A. Maxwell and Dallin H. Oaks, of the Quorum of the Twelve, met more
than once with the initial board and regularly with Ludlow and the senior editors, approved the choices of topics and authors, and read many of the finished articles. Four members of the Quorum of Seventy had special assignments. A few selections—"Evolution" and "Mountain Meadows Massacre" among them—were read and approved by the First Presidency and Quorum of the Twelve. They deleted only one topic from the proposed list.

The editorial board had to steer a delicate course between Macmillan's requirements (articles with standalone capability, strict length limitations, substantial lead paragraphs, and restrained apologetics) and the criteria of the Brethren (broad participation, no new doctrine, and "when in doubt, leave it out"). Some readers will decide that the board was too cautious, and some will wonder whether all editorial biases were successfully excluded. Many will be pleased by the degree of candor with which topics like Freemasonry, plural marriage, and temples are discussed. All readers should take comfort from the caveat that concludes the preface: "[The] contents do not necessarily represent the official position of The Church. . . . In no sense does the Encyclopedia have the force and authority of scripture" (p. lxii).

Most of the editorial interplay was between the authors and the supervising editors, each of whom was assigned one or more categories of articles. These editors prepared the "scope statement" that Macmillan required be sent to each contributor to minimize overlap and insure subject coverage. Differences unreconciled in author-editor conferences went to the senior editors, and sometimes higher. In a few instances differences were resolved by a test of wills, and higher authority did not always prevail.

The decision to ask no contributor for more than three articles was set aside in only a few instances. The policy, initially seen as not feasible by the publisher, was based on several considerations: It would illustrate the concept that Mormonism is a lay religion, help recruit contributions from ethnic and national minorities in Mormonism and interested "outsiders," speed up the project, and avoid conferring a cachet of "authority" or "expert" upon the small number of people, mostly academicians, who would produce the work if traditional methods of encyclopedia-making were followed. Among the non-LDS contributors are Timothy Smith, James Charles-
worth, Leslie Norris, Krister Stendahl, Huston Smith, Robert Flanders, and, from the RLDS community, Alma Blair and Richard Howard. However, 41 percent of the contributors (49 percent of the articles) came from BYU; identifying departmental affiliations in the “List of Contributors” (pp. xxxv-lix) would have helped users to judge whether authors drew on professional expertise.

There is a lot of history in the Encyclopedia, and it is generally informative and up-to-date. In addition to “History of the Church,” the forty-nine-page synopsis, whose twelve authors include six presidents of the Mormon History Association, at least 150 other historical articles range from “Anthon Transcript” to “Zion’s Camp.” Richard Bushman and Ron Esplin supervised most of the writing on nineteenth- and twentieth-century Church history, with help from Larry Porter and others. Since these authors and editors were generally comfortable with the rubric “faithful history,” the articles generated few serious differences. Both the overview articles (pp. 598-647) and “Plural Marriage” (pp. 1091-95) present this sensitive aspect of the LDS past without the trivializing and apologetic rationalizations that developed early in this century. A passing reference to Fanny Alger, a frank acknowledgement of post-Manifesto polygamy, and a statement that 20 or 25 percent (not 2 or 3 percent) of LDS adults participated in plural marriage will be “news” to some of their descendants. “View of the Hebrews” (pp. 1509-10) and “Blacks” (pp. 125-27) provide information not conveniently available elsewhere; like many other articles they acknowledge past problems and tensions but reach conclusions that reaffirm the basic premises of the Restoration. The outsider who seeks the Mormon past through these reference volumes will be enlightened, impressed, occasionally astonished, but rarely offended. And insiders who open the Encyclopedia with questions or curiosity will not emerge with mind narrowed or faith blinded by the experience.

A problem with the multiple contributors and the expedited timetable is that discrepancies may be found in closely related articles. To illustrate, here are three small errors involving the Utah Expedition, as the Encyclopedia designates the quasi-war over replacing Brigham Young as governor of Utah Territory in 1857-58. In “Thomas L. Kane” the title of colonel is associated with military service (p. 779); in fact it came from a
short stint as aide de camp to a Pennsylvania governor. In “History of the Church,” President Buchanan is said to have “secretly ordered 2,500 federal troops to Utah” (p. 619). The plan was reported in the eastern press even before the official military orders were cut, and some news reached Utah days before the famous 24 July 1857 celebration in Big Cottonwood Canyon. The illustration chosen for my own article on the subject is the puzzling and probably uncirculated 5 August 1857 version of Governor Young’s proclamation of martial law, rather than the slightly modified September 15 version that was “posted . . . throughout Utah Territory” (p. 1501).

More serious than the minor errors that knowledgeable readers may find elsewhere are these shortcomings:

1. There are too few biographical entries. Space limitations required that a long list of potential subjects be pruned, a task that proved politically infeasible. The editorial decision was then made to include the most significant leaders of the founding generation, both male and female, but thereafter only the presidents of the church (male) and a sampling of the presidents of the auxiliary organizations (mostly female). Figures like George Q. Cannon, Ellis R. Shipp, Karl G. Maeser, Brigham H. Roberts, James E. Talmage, John A. Widtsoe, J. Reuben Clark, Jr., Bruce R. McConkie, and Hugh B. Brown can be found only through the index, which shows them to be scattered in bits and pieces through such articles as the fine summary on “Intellectual History” (pp. 685-91). The biographical entries that look beyond institutional service are generally of high quality; both “Emma Hale Smith” (pp. 1321-26) and “Eliza R. Snow” (pp. 1364-67) come to life, with pictures. Appendices include “Biographical Register of General Church Officers” (pp. 1631-51) and “General Church Officers, A Chronology” (pp. 1678-85).

Readers of this review will be pleased to know that Leonard Arrington appears in both as Church Historian (1972-80).

2. The bibliographical suggestions are uneven. Too many articles list outdated, inaccessible, or superficial material while passing over some “state of the art” material. Many citations from Dialogue and Sunstone witness that “alternative voices” were bibliographically acceptable, and many contemporary Mormon-related associations and publications are noted in “Societies and Organizations” (pp. 1387-90).

3. The index is extensive but flawed. Being prepared by a
non-Mormon computer, it omits some of the relevant connections that are not tagged by key words; and at least in the instance of Zane K. Shannon, the page citation is off by one.

Many of the five hundred well-chosen pictures illustrate aspects of Mormon life, and the fifty specially prepared maps and charts add visual strength. The lay-out is clear and the paper, printing, and binding are of high quality. As an artifact, the work represents its subject favorably.

I agree with Eugene England that the Encyclopedia tells more about institutional Mormonism than about the Mormon people. But having seen how teachers and textbooks have wrestled with social and cultural history during almost a half-century in the classroom, I am willing to credit the authors, editors, and sponsors with making a good effort. Many articles, including a large selection of up-to-date “Vital Statistics” (pp. 1518-37), relate to the way(s) the Mormon people live. Their listing takes the last six pages of the Synoptic Outline; and in the aggregate, they tell a lot about the culture(s) of Mormonism. By emphasizing ideals and standards, soft-pedaling controversies, and acknowledging without highlighting failings and failures, the Encyclopedia projects a more homogeneous Mormonism than many members have experienced. Still, the treatments of such subjects as “Birth Control,” “Book of Abraham,” “Origin of Man,” “Mother in Heaven,” “Death and Dying,” and “Plural Marriage” incorporate contemporary scholarship and express understandings significantly different from scriptural fundamentalism and “right to life” absolutism. By demonstrating the range and magnitude of changes that have occurred in both institutional and cultural Mormonism, these volumes inspire confidence that, responding to new circumstances and new petitions, God “will yet reveal many great and important things.”

The Encyclopedia of Mormonism has been well received. Preparations for a second printing are being made at this writing, and a computerized edition and paperbacks bringing together articles on history, doctrine, or culture may occur in the future. At a testimonial dinner celebrating the completion of the project, Philip Friedman, Charles Smith’s successor at Macmillan, read from a very affirmative review written for Library Quarterly. It noted but did not fault the “apologetic” tone of some articles, and it characterized the work as “outstanding in
form and substance” and well organized for reference use. According to the non-Mormon reviewer, it “deserves to be on every library shelf.”

I hope that the *Encyclopedia of Mormonism* finds its way into many ward and stake libraries and the private collections of many men and women who have both a serious interest in Mormonism and the serious money that these volumes cost.

**Richard D. Poll**

RICHARD D. POLL, professor of history emeritus, Western Illinois University, is general editor of *Utah’s History* (Provo: Brigham Young University Press, 1978), author of *History and Faith: Reflections of a Mormon Historian* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1989), and author of a history of the Utah War, in progress.

1. For help in preparing this review, I am indebted to Eugene England, who wrote a fine review in the Holiday [December] 1991 issue of *This People* (pp. 17-22), and to the following people who talked with me between January 21 and 26, 1992: James B. Allen, S. Kent Brown, Ronald K. Esplin, William E. Evenson, Carol Lee Hawkins, Daniel H. Ludlow, Carol Cornwall Madsen, Robert J. Matthews, Morris S. Petersen, Mary Stovall Richards, Robert K. Thomas, John W. Welch, and David J. Whitaker. Welch, Whitaker, Richard L. Jensen, and Carl W. Poll commented on the first draft.

2. For those who already have the equivalent of a Triple Combination, the *Encyclopedia* is available in a four-volume set from BYU Bookstore for $249 and is being offered at reduced prices from other distributors as well.


4. My own invitation to contribute came from Elly Dickason, senior project editor at Macmillan, 15 September 1989, just two years before the printing began. Esplin was my supervising editor.

5. Initially it was decided that LDS General Authorities would not be contributors; but for special reasons Marion D. Hanks, John K. Carmack, and a few other Seventies, both active and emeritus, accepted writing assignments.

6. The entry on “Evolution” began as a thoughtful 1,000-word author’s draft. As it went through the editorial review process, it grew to 4,200 words. Confronted with differences of opinion in their own ranks, the reviewing General Authorities opted for a brief, authority-based article (p. 478), which acknowledges disagreement on “how” questions and asks agreement only on the unconsciously gender-biased proposition, “Adam is the primal parent of our race.” As for the non-judgmental article on “Mountain Meadows Massacre” (pp. 966-68), sensitivity among some of the General Authorities almost led to its elimination, but a strong editorial recommendation finally prevailed. The article credits Juanita Brooks’s research but does not acknowledge her early contribu-
tions to the reconciliation symbolized by the recent erection of a joint LDS-Indian-Fancher Train monument at the site.

7. Macmillan required that each author sign off on the print-ready version of an article. A strong institutional and editorial board desire to keep writers enlisted once contracts had been signed gave authors leverage that some used effectively. Only one contractee was paid off and dropped; but several, with varying degrees of reluctance, signed off on drafts that were largely editorial rewrites of their initial contributions. Shortcomings in scope, organization, writing mechanics, or meeting deadlines were responsible for the editorial creations in most cases.

8. Another positive result is that differing perspectives in closely related articles seems to confirm the Encyclopedia's thesis that Mormonism has neither a narrowly defined creed nor a closed canon. "Preface" (p. lxii); "Creeds" (p. 343).

9. In "Mormonism, An Independent Interpretation," Jan Shipps shares her unique "testimony" (pp. 937-40).

10. Many "lay" contributors sought help from specialists, and some collaborations resulted in co-authorships.

11. The suggested modifications in my "Utah Expedition" article improved clarity and even style; but two or three fellow historians had differences with other editors or senior editors that were not resolved to their full satisfaction.

12. This article encountered almost all the vicissitudes of the multilayered editorial process, being once recommended for deletion by readers less comfortable with LDS "intellectualism" than the reviewers who finally approved its inclusion.

13. Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought is one of fewer than two dozen sources listed in "Key to Abbreviations" (p. lxxxviii).


*Utah Art* is a large, beautifully illustrated, and long awaited addition to the visual literature of Utah. Its precursors are Alice Merrill Horne's *Devotees and Their Shrines: A Hand Book of Utah Art* (Salt Lake City: Deseret News, 1914); James Haseltine's *100 Years of Utah Painting* (Salt Lake City: Salt Lake Tribune, 1965); Robert Olpin's *Dictionary of Utah Art* (Salt Lake City: Salt Lake Art Center, 1980; unillustrated), exhibition catalogues, and books on individual artists.

This landmark publication,
originally titled, *Utah Art Through the Springville Museum of Art*, is, in fact, "a catalogue of the Springville Museum’s collection of Utah art and a comprehensive survey text delineating our art history since 1847" (p. vii). Although the editors broadened the scope of the book from Springville alone, about 80 percent of the artworks, which include 112 luxurious color plates, still come from the museum’s collections. The remaining 20 percent are from the LDS Museum of Church History and Art, Brigham Young University’s Museum of Fine Arts, Utah Historical Society, the Utah State collection, Gibbs Smith, and other private collections.

The book is organized by three sets of color plates, each of which is followed by a historical essay illustrated with black and white portraits of artists and other period paintings. The first set of sixteen plates presents 1847-1900 artists in chronological order: Alfred Lambourne, Danquart A. Weggeland, George M. Ottinger, Edwin Evans, James T. Harwood and Harriet Richards Harwood, C. C. A. Christensen, John Hafen, and Lorus Pratt. Seifrit’s essay, “From Pioneer Painters to Impressionism: 1847-1900,” follows, including a vivid discussion of the experience of several of these artists, called on “missions” by the Mormon Church to study art in Paris so they could ornament the Salt Lake Temple suitably, but then struggling to survive on their earnings.

The second set of color plates groups sculptures by Cyrus Dallin, Gutzon Borglum, and Avard Fairbanks; landscape paintings by Henry Culmer, John B. Fairbanks, Mabel Frazer, Waldo Midgley, A. B. Wright, and Calvin Fletcher; and genre scenes by Mary Teasdel, Florence Ware, John Held, Jr., and Irene Fletcher. This arrangement allows comparisons and reveals contrasts in training and conceptualization. Olpin’s following essay, “Tradition and the Lure of the Modern, 1900-1950,” is illustrated by black and white plates of sculptures by Cyrus Dallin and Mahonri Young and interesting photographs of classes and the artists at work.

The third set of color plates includes genre scenes by Alvin Gittins, Bent F. Larsen, LeConte Stewart, Frank Huff, Jr., and Gary Smith; still lifes from Richard Van Wagoner, Sam Wilson, David Dorman, and Randall Lake; fantasies by James Christensen, Bonnie Sucec, and Maureen O’Hara Ure; portraits by Bruce Smith, Lee Bennion, and Jeanne Lundberg Clark; abstractions by Donald Olsen, H. Lee
Deffebach, Douglas Snow, J. Roman Andrus, Carlos J. Anderson, Neil Hadlock, and Wulf Barsch; and landscapes by Valoy Eaton, Earl Jones, Lynn Fausett, and LeConte Stewart. Swanson’s “The Contemporary Scene: 1950-1991,” again appealingly illustrated with photographs of artists at work, was the most difficult to write since it involved judgment calls on which artists would have staying power.

Extremely helpful for scholars and historians are the supporting sections: a chronology of Utah’s art history in the front matter; “A List of Native, Emigrant, and Itinerant Artists of Utah,” which includes dates, place of work, abbreviated descriptions of style, subject matter, and media, a “History of the Art Movement in Springville, Utah,” the catalogue of the Springville Museum of Art’s “Permanent Utah Collection,” and an index of artists named in the essays or for whom works are reproduced. There is a bibliography, but it is disappointingly incomplete.

All three authors are unquestionably competent. Seifrit, though not a trained art historian, has been involved in historical and cultural organizations; Olpin has taught Utah art history for most of his career at the University of Utah; and Swanson, director of the Springville Museum of Art, is a specialist on the art of Utah. All three thus have a good background in Utah art and make historical sense of the many artists, movements, and styles which have contributed to Utah art history. The essays give interesting heed to personalities and politics. However, minor problems caused by multiple authors include repetition, difficulty in following an individual artist through time, awkward transitions, and substantive differences in writing styles. No general analyses give overviews, establish trends, furnish depth and meaning for the periods, or show how they fit together.

From the book's title, we might assume that there is something called “Utah Art,” even as represented in the Springville collection. In fact, as Gerdts states in his introduction, there is “no clear pattern in United States regional art” (p. viii); and Swanson concedes that even by the 1960s, “no distinctive Utah style had emerged” (pp. 181, 194). The 1950s “Battle of the Styles” (p. 183) between traditionalists and modernists, which agitates the art scene to the present, is one reason. Nevertheless, I feel that the title is apt. The book includes art produced in Utah, Utah subjects, and art produced by artists from Utah.
All three authors decry the conservatism of both Utah patrons and artists, who appear as a traditional and hidebound lot, reluctant to accept innovation. Still, Utah artists gratifyingly acquired proficiency in most major styles and sometimes were on the forefront of such movements. Utah's most renowned artists were sculptors; most sculptures commemorating Utah history have been commissioned from Utah sculptors.

A question not addressed by this book is why there is such a preponderance of landscape painting in Utah. One reason may be that unskilled painters are drawn to landscapes. Country is easy to find and doesn't complain about how the results turn out. Second, Utah lacked wealthy, sophisticated patrons; and landscapes, even modernist ones, are less controversial, making them the most marketable subjects. A related question is the concentration on alpine scenery and the underrepresentation of southern Utah's spectacular scenery.

If landscape is overrepresented, figurative art is underrepresented, except for portraitists and sculptors. This condition is true even in recent times, despite the relatively sizable number of Utah artists who studied figure drawing in New York City, California, and Europe. Conservatism may account for part of this imbalance: figure studies, especially nudes, were often considered controversial, and unclothed models were not allowed until Mabel Frazer introduced them in University of Utah evening art classes. Even now BYU requires draping for models.

The lack of emphasis on figures also reduced genre scenes, which require figures. This lack is important, since they might have enriched and helped define Utah life in art. Gerdts mistakenly asserts that Utah's earliest artists painted contemporary genre scenes (p. ix); they are actually history paintings—works executed years after the events depicted occurred. Mormon history painting has continued (Robert K. Duncan, Frank Huff, and Gary Smith); but as Swanson observes, "Contemporary Utah has perhaps never really understood that artists make better journalists (genre painters) than historians" (p. 181).

Another under-discussed topic is Utah's comparative lack of religious art. Except for Mormon historical scenes, it was not until the 1960s that BYU's "Mormon Art and Belief" movement developed in reaction to the larger culture's "cynicism and turbulence" (p. 194). This movement has continued to be an inspiration for
some Mormon Utah artists, but the results are scantier than might be expected. No book on Utah art can successfully sidestep the question of how much influence the LDS Church had (and has) on art in Utah; and the topic is conspicuous by its omission in *Utah Art*. Brigham Young, George Q. Cannon, and Heber J. Grant all encouraged and supported—to varying degrees—the creation of fine religious art. Mormon temples and ward buildings were routinely adorned with original art until the past few decades; but few works of fine art are now commissioned for places of worship; and non-Mormon artists, especially Harry Anderson, have produced many of the illustrations in visitors' centers. Such works reveal a rather commercial style, rather than individual expressions of spiritual interpretations. I do not know who makes decisions on commissions for works in temples, visitors centers, and official LDS publications or how; certainly no public competitions are announced. These questions should be asked in a book about art produced in Utah.

Another unanswered question is why fewer than 20 percent of the art illustrated in either color or black and white are works by women. Even more perplexing, the selections are often substandard. For example, the only painting from the gifted Utah-born Minerva Kohlhepp Teichert (Plate 60) is not a typical subject and is reproduced too small for any appreciation of her work. Ella Peacock, whom I consider one of the finest artists in Utah, is not even mentioned, nor is Lee Anne Miller who has received numerous awards, and has exhibited and worked at several prestigious institutions. Kathryn Stats was discussed in the text but no work was featured. I understand that difficult decisions have to be made in such a work as this volume, and no doubt others familiar with the art scene have their own lists of omitted favorites (Franz Johansen's work is not pictured); but only two or three women had more than one work illustrated while about fifteen men did. Lee Greene Richards, for example, is represented by six paintings and a portrait photograph. I would have omitted Bierstadt, Fery, and Maynard Dixon, outsiders who painted Utah scenery, in favor of many "real" Utah painters whose works were not reproduced at all.

Interestingly, Olpin claims that, even though "the gents carefully ran the show," women painters "were used and left pretty much alone to experiment more freely than
their male counterparts” (p. 119)—a dubious “advantage” which still exists for women. At the University of Utah, both Florence Ware and Mabel Frazer were overworked and greatly undervalued, a combination that apparently “made [Frazer] angrier and angrier with each passing year” (p. 120).

The decision to omit footnotes for financial reasons seriously dilutes the value of the scholarship. Seifrit’s extensive research in early newspapers is obscured by the lack of references. A glossary of art terms would have clarified various periods and movements, and the excellent black and white photos would have been more effective if they had been numbered and referred to in the text.

Despite these reservations, I wholeheartedly commend Utah Art’s many fine achievements. Its summaries of college and university art departments, art organizations, exhibit halls, museums, and art centers provide an overview not otherwise obtainable. Each collegiate art department is described and its most important teachers named. (I understand that these histories were greatly reduced during editing.)

This work is an excellent starting point which suggests more specialized projects. Swanson is working on two books—a critical study covering from 1945 to contemporary times, and a history of the Art and Belief movement at BYU. Olpin is revising his Dictionary of Utah Art. Forthcoming are Carma de Jong Anderson’s study on nineteenth-century Utah women artists and Jan Brussard’s analysis of Utah sculptors, emphasizing Avard Fairbanks. The authors encouraged continued research and publishing in a panel 12 April 1992 sponsored by the University of Utah “Sunday at the Marriott” Library series.

In short, Utah Art is a pioneering effort which anyone who appreciates art would enjoy. Handsomely designed by J. Scott Knudsen of Park City and at least partially funded by the Eccles Foundation and Geneva Steel, its clear typography and generous white spaces contribute to a luxurious presentation. Its high-quality color separations show that Peregrine Smith Books did not skimp on its most important task—accurately representing the art. It sets a baseline against which future scholars will define and amplify Utah’s contributions to American art.

Marian Ashby Johnson
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In 1958 Harvard University Press published Leonard J. Arrington’s *Great Basin Kingdom: An Economic History of the Latter-day Saints, 1830-1900,* a book which has profoundly influenced the study of Mormon history ever since. In May 1988 Utah State University’s Mountain West Center for Regional Studies along with the Charles Redd Center for Western Studies at Brigham Young University cosponsored a symposium to commemorate the thirtieth anniversary of *Great Basin Kingdom*’s publication. An impressive array of participants, carefully selected on the basis of their ability to critically evaluate the impact of Arrington’s work, contributed insights from their various academic disciplines; and seven of these presentations appear in *Great Basin Kingdom Revisited*.

The contributors represent the perspectives of environmental studies, literature, sociology, anthropology, geography, and history. Editor Thomas G. Alexander provides an introduction which offers background on the symposium, topics discussed, and a brief history of Arrington’s work. As Alexander notes, “Commentators who have assessed Mormon scholarship have seen the book as the beginning of a school of Mormon studies called, aptly, the ‘New Mormon History’” (p. 2), an event some date to the publication of Fawn M. Brodie’s *No Man Knows My History* (1945; 2nd ed. rev., New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1971) or Juanita Brooks’s *The Mountain Meadows Massacre* (1950; new ed., Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1962). It is a question worthy of debate, though probably not susceptible of a satisfactory resolution. In any case, Alexander’s stand is a strong one, and at least one essayist, Richard W. Etulain, concurs.

Etulain, a specialist in western history and literature, appraises “Re-visioning the Mormons: *Great Basin Kingdom* as Historical Literature” com-
menting on Great Basin Kingdom's impact upon not only Mormon but also Western American history. While Etulain agrees with an earlier assessment by Alexander that Great Basin Kingdom was "probably the single most significant bellwether of the New Mormon History" (p. 44), he applauds Great Basin Kingdom's place within American and Western American historiography. "Arrington's story is not so much the Mormons' errand into the wilderness," observes Etulain, "as their errand in the wilderness" (p. 41). In other words, Arrington does not simply recount the story of the Mormon hegira as much as he elucidates Mormon accomplishments once they had reached the Great Basin. As a result, Great Basin Kingdom falls solidly within the parameters of the "New Western History"—a revisionist field seeking to address the development process in the West as a region.¹ This, above all else, is what Great Basin Kingdom did for the Mormon West.

In his essay, "The Kingdom, the Power, and the Water," environmental historian Donald Worster discusses how the "collectivist spirit" of Mormonism was magnified by the Great Basin's arid environment, which forced an unprecedented adoption of agricultural and economic cooperation among even the already highly cooperative Mormons. The Latter-day Saints' nineteenth-century economic success in the Great Basin was derived in large part from their irrigation system. And, as Worster correctly observes, this system worked because of the concentrated power of the Church. For Worster, the irrigation myth dominates the West with its claims that arid land can be lastingly redeemed through irrigation technology. He notes that during the 1950s, when federal reclamation projects proliferated, Great Basin Kingdom offered "a challenging, and I would say radical, analysis of Western history" (p. 38). The Mormon success in the West as portrayed in Great Basin Kingdom strengthened, for better or worse, the "irrigation myth."

While Donald Worster implies a relationship between the historical and literary artifact of Great Basin Kingdom and the Eisenhower administration's active reclamation work, Mark P. Leone questioned, "What has kept anthropology from being influenced by so rich and resourceful a book?" (p. 77). He finds the answer in the structure of Great Basin Kingdom. While anthropologists focus on theories about culture, Arrington offers instead a plethora of facts regard-
ing Mormon life and economic development. "Our questions and the assumption that culture exists are different from Arrington's," writes Leone (p. 78). Finally, using insights one might expect from an anthropologist, Leone finds Great Basin Kingdom to be a "symbolic history" (p. 95)—a rite of passage for Mormon studies.

"Why have historians and geographers alike failed to recognize the considerable amount of scattering that accompanied the gathering of Mormons to their Great Basin Kingdom?" (p. 131), queried geographer Lowell "Ben" Bennion. He argued that more detailed maps in discussions of exploration, migration, settlement, and railroads "might have clarified key patterns and strengthened certain conclusions" (p. 113). Even though Arrington should not be faulted for failing to employ techniques that were not in common use in the late 1950s, the skills of the historical geographer, Bennion believes, might have made it apparent that the Mormon village is as intangible as Worster's irrigation myth.

The concluding essay, by historian Charles S. Peterson, is, perhaps, the more telling assessment of Great Basin Kingdom's enduring legacy. In "Beyond the Problems of Exceptionalist History," Peterson, who openly lauds Arrington's accomplishment, nevertheless sees the book's success as being associated with "serious problems" in current Mormon historiography (p. 133). One of them is its immense influence, which Peterson compares to Frederick Jackson Turner's frontier thesis. It has pulled potential trailblazers into the heroic Arrington path, setting the agenda for two generations of scholars.

Peterson's warning about exceptionalism articulates a concern expressed by others about the growing lack of vitality and energy in Mormon studies, perhaps related to the "graying" of Mormon history or perhaps, as Roger D. Launius put it in a recent conversation with me, the "ghettoization" of Mormon studies—the recurring tendency to always view Mormonism as something apart from the rest of history, a charge which Peterson's essay elaborates upon. Yet, as Peterson observes, "it is as a general regional history that Great Basin Kingdom succeeds best" (p. 138). And, after pondering the essays in Great Basin Kingdom Revisited, it seems that he is right.

Whether seen as the harbinger of the New Mormon History, a Mormon errand in the wilderness, a symbolic rite of passage, or simply excellent re-
Regional history, *Great Basin Kingdom* remains a mighty work. And *Great Basin Kingdom Revisited* offers stimulating thought for scholars and interested lay persons alike. Perhaps the present generation of Mormon scholars will find in the creative interweave of classic history technique and newer critical frameworks the dynamic from which future histories of Mormonism of equal stature.

*M. Guy Bishop*


In editing and publishing the diaries of William Clayton, George D. Smith has produced a work of true significance. Historians of Mormonism can ill afford to ignore this volume. Clayton's diaries contain information about the beginnings of plural marriage, the relationship of Joseph and Emma Smith, the initial meetings of the Council of Fifty, and the historical development of the temple endowment, as well as many entries regarding Latter-day Saint theology. Clayton, a meticulous, accurate record keeper, was often in the right place at the right time. His journals, together with Wilford Woodruff's, the writings of Joseph Smith, and a few others, represent the foundation stones upon which the house of Mormon history rests. This book is required reading for serious students of the restoration.

An introductory essay, a chronology, a listing of William Clayton's families, photographs, and map sections of the book are well done and greatly add to its appeal. They contribute to more fully understanding the man and his journals. Six of Clayton's journals and three appendices either written by or attributed to Clayton comprise the remainder of this almost six-hundred page volume.

*M. GUY BISHOP* is Head of Research Services with the Seaver Center for Western History Research, Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County.

Even though this book represents a major contribution to Mormon history, I would have preferred that Smith handle some things differently. His sixty-page introduction describes the setting, the historical context, and the significance of Clayton's journals. Although it is both well written and well documented, Smith tries to tease the reader with intriguing statements that, regrettably, lead to some distortions.

For example, in the very complex issue of Joseph Smith and plural marriage, careful descriptions, clear explanations, and impeccable documentation should be the rule. The second sentence in the paragraph introducing plural marriage reads baldly: “Although he eventually married more than forty women, Joseph Smith never publicly acknowledged that he had practiced polygamy. . . . Even while the prophet issued denials Clayton recorded his secret marriages” (p. xxv). This tone struck me as deliberately provocative, even sensationalizing. A similar statement was an undiscussed partial quotation from Clayton that Joseph had “warn[ed] Clayton that Emma wanted to ‘lay a snare’ for him and ‘indulge’ herself with him. Clayton worried that he might be cut off from celestial glory if he accepted any advances from Emma” (p. xxvii, 108). Surely these imputations of possible adultery deserve more detailed discussion and a more thorough context? Why was plural marriage secret in Nauvoo? Why did Clayton record this warning against possible advances from Emma? What does the incident reveal about relations between Joseph and Emma? Why would Joseph issue this warning to Clayton? Both flattering and frightening to Clayton, was it an attempt to isolate the beleaguered Emma in her battle against her husband's plural marriages?

As a second example, George Smith, too boldly, too confidently, and too broadly, paints the activities, purposes, and goals of the controversial Council of Fifty. He claims: “A shadow government for the city of Nauvoo, the Council of Fifty planned strategy and finances, provided bodyguards for church leaders, dealt with enemies, secured obedience to church directives, and planned for the growth of the kingdom” (p. xxxiii). Was the Council of Fifty really this powerful? Michael Quinn views the kingdom of God more moderately. Some historians do not believe that the existence of this council was a secret to the Nauvoo Saints, as Smith asserts. There is little evidence that it was a
shadow government in Nauvoo; and although Joseph's ordination as "King in the Kingdom of God" is clearly documented, the ceremony may have been related to the temple but not to the Council of Fifty. Nor is there unanimity that this council took responsibility for the political and economic development of both Nauvoo and Salt Lake City.

Having registered my protest at the introduction's tilt toward the sensational, I acknowledge that it is well crafted and constitutes an appealing introduction to Clayton's diaries.

Clayton's record begins 1 January 1840, when he was twenty-five years old, serving as second counselor in the British Mission presidency. In 1974, historians James B. Allen and Thomas G. Alexander published Clayton's British diaries in *Manchester Mormons: The Journals of William Clayton 1840-1842* (Santa Barbara: Peregrine Smith, Inc., 1974). While Allen and Alexander expanded abbreviations and provided proper names, Smith preserves original abbreviations, uses brackets when providing missing information (such as names or parts of names), and puts his notes at the bottom of the page—a system that is easier for the reader than the Allen/Alexander notes, which follow the daily entry, wherever that happens to fall on the page.

Smith's explanation of nineteenth-century British currency is valuable to readers not familiar with the British monetary system. His geographical footnotes, too, are insightful and clearly explicated. Although adequate, some of Smith's footnotes could have been even more detailed. The standard for Mormon diary editors for me is Juanita Brooks's exhaustive footnoting in the Hosea Stout diaries, which includes background, additional documentation on the diarist's life, and full explanations of associates, activities, mission, geography, and cultural milieu. I must admit, however, that few editors could satisfy me completely.

The Nauvoo diaries of William Clayton, housed in the LDS Historical Department Archives, are not available to scholars. Thus, Smith was forced into the unenviable position of publishing an "Abridgment of the William Clayton Journals" based "upon scrutiny—either my own or that of others [unnamed]—of the holographs of five of the journals. The text of the sixth, the 'Nauvoo, Illinois' journal, has been compiled from published and unpublished transcripts of the holograph, and checked against the *History of the
Church and other contemporary sources for thematic and chronological consistency" (p. lv). Compelled to publish an abridgement and being unable to verify the printed manuscript against all the holographs would cause many, if not most, historians, including me, not to publish this uncheckable text and thus to fault Smith's decision in doing so. Only through close scrutiny of the originals can a documentary editor produce a manuscript with some confidence that it is error free. Dean C. Jessee, an editor of legendary meticulousness, told me that he reads his typescript at least five times against the original manuscript before it is published.

The "Nauvoo Temple Journal" of Clayton presents still another challenge. Just how much of the material in Clayton's handwriting involved Heber C. Kimball in some way? Smith clearly informs us that the change in handwriting from "Kimball to Clayton occurs on 10 December 1845" (p. 199, note 1). He also tells us that "My wife" in the text is Vilate Kimball, not one of Clayton's. Still, one wonders if Clayton also wrote as if he were Kimball at other times. More than a quarter of a century ago, I read two small diaries that Assistant Church Historian A. William Lund informed me were Heber C. Kimball's. Some of my notes, taken while reading these diaries, resembles material in Clayton's handwriting. Smith, to his credit, clearly identifies the mixed roles but still leaves some doubt as to just how much and exactly where in the journal such intermingling occurs.

A far more significant issue involves propriety. In the discussion of the temple endowment, comments George Smith, "Joseph Smith characteristically regarded the most sacred aspects of his new religion as secret" (p. xxxviii). George A. Smith, Joseph's cousin and an apostle, admonished Clayton, "Whatever transpires here ought not to be mentioned anywhere else," and Heber C. Kimball quotes Joseph Smith as saying that "for men and women to hold their tongues was their salvation" (p. xxxviii). Should material that describes and quotes from the endowment ceremony, considered as both sacred and secret by Latter-day Saints from then to now, be published? While I do not believe that Mormons need to be "protected" from materials located in the Church's archives, I do hold the view that documents quoting the temple ceremony are best left there.

I also disagree with Smith's editorial policy of deleting re-
dundant material, “abridging within an entry,” and “silently” removing some entries, relying on the reader to notice “the gaps between the dates” (p. lxi). Such practices run contrary to my historical training. Noted editor Juanita Brooks once described her work of publishing pioneer diaries “jest a copyin’—word fir word.”

This is the policy I subscribe to. While publishing diaries and journals in toto increases their length and risks boring readers, it can be argued that no life is unimportant and that no record left behind is completely devoid of meaning. “Boring” passages are important for establishing context for the “exciting” ones, if nothing else; furthermore, each time the historian removes something from the record as unimportant, he or she has made a subjective judgment which may well deprive future readers of important material. Surely Laurel Thatcher Ulrich’s discussion of earlier editings of Martha Ballard’s diary should be convincing on this point.

Again, my professional opinion also represents my personal preference: I would prefer trying to digest the whole meal, not just the dessert. Smith’s scholarship certainly cannot be faulted in handling such passages; he is consistent in bracketing additions and indicating omitted words with ellipses.

The Clayton journal I found most valuable was the “Polygamy Mission to England.” We learn that while making their way east by wagon, the missionaries presided over by Orson Pratt spent not a few October evenings discussing the resurrection, the “baby resurrection,” how Adam came to be, the creation, progression from degree to degree of glory after death, when God continues to progress in knowledge, and Pratt’s arguments that “the God we worship is the same God that is worshipped by millions of other worlds” (p. 445).

On another night, Pratt contended that it is not the person of God we worship but the attributes or properties, and that a substance called the Holy Spirit fills the immensity of space. In perhaps his most appealing moment, we find the apostle pleading for tolerance and an outpouring of love for those with whom we might have theological disagreements (p. 431). This traveling theological feast seems striking and important, in itself, in my opinion, justifying the existence of this book.

Because of Smith’s editorial hand, this collection of William Clayton’s diaries is easy to read and historically important. In spite of its weaknesses, historians cannot afford to neglect
this volume. Moreover, its historical importance is not likely to wane.

Kenneth W. Godfrey
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For an organization that evolved in a milieu of dissent and defines itself philosophically as an "organization of dissenters," an inquiry into the "dynamics of dissent" seems not only reasonable but imperative. On the other hand, for a church whose theological foundation dictates that truth is revealed from God to prophets with the accompanying condemnation of disobedience and contention, such inquiry is fraught with many perils. Such is the compelling subject matter of this collection of nine essays.

Dissent means that somewhere in the organization an individual (or more likely a subgroup) demands that the organization either increase or decrease the rate of change. The concern over the change may be focused on people, policy, structure, or philosophy. Of course, the issues at stake in these discussions are not just academic. On the individual level, there is a threat to one's membership,


faith, or salvation. On the organizational level, the danger is focused on the strength and viability of the organization, if not its very survival.

The significance and volatility of the topic seem to engage both the intellect and the passion of the authors, each of whom was specifically invited to offer his analysis and opinions regarding historical, theological, and personal perspectives on dissent in the Church. The result is instructive, useful, and sometimes painful, especially for those with a personal interest in the topic. Each author takes an honest, open position in exploring the reality, strengths, and threat of dissent in the Reorganization. Some of the reflections are general or theoretical in nature, applicable to other churches or organizations. Others are specific to the history and future of the Reorganized Church. Paul M. Edwards’s personal essay expresses, with literacy and irony, ambivalence about the ethics of dissent in a religious group.

The essays are loosely structured, in the editors’ words, as “partly chronological, partly topical.” While each includes historical and topical analysis, each author comments individually from his own area of expertise. This is both a strength and weakness of the book—a strength in the range of descriptions and issues, a weakness when the reader, attempting to frame the broad topic, observes substantial redundancy between chapters and some conspicuously missing pieces. For example, the current fundamentalist dissenter is not represented except from the perspective of the progressive observer. For the reader without a good background in RLDS history, the discussions of history as illustrations for a particular argument may be confusing. A concise summary of RLDS history would be helpful.

The fact of this book’s publication is interesting evidence of tolerance for dissonance. The point is emphasized by the fact that it is published as a joint venture of Graceland College and Park College—the Reorganized Church’s two institutions of higher learning. The president of Park College (Donald J. Breckon) is one of the authors. Other contributors are current or past Church officers (Maurice L. Draper, Steven L. Shields, W. B. “Pat” Spillman, and Edwards), or academicians (Launius, William D. Russell, and Kenneth R. Mulliken), and one is a Methodist pastor, formerly an RLDS member (Larry W. Conrad).

The nine essays are Launius’s, “Guarding Prerogatives: Autonomy and Dissent in the Development of the Nine-
One of the book's absorbing and powerful messages is the authors' substantial agreement on a few pivotal points. First is a strong tendency to trace the logic of dissent historically—certainly to the administration of Joseph Smith, Jr. (and in one case even to Martin Luther) (p. 259). The dissent of many members and leaders during 1834, 1837-38, and 1842-44 becomes the prototype of subsequent protest. The dominant issue in each dissenting Reorganization movement is authority: does ultimate power resides in the president or the people? The competing traditions of individual freedom and congregational autonomy surface whenever a central decision moves in either a progressive or a fundamentalist direction. This is what Mulliken calls the "paradoxical doctrine of theocratic democracy" (p. 91).

There is also agreement on the periods and meaning of the major dissenting movements. After the death of Joseph Smith, Jr., as Launius suggests, the "moderate element of Mormonism" brought to the Reorganization "a pluralism more in tune with the world around them and a commitment to mainstream American religious ideals" (p. 26). These individuals coalesced around Jason W. Briggs and Zenos H. Gurley in the 1850s, and the Reorganization was under way. Paradoxically, Briggs and Gurley moved outside the Reorganization in the late 1870s and early 1880s as they rebelled against what they thought was an excessive exercise of power by Joseph Smith III. The next period of major dissent came in 1915-25 during the administration of Frederick M. Smith, whose style of centralized authoritarianism ("Supreme Directional Control") officially carried the day but alienated many members and leaders.

In an intriguing turn of events, the early dissenting movements were all from the left—those who wanted even more decentralized democratic
power in the organization. But the earlier liberal forces who were on the edge of the organization are now in power, and the current dissent (1958-present) is a reaction against liberal forces by the fundamentalist right. Among the policy and doctrinal decisions which they find unacceptable modifications of the "restoration gospel" are questioning the Inspired Version of the Bible and the historicity of the Book of Mormon; asserting that the Reorganized Church is "a" not "the" true church; deemphasizing the gathering to Zion and the second coming of Jesus Christ; instituting educational requirements for priesthood service; building a temple; and ordaining women to the priesthood.

In addition to the authors' general agreement on the philosophical foundation of dissent, the periods of dissent, and the issues of dissent, each seems to believe that dissent is not only to be tolerated, but is essential, and to hope that the current dissent can be contained or managed. A perhaps unconscious message is the implied "wish" that all RLDS members were like the authors. Then dissent could be placed in proper perspective. But that is exactly the problem. The current dissenters are not like any of the authors. Russell states their dilemma: "The more firmly a person believes the traditional message of the church the more likely they [sic] are disturbed by the direction the church has headed, but the more firmly they believe the traditional message of the church the more difficult it is for them to break with the authority of the church because they take that authority so seriously" (p. 139).

While the dilemma may be clear, the resolution is not. Conrad, however, offers some theoretical advice: "To be a Reorganized Church member is to live with the tension, to choose both Mormon origins and Protestant openness" (p. 228). Yet as Edwards points out in a compassionate reflection on the problem for fundamentalists, for "institutional Mormonism, of either the Latter-day or Reorganized Church variation, . . . dissent cannot be ethical" (p. 246)—and says it as someone who considers himself to be a lifelong dissenter. In my view, here is a fundamental dilemma for both LDS and RLDS society: what determines fixed "truths" and leaves others subject to review and member discretion? While I don't expect the authors to provide an easy answer, more discussion would be helpful.

For those interested in organizational power, dissent and
change in general, this book could be a useful case study. For anyone interested in the history and future of the Reorganized Church, this book is a critical contribution. And for those interested in LDS history, theology, and culture, the book provides thoughtful comparisons that highlight differences and similarities between LDS and RLDS organization. It also raises a question which I feel any thoughtful Latter-day Saint ought to explore: what are the topics and limits of dissent that make for a better/worse individual and a better/worse organization?

J. Bonner Ritchie
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Mormon scholars have so refined their skills that they can converse seriously about their own religious tradition in the best academic circles; but unfortunately, they usually prefer to talk among themselves. One felicitous exception is Philip Barlow's Mormons and the Bible, published as part of Oxford University Press's Religion in America Series. It was the sole Mormon entry in a recent issue of the Christian Book Distributors Academic Catalog, a fairly comprehensive collection of significant titles in Christian history and theology, and thus becomes part of a rare dialogue with non-Mormon audiences that will enlighten Latter-day Saints as well. In fact, in May 1992 the Mormon History Association honored it with the Frances M. and Emily S. Chipman Award of Excellence for First Book.

The task Barlow sets himself is "to sketch, through pivotal figures, the main developing lines of LDS biblical usage, and to compare those lines to those of other American religions," acknowledging "the paradoxical tendency of the Saints to employ the Bible sometimes like other Americans and sometimes as outsiders" (pp. 216-17).

In his preface, Barlow en-
gages his non-Mormon readers by quoting Sydney Ahlstrom, an expert in American church history, who maintains that a careful study of Mormonism “yields innumerable clues to the religious and social consciousness of the American people” (p. vii.) Besides, Barlow observes, Mormonism is “inherently fascinating” (p. viii). Barlow’s main contention is that nothing captures the essence of Mormonism better than the Latter-day Saints’ use of the Bible. Exploring the way Mormons relate to the Bible, he feels, is more fundamentally enlightening than analyzing their social, political, or corporate behavior.

Barlow’s introduction describes the “Bible-saturated culture” of antebellum America in which Joseph Smith grew up (Chapter 1), his “boy’s mind steeped in the words and rhythms” of the King James Version (p. 14.) The tendency among Protestant Americans, Barlow notes, was to emphasize the primacy of the Bible as interpreted by individual conscience. By going one step further and entering into the biblical world of visions and miracles, Joseph Smith maintained the primacy of personal religious experience. Joseph revered the Bible as the word of God, but his sense of his personal mission gave him “prophetic license,” an unusual freedom with sacred language (p. 61). For example, he reported that heavenly messengers quoted scriptures but with alterations in the text. Joseph spoke in the name of the Lord, using phrases that echoed the King James version; but he freely amended his own revelations, showing that he did not consider them “verbally bound” (p. 23.) Barlow portrays a prophet confident of his access to divine truth but profoundly aware of the limitations of human language in communicating that truth. In 1832, Joseph Smith wrote: “Oh Lord, deliver us in due time from the little, narrow prison, almost as it were, total darkness of paper, pen and ink;—and a crooked, broken, scattered and imperfect language” (p. 24).

In Chapter 1 Barlow also opens a discussion on the relationship of the Book of Mormon to the King James Version, calling “the new ‘gold bible’” virtually “incomprehensible apart from a biblical context” (p. 26) and acknowledging that “biblical phrases constitute the vocabulary building blocks of much of the Book of Mormon narrative” (p. 28). Unfortunately he sidesteps some of the most difficult and intriguing questions which have captured the interest of both admirers and critics of the Book of Mor-
mon. To what extent can a book so immersed in the idioms of the King James Bible be called a "translation" of an ancient text? Does the Book of Mormon represent Jewish thought patterns and institutions? Does it also reflect the theological questions of the nineteenth century which were foremost in Joseph's mind? How can we understand the Isaiah sections of the Book of Mormon in light of biblical research on the authorship of Isaiah? Did Joseph rely on the King James text while dictating portions of the Book of Mormon such as Alma 13 which draws on Hebrews, as biblical scholar David Wright asks? What are the implications of Stan Larson's observation that 3rd Nephi incorporates the KJV Sermon on the Mount rather than agreeing with the earliest biblical texts? Barlow admits that "despite scholarly progress on several fronts, considerable mystery yet shrouds the Book of Mormon" (p. 32). Nevertheless, by avoiding so many important questions, he fails to communicate the nature of this crucial Mormon mystery to his non-Mormon readers.

In contrast, Barlow's discussion of the word "translation" as it describes Joseph Smith's revision of the Bible is sophisticated and thorough. Chapter 2 discusses both the nature of Joseph's emendations and the importance of biblical review to stimulate new revelations. Again, Barlow emphasizes that Joseph "did not seek to enthrone the Bible, as final authority," but to "restore the authority, truth and prophetic gifts recorded in the Bible" (p. 72).

With this background, Barlow then begins a systematic analysis of biblical use by influential Mormons, beginning with Brigham Young and Orson Pratt, both products of Bible culture and both disciples of Joseph Smith, who nevertheless disagreed about the role the Bible should play in the emerging Latter-day Saint movement (Chapter 3). Young felt that the Bible was only one source of revealed truth and could be contradicted by contemporary revelation, while Pratt sought to "reconcile all Mormon revelation and speculative theology with the Bible" (p. 92). Significantly, both men were still more comfortable quoting from the Bible to defend Mormonism than quoting from new revelations. "The heroes of the first Mormons were Abraham and Joshua rather than Captain Moroni or the sons of Helaman," Barlow comments (p. 225).

In Chapter 4 Barlow describes America's reaction to higher criticism of the Bible at the end of the nineteenth cen-
tury as a context for the Mormon response. As Barlow correctly observes, the Latter-day Saint tradition holds the potential for both positive and negative views of higher criticism. On the cautious side, both Mormon scriptures and Mormon appreciation of miraculous experience reinforce biblical literalism. On the more receptive side, Mormon awareness of the Bible’s limitations suggests a willingness to see the human hand in the creation and transmission of the biblical text.

Barlow presents three early twentieth-century figures—Joseph Fielding Smith, B. H. Roberts, and William H. Chamberlain—as characteristic of the spectrum of Mormon response to higher criticism. Joseph Fielding Smith resisted higher criticism as a potential threat to faith. B. H. Roberts respected the new techniques of Bible study but was concerned about conclusions that might undermine the Bible’s divinity. W. H. Chamberlain embraced the idea that God communicates with humans within the context of their experience, a position that, according to Barlow, was “well within the tradition of Joseph Smith and Brigham Young,” who were both sensitive to the human dimension of revelation.

Barlow demonstrates the impact of the conservative response to higher criticism on the average Mormon most forcefully when he analyzes the factors leading to the adoption of the King James Version as Mormonism’s “official” Bible. He carefully evaluates J. Reuben Clark’s defense of the King James Version (Chapter 5) and then describes the role of Bruce R. McConkie and other conservative scholars in producing the 1979 LDS edition of the scriptures (Chapter 6). Barlow points out the tremendous influence of the new Bible’s chapter headings, topical guide, cross-reference system, and Bible dictionary on how Mormons interpret scripture. A fascinating section is Barlow’s analysis of the conservative adaptations made in the Cambridge Bible Dictionary to produce the LDS Bible Dictionary (pp. 209-12). His discussion of the adoption of seventeenth-century English as Mormonism’s sacred language is also thought-provoking as he asks, “Is Smith’s English, like Mohammed’s Arabic, permanently sacrosanct?” he queries (p. 180).

Balancing McConkie in this chapter is a discussion of Lowell L. Bennion’s approach to the Bible. McConkie was deeply concerned about doctrine: one’s salvation depended significantly on proper theological belief. Bennion emphasized religion as “living, actual wor-
ship of and service to God” (p. 199). While both McConkie and Bennion realized the importance of context in interpreting scripture, McConkie felt the key to interpreting scripture was an understanding of Mormon theology, and Bennion was more concerned with separating human culture from eternal truth.

By focusing on individual Mormon thinkers in chronological order, Barlow has chosen a rather traditional approach to intellectual history. Nevertheless, he supplies an unusually rich context of American thought, and his book sparkles with comparative insights and vivid writing. What Mormons and the Bible lacks is a feel for the Mormon communal use of the scriptures which could be gleaned from Church magazines, lesson manuals, hymn books, personal journals, and popular literature. His summary, “The Ambiguities of a New Religious Tradition,” suggests several avenues for future studies: “popular cultural uses of the holy text”; “the fascinating genre of popular LDS literature about the Bible”; how other leaders, women, and international Saints use the Bible; regional variations in use; comparisons between admonition and practice, and “a detailed comparison between the LDS and RLDS churches” in scriptural use (pp. 215-16).

Even though the book is not as inclusive as its title, Mormons and the Bible gives non-Mormons a scholarly and incisively written look at the tradition Joseph Smith set in motion. Further, it creates for Latter-day Saint readers an opportunity for enlightened and enlightening self-analysis.

KATHRYN H. SHIRTS holds an M.T.S. from Harvard Divinity School with an emphasis in American church history.

The Papers of Joseph Smith, Vol. 2, Journal, 1832–1842. Edited by Dean C. Jessee. The Prophet’s journals in Ohio, Missouri, and Illinois. Presents an accurate and complete text of original writings including study aids. The writings are typeset exactly as they were handwritten. $21.95, 2142270.

Prisoner for Conscience’ Sake: The Life of George Reynolds. By Bruce A. Van Orden. Important facets of LDS Church history are discussed in this biography of George Reynolds, a secretary to the First Presidency for forty-four years, and a test case in the courts on polygamy. $22.00, 2235538.
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Mormon History Book Sale

A great selection of titles (most are now out-of-print) offered at 50%-75% OFF their original prices:

Quantities Limited.

(Juanita Brooks, Ed.)
Was $39.95
NOW $19.99

Joseph Morris
& The Saga of the Morriseites
(Anderson)
paperback
Was $14.95
NOW $4.99

Mormon Enigma: Emma Hale Smith
(Newell & Avery)
Was $19.95
NOW $9.99

History & Faith
(Poll) paperback
Was $9.95
NOW $3.99

A Century of Mormonism in Great Britain (Evans)
Was $8.95
NOW $3.99

Establishing Zion
(Campbell)
Was $20.95
NOW $5.99

Mormons & Gentiles: History of Salt Lake City (Alexander & Allen)
Was $19.95
NOW $5.99

Books may be ordered by phone with Mastercard/VISA or via mail with check or money order. Please add $2.50 for 1st book and $1.00 for each additional book for postage/handling. Utah residents please add 6 1/4% sales tax.

We also have thousands of other LDS books for sale, both in print and out-of-print. We buy and sell used, out-of-print, and rare LDS books. If you have books you'd like to sell or if you're looking for out-of-print titles, please contact us by mail or phone or come see our shop at 331 So. Rio Grande St., 3rd floor, Mon.-Fri. 10 - 6.
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Salt Lake City, Utah 84109-0027
(801) 532-3100
Letters of Catharine Cottam Romney, Plural Wife
Edited by Jennifer Moulton Hansen
A compelling autobiography in more than 170 letters written between 1873 and 1917. Romney wrote from St. George, Utah, and from eastern Arizona and northern Mexico. “Like time-lapse photography, Catharine’s weekly accounts of her life in a polygamous family... make that life accessible to women, and men, universally.” — Maureen Ursenbach Beecher, author of Eliza and Her Sisters. Illus. $29.95

Solemn Covenant
The Mormon Polygamous Passage
B. Carmon Hardy
“An intellectual tour de force—sophisticated and urbane, yet tempered by empathy and understanding.” — Klaus J. Hansen, author of Mormonism and the American Experience. Illus. $34.95

Mormon Odyssey
The Story of Ida Hunt Udall, Plural Wife
Edited by Maria S. Ellsworth
“From frontier Arizona and Utah in the late nineteenth century comes the voice of a remarkable woman. Maria Ellsworth has served us well by preserving and editing her grandmother’s journal and birthday book.” — Davis Bitton, author of Les Mormons. Illus. $29.95

Science, Religion, and Mormon Cosmology
Erich Robert Paul
This first book on the topic explores the relationship between science, religion, and Mormonism, and the cosmological thinking of Joseph Smith, Brigham Young, Orson Pratt, B. H. Roberts, James E. Talmage, John A. Widtsoe, and Joseph Fielding Smith, among others. Illus. $29.95
Victims
The LDS Church and the Mark Hofmann Case
Richard E. Turley, Jr.

Three pipe bombs exploded in Salt Lake County in 1985, killing two people. Behind the murders lay a vast forgery scheme aimed at dozens of other victims, most prominently the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Mark Hofmann, a master forger, went to prison for the murders. He had bilked the church, document dealers, and collectors of hundreds of thousands of dollars over several years while attempting to alter Mormon history.

Turley adds substantially to the record with previously unavailable church documentation and exclusive interviews with church officials, exposing the myths and complexities of this case with skill and objectivity.

"This book adds to and corrects the historical record." — Jan Shipps, author of Mormonism: The Story of a New Religious Tradition. Illus. $27.95

New Paperbacks

Building the City of God
Community and Cooperation among the Mormons
SECOND EDITION
Leonard J. Arrington, Feramorz Y. Fox, and Dean L. May

A new preface explains the history of the first edition and brings the work up to date. "Probably the most important work relating to Mormon economic history since Arrington’s Great Basin Kingdom." — James B. Allen, author of Trials of Discipleship. Illus. Paper, $16.50

The Mormon Experience
A History of the Latter-day Saints
SECOND EDITION
Leonard J. Arrington and Davis Bitton

"This is without a doubt the definitive Mormon history." — Library Journal. Illus. Paper, $14.95

Order toll free 800/545-4703, or FAX 410/516-6969 from University of Illinois Press 54 East Gregory Drive • Champaign, IL 61820
Temple Not Taken for Granite.

Set in Stone, Fixed in Glass
The Great Mormon Temple and Its Photographers
by Nelson Wadsworth

On April 6, 1993, Latter-day Saints will celebrate the centennial of the Salt Lake Temple dedication. In this commemorative coffee-table volume, over 300 photographs document events from temple groundbreaking in 1853 to completion forty years later.

Wadsworth is professor of journalism, Utah State University, and author of The History of the Mormons in Photographs and Text: 1830 to the Present.

225 pages. $39.95.

Woodruff Abridged.

Waiting for World's End
The Diaries of Wilford Woodruff
edited by Susan Staker

To complement the exhaustive (and now largely unobtainable) ten-volume Wilford Woodruff diaries and index, Staker has condensed highlights of Woodruff's revealing diaries into one readable volume with prefatory information, annotation, and appendices.

Staker is a Ph.D. candidate in English Literature, University of Utah. She is co-author of Sisters and Little Saints and compiler of Wilford Woodruff's Journal: An Index.

400 pages. $19.95.
Sacred Land, Sacred View: 
Navajo Perceptions Of The Four 
Corners Region 
Robert S. Macpherson

Dramatic geographical formations within the Four Corners region, familiar landmarks to anglo travelers, orient Navajos both physically and spiritually. MacPherson describes the significance of these landmarks in Navajo religious life.

MacPherson is author of The Northern Navajo Frontier, 1860-1900.
150 pages. $8.95.

Following Where The River Begins: 
A Personal Encounter 
With The Colorado River 
James C. Work

Work eulogizes the Colorado River wilderness in an essay reminiscent of Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance. He shares an intimate travel memoir of self-discovery.

Work is professor of English, Colorado State University.
95 pages. $8.95.
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YOUR HEADQUARTERS FOR LDS BOOKS

New, Used, Rare, Out-of-Print, Hard-to-Find Titles

Mail and phone orders welcome
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WANTED.

Your rare and fine Mormon books are wanted by John Hajicek, the Mormon bookseller from Wisconsin.

Where is Wisconsin? Right in the midst of the early Mormon gathering spots in Ohio, Missouri, and Illinois. In 1836, Joseph Smith, Sr. sent Moses and Aaron Smith to Burlington, in Wisconsin Territory, to begin the first northwestern branch of the Church. Hajicek now buys and sells books from a restored 1840s Mormon house on Burlington’s scenic Mormon Road, just 90 minutes north of Chicago.

Hajicek uses his central location to purchase books (often by telephone and insured mail) throughout the United States, then sells them through his fine book catalogues to sophisticated collectors in the West. Before selling your best Mormon books, call the dealer who mails his catalogues to 2,500 Mormon collectors. He will travel anywhere to offer cash for rare books.

Hajicek specializes in fine and rare scriptures, LDS and RLDS books and pamphlets, divergent movements, and obscure or unusual imprints. He wants the Book of Mormon from Palmyra, Kirtland, or Nauvoo; Emma Smith’s hymn books; the D&C from Kirtland or Nauvoo; and another Book of Commandments.

1-800-862-5667

4325 Mormon Road ◇ Burlington, Wisconsin ◇ 53105