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Corrected Study in Scarlet

Subsequent to completing my review (Fall 1994 issue of the Journal of Mormon History) of Arthur Conan Doyle’s A Study in Scarlet, edited with an introduction by Owen Dudley Edwards (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), the paperback edition was published. I wish to inform readers that many of the minor inaccuracies pointed out in my review of the hardback edition have been corrected, among them:

1. Footnote 30: “presumably Mormons would not be permitted to be Masons: the association is further evidence of Drebber’s apostasy” has been changed to “some Mormons were Masons at this time, Brigham Young being photographed wearing a Masonic device.”

2. Footnote 77: “It was at Manchester, NY, in 1827 that he [Joseph Smith] received the gold-
the Mormons succoured others whom they encountered on their journey (black and white)."

5. Footnote 79: "It was organized as Utah Territory, limited to what is now the states of Utah and Nevada, in 1850 but was not admitted to the Union until 1896" has been changed to "It was organized as Utah Territory, limited roughly to what is now the states of Utah and Nevada, in 1850 but was not admitted to the Union until 1896. Nevada had been admitted in 1864."

6. Footnote 82: "In the strictest sense the Mormons thought of themselves as predestined or Elect, and they were convinced that blacks, as the children of Cain, could not be saved or be admitted into the faith" has been changed to "In the strictest sense the Mormons thought of themselves as predestined or Elect, and they were convinced that the blacks, as the children of Cain, could not be saved or be admitted into the priesthood (they have since 1978)."

7. Footnote 86: "Jedidiah Morgan Grant (1817-56) had announced the doctrine of 'blood atonement' in which sinners could only remit their sins by the shedding of their blood" has been changed to "Jedidiah Morgan Grant (1817-56) revived Smith's doctrine of 'blood atonement' in which sinners could only remit their sins by the shedding of their blood."

8. Footnote 89: "Kemball certainly spoke in this strain, ['his hundred wives'] even though the context has not been found. He had, however, only forty-five wives. The exaggeration is the fruit of rage on ACD's [Arthur Conan Doyle's] part of the degradation. He was thinking of his mother and his sisters; and of his own wife," has been changed to "Heber C. Kimball, the next in office to Brigham, frequently mentions his [45] wives by the endearing appellation of his 'cows'." Edward F. Hingston, Introduction to the Lecture, Artemus Ward Among the Mormons (1865). Ward (Charles Farrar Browne, [1834-67]) performed it in Edinburgh on the British tour ending with his death at Southampton."

These changes fulfill the hope I expressed in my review that future editions would correct the trifling inaccuracies therein noted and more accurately report the teachings of the Mormon Church concerning black Americans.

Michael W. Homer
Salt Lake City
Mormon Memory, Mormon Myth, and Mormon History

Roger D. Launius

President De Pillis, distinguished guests, friends, senior historians, junior scholars, critics, innocent bystanders, fellow travelers near and far, I thank you for the opportunity to speak this evening at the 1994 meeting of the Mormon History Association. My intent in this discussion is to consider, perhaps to reconsider, something about the memory of the past in Mormonism and how it has affected our historical sensibilities. Moreover, I want to examine the differences between memory of the past—what some have called the "digested past"—the unrecoverable past that is never truly knowable at all, and the myth of the past within the context of Mormon history and culture.¹

Something more than a century ago William James wrote in *Principles of Psychology* that "the universal conscious fact is not 'feelings exist' and 'thoughts exist', but 'I think' and 'I feel'."\(^2\) For consciousness to take place, therefore, a linkage must be made between experiences, thoughts, and behavior in humanity. That linkage is accomplished through memory. It provides the context for all thought and action, and without it we are adrift in time and space. To a very real extent, it makes us human, capable of reason and understanding and, most important, identity. A graphic illustration of memorylessness is found in the case of "Clive," a victim of viral encephalitis which attacked both of his temporal lobes and part of his left frontal lobe. While his intellect is virtually intact, and he perceives the world immediately about him, when he looks away it is gone for him. Clive lives in a moment-to-moment consciousness with no past and no future. He always feels as if he has just awakened from a deep sleep. It is the consummate "zen-like" existence. Clive's wife said of him:

You're dealing with a perfectly lucid, highly intelligent man who had been robbed of the knowledge of his own life. And he feels deeply humiliated to be put in that position; very, very frustrated. He can't grasp what's wrong with him because even as you are telling him something, he is forgetting the previous sentence. So he can never take in or understand what is wrong with him.\(^3\)

Fortunately, most people do not suffer from the type of memorylessness of Clive. They have memory, both of themselves and of their lives and of stories of what has gone before. They can, and they do, project themselves back and reexplore that past, and go forward by planning for the future. Such a faculty is enormously important. Memory helps give meaning and direction to life and consciousness and allows for the measure of change over time. Most importantly for our discussion, it helps to forge identity, those that are personal as well as that of groups and cultures. Without that identity we are like Clive.


Shared memory is a powerful force for any person and group. I will give a couple of examples. The Mormon History Association has traditionally enjoyed a strong group identity based on a shared memory. I cannot tell you how many times I have heard various members of this organization talk about early meetings of MHA in the most nostalgic terms. They describe the various small gatherings that took place in hotel rooms late at night, how Leonard Arrington would get historians together and go around the room, asking each to describe for the other members of the group the work they were doing. Not at all unlike a graduate seminar, the discussion revolved around that shared interchange of ideas. Others emphasize Jan Shipps’s legendary “smokers” that she typically holds at every MHA conference. Some remember the tours, both the good and (especially!) the bad moments, that they have been on with the MHA. Maureen Ursenbach Beecher provided us with a wonderful memoir of such MHA activities in her 1985 presidential address. In it she feelingly celebrates an intimate portrait of the relationships that have been developed and nurtured over the years as historians of various backgrounds and perspectives came together to discuss issues of common concern. These experiences have forged a group identity that defines what this organization is and how its members are related one to another. Those who have been a part of the organization from the beginning probably view the present annual meetings with a mixture of joy and sorrow—joy at the size and diversity of the organization, sorrow at the loss of the intimacy that had been so much a part of the MHA’s early existence. Our group memory, I contend, is a critical component of what it means to have identity as a historian of Mormonism at the end of the twentieth century.

Shared memories also allow us to interact with strangers. Typically, we try to find a common experience to help us upon first meeting other people. It might be as simple as having lived in the same state at some time in our lives, or our mutual like or dislike of a sports team, or our grandparents both immigrating to this country at a similar point, or our ethnic or cultural back-
grounds, or any number of literally thousands of commonalities. Through these linkages of memory we interact and identify ourselves to both ourselves and to others.

As members of religious organizations, our group identities are in large part defined by our shared memory. In his book *Rocky Mountain Empire*, Samuel W. Taylor tells a humorous tale of how a Mormon group from Redwood City, in the Bay area of California, chartered a bus and traveled to the then recently completed Los Angeles Temple on one Saturday. This temple excursion, in Taylor's telling, was a comedy of errors from first to last. The trip was back-wrenching and nerve-wracking, the bus broke down, the weather was less than inviting, and on and on. When the group returned from the temple excursion and showed up at the LDS chapel the next Sunday morning, however, almost all commented on what a wonderful experience it had been. Aside from the comedy played out in this story, Taylor makes an important point about the sense of shared Mormon memory. Shared experience and misery has been one of the key elements of the Mormon religion. He concludes: "Sacrifice is part of the religious experience. The greater the suffering, the more glorious the reward. These people loved temple excursions, not despite travail but because of it."5

Shared memory is also not limited to the reflections of individual experiences. Collective memory of the long past is just as real and powerful and all-encompassing as personal experience. Through it we also help to define ourselves and our groups. Understanding and accepting the Mormon past is central to what it means to be a Latter-day Saint. Much the same also used to be true of the Reorganized Latter Day Saints; but in the last quarter century, the Church has shrugged off many of its Mormon roots and, as an institution, is cast adrift without a usable past with which to identify.6

---


6On this issue see Larry W. Conrad, "Dissent Among Dissenters: Theological Dimensions of Dissent in the Reorganization," in *Let Contention Cease: The Dynamics of Dissent in the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day*
The General Authorities of the LDS Church understand this group-identification through memory very well and seek to manage it in an effort to ensure the strongest possible organization.\(^7\) In essence, memory is constructed through both overt and covert acts and reinforcements. The basics of this collective memory for the LDS, although they were never as important for the RLDS identity, are historic episodes of Joseph Smith's first vision, the coming forth of the Book of Mormon, the restoration of the priesthood, and the organization of the Church and its restoration of supposedly ancient doctrine. Over many years the institutional church has defined the way in which these issues and themes are to be recounted and interpreted, and only moderate latitude is tolerated from the agreed-upon story. This official consensus amounts to an official effort to construct memory for the Saints and to create an identity with specific attributes, an identity that has led to the development of a number of \textit{a priori} assumptions about what is good and bad in Mormon history. While there has, of course, been some room for permutations of interpretation, the institutions interested in Mormon identity have closely watched the interpretive frameworks developed by historians, and most of those involved in studying Mormon history have accepted it (or perhaps have never even considered going beyond it because of their religious convictions).

The historian of the Mormon past has an enormous responsibility in dealing with this shared memory of our past, for it has become such a critical component of the Mormon group consciousness. For example, I recently read a poignant essay on one of the Mormon e-mail discussion groups about a visit to the Carthage Jail. The author, a Mormon without special historical training, had been preconditioned to view the experience in a specific way, and it affected him in a deeply religious manner. He wrote about the visit:

\begin{quote}
\end{quote}

\(^7\)This phenomenon has been eloquently described in Davis Bitton, "The Ritualization of Mormon History," \textit{Utah Historical Quarterly} 43 (Spring 1975): 67-85.
I looked at the windows, trying to determine which one was the infamous spot of the actual shooting of the prophet. As I walked around I found the front of the jail. There was already a group in the jail on tour, so I joined them but soon found myself walking around the jail by myself. The older sister missionary soon finished the tour, and then came and gave me an abbreviated version.

The jail was much different from what I expected, both much nicer and yet much darker. On the second floor is the dungeon room, a room with only small slits for windows and a great iron cage. It truly felt like a dungeon. The prophet and his party of 10 only spent a few hours here. The jailer kindly moved them from this cell down to the debtors' cell, a room with large, barred windows and a barred door. It was here that the group spent their first night.

The next day the jailer, again as an act of kindness, moved them from the debtors' cell to the upstairs bedroom. This bedroom, the personal sleeping quarters of the jailer, is on the same floor as the dungeon room. However, this room is quite bright and nice.

Four of the men left the party on the second day, and six of the brethren, including Hyrum, Joseph, Willard Richards and John Taylor spent the night in this room on the second night.

Two more of the party left early the next morning, leaving the four. At a little after five o'clock the next day, the mob burst in. The room appears much as it did on that fateful day. The bullet holes where the mob shot out the lock are there, as well as the dreadful hole where the bullet came through the door to kill Hyrum.

After the tour group left, I had several minutes alone in the room, and the spirit of sadness is almost overwhelming. It seemed to my mind that I was reliving those dreadful moments. I heard the mob rushing in from outside. I watched Joseph move to the door to fire the revolver down the stairs. I saw Hyrum positioning himself to block the door, then fall with a bullet to the face. The walking stick was then raised to thwart the rifles coming through the door. The prophet, seeing his beloved brother lying on the floor, with grief that comes with the understanding that he will not see his family again, rushing to the window in one last vain effort to perhaps escape. The shots ring out, and he falls down through the window and to the ground below.

I could not move for several minutes, and the tears stood at the brink, for the entire building seemed to convey the sorrow of that terrible day so long now passed. Later, as the next group came through, the missionaries played a tape which was a re-creation of the events of that day. I'll never be able to hear "A Poor Wayfaring Man of Grief" again and not think of that room and the events of that day.\(^8\)

\(^8\)Photocopy of printout in my possession.
The power of a dramatic historical episode, in this case the assassinations of Joseph and Hyrum Smith, led directly to a unique religious experience for this pilgrim at a Church historic site. As this “testimony” shows, the LDS institution’s construction of memory has been highly successful.

I would suggest that the author of this account was reacting pretty much as Church leaders would approve to a memory constructed over several years, reinforced repeatedly within the institution, and solidified by a conscious effort to create a specific historic ideal. Thus, the memory is myth, by which I mean, not that it is false but rather a story about our past that points up the highest ideals of the group. As James Oliver Robertson observes in *American Myth, American Reality*, “Myths are the patterns of behavior, or belief, and/or perception—which people have in common. Myths are not deliberately, or necessarily consciously, fictitious.”

Our collective myth is not so much a fable or falsehood, as it is a story, a kind of poetry, about events and situations that have great significance for the people involved. Myths are, in fact, essential truths for the members of a cultural group who hold them, enact them, or perceive them. They are sometimes expressed in diffuse ideologies; but in literate societies like the United States they are also embedded in historical narratives. Robertson’s book is one of many studies that focuses on American myths—such as the myth of the chosen people, the myth of a God-given destiny, and the myth of a New World innocence or inherent virtue. As scholars of Mormon history now recognize,
versions of these myths have also been held by Mormons, who related them to their Church experience.  

Memory, myth, and history are closely akin to each other; essentially they are stories that explain how things got to be the way they are. But common parlance suggests that memory is often faulty, myth is fiction, and only history is, or at least aspires to be, true. History to me, however, is an attempt to recount, model, or reconstruct the memory of the past for the purposes of the present. For a variety of reasons, such attempts are never completely successful. Thus, although few historians overtly do so, it is important to distinguish between history—the recounting of past events—and the past that is truly lost forever. History never fully or completely or accurately describes the past, but attempts to develop approximate mental models or reconstructions of events. Different cultures at different times formulated and presented their reconstructions of the past in strikingly different ways. Thus, it is highly dangerous to attempt to evaluate the relationship between another culture's concept of "history," our own concept of "history," and the lost reality of the past. All themes overlap in some way, but none is a precise mirror image of the other. Many people confuse history with the unrecoverable past and confuse myth and memory with fiction.

More than a century ago, as history developed into a profession, its practitioners thought they had a way out of this morass of philosophical problems with memory, myth, and history. Their solution was to apply scientific principles to the study of history.

Enamored with the rise of the physical and natural sciences in the latter nineteenth century, numerous historians proposed writing "scientific history," free from bias and emotion, full of truth with a capital "T." Lord Acton, Regius Professor of Modern History at Cambridge University until his death in 1902, as editor of the twelve-volume *Cambridge Modern History* (1902-10), told his contributors that with exhaustive research, exhaustive mining of documents collections, and authoritative writing this series would "meet the scientific demand for completeness and certainty." He also noted: "The long conspiracy against the knowledge of truth has been gradually abandoned," and in a relatively short period all Truth will be known about the past. 12 As one might expect from this approach to doing history, Acton’s Cambridge series was legendary for its thoroughness, even-handedness, and depth of understanding. In large measure we have the scientific history tradition either to blame or to honor, depending on one’s viewpoint, for much of our present emphasis on hard facts and reliance on archival sources when writing our present-day discourses.

At the same time, neither Acton nor his colleagues recognized the limitations of scientific history. All the toiling in archives that scientific history demanded, all the heaping of fact on fact, and all the cataloging of information could not approximate the totality of the past. Although they labored valorously to bring to fruition Leopold von Ranke’s dictum—to write history wie es eigentlich gewesen (as it actually happened)—the task was impossible. This was the case in large measure because the past is unrecoverable through the mix of myth and memory that we have digested and must rely on to inform our historical discourse.

Historians of the first part of the twentieth century began to question the scientific mode of writing history. They argued that the endless piling up of details did little to enlighten readers about the unrecoverable past. No less a figure than Carl I. Becker asked the question in the title of one of his seminal essays, "What Are Historical Facts?" He commented:

---

The simple historical fact turns out to be not a hard, cold something with clear outline and measurable pressure, like a brick. It is so far as we can know it, only a symbol, a simple statement which is a generalization of a thousand and one simpler facts which we do not for the moment care to use, and this generalization itself we cannot use apart from the wider facts and generalizations which it symbolizes.

For Becker, historians imbued facts with importance based on the concerns they personally felt and the issues of the age in which they lived. In short, they wrote their discourses within the larger "climate of opinion" that was present in the age.\textsuperscript{13}

In 1912, a contemporary of Becker, Columbia University's James Harvey Robinson, published an important collection of essays called \textit{The New History} that blew to pieces the major elements of the scientific school of historical study. He urged historians not to respond to von Ranke's dictum of \textit{wie es eigentlich gewesen} but to transform it into \textit{wie es eigentlich geworden ist}, history as we interpret it. Robinson asked historians to write about the past in such a way that it would be more usable to the present. He advocated the creation of histories that would set humanity free from ideas and beliefs that no longer held importance for the present. In this regard, the history of the Magna Carta is not the detailed "facts" of the revolt of the nobles and the forcing of the king of England to sign a simple document of modest import at the time, but the overall relevance of the document to the development of liberty and the social contract. \textit{The New History} hoped to serve the progress of civilization by eliminating "anachronisms in conservative economic and legal reasoning" and in other areas of human activity, by exploiting "it in the interests of advance."\textsuperscript{14}


Progressive reform was a persistent aspect of these historians, leading them to a fundamental "presentism" in their work. Frederick Jackson Turner, another of these "new historians," explicitly noted: "The value of our studies is not merely historical. . . . If properly worked up they will be a basis for State legislation—and that is the right kind of historical work."¹⁵ Becker echoed these sentiments by commenting in 1912 that "historical thinking. . . . is a social instrument, helpful in getting the world's work more effectively done."¹⁶

In many respects historians of Mormonism's unrecoverable past still take something of a progressive approach toward their historical explorations. From John Whitmer to the present, most writing on the Mormon past has been oriented toward producing a rather simple, celebratory, nonanalytical narrative that argues in subtle (and sometimes not so subtle) ways that God's word, as defined by the Mormon prophets, is spreading throughout the world in a never-ending advancement of the Church. The result has been a preoccupation with piling up facts along an a priori line of reasoning. Most Mormon historians have accepted this progressive interpretation because, as Klaus J. Hansen has suggested, most Mormon scholars are members of the Latter-day Saint faith community, and they write from a background that includes years of religious training predisposing them to view the Church, its leaders, and its institutions as righteous and just.¹⁷ LDS Apostle Boyd K. Packer has even invoked an espousal of the progress of Mormonism as a religion as the primary purpose of historical investigation, telling Church educators in 1981 that "your objec-


tive should be that they [those who study Mormon history] will see the hand of the Lord in every hour and every moment of the Church from its beginning till now.”18 With such a perspective, Church-mandated progressive interpretations of the Mormon past are not easily altered.

As a consequence, although using the tools of modern secular scholarship, Mormon historians generally view the Restoration as the sacred history of a Church whose mission was, and is, to restore erring humanity’s true relationship to God, hasten the millennium, and bring salvation to the peoples of the earth. But unfortunately, as an explanation for past events, this type of progressive, linear, sacred history has serious limitations. Religious scholar Jan Shipps has explained some of these limitations in a fine short article on Mormon historiography:

In sacred history, the divine is an actor in the drama, a direct participant, not a supernatural presence. Because the divine is a natural part of the process, sacred history inevitably takes on a mythic character, which makes it “truer than true,” if by truth one means that which is established and verified according to the canons of historical scholarship. Sacred history has other characteristics as well. It is stripped down—in artistic terms, stylized—so that the story is told in blacks and whites, with no grays. The persecuted and persecutors, the people of God and the people of Satan, good and evil are locked in mortal combat in which compromise is out of the question. All the ambiguity and complexity of human experience is shorn away. Moreover, the context is left ambiguous enough to keep the narrative from being either time bound or culture bound; it functions as scripture. . . . Mormonism’s sacred history, like all sacred history, is a part of the mythological dimension of this religion. By its very nature it can only be retold and defended; not reinvestigated, researched.19

If not overtly mythic—as Mormon historical writing once was under such scholars as B. H. Roberts—most recent historical explanation too often reduces the complexity of events, avoids matters that challenge or contradict Mormon myth, views the


Mormons as good and their opponents as evil, and ignores the cultural context of the development of the Mormon Church. Hence, Mormon scholars too often write history that, if not blatantly, at least tacitly defends the faith. Their work might be of a scholarly nature, but it strives to reinforce traditional Mormon conceptions about the Church and to delineate the past as a coherent progression into a future that sees Mormonism as "filling" the world.


Mainstream work in U.S. history has moved far beyond these concerns with fostering "progress"—whatever that means; the term is a particularly slippery customer to pin down, for one person's progress is another person's regression. As an example, how would you interpret the virtuoso performance of U.S. technology that placed Americans on the moon twenty-five years ago? Was it "progress" in American technology and society, or the waste of billions of dollars that might have been used to further social justice, or something else altogether? I think we would find several answers to these questions even among the membership of this relatively homogeneous learned society.

The abandonment of "progressive" history, and the attendant philosophical issues that emerged as a result, recast historical inquiry as an intellectual battleground where the casualties were no longer theories about the past that matter mostly to historians but the overall *Weltanschauung* of society in a post-modern, multicultural, anti-hierarchical age. Two major components of this new approach have been the overturning of the shibboleth of "objectivity," called "that noble dream" by Charles Beard and others, and the epistemological questioning of whether or not anything is truly knowable. The fundamental philosophical thrust of recent historical inquiry has been a blurring of the line between fact and fiction, between history and poetry, between the unrecoverable past and our memory of it. 22 According to Robert F. Berkhofer, the philosophy of history presently in vogue essentially denies factuality. He claims that the "transmutation of so much—some would say all—of the referential side of history into the presentational and narrative side destroys the effect of overall factual authority claimed for historical productions." 23

Footnotes:

White, a leader in this field, argues that historical writing is not simply noting "facts" in a chronological sequence and allowing a theme to emerge; rather, it involves consciously fashioning a story, an "emplotment" in White's jargon, that achieves coherence only through the decryptions and glossing of the historian. Hence, White stresses the imaginative and literary aspect of all historical writing, in the process largely rejecting the necessity of maintaining a touchstone to the unrecoverable past through documentary sources.  

All of this activity has raised the specter of the inexact character of historical "truth" and of its relationship to myth and memory and the reality of the dim and unrecoverable past. It has reinforced, however, that what particular groups have understood and acted upon as truth, even if quite absurd to outsiders, has changed throughout time, circumstances, and other mediations in the social fabric. Indeed, these truths have differed from time to time and place to place with reckless abandon and enormous variety. Religious, social, ethnic, national, language, and other types of groups over time have created a remarkably diverse set of truths, all internally consistent and rational, that have ruled their cultures. A forced choice among them is present everywhere both in the past and the present; my truth dissolves into your myth and your truth into my myth almost as soon as it


is articulated. We see this reinforced everywhere about us today, and mostly we shake our heads and misunderstand the versions of truth espoused by various groups about themselves and about those excluded from their fellowship. Perhaps Pontius Pilate framed the dilemma best two millennia ago when he asked Jesus, “What is truth?” (John 18:38) We tend to call those versions of truth that we do not accept folktales, superstitions, opinions, or some other word connoting both untruth and high subjectivity, as Pilate obviously thought about the truth espoused by Jesus. Such truths cement relationships and provide rationale for actions, regardless of their rejection by outsiders. In fact, their rejection by outsiders may be, precisely, what creates the boundary between “us” and “outsiders.” These “tribal” or insider truths have given and continue to give meaning and value to individual human lives and to create a focal point for explaining the sufferings and triumphs of the group.

My own curiosity about this variety of truths was piqued by the insights offered in The Gnostic Gospels by Elaine Pagels. Pagels used the Gnostic documents discovered since World War II to show that an entirely different interpretation of Jesus existed from the received “orthodox” Christian view; she brings to light a conflict in the ancient world over how the mission of Jesus would be understood and taught. Either side could have won, but what was remarkable in this battle was that the Gnostics used the same information as the orthodox to arrive at entirely different perspectives on Christianity. For a time it appears that either the Gnostics or the Pauline Christians might be successful in capturing the institutional Christian church. Over the years, however, the position currently accepted as orthodox Christianity gained credence and the Gnostic approach was gradually eliminated.

In the same way, we have different interpretations of the Mormon past that are all internally consistent and rational in perspective. Brigham Young, for example, interpreted the Nauvoo experience as the best and most advanced manifestation of Mormonism and worked to ensure its preeminence, while Joseph Smith III or any number of other nineteenth-century dissenters.

thought it represented much that was wrong with the Church and strove to assert their own positions.

Where, in such a cacophony of competing ideas and issues, can we hope to locate historical truth—if it exists—particularly historical truth about that group of humans who represent the factions of Mormonism? Where can we begin to understand and explain Mormon memory, myth, and the unrecoverable past of the Saints? Where can we make a positive impact on those who share the legacy of Joseph Smith with our historical enterprise? Many faithful Mormons believe they have the answer to these questions, postulating that truth rests ultimately with the Church and its prophetic leadership; those holding this position argue that historians of the Church must reinforce traditional conceptions of the unrecoverable past. One sophisticated exposition of this position boiled the issue down to the answers that had to be given of two related questions: “Was Joseph Smith a genuine seer and prophet, and is the Book of Mormon true? If either one or the other is true, because both are linked, the truth of the other is thereby warranted.”26 If members do not accept these truths as espoused by the Church’s leadership, advocates of this position argue, Mormonism would and probably should fall of its own weight.

This is a misguided and ultimately a dangerous conclusion that abdicates responsibility for one’s own beliefs. My own idea of truth and where it resides is much more ambiguous, and my concern for either the prophetic role of Joseph Smith or the historicity of the Book of Mormon is largely irrelevant to my search for truth. The ideas of the Enlightenment, which I explicitly invoke as critical to my own quest for truth, holds that in a free marketplace of ideas truth will eventually prevail. Even so, confusion and lack of coherence have been and will continue to be present. I would like to think that the resulting uncertainty would be bearable for the large numbers of groups—religious bands such as Muslims and

Mormons, communists of varied stripes, ethnic groups with hostilities toward other groups going back for centuries, and American crusaders and pragmatists—all who believe they already hold the truth, competing truths though they may be. Acute distress within society is present everywhere, of course, fostering the human need to band together as a tightly knit community that can shut out troublesome dissent on important questions.

Historians play a critical role in this search for truth, and abdication of our responsibility for pursuing the quest by invoking allegiance to some other person or hierarchy is an unacceptable position. As I see it, it is important for historians to mediate the unrecoverable past with myth and memory to assist the broader community that they serve in ascertaining their place among all the other groups with their own truths. Such activity has always been a part of the historical enterprise. In its realm, it is fundamental in defining the identity of the group in ambiguous situations. Consciousness of a common past, as I stated earlier, is a necessary ingredient in defining an "us" and a "them." Without this definition process, the group lacks identity. Historians are uniquely skilled in helping with this process, providing context and coherence that helps the group shape its identity. Historians are also properly trained to rectify memory, myth, and the unrecoverable past into a useful whole. A group without historians would have to invent them.

Trouble develops, however, when there is a significant disconnection between what the group believes about itself through memory and myth about the unrecoverable past and what historians say about it. All human groups, and Mormonism is no exception, like to be flattered; historians generally tend to do so by reconfirming the digested mythic past pretty much as it has been remembered by the group.27 Mormon historians, myself included, tend to write about the Mormon past by speaking the language of the group and recreating the images that the group already holds; we meet the wishes of the group, mingling myth and memory and calling it the truth of history. The result is a

history of the group as the group, which also includes us, pretty much wants it to be. We tend to choose “facts” and to organize them to create a coherent identity of “us” and “them” that is generally flattering to the group. Most Mormon history is in this category, including my own. As such, the group embraces it and uses it in the task of self-definition.

Sometimes a historian sees that how a group wishes to be seen leaves a significant body of data that must be discarded or disregarded. The historian who addresses this data becomes, in the group’s eyes, a “traitor,” who has exposed not only its pretensions and peccadillos to public view but also its sacred objects and cults. That person will be condemned and perhaps exiled from the group.

I would suggest that this has happened to some people within this room in regards to Mormon history. Certainly D. Michael Quinn, as skillful and innovative a historian as the Mormon historical community possesses, is one of the most recent historians to fall into this category, although I do not want to suggest that he is the only one receiving various types of censure. In my opinion, Quinn’s work is genuinely brilliant, but he has the propensity to gravitate toward exceedingly complex and controversial topics where his hard work and interpretive skills are not appreciated by the LDS faith community. It is not simply a question of telling the truth and being condemned for it, or lying and being condemned for that; rather, his situation illustrates the much more complex process of negotiation between the historian and the community served with investigation of the past. The most critical component of this issue, it seems to me, is that ideas matter greatly. Individuals can and do cross swords over them, contrary to the musing of economic and other types of determinists, and historical interpretations have value to the community they identify that lie beyond price. There are consequences in flesh and blood and lives that result from the cold words we place on a page or that we speak from a lectern or pulpit. Every historian must weigh these consequences against the message he or she chooses to expound. Like John the Baptist, we might be wrongly condemned for our beliefs or like John Tlinket, wrongly venerated for them. It also could work the other way. It seems to me, however, that we decide what is appropriate and stand up for it
regardless of the cost. If we do not, we may or may not regret it. If we do, we may or may not regret that as well. Ultimately, I believe, the more voices of divergent positions that are heard the greater the possibility of justice and the arrival at an approximation of truth.

In some instances the traitorous historian is deserving of censure, as for instance when he or she violates in a serious way, to quote John H. Zammito, the "rules and codes to which members can and must be held rationally accountable." This censure comes through reviews and in other forums within the historical community. These processes are representative of the working of the marketplace of ideas. In other instances, censure comes from the group that the historian serves and may be neither rational nor justified, but simply expedient. William H. McNeill has concluded: "Groups struggling toward self-consciousness and groups whose accustomed status seems threatened are likely to demand (and get) vivid, simplified portraits of their admirable virtues and undeserved sufferings." I would suggest that Mormondom fits into this category.

How, then, do Mormon historians respond to this situation? I think we all exhibit varying degrees of commitment to, as well as detachment from, the digested past of myth and memory and its centrality to the group's identity. Moving between these two poles, we construct our historical narratives so that they will be of value to the group. We wrestle with the complex weavings of myth and memory as they relate to the unrecoverable past of the religious group. Our constructions are different, in part because we are each different individuals with unique experiences and perceptions, but our allegiances are also different. As an RLDS I am free to criticize the LDS construction of the past and be cheered, or at least agreed with, by the group that I serve. I do

---


not have the same luxury when I criticize certain segments of my RLDS religious tradition and identity. The same holds true for the LDS community and its view of the RLDS, but not of its own.\(^{30}\) I would argue that differing visions of the past are healthy and important attributes of the marketplace of ideas; the varieties of expression they offer leave the Mormon identity richer and more clearly defined. I have been endlessly struck by what can be learned and how the Mormon community can be enriched by looking at the same issue in the Mormon past from a variety of perspectives.\(^{31}\)

As a final major point, I believe that one person’s truth is often another person’s myth. The fact that one faction of Mormonism accepts a given version of the past does not make that version any truer or falser than any other. The LDS and the RLDS have held different positions on all manner of issues for the past 130+ years. I do not believe that either has a monopoly on truth; rather, both have a lot to learn still from each other and the wider religious community of faiths present in the world. At the same time as historians we play to the sense of self-image of Mormondom constantly in our research and teaching. Almost always we reinforce the dominant perception of the group we serve—the heroism of the Prophet at Carthage, the perseverance of the faithful in visiting the temple, and the rigors of the group’s digested past. Before we reject this idea, we should understand that our response to Mormondom’s digested past allows us to offer valuable


\(^{31}\)There are several other instances when we have done this, but a good example is the LDS and RLDS perspectives on baptism for the dead, discussed in a session at the 1989 Mormon History Association annual meeting and published in *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 23 (Summer 1990), as M. Guy Bishop, “What Has Become of Our Fathers? Baptism for the Dead at Nauvoo,” 85-98; Roger D. Launius, “An Ambivalent Rejection: Baptism for the Dead and the Reorganized Church Experience,” 61-84; and an insightful comment by Grant Underwood, “Baptism for the Dead: RLDS and LDS Perspectives,” 99-108.
course corrections that may actually be heeded. That is a critical task and no one can perform it as well or as usefully as those applying the tools of historical scholarship.

But if we become traitors to the tradition, our ability to offer those desperately needed course corrections will be either greatly minimized or nullified altogether. A caustic, volatile version of history that constantly calls up the delta between the ideal of the digested past and the reality of the unrecoverable past can destroy a group's cohesiveness and reason for being. The real tragedy and perhaps the irony of the case of Michael Quinn, and I could use other examples as well, is not that he was excommunicated from the LDS Church, but that he no longer has the ability to influence the group in any serious manner. The institution and its members sorely need the thoughtful reflectiveness and the interpretive virtuosity and, yes, even the iconoclasm and stridency, of D. Michael Quinn and others who have been censured. A voluntary institution, especially a religious organization which claims to hold all critical truth, yet is too small to allow the expression of the diversity of explanations offered in larger society, is simply too small, both figuratively and literally.

At the same time, there are many memories and myths incorporated into the digested past of the both Latter-day Saints and the Latter Day Saints that are exceptionally dangerous and require debunking by historians. A portrait of Mormonism that praises the organization as always virtuous and the Saints as blameless targets of bigotry, and one that condemns or denigrates others, unacceptably distorts the people's image of non-Mormons and can lead to dangerous consequences. For example, dissent in the Mormon tradition has developed overwhelmingly negative connotations in our digested past. Always dissenters have been characterized in our history as misbegotten, woeful malcontents whose arguments were without foundation. Dissenters, because of flaws in their characters, were threats to the integrity of the gospel and deserving of expulsion. The institution was always judged to be sound, the dissenters themselves were defective.32

32Gordon D. Pollock, "In Search for Security: The Mormons and the Kingdom of God on Earth, 1830-1844" (Ph.D. diss., Queen's University, 1977), 292-93;
While this perspective has served as a defense mechanism for the various institutions of Mormondom from the beginning to the present, it is a deeply dangerous group attitude and must be altered in the institution's perception of its past.

I would suggest that as historians one of our goals is to mediate the differences between those of the various Mormon groups and those who are outside those groups. We can help in more ways than we can ever know to define "us" and "them" and in the process make a part of the digested past of the group more deeply ecumenical. With the fracturing of society at every level into smaller and smaller, tightly knit groups, there is probably no greater task for the historian at present. The breaking down of boundaries and the understanding of the "other" must be a critical component of our discourse. To quote William McNeill, "What we need to do as historians and as human beings is to recognize this complexity [of life on planet Earth] and balance our loyalties so that no one group will be able to command total commitment."\(^{33}\)

I would hope that we can alter the course of historical understanding within Mormonism, so that its truths—however those might be defined by different people and religious leaders at different times—might be discerned at different levels of generality with equal precision and appreciation. At a fundamental level, the objective of the historian must be to serve the present. We have a sacred task—that of seeking to expand the perceptions of a group beyond its digested, constructed memory of the past. That truth is not an iron rod, but a liahona. It is not a road well-trodden but a rocky and treacherous path. It might lead either to censure or celebration by the group for the illumination our inquiries offer. We must not shrink from challenges of interpreting the past because of fear, yet we must always be mindful that our negotiations with Mormon history have consequences. We must recognize those consequences for what they are and proceed with integrity toward the pursuit of understanding about the unrecoverable past and the service it will provide toward the

---


groups we serve. My sense is that most historians of Mormonism have been unwilling to stand up for what they believe in the same way that those censured—whether right or wrong matters not in the least—have done. Each one of us must decide for ourselves what boundaries to our studies we wish to recognize. For myself, I will proceed as freely as my limited ability allows. In the process, I pray that a wider perspective will emerge than has been the case in the recent past.
Conflict in the Camps of Israel: The 1853 Cutlerite Schism

Danny L. Jorgensen

INTRODUCTION

On 19 September 1853, Alpheus Cutler, a Mormon high priest, and about a hundred Latter-day Saint followers founded the Church of Jesus Christ (Cutlerite) in southwestern Iowa. Boldly...

DANNY L. JORGENSEN is professor of religious studies at the University of South Florida. He presented an earlier version of this paper, "Antecedents of the Cutlerite Schism," at the Mormon History Association annual meeting, May 1990, in Laie, Hawaii. Research was supported by grants from the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, University of South Florida, and the Southeastern Regional Education Board. The author gratefully acknowledges assistance from the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints' Historical Department Archives (hereafter LDS Church Archives), the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints' Library and Archives (hereafter RLDS Library-Archives), the Harold B. Lee Library at Brigham Young University, the Frederick Madison Smith Library at Graceland College, and the Nelson Poynter Memorial Library at the University of South Florida.

Cutler's first name sometimes is given as "John." On Cutler and his schism, see Rupert J. Fletcher and Daisy Whiting Fletcher, *Alpheus Cutler and the Church of Jesus Christ* (Independence: Church of Jesus Christ, 1974); Emma L. Anderson, "History of the Cutlerite Faction of the Latter Day Saints," *Journal of History* (1895): 454-57; Hallie Gould, ed., *Old Clitherall’s Story Book* (Fergus Falls, Minn.:...
claiming to be the exclusive successor to Joseph Smith's new American religion organized in 1830, the Cutlerite schism attracted Latter-day Saints scattered across Iowa until, by 1859, it had about five hundred participants. After Cutler's death in 1864, the church fragmented and its membership gradually declined. Today, three Cutlerites constitute a branch at Clitherall, Minnesota, while another branch at Independence, Missouri, claims about thirty members.

What provoked this schism? The Cutlerites' separation from Brigham Young's organization, like most religious schisms, involved differences over goals, beliefs, and practices. Although Latter-day Saint authorities charged them with heresy and apostasy, the Cutlerites subscribed to a mostly conventional Nauvoo Mormonism, selectively stressing certain themes, plans, and activities. Critical disagreements between the Cutlerites and some Mormon leaders over authority and power compounded the ideological conflict. Richard E. Bennett astutely pointed out that Cutler's seemingly peculiar teachings and claims to leadership emerged gradually, largely to distinguish themselves from the "Brighamites." Bennett therefore concluded that Cutler opposed


3Richard E. Bennett, "Lamanism, Lymanism, and Cornfields," *Journal of*
Brigham Young's doctrines and policies. D. Michael Quinn, in a singularly important examination of the 1844 succession crisis, briefly examined Cutler's claims. Identifying them with the Council of Fifty, he concluded that "Cutler's was an aberrant of the political Kingdom of God." These conclusions, I will argue, confuse causes of the schism with justifications for it.

The Cutlerite schism presents other perplexing anomalies. Many of the Cutlerites, unlike other dissenters, were fully integrated into Nauvoo Mormonism and played consequential roles in it. Following Joseph Smith's 1844 martyrdom, they accepted the apostles' leadership and Brigham Young's 1847 reorganization of the Church presidency. Alpheus Cutler's prominence in early Mormonism has been neglected and depreciated; but he belonged to Smith's elite inner circle, like the apostles who secured control of the largest fragment from the Nauvoo church. Cutler, unlike other faction leaders, never claimed to be Smith's prophetic successor nor did he intend to create a separate organization. Cutler and his followers were bound by kinship and other powerful social ties with the Utah Mormons, including some of the most important leaders.

In this paper, I describe, analyze, and interpret the 1853 emergence of the Cutlerite schism as a product of conflict in the Camps of Israel, as the migrating Mormons defined themselves, between 1846 and 1851. No single cause explains it adequately. The schism gradually emerged through a complex process in which the Cutlerites and the Brighamites symbolically constructed meanings for their situation based on different perspectives. Although these meanings and related actions produced the

---


5On the sociological theory of "symbolic interactionism," see Herbert Blumer, Symbolic Interactionism (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1969);
schism, in an important sense it was accidental—the unintended result of a complex historical and organizational situation. It reveals the doctrinal and organizational precariousness of a new religion following the murder of its charismatic founder. The Cutlerite schism suggests the need for studying the "routinization of charisma": the social processes whereby the sometimes ambiguous teachings and organization Joseph Smith created by prophetic revelation were rationalized and transformed into the dogma, institutions, and formal organization that became the most successful new religion in the United States and one of the fastest growing religions in the world today.

**FATHER CUTLER AND HIS FOLLOWERS**

Alpheus Cutler was born in Plainfield, Sullivan County, New Hampshire on 29 February 1784. He was baptized a Lat-
ter-day Saint on 20 January 1833 by David Patten and ordained an elder. A short while later the Cutlers moved from New York to the vicinity of Kirtland, Ohio, where Alpheus worked as a stone mason on the temple, helped compile the Doctrine and Covenants while attending the School of the Prophets, and was ordained a high priest in 1835. About 1836 the Cutlers moved to Ray County, Missouri, where Joseph Smith called Alpheus to work on a temple and where, in Far West in 1839, as a stone mason, he laid the temple corner stone with the assistance of Joseph Smith and some of the Twelve.

“Father Cutler,” as he was known respectfully, also served on various committees and was active in church and civic affairs at Nauvoo, Illinois. As a high councilman, Alpheus was present in July 1843 for the reading of the revelation on celestial marriage, which he apparently accepted without demur. As one of the three-person temple building committee, he supervised the construction and became the seventh member of Joseph Smith’s

---


---

Cutler was selected as the architect for a stone schoolhouse in 1839; in 1843 he chaired a committee seeking resolutions about the Missouri persecutions. See Cook, *The Revelations of the Prophet Joseph Smith*, 255; Journal History, 7 December 1843. He was an associate of the Nauvoo Agricultural and Mechanical Association and, with Peter Haws, headed a lumber expedition to Wisconsin. See Robert B. Flanders, *Nauvoo: Kingdom on the Mississippi* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1965), 149, 183.
secret Quorum of the Anointed. Alpheus and Lois Cutler received endowments from the Mormon prophet on 12 October 1843 and the second ordinance, "the fulness of the priesthood," on 14 November 1843. The Cutlers, like all members of this elite inner circle, participated in plural marriage. Alpheus joined the parapolitical Council of Fifty on 11 March 1844 as its fourth ranking member and was appointed by Joseph Smith to a special committee in charge of Lamanite ministries, captained Smith's bodyguards, and in 1844 helped bury the martyred Smith brothers in their unmarked graves. While awaiting the return of the Twelve to Nauvoo, Cutler unofficially served as an apostle and thereafter acted as a liaison between Emma Smith and the apostles.

After discrediting the claims of Sidney Rigdon and other would-be leaders, the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles (though only nine remained unified) was the most visible and highest ranking remnant of the Nauvoo Mormon theocracy. The Anointed Quorum was almost entirely unknown, and not many Nauvoo

10 Two Cutler daughters, Clarissa and Emily, married Heber C. Kimball in 1845. Launa Hart Beebe Rockwell married Alpheus on 9 August 1845. Five additional wives, Margaret Carr and her sister Abigail Carr, Sally Cox, Daisey Caroline McCall, and Henrietta Clarinda Miller, were sealed to Alpheus Cutler on 3 February 1846. See Kimball, On the Potter's Wheel, 133, 163-64; Danel W. Bachman, "A Study of the Mormon Practice of Plural Marriage Before the Death of Joseph Smith" (M.A. thesis, Purdue University, 1975); Hosea Stout, Diary, 1:178; Stanley B. Kimball, "Finding a Great-Great Grandmother: Clarissa Cutler Kimball," 1979, unpublished paper, LDS Church Archives; Kimball, Heber C. Kimball: Mormon Patriarch and Pioneer (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1981); Harold Schindler, Orrin Porter Rockwell: Man of God, Son of Thunder (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1966); Clare B. Christensen, Before and After Mt. Pisgah (Salt Lake City: privately published, 1979), 176; Cook, The Revelations of the Prophet Joseph Smith, 255. Contemporary Cutlerites deny that Alpheus Cutler practiced plural marriage.

Saints were familiar with the Council of Fifty. Father Cutler, however, was a conspicuous ecclesiastical and civic leader, a close friend of the martyred prophet, a member of the Nauvoo High Council, and daily supervisor of temple construction. When Cutler acknowledged the apostles' leadership, he was endorsing the theocracy to which he was intimately connected in significant ways.

Cutler, with other Council of Fifty members, helped organize the Mormon exodus from Nauvoo, starting in February 1846, and took his own departure on 14 March. On 12 June he arrived at the Missouri River, crossed into Nebraska, and founded one of the first Mormon encampments, which Young designated "Cutler's Park" in his honor. That summer, Cutler served on a committee to select the site of Winter Quarters and was sustained president of its Municipal High Council. It is no exaggeration to say that Cutler, next to the apostles, was one of Mormonism's most important leaders during this period. As the fall of 1847 began, no one would have predicted that Cutler would never make the trek west but instead would end up alienated from the Quorum of the Twelve, surrounded by a small group of other believers in Iowa.

The other people who would eventually follow Cutler were scattered across Iowa and along the Missouri that summer and fall. Some remained for an extended period at Mt. Pisgah, others created what they thought would be a temporary encampment at Silver Creek, while others gathered at Farm Creek. Despite the
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12He presumably had Brigham Young's permission to do so but only the letter requesting permission seems to have survived. Stella Cahoon Shurleff and Brent Farrington Cahoon, eds., Reynolds Cahoon and His Stalwart Sons: Utah Pioneers (Salt Lake City: Paragon Press, 1960), 47-49; Alpheus Cutler and Reynolds Cahoon, Letter to Brigham Young and the Council of the Twelve from Upper Camp of Israel, 12 June 1846, LDS Church Archives; Watson, Manuscript History of Brigham Young, 297-98. A small memorial marks this site about two and a half miles northwest of Winter Quarters.

13Hosea Stout, Diary, 194; Journal History, 6 November 1846; Watson, Manuscript History of Brigham Young, 297-98.

14Silver Creek is about three miles northwest of Malvern, Iowa. See Allen Wortman, Ghost Towns of Mills County, Iowa (Malvern, la.: privately published, 1975). Here the Mormons constructed a grist mill, built cabins, farmed, and
severe hardships of the Iowa trek, they fully expected to continue west. Most were early converts from Protestantism, New Englanders, and ardent believers in the republican form of government. Sometimes before and certainly after joining the Latter-day Saints, they were geographically mobile. A majority had “common school” educations but infrequently some college; some were tradesmen or merchants but most were farmers, either full-time or part-time. As a group, they were much like other Mormons, including other followers of Brigham Young. There is no evidence that underlying political, economic, social, or cultural differences between the founding Cutlerites and other Brighamites contributed to the formation of their splinter movement.

The Cutlerite founders, like other early Mormons, commonly converted in nuclear and even extended family groups, then created a cemetery. See Christensen, Before and After Mt. Pisgah, 175-86. Farm Creek is about two miles east of Henderson, Iowa, at the crossroads of Highways 59 and H-112. It was bounded by the creek to the north and east, and roads to the west and south. A cemetery is about a mile and a half southwest of the crossroads.


gathered with the Saints—but not always in the designated center place. For example, in 1839, such future Cutlerite families as the Andersons, Murdocks, and Shermans settled, like the Cutlers, in Nauvoo; but the Whitings, Coxes, and Hulets lived about twenty-five miles south of Nauvoo near present-day Lima in the Morley Settlement, while other future Cutlerite families were dispersed among other settlements near Nauvoo.18 The Morley community, unlike most outlying settlements, was connected with Nauvoo Mormonism at the highest levels. Its leaders received instruction in temple theology and plural marriage from Joseph and Hyrum Smith, Brigham Young, and other apostles. Many of these future Cutlerites were related to each other or knew one another; sometimes they worked and worshipped together; yet they did not compose an ideological faction.

Through intermarriage, the eventual Cutlerites became integrated into elaborate kinship networks which included eminent Mormon leaders.19 Apostle Heber C. Kimball married two Cutler daughters; two of his sons, Abraham and Isaac, lived among the schismatic Cutlerites until they came to Utah as teenagers. The ex-wife and children of Porter Rockwell, Joseph Smith’s second cousin and bodyguard, were sealed to Alpheus and lived among his followers even after his death. The families of a brother and sister of Lyman Royal Sherman, a member of Zion’s Camp who was called to be an apostle but died before ordination, were among the Cutlerite founders. The Cox, Whiting, and Morley families, closely related by kinship, included such prominent early Saints as Titus Billings and Isaac Morley. Founding Cutlerite families probably were linked by marriage to prominent Latter-day Saint families like the Pratts, Pattens, Murdocks, Partridges, 

---

18"Journal of Levi Ward Hancock," n.d., LDS Church Archives; Emer Harris, "The Church Record of the Lima Branch Who Belong to the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1840, LDS Church Archives; Christensen, Before and After Mt. Pisgah, 97-116.

Richards, and Snows, but sorting out relationships based on secret marriages during the Nauvoo period is difficult.

Father Cutler was the best known but not the only distinguished Latter-day Saint member of the group. Buckley Anderson, Wheeler Baldwin, Calvin Beebe, Luman Calkins, Thaddeus Cutler, Lewis Denna, Pliny and Edmund Fisher, Isaac Perry, William Redfield, Augustus Richards, and Almon Sherman, among others, held important positions and performed leadership roles. Future Cutlerites Calvin Beebe, Isaac Perry, and Almon Sherman were members of Zion's Camp. Like Father Cutler, Lewis Denna (or Dana, an Oneida Indian) was a Council of Fifty member with responsibility for Lamanite ministries. A high proportion of eventual Cutlerites, in comparison with the general Mormon population, received temple endowments before leaving Nauvoo. Cutlerites Samuel and J. R. Badham, Amos Cox, Dexter and Clark Stillman, Almon and Edmund Whiting served in the Mormon Battalion. These findings do not support the hypothesis that the Cutlerite schism resulted from its members' lack of integration, influence, power, or participation in early Mormonism.

CUTLER'S LAMANITE MISSION IN KANSAS

Mormon-Indian relations was one of Father Cutler's many


21William Clayton reported that Denna was "the first Lamanite who has been admitted a member of any Quorum of the Church." Quoted from Ehat, "It Seems Like Heaven Began on Earth," 269. "Dana," rather than "Denna," is a spelling commonly used in LDS writings. Denna, however, is the preferred Cutlerite spelling, and it is how the name is spelled on his tombstone in Mount Pleasant cemetery, Clitherall, Minnesota.

responsibilities as high council president at Winter Quarters. In the fall of 1847, several encounters with Oneidas seeking Mormon assistance stimulated Cutler to pursue the Council of Fifty assignment to Lamanite ministries. After considering the Indians' request, Brigham Young remarked: "That pleases me—let Father Cutler be the man to preside there." 

From 2 December until Christmas night 1847, Cutler and James Willard Cummings explored the Indian Territory southwest of Fort Leavenworth and north of the Kaw (Kansas) River. Here they met Elder Lewis Denna and formulated plans for establishing a mission for the New York Indians on Delaware lands. Cutler's plan to secure government contracts for constructing a mill and school, developing farms, and seeking converts, Hosea Stout noted, "was as good or better than we could expect. A great prospect of much good resulting from the works there." In a council meeting of the elite inner circle, Cutler and Young also deliberated about forming an Indian alliance for protection and perhaps avenging previous Mormon grievances against Missouri. Government contracts would supply money needed for the westward migration. Brigham Young was in favor of the alliance as a means of "redeeming" the Indians but was not in favor of pitting them against the United States in an armed confrontation except as a last resort. This meeting was a crucial one in the Cutlerites' ...
later feeling that Cutler had been confirmed in his special mission by Young; but documentation for this meeting exists only in the later references to it by both Brigham Young and Alpheus Cutler. Apparently no minutes were made, and neither Hyde nor any of Cutler’s followers were present. Thus, the divergence in the two men’s memories about what was decided and the subsequent interpretations of their followers contributed significantly to the schism that followed.

During the spring, summer, and early fall of 1847 while Brigham Young went to Salt Lake Valley and returned to Winter Quarters, Alpheus Cutler resided in Winter Quarters where he presided over the high council and supervised the activities of the camp, even when apostles were present, another indication that he was viewed as a respected and trusted general ecclesiastical officer. Young’s leadership base was strong but far from secure. The Saints were still scattered. Disaffection was common: a variety of dissidents, including Joseph Smith’s immediate family, remained at Nauvoo; James J. Strang was attracting several thousand followers to a rival organization; and the Iowa trek continued to take its toll in disease and death. Young was especially worried about challenges from Apostle Lyman Wight, Bishop George Miller, James Emmett, and other Council of Fifty members. There is no indication, however, that Young questioned Cutler’s loyalty. When Young reorganized the First Presidency

27See Bennett, “Lamanism, Lymanism, and Cornfields,” 47-49, for an excellent description of this situation.

28Bennett, “Lamanism, Lymanism, and Cornfields,” 49-50, mistakenly argued that Cutler’s Park was “rejected” by the Twelve because Winter Quarters became the main camp. Bryson, Winter Quarters, 54-55, discusses a variety of reasons for relocating the camp, none of which pertained to Cutler. Cutler did not leave with the 1847 vanguard company as originally planned, which some have mistakenly interpreted as the dissatisfaction of Young or of other apostles with him. See Watson, Manuscript History of Brigham Young, 414, 438; Journal History, 26 January 1847. There were sound reasons for this change in plans, including Cutler’s leadership, needed at the Missouri, and his preparations for the Lamanite mission. Because Cutler’s daughters, Clarissa and Emily, did not go west with their husband, Heber C. Kimball, some have hypothesized a rift between the two men. Bennett, “Lamanism, Lymanism, and Cornfields,” 50; Kimball, “Finding a Great-Great-Grandmother,” 5-6; Kimball, Heber C. Kimball, 146; and Cecil E.
in December 1847, Cutler sustained the reconstituted presidency of Brigham Young, Heber C. Kimball, and Willard Richards.

When Winter Quarters was abandoned in early 1848, the remaining Mormons moved back across the river to Iowa. Orson Hyde, the new president of the apostles, assumed leadership of the high council at Kanesville and responsibility for the Saints. Formally sustained as counselors were E. T. Benson and George A. Smith, with Evan M. Greene as clerk, but Charles Bird, Luis Harvey, William Snow, Elder (also Father) Stoddard, Cyrus H. Wheelock, and Joseph Young are also recorded as assisting them. Their exact authority and responsibilities are not clear; at this fluid period, availability to serve, personal relationships and loyalties, and kinship were as significant as explicit formal authority.

Between December 1847 and March 1848, Father Cutler presumably remained at Winter Quarters where he presided over the high council and directed many of the camp's daily affairs. In March, he joined family and friends at Silver Creek, where he took the leadership of the local branch. Mormons in the area included the immediate and extended future Cutlerite families of Luman Calkins, F. Walter Cox, Lewis Denna, William P. McIntire, David P. Rainey, William Redfield, Almon Sherman, and others.29 Cutler McGavin, "Apostate Factions Following the Martyrdom of Joseph Smith. VII: Alpheus Cutler," *Improvement Era*, November 1944, 660. There is no evidence of a rift; in fact, in 1848 Cutler remarked: "Bro. Kimball told me that if I did not come and see him in three years, he would come and see me, so I hope to see him again." In Orson Hyde, George A. Smith, and Ezra T. Benson, "Report to Brigham Young and Council of Twelve," 14 March-5 April 1849, 21, LDS Church Archives. All other evidence suggests that Cutler was in good standing and planned to continue west at this time.

29Because of the extent and, in some cases, tenuousness of kinship networks at this period, particularly those based on plural marriages that were later denied, it is difficult to identify the future schismatics with precision. For example, F. Walter Cox resided at Silver Creek, many of his relatives became Cutlerites, and he played a role as part of the Silver Creek branch but ultimately continued west. David P. Rainey, identified by contemporaries as one of Cutler's strongest supporters, did not join Cutler's group after the formal break, but it is not possible to ascertain from existing records what happened to him. Other Cutler associates eventually went to Utah, others stayed in Iowa and participated with the Cutlerite Church but did not formally join it (some later joined the RLDS Church), and, of
anticipated preaching the gospel among the Indians. When Brigham Young left Winter Quarters in April 1848, he encouraged Cutler to continue west. Cutler replied that he would start as soon as “circumstance will permit,” offered his best wishes and blessings, and signed the letter “your brother in the new and everlasting covenant.” Over the next three years, Cutler and a few Mormon missionaries traveled back and forth between their main settlement on Silver Creek and Indian Territory where Lewis Denna had established an encampment. There they eventually built or rebuilt and operated a mill, erected three or four log cabins, and farmed fifteen or twenty acres.

CONFLICT AND DISSENT IN THE CAMPS OF ISRAEL

Orson Hyde warned Brigham Young in early 1848 that a Brother Stoddard, a traveling missionary, encountered “a good deal of disaffection” among the branches in Iowa. The Saints, according to Hyde, complained that Hyde was too “strenuous,” especially on those who favored stealing; they were “tithed to much”; teams were being redistributed to people no worse off than those from whom they were taken; and men were being asked to support other men’s wives. Hyde did not mention names course, some formally joined the Cutlerite Church in 1853. This fluidity accurately represents the situation with the Camps of Israel at the Missouri and constitutes a warning against trying to pigeonhole participants by reading their later decisions back into this turbulent period.

30 Brigham Young, Letter to Alpheus Cutler, 21 April 1848; Alpheus Cutler, Letter to Brigham Young, 23 April 1848, both in LDS Church Archives.


32 Orson Hyde, Letter to Brigham Young, 22 April 1848, LDS Church Archives.
or branches, but his letter described the situation generally among the Mormons along the Missouri.

Persistent questions about Father Cutler's mission to the Lamanites disturbed the Kanesville High Council during the fall of 1848. At this point, the best record is a lengthy letter written by Orson Hyde, E. T. Benson, and George A. Smith the following March and April, summarizing six months' worth of events:

The air has been darkened almost, with clouds of rumors and statements in relations to this wonderful mission. Reports said, "a union has been formed with thirty-seven nations," and "like the states of Greece by Alexander the Great, they have elected Father Cutler Generalissimo of the Confederacy." Some reports say, "it is not worth while to go to the Mountains, it is so far." And, "Father Cutler's Trowel is going to ring on the Temple walls of Jackson County in a few days." "There is great things and there is them that knows." "The remnants of Jacob [Indians] are going to slay, go through, tear down, break to pieces, and none can deliver." "I tell you, it is a great deal closer than anybody thinks, for Father Cutler has done a greater work than any man since the days of Jesus Christ." We paid no attention to any of these matters, considering Report as a common liar, expecting every day that he [Cutler] would come up, as he said he would, and let us know how he got along.33

When the expected meeting did not materialize, E. T. Benson, George A. Smith, Joseph Young, William Snow, and Charles Bird visited the Silver Creek settlement in September where they consulted with Father Cutler and Bishop Luman H. Calkins. They agreed that Charles Bird would accompany Cutler and Calkins to the Indians in the South, show them a "new road," and attend to mission business (11). Bird also carried a message for "Pousheik, Chief of the Sak Nation." Benson and Smith wrote an ambiguous report to Brigham Young:

We considered your pledge [Young's confirmation of Cutler's Indian Mission] to the Old Fox [Alpheus Cutler] a sacred one. . . . Our spirit seemed a little troubled, but we could see nothing wrong that we could get hold of, and thought it was quite probable that our feelings might

33Orson Hyde, George A. Smith, and Ezra T. Benson, "Report to Brigham Young and Council of Twelve," 14 March-5 April 1849, 14, Brigham Young Correspondence, LDS Church Archives; cited parenthetically in the text for the rest of this section.
be effected by the old gentleman's natural parabolical, allegorical, symbolical, mysterious, secretative way of telling things. We had an excellent visit with them; found their Branch in good order; and hoped, believed all that we could that everything was right. (12)

Obviously, people were uneasy with Cutler's mission, provoking the investigation. Yet as Hyde's report makes clear, no one was sure that anything was actually wrong although the investigation did not, obviously, provide total reassurance. Cutler did not share Hyde's singleminded determination to move the Mormon population west because of the priority he gave to his Indian mission. Furthermore, two legitimate forms of authority were at issue. Hyde was an apostle, Cutler a member of the more secret Council of Fifty. Who was authorized to resolve differences? If Cutler could be perceived to be "out of harmony," then the issue of authority would become moot—and this is, in fact, what happened. Furthermore, as Hyde described, Cutler steeped himself in the secretive, mystical aspects of Nauvoo Mormonism and fully embodied the "magic world view" pervading American culture of the period—a worldview he shared with Joseph Smith. Cutler would continue to speak in riddles, creating further dissonance with Hyde's more rationalistic approach.


35Cutler can be said to embody the nineteenth-century magic worldview with its elements of biblical Christianity, occultism, and hermetic-kabalastic aspects shared by many Americans and Mormons. An example of Cutler's "parabolical, allegorical, symbolical" style occurs in this 1856 letter, although it is from a different time period and different circumstances: "Can a stream rise above it's fountain, or can a stream raise without a fountain above it to supply it. . . . There is a principal of greater and lesser, in all things revealed that none can deny. Now if the Church is the greater or greatest, what is the lesser? If the Church is the lesser, what is the greater? Herein is the stream and the fountain illustrated. I boldly answer this short question, and say the Kingdom of God on the Earth is the Greater, and by this authority was all the revelations given in 1828 and 1829 as well as since, and by this authority was the Church organized the 6th of April 1830, and by the authority of the Kingdom, did Joshua lead the children of Israel,
Even this visit, however, triggered an open conflict. Bird set out separately on his missionary assignment while Calkins rather elaborately conveyed Cutler by covered wagon from Silver Creek to conceal him from the "jealousy of the Missourians" (12-14). All three reached Stephen Markham's home south of Winter Quarters where they spent the night; but that evening Calkins accused Bird of "betraying" Cutler's mission to other Mormons along the trail, thus risking interference from Missourians who would naturally be alarmed at an effort to organize the Indians. Bird denied the accusation but apologized if he had done anything wrong. In reporting the incident to Smith and Benson, he said that Calkins forgave him but also told him he had come on a "fool's errant," then continued heatedly:

You know, and I know, and Br. G. A. [Smith] knows, and I think Br. Benson knows that all the business pertaining to the Indian Affairs in the South, Brother Brigham Young gave to Father Cutler, the whole control of them. And if Br. G. A. Smith had any business that he wanted done with any of the tribes, he should have said, Father Cutler, I want this done, or that done, with this tribe, or that tribe, and then Father Cutler would have known all about it, and that would have been in order. Br. Bird, I know there is order in the Kingdom of God and order must be obeyed, and if I was in your place, I think I should go back. (14-15)

In the morning Bird gave Cutler the information for the Sak Chief, they shook hands, and Bird returned home, "not filling my Mission according to the commandment."

The high council, the report continued, "heard several statements, from responsible men, that astonished us" (15-16). For example, William P. McIntire, a Mormon living near Silver Creek,36 reported that Calkins spent a night at his home and said he was going to visit Lyman Wight—the wayward apostle who led after the old stock had forfeited their right to inherit Canaan, and by this same authority will that Prophet lead up to Zion in this generation." Alpheus Cutler, Letter to Zenos H. Gurley, 29 January 1856; typescript copy in RLDS Library-Archives.

36Statement by William Patterson McIntire, 21 March 1849, in his Notebook 1840-45, LDS Church Archives. The statement is also quoted in the high council report. Some of the McIntire family became Cutlerites and later RLDS.
a colony to Texas. McIntire asked Calkins if he had been appointed
to labor with Wight. Calkins said, "no," it was on different busi-
ness, but "Zion will be redeemed . . . speedily [and] to the
astonishment of this whole Church." "I enquired," McIntire con-
tinued, "how this was to be brought about." Calkins, according
to McIntire, responded:

Father Cutler had been ordained to lead this people and bring about
the redemption of Zion, and that in the life-time of Joseph Smith. . . .
Brigham knows that it is Father Cutler's right, for Brigham last winter
in the presence of about 30 persons (mostly policemen) laid his hands
on Father Cutler's head, telling him, you know your duty, for I do not
do this only to stir up your mind by way of remembrance of the thing
that was conferred on you by Joseph Smith. As you have the power to
choose and refuse, let nothing stop you, and if anything crosses your
path, go ahead. And if I should come in your way, or cross your path,
all you have to say is, get out of the way. (16)

Furthermore, McIntire reported, Calkins called himself Cutler's
right-hand man and said Brigham had told him to "stick to Father
Cutler till death." Thus, Calkins concluded, he did not know
when he would go west (16).

Smith and Benson planned another visit to Silver Creek. In
the meantime, Hyde warned that "Father Cutler and Bishop
Calkins were taking to themselves strength, and laying a plan that
was calculated to destroy the life blood and best interest of the
Church. The Brethren were counseled not to follow them any
farther until the Books were balanced before the High Council, as
the Big Head is a dreadful and contaminating disease" (16-17). The
high council sent Stoddard to Silver Creek with instructions to
read Hyde's November 1848 letter to the Cutler camp, "and in
case the infection was likely to be spreading, to read it to the other
Branches" (17).

Stoddard's reading understandably "stirred up a Hornet's
nest" (17). "After a number of severe speeches against him; many
declarations that he had no business with them; that the High
Council had none; a resolution was passed to reject the advice
contained in the letter, and to sustain Father Cutler any how." The
report continued:

Father Stoddard told them that he had not encountered such a spirit
since he had to deal with the Niggerites. This irritated Father Cutler,
who had hitherto seemed quite calm. [Cutler] gave him a severe lecture, and the old women and girls, men and boys all irritated and insulted, poured upon the head of the lean, lame Doctor, such a flood of anathemas that we have no doubt that every reflection he has cast upon that scene from that day to this has been attended with a shudder if not a groan or a sigh. (17)

Shortly thereafter the high council received a letter from David P. Rainey, F. Walter Cox, and William Redfield of the Silver Creek branch, sanctioned by the branch, justifying their actions, disapproving of the actions of the council, and charging them with interfering with Cutler's mission. This letter has not survived, nor has the high council's reply; but in the high council's report to Brigham Young, the writers commented: "If our first letter was rather high seasoned, and was calculated to produce excitement, our second one was decidedly of a mild and pacific character." The letter also "advised" the branch leader to come see them (17).

Getting no response, they sent George A. Smith and Cyrus H. Wheelock to Silver Creek. Father Cutler, according to Smith, explained that he had been unable to visit Hyde because he had "stuck a broad axe in his shinbone" (18). According to their report:

He wished to do right, and it was ticklish times. He had ten sons born this season. Do you understand that? We suppose he meant, ten nations. He said, he did not want to be killed. Was afraid of his life. Meant to do right, but could not believe a man who would try to get his children to rob and murder? He was afraid to tell names. Did not want to be killed because he was opposed to stealing, robbing, etc. He believed that men were telling lies between him and us. Would come to the Council as soon as his leg got well. (18)

Despite these somewhat obscure references, "the old gentleman, seemed quite pliable. The weather was cold, and fearing a head wind from the north, Elders Smith and Wheelock returned to Kanesville" (18).

On 15 December 1848, Father Cutler, Luman Calkins, F. Walter Cox, David P. Rainey, William Redfield, Almon Sherman, and several other Silver Creek Saints arrived at Kanesville. They protested the high council's investigation of Cutler's Indian mission, presumably because it was Council of Fifty business. Out of
deference to Father Cutler, the high council did not convene a formal meeting but held a more private conversation and read aloud the previously exchanged letters. They found Cutler “pliant but mysterious,” while Calkins challenged the high council’s authority to interfere with Cutler’s mission, try him, or cut him off. He also expressed offense at Hyde’s implication that he (Calkins) had “the Big Head” (18).

A lively argument ensued over Cutler’s mission. “We,” the high council maintained, “understood it to be to preach the Gospel; baptize those that believed; build mills, teach school, and do good to the people they were among; [and] inculcate peace and union” (19). Calkins argued that these activities were a “cover up” for a more delicate and mysterious business, observing that “things were at a dangerous pass.” Following Calkins’s “long spirited and heated speech,” E. T. Benson replied “with energy”:

“Br. Calkins,” says he, “if you have got the spirit of God, we have not; that the Spirit you are of, if carried out, would lay the knife to the throat of this people; and my remarks are not for what had transpired, particularly, but for the spirit that you now manifest will lead you to it. You manifest a spirit to ride over us rough shod, and we will not put up with it.” (20)

Benson interpreted Calkins’s hints to mean that Cutler intended to stir up the Indians against the whites, as Cutler and Young had previously discussed. Apparently Calkins took the position that the mission was not high council business since it was a Council of Fifty matter, for the dispute turned to their relative measures of authority.

Hyde, as president of the high council, sent for George W. Harris, a member of the high council, William McIntyre, a witness (he was apparently Calkins’s neighbor), and Evan Greene to take minutes (21). Hyde convened a special conference the same day at the Kanesville schoolhouse. He saw it as a high council proceeding, but the Silver Creek Saints apparently did not. McIntire testified about his conversation with Calkins. Hyde asserted that the spirit of the branch was not in accord with the spirit of the Church, expressed his willingness to submit the matter to the high council, the First Presidency, or to God, and affirmed that he did not intend to deprive Cutler of his mission, but warned: “Do not
cut any pranks with the Indians.” Cutler apparently played a very limited role in this discussion, for it was Calkins who replied that he believed in the authorities as established, acknowledged the presidency of Brigham Young, and agreed not to “cut any pranks with the Indians.”

E. T. Benson, however, took umbrage at Calkins, possibly because of his tone, but Calkins refused to “eat his words” (22). George W. Harris “touched heavily upon the spirit manifested by Br. Calkins . . . admonishing him as a father would a son whom he loved.” Calkins then “made satisfactory retractions,” and the high council reported that “all things were settled, the two parties agreeing to burn the letters and papers that had passed between them, and no reference had be had to any other council.” The volatile conflict, it seemed, had been compromised. The high council would sanction Cutler’s mission as long as it did not harm the Church; Cutler and his associates, in return, would respect the high council’s authority and offer retractions of any inappropriate claims about the mission and Cutler’s authority.

Hyde drafted a letter to the Silver Creek Saints outlining the agreement; but when he met the next day with them, Rainey and Cox, apparently representing the group, refused to sign it, saying that “they did not understand it so at the time” (24). Hyde warned that to refuse would “increase the alienation of that Branch from the Body of the Saints.” Father Cutler now took a hand, advised the two hold-outs to agree to the letter, and added, on a wryly practical note, that “if they went before the High Council, they would have to swallow more than that, or be cut off from the Church” (25). Rainey and Cox then agreed.

On Sunday, 17 December, Luis Harvey, a seventy probably residing in Kanesville, went separately to Silver Creek, representing the high council. He reported that Cox and Rainey read the letter “amid sarcastic expressions from some in the crowd.”

It was proposed to lay it [the letter] under the table . . . but it was finally concluded to lay it on the Table and wink at the ignorance of the thing; as they cared not for it. Father Cutler said very little concerning these things. Bishop Calkins, said, the spirit that whispered to Br Hyde was through Br McIntire. They spoke in a tantalizing manner, concerning
Geo. A. Smith & Ezra T. Benson. . . . There was the greatest manifestation of speaking in tongues, and interpretation I ever heard or saw. (25)

Given the widespread nature of charismatic gifts in the early Church, this statement is extraordinary and probably increased the discomfort of those who, like Hyde, preferred their religion rational. A month later, Calkins aggravated the high council further by complaining to Greene that he had omitted details from his report, questioned his role as a clerk for the high council rather than as a recorder doing a favor for Calkins, claimed that Calkins had made no "satisfactory retraction" of claims about Cutler's mission and about his failure to acknowledge the high council's authority, and contested any agreement to burn letters because none had passed among them. Greene responded, not to Calkins but to George A. Smith, informing him that the minutes were "substantially correct," indicating that he thought he was acting as high council clerk, and strongly objecting to Calkins's charges of lying and dishonesty (23-24).

CONFLICT WITH THE IOWA HIGH COUNCIL

For the next ten months, matters apparently rested where they were. Then tensions flared up again. Orson Hyde's determination to deal firmly with misdemeanors and urge the Saints to gather in the West had apparently not slackened; and after he purchased a printing press in St. Louis in 1848, he began printing a paper, the *Frontier Guardian*, to help achieve both goals. In a letter to the *Millennial Star* written in February 1849, George A. Smith observed jovially: "Elder Hyde is here at home presiding, and is a terror to evil doers, and a comfort to the Saints. Before him sinners in Zion tremble and the Saints rejoice, and he enjoys himself first rate."*37* Hyde was ambitious, forceful, intelligent, educated, and capable. He also appeared to be heavy handed.

In March 1849, Hyde printed a letter to the editor from "G.D.G." about rumors of minting counterfeit money, efforts to

---

organize the Indians, and an attempt to reestablish the Church in Jackson County.38 Mormons along the Missouri accepted the Mormon belief that the Indians would be redeemed in Zion; Cutler thought that the time had come to fulfill this responsibility and also felt that the Indians would be a bulwark to defend the Saints against their enemies (the Gentiles and the U.S. Army) if necessary. Both beliefs were further bolstered by the Mormon belief that Jackson County was the site of Zion, the new temple, and the Second Coming—all of which would happen within their lifetimes. Because Cutler was identified with these beliefs, Mormons would therefore assume that the rumors of counterfeiting also referred to him. The writer sarcastically commented that “these men... have some very pious streaks” and “can not look upon sin with the least degree of allowance, and even, at times, profess such holiness that it is enough to make one pity the weakness and wickedness of man”—remarks likewise obvious gibes at Cutler and his associates. One Mormon was excommunicated for forgery, but there is no evidence of a connection with Father Cutler.39

Hyde did not write this letter, but he printed it and the Silver Creek Saints surely felt maligned. From the standpoint of New England republicanism, Hyde's actions were also tyrannical.

On 6 April 1849, the Church in Iowa met in a general confer-

---


39According to Hyde, Smith, and Benson, “Report to Brigham Young and Council of Twelve,” 7-11, James H. Mulholland was arraigned before the high council on 6 January 1849 and excommunicated for forgery; the only known relationship between the “bogus business” and Cutler was that Joseph Kelting, a witness for Mulholland, “treated the Council, in such an unsaintlike and contemptuous manner, that they required at his hands some confession; which he refused to make. After considerable attempt to induce him to acknowledge [his fault], the Council cut him off... after which he raised his stentorian voice and summoned the Council of Fifty to assemble, and try his case as he took an appeal from the High Council to that Honorable Body.” The case shows the competing jurisdictions of the high council and the Council of Fifty, as does another case Hyde documents: that of Peter Hawes who insisted that only the Council of Fifty could try him, while the high council claimed that only Brigham Young had authority to call a Fifty meeting. George A. Smith, contrary to his own involvement, dismissed the Fifty as merely “a Debating School” (8-11).
ence at Kanesville. Cutler and Calkins did not attend, but their case was reviewed in public on the third day.40 Hyde related the case in detail. He admitted being a “little warm or heated at times” but noted that he was fortunate to have two “cool, deliberate and calculating” counselors. The Silver Creek Saints, he commented, have seldom, if ever, come before the high council cheerfully, and they are “very technical, and metaphysical.” He dealt systematically with the beliefs he objected to. First was their idea that the work of God would be “speedily consummated.” Hyde argued that “no enthusiastic flirts, no vain or wild chimera, no mysterious humbug is going to accomplish the great purposes of our Heavenly Father in these days.”

Hyde’s remarks reveal an important conflict between worldviews. As a college-educated man, he was influenced by Enlightenment rationalism, while Cutler and many of his followers exhibited a more esoteric, other-worldly, mystical, and magical worldview. Both worldviews coexisted in early Mormonism; but with the death of Joseph Smith, a magic worldview gradually was displaced by a more pragmatic, rationalistic one. Under the leadership of men like Young and Hyde, Joseph Smith’s charisma became routinized and more priestly.41

After summarizing Cutler’s mission, Hyde described the high council meeting of 15 December 1848. He observed that “Father Cutler lies a little back in the shade, behind the curtain while


41 From Max Weber, 295-301; O’Dea, The Mormons, 155-60. For Hyde to call Cutler’s teachings “mysterious humbug” is perhaps less than sincere. If he was familiar with the teachings and history of the Quorum of the Anointed, which is almost certainly the case, then Cutler’s approach was neither mysterious nor humbug to him. However, he was able to distance himself from Cutler and present Cutler as a dissident by use of the label. Much of the Iowa audience he was addressing did not know that the teachings stemmed from Joseph Smith and his secret organizations or, like Hyde, did not care. Furthermore, Young and the leadership in the west, who unquestionably knew the source, had to defer doctrinal complexities in favor of relocating as many Saints as possible and consolidating their own authority.
Bishop Calkins is his organ and mouth-piece and the ‘Magnus Apollo’ to carry out his measures.” Hyde asserted the high council’s authority to represent the First Presidency and argued: “If the Silver Creek Branch were as frank and honest as they pretend, they would say . . . that they regard Father Cutler as the highest authority on earth.” Hyde vigorously continued with what amounted to an accusation of false charisma:

The wicked subterfuge is resorted to, in order to beguile the unwary, that the ancients have visited them, tongues and prophecyings are dealt out so profusely that the market is glutted. We are weak mortals; but when the Holy Spirit comes upon us, and we take an action upon those who have questioned our power, our right, and our jurisdiction, in order to get a lengthened term to do wrong, they will find, sooner or later, that what we bind on earth is bound in Heaven.

Hyde then had the letter from Calkins to Greene read into the record. He “explained that some who have visited that branch caught their spirit and returned teaching that the church is separated, that some of its members are here and some in the Valley; that there is no organization here, nor in the Valley; that the church is disorganized.” He then accused the branch of “wanting us to hold still about their bogus press and their dark designs until they can bring all the evil they can upon this people.” The reference to the “bogus press” may refer to Cutler’s teachings and/or counterfeiting. Thus, Hyde publicly linked the Silver Creek Saints with counterfeiting in a rhetorical display that, in my opinion, was primarily aimed at the audience in Salt Lake Valley and the Saints still in the East who were hesitating. By using the Silver Creek Saints as an example of all of the problems with the Saints along the Missouri, Hyde could affirm his own authority and encourage the Saints to move west.

Following Hyde’s lengthy discourse, William Redfield of Silver Creek and Luis Harvey addressed the conference. Redfield pointed out that “the Branch acquiesced to the letter; and there has been everything done to sustain the Authorities of the Church here and elsewhere.” Father Cutler, he continued, “always sustained the heads of the Church,” and he will “make full return to the authorities here” as soon as he gets back. Redfield maintained that “if Bishop Calkins taught wrong things it was private, and not in public.” Finally, he challenged, “Let those who have said
anything against the Branch prove it." Harvey, in rebuttal, weakly confirmed his report about the branch's response to Hyde's letter and partly acknowledged Redfield's contention that the actions of a few members had been exaggerated. Two other witnesses were present for "both sides of the question, but were not called to testify."^42

Hyde recommended that Calkins be "dis-fellowshipped until he makes satisfactory retractions" and Alexander Stanley, one of the members in attendance, moved that Father Cutler's mission be suspended pending investigation, approval by "the Authorities of the Church, and . . . until he knows us and knows himself." Both carried unanimously. Cutler had not openly defied the authorities. By August, he still had not reported to the high council, as Hyde reported sarcastically;^43 but there were no new developments.

The next recorded event occurred on 5 April 1849 when Hyde, Smith, and Benson drafted the report to the First Presidency which has preserved many of the details of this curious exchange. Rather flamboyantly and defensively, they wrote:

The Presidency will see that we have many kind of spirits to deal with, and that we have had to set our faces as flint against spiritual wickedness in high places. It has been our object by day and by night, and still is, and we trust will continue to be, to guide the course of the little ship which we have been entrusted to command as directly as the winds and currents will allow to the harbor in the Great Basin, called Great Salt Lake City. We have had use for all the moral power, and spiritual strength, wisdom, and intelligence that we possessed to compete with the refractory spirits that have sprung up like mushrooms since your departure from us. It has ever been our object to maintain the true order and government of the Church, and to induce the people to hold fast the Iron Rod which conducts hence to the Valley of the Mountains. Because we would not hold still and suffer ourselves to be jumpt on rough shod, and rode down out of sight, we have been called usurpers, tyrants, and religious despots. (26)

Within days, Chancey Whiting, one of Cutler's most zealous followers, was writing aggressively to relatives at Mount Pisgah:


^43Hyde, "Cutlerism," Frontier Guardian, 8 August 1849, 2.
I suppose you are making arrangements to go to the Valley this spring. But we intent to put a clog in the road so large that you cannot climb over it and try to draw your mind to the true point of compass. I expect you have heard awful stories about Father Cutler but all the bad stories you hear about him you may sit it down as false for a better man never nor never will be in this church. At all events he is but mighty little if any behind Joseph, and if you was here you would believe just as we do. No doubt you hear great stories about the Valley but I can tell you will miss it if you go there. I would not go there if I knew I could dig gold enough every day to load [a] six horse team and was all fitted out with everything necessary for the journey and ten years extra provisions besides.\(^{44}\)

Almon W. Babbit, who had the government mail contract, delivered the lengthy missive of Hyde, Smith, and Benson, representing the high council, to the First Presidency in Utah in September.\(^{45}\) The amount of time devoted to the matter, the hyperbole and rhetoric, the report’s comprehensive detail, and the personal representations indicate that Father Cutler and his followers were not a casual concern.

Brigham Young responded promptly and cordially to Alpheus Cutler. He offered assistance to Iowa Saints intending to move west, enthusiastically described the rising city, comfortable homes, and splendid farms, counseled Cutler to travel during the summer of 1850, offered him a house and promised that his old friends would welcome him. It closed with a fervent blessing: "May the Spirit of peace rest and abide upon you & yours, and the blessings of our Father in heaven crown your efforts with success, that you may be enabled to accomplish all the righteous desires of your heart, that you may have wisdom & happiness abundantly in this life, & in the world to come life everlasting, is the prayer of your sincere friend and brother in time & all eternity Brigham Young."\(^{46}\) Young obviously hoped to keep the "Old Fox" and his followers in the movement, but they had to move west. The F.


\(^{45}\)Hyde et al., "Reported for the Frontier Guardian," 2; Journal History, 7 September 1849.

\(^{46}\)Brigham Young, Letter to Alpheus Cutler, 21 October 1849, Brigham Young Correspondence, LDS Church Archives.
Walter Cox and Edwin Whiting families left Silver Creek for Salt Lake Valley in the summer of 1849 and the spring of 1852 respectively, but Cutler made no move.47

In January 1849 Cutler and unnamed others ordained Pliny Fisher as patriarch.48 Although Michael Quinn has argued that this ordination signaled Cutler's intention to create a separate organization, Cutler performed the ordination acting on “authority for the Holy Priesthood,” as Fisher records on the first page of his book of blessings. Cutler evidently thought that he was acting within the limits of his authority as a Mormon high priest.49 It would be three or four years before Cutler publicly advanced claims to any separate authority; and, even then, these claims were grounded in authority he claimed from Joseph Smith.

Four months after Fisher's ordination, Hyde convened the traditional spring conference on 6 April 1850 at Kanesville for the Iowa Saints. Hyde “spoke relative to Father Cutler’s going to the Valley this season, according to the request of the Presidency, or that he come up here and show that he has desire to go. He said he verily believed if Father Cutler really wants to go to the Valley and had not means, that he could be helped so that he could go.”50 The conference decided that failure to satisfy these conditions would result in Cutler’s disfellowshipping. In point of fact, however, the psychological break had already been made. The spring and summer of 1849 found the Cutlerites still on Silver Creek. They made no move to reconcile their differences with the high council and became increasingly vocal in denunciation of tyranny. Meanwhile, Hyde gradually fixed on them as symbolizing assorted problems with the Iowa Saints. In the Frontier Guardian, he often decried the lack of westward progress, the development of heresy, and the growth of apostasy; in this context, he sometimes focused on the Cutlerites and their beliefs. Soon after the confer-

47Christensen, Before and After Mt. Pisgah, 175-210, 213-16.
48Pliny Fisher, Book of Patriarchal Blessings, 1 January 1849, 1, RLDS Church Library-Archives.
ence, Hyde wrote Brigham Young: “Everything is precarious with us here. Indian Cutlerism in five hundred forms would rage like wild fire through this country if the strong arm of power were not upon it all the time. I do assure you . . . that it requires the utmost care, diligence and watching over this people to keep their eye towards the Salt Lake Valley.” 51 Hyde exaggerated the Cutlerites’ influence; they never became a substantial threat to Utah Mormonism.

After preserving silence all winter, Cutler responded to Brigham Young’s letter in June. 52 Even though the threatened disfellowshipment would technically take effect only if Cutler did not appear before the high council and explain himself to its satisfaction, Cutler obviously had no intention of doing so and appealed his disfellowshipment, about which he assumes Young has been informed, directly to him because Young had appointed him to the Indian mission. Cutler requested another year or so to complete mills under contract, defining it as a matter of honor to himself and the Church. Once the work was completed, Cutler maintained, he would move to the Valley or anywhere else Young directed.

Young’s response, if any, has not been preserved; but in September 1850, the high council appointed a committee to investigate the Silver Creek brethren. 53 They found that Calvin Beebe, Jacob Myres, the Jacobs brothers (Michael, Dana, and Sandford), Ruben P. Hartwell, Herman Abels, Lewis S. Dalrimple, and Jehial Hildreth were “disaffected,” and they disfellowshipped them. Calvin Beebe excepted, none of these men joined the later Cutlerite Church. Hyde warned the Iowa Saints that if they associated with the Cutlerites, they too would be “cut off.” Although some of the Cutlerites allude to westering plans in their correspondence,

51 Orson Hyde, Letter to Brigham Young, 27 April 1850, Brigham Young Correspondence, LDS Church Archives.
52 Alpheus Cutler, Letter to Brigham Young, 13 June 1850, Brigham Young Correspondence, LDS Church Archives.
they made no active plans to do so, and the disfellowshipped men remained unrepentant and defiant toward the high council.

At the summer’s end, the fall semi-annual conference in Salt Lake City reviewed the charges against Cutler, Calkins, and the Silver Creek Saints. Brigham Young downplayed the developing schism, explained Cutler’s Indian mission briefly, stated that this mission had “been turned into an under current of lies, and has destroyed his [Cutler’s] influence,” and stated, “There is no trial before the Church concerning the Silver Creek Branch, where Father Cutler resides.” This action thus upheld the Iowa conference actions.

In December 1850, Hyde wrote the First Presidency: “Father Cutler and his adherents, I think do not wish to go to the Valley, and probably they would not go if they had millions.” Three months later, he published a letter from Alfred Cordon of Burlington, Iowa, reporting a meeting of the Saints in St. Joseph, Missouri:

While in this place Mr. Rainey, Cutler’s right hand man attended meeting and desired us to investigate; investigation is all the cry with them; but where is there a sensible man on earth that would trouble himself with such nonsense; a man might with equal propriety investigate a putrid carcass, to see from whence the stench arises, when at the same time his olfactory nerves are stung so severe’y by the nauseous effluvia, that he can scarcely breathe. The Cutlerites hold meetings in that place, but do not meet with much success. Some few of the Saints, attend at time, but it is those whose spirits have become adulterated with Biology, Whiskeyology, etc.

Hyde’s willingness to publish such intemperate remarks and his own exasperation left no room for negotiation or reconciliation. Two weeks later, he defined Cutlerism as: “The big Head,

---

54Miscellaneous Minutes Collection, 7 September 1850, LDS Church Archives; also see Journal History, 4 September 1850.
55Orson Hyde, Letter to Brigham Young, Heber C. Kimball, and Willard Richards, 29 December 1850, Brigham Young Correspondence, LDS Church Archives.
56Alfred Cordon, Letter to the editor, 10 February 1851, Frontier Guardian 3 (7 March 1851). Despite Cardon’s description of Rainey as Cutler’s “right hand man,” Rainey did not join the schism.
swelling into sore accusation, breaking out and freely discharging the corruption of Apostasy."57 On 20 April 1851, the high council excommunicated Cutler.58

Some of the Cutlerites maintained their relations with family and friends in Salt Lake Valley, and a few families eventually moved west. Furthermore, despite Cutler’s excommunication, Daniel H. Wells wrote an amiable letter to Cutler that fall, relating the news about old friends and encouraging him to bring his family and followers to the Valley.59 Although he does not allude directly to Cutler’s excommunication, Brigham Young attached a note telling Cutler to forget the past. Cutler did not respond; perhaps he did not receive the letter.60

Nearly a year later, Brigham Young again wrote warmly: “With feelings of sweet regard I again embrace an opportunity of communicating with you, always concerning a lively interest in whatever concerns your welfare.”61 He was “truly pained” to learn that Cutler had been ill, then continued with emotion:

I was in hopes of seeing you here this season but shall expect you next as Bro. Daniel Wells who is appointed to preside and gather-up the Saints has received instructions to aid you in coming. Come then and bring all with you. Gather up your children and grand children and come to the Valls of Ephraim and sojourn awhile with your brethren while the work of the Almighty is rolling and the day is fast approaching when you shall be redeemed and the whole earth rejoice in King Emmanuel’s reign of peace. And my heart is good towards you Father Cutler and my most ardent desire is to see you happily and comfortably situated where we can occasionally meet and enjoy discourse of things past, present and to come. I have heard that you thought you had enemies in this region who might set to do you harm, but I have never

58Quinn, “The Mormon Succession Crisis of 1844,” 198. Cutler was posthumously restored to full membership in 1971.
59Daniel H. Wells and Brigham Young, Letter to Alpheus Cutler, Brigham Young Correspondence, 28 November 1851, LDS Church Archives.
60Since Cutler had responded to all of Young’s previous letters, it seems strange that this letter apparently went unanswered.
61Brigham Young, Letter to Alpheus Cutler, 14 September 1852, Brigham Young Correspondence, LDS Church Archives.
heard any expression concerning you in all of the vallies but an ardent desire to see you.

Young signed the letter, "As ever your friend and brother in the new and everlasting covenant." This spirit of conciliation and affection is remarkable. As late as 1856, after Cutler had established a separate organization, Young expressed his willingness to other General Authorities to overlook Father Cutler's foolishness and receive him.62

**THE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST (CUTLERITE)**

A few Cutlerites remained at the Indian mission into 1851, despite its difficulties.63 Hardship and disease took several lives, including those of Cutler's youngest plural wife and two of his daughters, both of them former wives of Heber Kimball; conflicts with other missionaries and Indian agents over Mormon proselytizing, the mill operation, and probably plural marriage ground on; they were unable to secure title to land and improvements in Indian Territory; and they made no lasting Indian converts. In 1851 the Cutlerites abandoned the mission and returned to Silver Creek. Succumbing to legal threats by Iowa civil authorities, Father Cutler "put aside" his remaining plural wives.64

With the anchor of the Indian Mission gone, other changes were necessary. In the spring of 1852, Cutlerite Edmund Fisher headed a committee that located and purchased land about twenty-five miles southeast in present-day Fremont County.65 Thirty-five to forty Cutlerite families moved there and founded Manti, a village with a Book of Mormon name. In September 1853,
Father Cutler began rebaptizing his followers into the Church of Jesus Christ (Cutlerite).

The Cutlerite claim to be the exclusive successor of Nauvoo Mormonism was complex and legalistic. The martyrdom of the Prophet, they argued, signaled God's rejection of the Mormon Church and the status of the Gentiles as "chosen" people, but not the end of priesthood authority, the termination of the kingdom of God, nor the favored status of Jews and Lamanites. They claimed that at Nauvoo Alpheus Cutler was ordained by Joseph Smith through divine revelation as the seventh member of a special, secret quorum entrusted with all the keys and authority for the priesthood and kingdom. Cutler received exclusive authority for Lamanite ministries. As the seventh, Cutler had to wait until the six ranking members were dead or in apostasy before acting. Cutler "re-organized" the Mormon Church in 1853, according to his followers, after receiving a heavenly sign that Smith had foretold—two half moons with their backs together. Alpheus Cutler deliberately made no claim that he was succeeding Joseph Smith as "prophet, seer, and revelator," although some of his followers subsequently advanced this contention.

The Cutlerites acknowledged Joseph Smith, Jr., as a prophet and took the Bible, Book of Mormon, and Doctrines and Covenants as basic scriptures. Indicative of their republicanism, they


68Fletcher and Fletcher, *Alpheus Cutler and the Church of Jesus Christ*, 46-63; *Manti Book Number One* (Independence: Church of Jesus Christ,
recognized the U.S. Constitution as a sacred work. Cutlerism emphasized Mormon restorationism, millennialism, adventism, communalism, and gifts of the Spirit. The Cutlerites spurned celestial and plural marriage, but Father Cutler taught them the other Nauvoo Temple doctrines and rites that he learned from Joseph Smith as one of the Anointed. They rejected tithing for the "more perfect" Order of Enoch, or holding all things in common, although participation was voluntary and not all members dedicated their properties to the church. The Cutlerites believed that Independence, Missouri, was the location of Zion and that Cutler would "redeem" it and build the temple in which Christ would appear at his second coming.

Cutler's distinction between the priesthood-based kingdom and the earthly church produced two lines of organizational authority. One president, supported by first and second counselors, held authority for the priesthood and kingdom of God, while another president, with first and second counselors, presided over the earthly church and its meetings. They largely retained priesthood quorum structure, each with a president and counselors, established a high council, and held biannual conferences. However, they had no apostles or bishop. Contemporary Cutlerites have been unable to avoid secular society completely, but they endeavor to preserve the Nauvoo Mormon image of the theocratic kingdom of God.

unpublished records compiled by Chancey Whiting); Edna Fletcher, ed., "A Brief Sketch of the History of the True Church of Jesus Christ (Cutlerite) as Taken From the Written Records of Those That Knew," mimeograph (Fergus Falls, Minn.: Otter Tail County Historical Society, 1960); Jorgensen, "The Fiery Darts of the Adversary," 70-83. The Cutlerites accept pre-1844 versions of the Mormon scriptures and sometimes also use the Joseph Smith translation published as the Inspired Version by the RLDS Church.

Cutlerism thereby provides a rare window to the past. The Cutlerites, for instance, preserved the Nauvoo endowment commitment of a vague sense of priesthood for women. What this meant was interpreted differently in the Utah Mormon tradition, thereby resulting in some confusion. See Ian G. Barber, "The Ecclesiastical Position of Women in Two Mormon Trajectories," Journal of Mormon History 14 (1988): 63-79; and Jorgensen, "The Fiery Darts of the Adversary," 78-83.

See Jorgensen, "North from Zion."
DISCUSSION

The emergence of the Cutlerite schism reveals the doctrinal and organizational precariousness of a new religion once its charismatic prophet-founder is gone. The Cutlerite schism was a product of conflict over goals, beliefs, and especially power within the westward bound Camps of Israel. Yet the unqualified conclusion that it was “caused” by a power struggle is too simplistic and synchronic. This explanation ignores the complex processes whereby the participants became opponents and, through social interaction, fashioned symbolically meaningful definitions of one another. These images served as the basis for actions which, in turn, resulted in the formation of a schismatic organization.

In spite of the high council’s allegations of heresy, Cutlerism derived from conventional Mormon doctrines and beliefs. “Lamanism,” as the high council labeled Cutler’s Indian teachings, was drawn from the Book of Mormon account and manifested the Mormon belief that the Lamanites would be redeemed in Zion before the Second Coming and the Millennium, both of which were thought to be imminent.71 The idea that God rejected the Gentiles because of their role in the murders of Joseph and Hyrum Smith was widespread among the Nauvoo Saints. Even the element of Indian militancy was not especially novel when linked with the redemption of Zion and the Mormons’ recent history. Lyman Wight, George Miller, James Emmett, and other Fifty members familiar with Joseph Smith’s private teachings advanced similar doctrines.72 Cutler’s Lamanism reflected Joseph Smith’s views of the political kingdom of God.

Most Mormons also shared the founding Cutlerites’ belief that Independence was the land of Zion and the site of the last gathering, the construction of the temple, and the advent of Christ. Similarly, many Latter-day Saints shared the Cutlerite belief that tithing was a less perfect principle than the original “law of consecration.”73 None of these beliefs was heretical; rather, they

73 Leonard J. Arrington, “Early Mormon Communitarianism: The Law of
presented potential distractions and obstacles to the high council's prime objective of moving the scattered Saints to Utah. Heresy did not cause the schism; rather, charges of heresy justified the council's actions. By labeling Cutlerism deviant the high council legitimated its use of power to define and control doctrines and goals.

Having formed a schismatic organization, the Cutlerites sought to distinguish themselves from the Utah Mormons. They accomplished this in part by symbolically reinterpreting their previous experiences as Mormons. Dissent from plural marriage, they maintained, was a principal reason for their disaffection. Their official history observed that:

The first task was to eradicate any taint of plural marriage. Few families had escaped the embarrassment and humility of having daughters espoused as plural wives to leading men of the church, or suffered the shame of seeing sons, brothers, or fathers participate in the practice. Many had been deceived into actually believing they were doing God's will. In this manner families became divided and grieving relatives bade their loved ones farewell.  

Though unambiguously opposed to polygamy, this statement also concedes that Cutlerite families were involved in the practice. The official position taken by Chancey Whiting, Cutler's successor, was that the Silver Creek Saints knew nothing of the doctrine and practice of plural marriage; when they heard rumors of it in 1849, they sent representatives to Winter Quarters, determined that the Brighamite Mormons were indeed practicing it, and promptly rejected it. Whiting succeeded in establishing this position as the new orthodoxy and in concealing the Cutlerites' involvements in plural marriage; however, there is overwhelming evidence that the adult Cutlerites had direct contact with plural marriage at Nauvoo or by the time they reached Iowa in 1846-47.  

Ironically, it was perhaps the intimate in-
volvement of founding Cutlerites in plural marriage, rather than ignorance, that distanced them from Brigham Young's organization. Through experience many of them increasingly found the practice repulsive. Their rejection of plural marriage consequently justified, but did not cause, the schism.

The Cutlerites also employed Alpheus's contentions to justify and legitimate the schism. Cutler did not advance exclusive claims to leadership before 1853. The high council's exaggerated accusations against the Cutlerites do not mention such claims, and other evidence confirms that Cutler respected Brigham Young's authority. Richard Bennett is mistaken in asserting that Cutler opposed Young. Cutler's claims to authority are preserved largely through oral tradition during the first crucial years, thereby blending and blurring previous events. The "quorum of seven" contention clearly refers to the Quorum of the Anointed, in which Cutler was the seventh member and where he received the fullness of the priesthood from Joseph Smith, including the explicit bestowal of keys to the priesthood and the kingdom. Cutler's related claims to authority for Lamanite ministries and the kingdom derived from Joseph Smith's instructions to the Council of Fifty. Brigham Young almost certainly recognized that Cutlerism plausibly derived from the teachings and actions of Joseph

photocopy in my possession; and Robert Barnes, "A Beebe Paper," 1988, unpublished paper, photocopy in my possession. For example, Chancey Whiting's father-in-law, Isaac Morley, took plural wives at Nauvoo. His wife's sister, Cordelia Morley, became a plural wife of F. Walter Cox, whose first wife was Whiting's sister, Emeline. Chancey Whiting was sealed as a son to Isaac Morley in the Nauvoo Temple and probably witnessed some of these marriages. Chancey's older brother, Edwin, took plural wives at Nauvoo. Chancey's sister, Jane, and widowed sister-in-law, Martha Hurlbut Whiting, both married the noted Mormon scout, Return Jackson Redding. Cutlerite Calvin Beebe, the brother of Cutler's plural wife Luana, performed plural marriages in the Nauvoo Temple, and one of Calvin's brothers and perhaps his father took plural wives. There no doubt were other plural marriages among Cutlerite kinfolk, many of whom continued west, that remain to be documented. The extent of these plural marriages, the intimacy of trail life and wilderness camps, and the births of children to "unmarried" women, unequivocally refute the contention that the Cutlerites were ignorant of plural marriage before 1849.

76Bennett, "Lamanism, Lymanism, and Cornfields," 45-49.
Smith. After 1853, Cutler's assertions—as presented by the oral tradition—may be an aberration of the political kingdom of God. His pre-1853 contentions, however, are supported fully by what Joseph Smith taught the Quorum of the Anointed and the Council of Fifty, contrary to Michael Quinn's conclusions.  

The conflict between the Silver Creek Saints and the Iowa high council essentially was over immediate organizational goals and authority. Cutler and his followers were committed to Lamanite ministries. The paramount objective of the council was to move the fractured and scattered remnant of the Nauvoo church to the Salt Lake Valley. Richard Bennett correctly interpreted this situation as a disagreement over priorities. This disagreement raised serious questions, however, about the socially legitimate use of power. The council defined Father Cutler as an apostate to justify excommunicating him, but apostasy did not cause this schism. Cutler and his followers founded a separate organization only after they were cut off from Utah Mormonism.

Personality differences contributed to the schism. Hyde was pragmatic, hot tempered, and perhaps heavy handed; Cutler was mysterious, mystical, and perhaps passively aggressive; George A. Smith and E. T. Benson were eager to assume greater prominence in the reconstituted leadership of Young's organization. Calkins and other Silver Creek Saints were zealous and impetuous. The high council did not intend to exclude the Cutlerites from participating in Utah Mormonism, and Father Cutler and his followers did not aim to create a separate movement. Neither of these decisions was especially rational in the sense that the conflicting parties carefully calculated costs, benefits, or consequences. Viewed rationally, the parent organization gained somewhat greater definitional clarity of its immediate mission and organizational structure at the heavy cost of precious human resources. The Cutlerites gained greater control over a very small organization at a tremendous cost: divided families, broken friendships.


78 Bennett, "Lamanism, Lymanism, and Cornfields," 45-59; Bennett, Mormons at the Missouri.
and a certain marginality by comparison with the highly successful parent organization. But the decision was not a rational one. It was a costly, highly emotional decision for all parties—essentially an accidental product of a unique set of circumstances.

Richard Bennett convincingly demonstrated that the Camps of Israel were scattered and affected by severe hardships. As Mormons, the Cutlerites' decisions were influenced by a variety of existential conditions. Many of them were weary and impoverished from sixteen years of successive moves, often losing most of their possessions in the process. Almost all of the Cutlerite families lost loved ones to illness, disease, and the hardships of frontier life and travel. Many families included the very young or elderly as well as people too weak or ill to travel. Some of the Cutlerites established promising or successful farms and businesses in southwestern Iowa. Some became increasingly disaffected over plural marriage, and many were embittered by the prolonged conflict with Mormon authorities in Iowa. Some believed sincerely in Cutler's emergent claims to a special ministry, authority, and leadership; but others initially associated with Cutler did not join the schism, and many of those who did join it converted to Joseph Smith III's "new organization." Less than one-fifth of the people associated with Cutlerism zealously continued with the schism. These different responses strongly suggest that the Cutlerites were reacting to a variety of conditions, definitions, and interpretations of their situations.

Joseph Smith's assassination, as Michael Quinn convincingly showed, resulted in a crisis of authority, leadership, and continuity in an organization already fragmented by dissent, apostasy, and schism. The most innovative doctrines the Prophet introduced at Nauvoo were elaborate, complex, ambiguous, incomplete, and sometimes unknown to the general membership. In spite of hierarchical principles, the exact relationship among the intricate and sometimes secretive offices and units composing Nauvoo's social organization was enigmatic even to Smith's elite inner circle. If the new religion he created and developed by charismatic authority survived, its goals, doctrines, practices, and organization required further development, refinement, routinization, and institutionalization.

When the apostles secured control of the largest single body
of the Church it was because the Saints publicly recognized them as the most viable remnant of the existing theocracy. The potency of the apostles' claims, contrary to Michael Quinn's argument, did not derive unequivocally from theologically based claims. Rather, Brigham Young and his fellow apostles embodied the principle of apostolic succession and legitimated it through pragmatic leadership and their ultimate success. Their claim to possess the keys to the priesthood and kingdom, like that of Alpheus Cutler, derived from their membership in the Quorum of the Anointed. Joseph Smith, moreover, invested his ambitious plans for the political kingdom in the Council of Fifty. Under the circumstances, the apostles' accomplishments truly were astonishing. Conflict and dissent in the Camps of Israel were products of unfinished doctrines and a lack of orthodoxy as well as continuing questions about authority compounded by the monumental problems of relocating the Saints to the Rocky Mountains.

The emergence of the Cutlerite schism dramatically reveals and illustrates some of the processes by which Joseph Smith's charismatic brand of Nauvoo Mormonism was routinized and institutionalized during the period of relocating in the West. Labeling Cutler a deviant helped clarify, define, and legitimate the apostles' authority as they pragmatically adapted Nauvoo Mormonism to changing circumstances. The Cutlerites, essentially religious reactionaries or conservatives whose aim was to preserve Nauvoo Mormonism, represent one of the many faces of Mormonism. This vision limited their ability to mobilize human and economic resources, yet they survived for more than a century and thus were more successful than most of the hundred-plus organizations derived from Joseph Smith's teachings. Perhaps Cutlerism's greatest contemporary value is that it requires us to think in terms of Mormonisms.
Migration, Social Change, and Mormonism in Portugal

Mark L. Grover

In October 1975, Maria (a pseudonym), age thirteen, disembarked alone at the airport in Lisbon, Portugal.¹ No one was waiting for her. The previous twenty-four hours had been filled with distress, fear, and confusion. Maria, of white Portuguese ancestry, had been born and raised in the Portuguese African colony of Angola where her father, also Angola-born, was the head of a bank. The past few months in her home town of Novo Lisboa, Angola, had been a nightmare of terror. Portugal’s colonial control of Angola was ending, and the removal of the Portuguese troops accompanied a steady increase in internal violence. Native Angolans, fragmenting along racial lines and supported by outside international forces, began attacking the remaining ves-
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¹Maria’s story comes from oral interviews with her parents and husband, conducted in May 1986 on condition of anonymity; copy of transcript in my possession.
tiges of Portuguese officialdom. Maria had been afraid for her life for weeks, subjected daily to views of bodies in the streets and other horrors of war.

Even though the level of violence was high, Maria’s father had no intention of leaving. He considered himself African and believed he could ride out the unstable transition, then work with the new independent government. However, he feared for the safety of his three children; and when Maria asked to leave the country, he sent her to relatives in Portugal until the situation became more stable.

But the airport was thronged with refugees, the scene chaotic and confused. Somehow the message that Maria was coming failed to reach her relatives. No one answered her telephone calls. Exhausted and frightened, she was befriended by a woman she did not know, who took her home for several days and helped her finally locate relatives.

Conditions worsened, and Maria’s parents left Angola a month later. Two years later they were baptized members of the LDS Church. The connection between their conversion and the tragic events of 1975, when over a half million whites fled from their homes in Africa to seek refuge in Portugal, may not be easily understood. Historically, however, social disruption and physical dislocation have been key variables in the expansion of what have been termed alternative religions. The history of the LDS Church in Portugal during the 1970s and early 1980s is a dramatic example of religious growth in disruptive and difficult circumstances. It also serves as a case study that can provide clues for the growth of the Church throughout the world.

THE PORTUGUESE IN AFRICA

The Portuguese had been the first European colonists in Sub-Saharan Africa and were the last to leave four hundred years later. Though their presence was significant in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the activities of other European countries eventually limited the Portuguese presence in Africa to small areas in West Africa and the two wealthy southern colonies of Angola and Mozambique. During the 1950s and 1960s, as other European colonial powers granted independence to their African colonies, the
Portuguese increased their presence in Africa by encouraging the migration of over 200,000 whites from the continent.\(^2\)

The fascist political regime of António de Oliveira Salazar and others kept Portugal isolated from the rest of Europe for almost fifty years (1926-1974), while the country concentrated on extracting wealth from its African colonies. Significant African resistance to the Portuguese presence began in 1961 with the outbreak of fighting in northern Angola. Portugal countered with a large military presence that subsequently increased the pro-independence debate. On 25 April 1974, a military coup in Portugal ended fifty years of fascist dictatorship. A political shift to the left confirmed that Portugal would leave Africa; the government granted independence to Angola and Mozambique at the end of 1975.\(^3\) The immediate effects were economic. In addition to the costs of the war, Portugal lost an important source of revenue just as the world entered a global recession. The political move toward socializing the country’s industry frightened away capital, further weakening the economy.

The favorable social and economic position of white colonists in Africa, already suffering during the colonial wars, ended. Some of the rich had already liquidated their holdings and left for Portugal, France, or Brazil; but most had remained, refusing to believe the new military government would actually free Portugal’s wealthiest possessions. The 1975 independence announcement for the African colonies, combined with a significant


increase in violence, convinced the white population that their presence in Africa was at an end.4

The exodus from Africa was a personal tragedy for many. Within a few months, over a half million whites left Africa for Portugal. Most came by plane and boat. Others, caught in the fighting, got out any way they could. Most experienced separations from their families. Many had family members slain. Nearly all abandoned most of their possessions, entering Portugal with a suitcase or two. Precious metals were not allowed out of the country, and Lisbon banks refused to honor colonial scrip. The lucky ones had relatives who took them in. The government placed others in hotels until permanent housing could be found. Refugee camps and shanty towns sprang up on the outskirts of major cities.5

The government funneled millions of dollars into emergency assistance, but it was not enough. The Portuguese economy was weak, due to a global recession, the loss of the rich African colonies, and a change in the economic direction toward industrialization. Thanks to an unusually strong sense of identity and personal resourcefulness, the retornados were, for the most part, able to find jobs or start small businesses with limited government help. Within a few years, they were successfully integrated into Portuguese society. But their favored life-style and status in Africa were gone forever.6


Sociologists and historians have long recognized a relationship between economic and social disruptions caused by migration and the growth of new and alternative religions. Emilio Willems, in *Followers of the New Faith*, examined the growth of pentecostalism in Brazil and Chile. He noted a direct correlation between the growth of Pentecostal churches and widespread migration into the cities. Rural migrants were often separated from their families and from the churches that traditionally supplied social, emotional, and occasional economic support. Looking for replacement support systems, many found that the energetic missionary activities of pentecostal churches, coupled with the general ineffectiveness of Catholic organizations, made changing religions attractive.7

Willems's study focused primarily on the migration of the lower classes and concentrated on economic and social variables, but similar results follow migration among the middle and upper classes.8 A person's separation from family and tradition

---
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increases the potential for changes in religious affiliation. Significant social and economic changes always result in greater mobility and, consequently, a larger pool of potential converts for new religious groups with aggressive missionary programs. In Portugal during the 1970s, the traumatic political and economic changes resulted in thousands of retornados affiliating with new religious groups.9

**CHARACTERISTICS OF THE RETORNADOS**

Most retornados immediately dropped from middle or upper class to extreme poverty. The dependence on families and the government for support was psychologically shattering as well as socially humiliating.10 The violence of the immediate past and the disruption of the hasty exodus left many retornados suffering from nightmares, anger, prolonged depression, and melancholia.11

For most retornados, settling in Portugal was not returning “home” but leaving the uniquely African social, cultural, and

---


9For example, the Jehovah’s Witnesses had been in Portugal since 1925, with missionary activities beginning in earnest in the 1940s, despite active persecution by the government. In 1971 they had 108 congregations and 1,203 baptisms. After the coup, baptisms jumped to almost four thousand in 1975, and a new congregation was formed almost weekly. That surge created by the return from Africa lasted until 1978. By 1981, growth dropped to the pre-revolutionary level of 1,200 baptisms. *1983 Yearbook of Jehovah’s Witnesses* (Brooklyn, N.Y.: Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society, 1983): 130-256.


economic institutions the Portuguese community had created overseas. Many felt uneasy with life in Portugal and suffered some degree of alienation. Many who went to rural areas soon migrated to cities, not only for jobs but also for the psychological comfort of associating with former colonists.\(^{12}\)

Furthermore, Portugal's citizens definitely had mixed feelings about the colonists' return, especially since a similar number of Portuguese "guest-workers" returning from recession-smitten European countries increased the already high unemployment rate and put an enormous strain on the struggling economy, which many resented. The political left, though offering assistance, had ended the African idyll for the retornados, and had no reason to expect their loyalty; further, they feared the voting power of the generally conservative retornados. Hostile rhetoric and anger bristled in the media, as well as on the streets. The colonists were blamed for housing shortages, deterioration of the cities, and increases in crime and drug use.\(^{13}\)

Some refugees could not feel at home in Portugal and went on to Brazil, France, and other countries. Many began to search for social and psychological relief. Special groups of retornados met the need for some. But still others found new homes in alternative religions that provided assistance, friendship, and answers to basic questions about life.

A study of the 1980 national census by the Instituto de Estudos Para o Desenvolvimento (Institute for Development Studies) showed the changing religious world of the retornados. Ninety-four percent of the total Portuguese population answered a question about religious affiliation while only 78 percent of the retornados responded. This lack of response could indicate either a rejection of Catholicism, a fear about expressing a religious preference other than Catholicism, or confusion about whether

---


\(^{13}\)Lewis and Williams, "Emigrantes and Retornados," 221.
their new religion was "Protestant," "other Christians," or "other non-Christians."

An evaluation of the percentage that did declare a religious preference indicates a decided shift away from the Catholic Church. Ninety-three percent of the retornados indicated preference for the Catholic Church as compared to 95 percent of the non-retornado group. The retornados represented 6 percent of the total Catholic population, 9.4 percent of the Protestant population, and 10 percent of "other Christians." The non-Catholic figures would almost certainly have been higher if these figures had been included and if the silent 20 percent had responded. The author concluded: "Recognizing the limitation of the data available ... it shows that the return has resulted in the substantial numerical increase in some minority religious groups in Portugal."\(^{14}\) One of these new religious movements was the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

**THE LDS CHURCH IN PORTUGAL**

The Mormon Church's greatest success in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries came in the Protestant countries of Europe and in North America. It was not until the 1950s, when missionaries began to experience limited success in Latin America, that the possibility of proselytizing on the Iberian peninsula was considered. At this time, however, both Spain and Portugal were controlled by dictators who limited the activities of non-Catholic churches.\(^{15}\)

The end of the Portuguese dictatorship came three weeks after President Spencer W. Kimball issued an urgent challenge to leaders of the Church to expand missionary work. Kimball asked


\(^{15}\)For a study of how missionary work among Catholic countries compares with other nations, see Brad Morris, "The Internationalization of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints," 1972, unpublished manuscript, copy in the Historical Department Archives, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City (hereafter cited as LDS Church Archives).
David M. Kennedy, a former member of U.S. President Richard Nixon's cabinet, to negotiate with the new leftist military leaders about permitting the entry of missionaries. After several meetings with cabinet-level officials, Kennedy obtained the Portuguese government's permission to open a mission. Kennedy, in commenting on his success, specifically targeted Portugal because of its social disruption: "When President Kimball asked me which countries I thought we could open up, I said I would put Portugal first on the list because the people there were undergoing massive change. The timing looked good."  

Establishing the Church in Portugal was facilitated by forty years of experience in Brazil. Not only was there a group of seasoned Portuguese-speaking leaders in Brazil, but there was also a secular bureaucratic structure with language translation and publication services. Church leaders in Salt Lake City determined that half of the missionaries should be native Brazilians and that the first mission president in Portugal should have previously served in a similar capacity in Brazil. The person selected was William Grant Bangerter, president of the Brazilian Mission between 1958 and 1963. Bangerter and his family arrived in Lisbon in November 1974. He served for a year, then was replaced by W. Lynn Pinegar, a three-year-term president. The first missionaries were four seasoned elders transferred from Brazil.  

The first few months were frustrating for the missionaries, partly due to Portugal's political situation. The conservative dictatorship had been replaced by a strong anti-American leftist group, resulting in uneasy relations with the United States. Within this uncertain political environment, Church leaders feared that if the presence of Mormon missionaries became widely known, certain

\[16\] David M. Kennedy, "The Opening of Portugal," 1, unpublished manuscript, edited by Spencer Palmer; photocopy in my possession.  

\[17\] See Historical Record of the Portugal Mission, 1973, 1974, 1975, LDS Church Archives. It was probably written by Bangerter. See also Dale Earl Thompson, Diaries, 1973-May 1975, photocopy in LDS Church Archives (Thompson was one of the first missionaries in Portugal); and William Grant Bangerter, Oral History, interviewed by Gordon Irving, 1976, James H. Moyle Oral History Program, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, LDS Church Archives.
Table 1: Baptism Numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Baptisms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 1974 - April 1975</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1975 - October 1975</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1975 - April 1976</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1976 - October 1976</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1976 - April 1977</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1977 - October 1977</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Calculated from baptismal records and reports at the Portugal Lisbon Mission Home.

governmental elements might push for the Church’s expulsion. Consequently, the opening of the mission was not announced, even in American Church publications. Missionaries were forbidden door-to-door contacting, the common activity in most new missions, and instead concentrated on searching for relatives and friends of members in Brazil. These restrictions and the resultant low success were difficult for missionaries who had come from Brazil, with one of the highest baptism rates in the world. Furthermore, the Portuguese were unfamiliar with and generally unsympathetic to non-Catholic proselytizing activities. Mormonism’s growth in Portugal during the first year was slow and difficult.18

In Lisbon, a few English-speaking members met weekly for services in private homes. As investigators increased, the group rented a hall in a local hotel for Sunday meetings. The branch president was Ray Caldwell, a Canadian embassy worker. Caldwell conducted the meetings in English, and a Brazilian missionary translated. The first Portuguese baptism occurred in March 1975 with an average of seven baptisms per month for the next six months.19

During the last months of 1975, as the Mormon missionaries

18Bangerter, Oral History; Thompson, Diaries.
19Historical Record, 1974, 4-5.
began encountering more and more African immigrants, they experienced a change in the level and success of missionary work. In September, the Mission History noted: “The evacuation of people from Angola has been intensified as more than 200,000 have yet to leave that country before November. It has caused a lot of commotion and feelings are very sensitive from these refugees. Some of the elders are now teaching some of these families who have had to leave all but the clothes on their backs.”

Missionary success dramatically increased during this period. (See Table 1.) During the first year, just over forty were baptized. During the next six months, close to one hundred were baptized, a level sustained during the following half year.

The natural evolution of a new mission, plus an increase in the number of missionaries, would predict an increase in baptisms even without changed circumstances, without the impetus of the new members from Africa. By 1977, the number of missionaries had increased from the initial four to just over 90. However, the average number of baptisms per missionary increased significantly. (See Table 2.) The average number of baptisms per missionary for the first year was .5. When missionaries began teaching retornados the next year, the figure increased to 3.8 baptisms per year. By 1985, the baptisms-per-missionary rate was 8.08.

By 23 November 1975, there were fifty-one members in

---

**Table 2: Baptisms Per Missionary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Baptisms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 1974 – October 1975</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1975 – October 1976</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1976 – October 1977</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1984 – October 1985</td>
<td>8.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Calculated from baptismal records and reports at the Portugal Lisbon Mission Home.

---

20Historical Record, 31 September-6 October 1975.
Lisbon (recent converts and members who had moved to Portugal), but attendance at sacrament meetings exceeded 130. A few months earlier, missionaries had struggled to find investigators; now they struggled to find enough time to teach those interested. At the end of November, the mission history stated, "The work is growing at an incredible rate. The missionaries are working at an unbelievable speed trying to find time for all of their investigators." Within two years, Mormon missionaries were consistently baptizing more converts in Portugal than in any other European mission of the Church. Six years later in 1981, the Lisbon Portugal Stake was organized with over a thousand members, staffed primarily by recent Portuguese converts. In 1983, A. Theodore Tuttle, the General Authority supervisor for Europe, declared that Portugal is the "key that will open up Europe and help the Church grow in that part of the world."

In 1985, over 50 percent of the membership of the Church in Portugal had previously lived in Africa. Reuben Perry Ficklin, mission president from 1984 to 1987, contrasted the missionaries' success among the retornados with the comparative disinterest of the labor migrants who had returned to Portugal about the same time. "Those that went to Europe lost nothing. They come back, and they still have the same social peers, the same traditions, the same economic base upon which they live their lives. Whereas the Africans lost everything. There is no structure left holding them up. There is no peer group, no tradition, no family pressure to get them to stay in the Catholic Church."

Two case studies show how a disruption of daily life created an environment in which two families accepted Mormonism. These examples are typical of what retornados experienced leaving Africa and then joining the Church. Arnaldo Hernani Teneiro Teles Grilo and his wife Eugênia de Carlos Lopes Grilo

---

21Historical Record, 2-8, 23-29 November 1975.
22As quoted in Harold G. Hillam, "Mensagem do presidente," Caravela, March 1983, 1; photocopy in my possession. The Caravela was the missionaries' monthly newsletter.
were born and raised in Angola. Arnaldo worked first for the Portuguese government and then for a private Portuguese agricultural bank in Angola. He was financially well off, owning several cars and four houses. They did not leave Angola until their bank was attacked. Late at night, they hastily packed a few suitcases and within five hours were on a flight to Portugal. The government lodged them temporarily in a hotel. They sent their three children north to relatives in Coimbra and Chaves, while Arnaldo attempted to obtain another position with his bank. It took him almost a year to find work and reunite the family in a small apartment.

At this point, they met the missionaries. Eugénia commented: “I had the sensation I had died materially. I had died. We had to begin at the complete bottom once again. . . . When we arrived in Portugal we had nothing. We didn’t even own a bed, we had absolutely nothing.” She turned to her faith in God and it “did not allow me to remain angry or depressed. I prayed every day for Him to help us.” The separation from her children focused her mind on the important things of life. When the family was finally reunited, “I vividly remember the joy of my children when we were able to get back together. They would say to me: ‘Don’t worry Mom. We will make it.’ The joy of being together was incredible. The life we had in Angola was good and we were happy, but here we have a much greater purpose in life and now we have a greater joy.” A crucial moment came “one day in February [when] I prayed very hard to the Lord and said I wanted to understand my new life and dedicate my life to serving him. It was because of this that when the missionaries knocked on our door we could accept the gospel. . . . It appeared that we were prepared to accept the Church.”

Arnaldo shared the same view: “We lost everything we owned in Angola but got the Church of Jesus Christ. I have an impression that it was not only us, but that a large percentage of the members of the Church here in Portugal are Angolan and Mozambiquen and that the reason all this happened was so that they could accept the gospel.”

---

24 Arnaldo Hernani Teneiro Teles Grilo and Eugénia da Carlos Lopes Teles
A second example is that of Francisco Saraiva dos Santos. Born in Portugal, he immigrated to Africa as a teenager. After twenty years in Angola, he owned a hotel, was building a second, and had a large sum of money in the bank. He took his family to Portugal in November 1975 for safety. He was planning to return, but the government refused to let him, so he stayed at the home of relatives in a small interior town. He left his family to work at a pet shop in Coimbra; but when the job didn’t materialize, he began baking small pastries in his home and selling them to shops, markets, and street vendors. His wife also worked; between them, they earned barely enough to support themselves. Francisco was angry with the Portuguese government and blamed them for his problems.

At this point, they met the missionaries. Though he had never been interested in religion, the missionaries interested him in their message. He and his wife were baptized in January 1977. Though the Church did not offer material assistance, Francisco felt that “it was because I accepted the Church that I gained the necessary strength to begin living again, not in a monetary sense, but spiritually. I became enriched and there [Angola] I had nothing. It was this fact that helped me in my life.” His hatred toward the government dissolved. “I stopped being a violent person. I became patient and learned to accept things the way they were.” From concentrating on making money, he “tried to learn how to appreciate life. I was able to overcome most of my difficulties.”

CONCLUSION

Shifts from traditional to alternative religions have received considerable attention over the past twenty years. In most cases, scholars agree, disruption in personal life or mind set creates an environment in which accepting a new religion with unique or unusual ideas becomes more possible. If the disruption is signifi-


cant and an alternative is attractive and available, then the possibility for religious change is enhanced.

The dramatic and disruptive decolonization of Portuguese Africa was of such magnitude that those whites leaving Africa were susceptible to religious change. As a consequence, in the 1970s and early 1980s, alternative religions such as the Mormon Church experienced considerable success in Europe's most tradition-bound country.

I am not suggesting that the source of converts came totally from Africa, because many non-retornados joined the Church at the same time. In fact, the number of retornados joining the Church at present is low. Nor do I suggest that these conversions were any less sincere or less spiritual because those involved were experiencing difficult times. The case of LDS converts, however, does show that traumatic events frequently make investigators more open to the gospel.

The experience of the LDS Church in Portugal is not unlike that of other European countries. French fleeing from Algeria at their independence in the early 1960s joined the LDS Church in significant numbers. Immigrants from Africa and the Middle East form significant parts of congregations in most countries of Europe. Understanding how new religions grow in the face of economic and social disruptions is important in understanding the growth and development of Mormon congregations throughout the world.

The LDS Church in Portugal has continued to experience above-average growth, although the rate of retorno baptisms has decreased. Portugal currently has three missions, five stakes, and over thirty-five thousand members, and Portuguese youth form the core of the missionary force. Nor is the Portugal story over. The economic and political strains in Angola and Mozambique have prompted a significant migration into Portugal of black Africans, some of whom are joining the LDS Church in much the same way that white Africans did fifteen years ago.

There has been little written about this aspect of the history of Church growth in Europe. For some general observations, see Bruce A. Van Orden, "More Nations Than One": A Global History of the LDS Church (forthcoming).
“Are You That Damned Presbyterian Devil?”
The Evolution of an Anti-Mormon Story

R. Douglas Brackenridge

The story of Brigham Young, salty Mormon prophet, threatening Duncan J. McMillan, intrepid Presbyterian missionary, in Mount Pleasant, Utah, in 1875, has become a colorful and widely known anecdote that has evoked sustained attention from Mormon and Presbyterian writers. Nearing the end of his career as Church president, Young unleashed a stinging verbal attack on “sectarian” education and on McMillan, a twenty-nine-year-old Presbyterian clergyman who had recently opened a day school for Mormon children. It was not the first blast from disapproving Mormons that McMillan had withstood; he himself would provide the basis for numerous anti-Mormon tales with his accounts, including two of the most colorful incidents. One involved the alleged query of Canute Peterson, LDS bishop in Ephraim, Utah: “Are you that damned Presbyterian Devil who is preaching in Mount Pleasant?” A second described McMillan subduing a hos-
tile Mormon audience by preaching with a Bible in one hand and a revolver in the other.¹

Embellished, expanded, and exported by the popular press, the McMillan-Young stories augmented portrayals of Utah Saints as hostile, rapacious, and bloodthirsty reprobates, a people who persecuted “outsiders” venturing into Mormon territory. Protestant historians of the time described Mormon intimidation of evangelists and teachers including death threats, physical abuse, and the defacement and destruction of church property.² Mormon apologists countered with assaults on the character of Protestant missionaries, arguing that they exaggerated conditions in Utah in order to solicit financial support from eastern audiences. The Mormons’ impassioned responses to McMillan’s alleged “tall tales” particularly heightened the public images of Mormons as reclusive and “un-American.”³ Even in recent years, Mormon and Protestant historians have cited McMillan’s experiences in describing relationships in pre-statehood Utah.⁴

Since most anti-Mormon stories originated as oral tradition and then circulated in a complex matrix of undocumented sources, verification of any one event is difficult, if not impossible.

¹Hans P. Freece, “Dividends from Utah,” Presbyterian Magazine, October 1931, 556-57. It was originally published in tract form as “Are You That Damned Presbyterian Devil?” but was retitled for readers of the denominational magazine.


Numerous published versions of refutation and defense of the McMillan-Young episode, however, permit one to analyze the effect of transmission as episodes acquired detail and specificity. The literary evolution of this particular cluster of stories provides a paradigm for examining the wider genre of anti-Mormon literature. Exaggeration, hyperbole, noncontextual citation, and coloring of facts was common practice in heated Mormon-Protestant journalistic exchanges. Even people of high moral character could rationalize overstating the factual evidence or omitting pertinent information for a worthy cause. Such behavior, incidentally, was not limited solely to Mormons and Presbyterians.

THE SETTING

Hampered by a lingering bronchial condition, Duncan James McMillan left his family home in Illinois in February 1874, searching for a moderate climate and an opportunity to test his evangelistic skills as a home missionary. Although only in his late twenties, McMillan already had considerable vocational experience—Civil War veteran, farmer, schoolteacher, and Presbyterian minister. In Denver he met Sheldon Jackson, superintendent of Presbyterian Home Missions in the western states and territories, with whom he had corresponded regarding positions in New Mexico, Montana, and Utah. Preferring Utah's milder weather, he traveled by rail to Salt Lake City, arriving in time for the inaugural session of the Presbytery of Utah on 1 March 1875. Although Jackson urged him to organize a new church in nearby Ogden, a railroad center with a growing Gentile population, McMillan opted for southern Utah, where no Protestant missionary had ever attempted a permanent ministry. Despite warnings of bloodthirsty Danites and primitive living conditions, he selected Mount Pleasant, Sanpete County, where some disaffected Scandinavians reportedly had banded together and constructed

a small meeting house. Using these apostates as a nucleus, McMillan intended to organize a Presbyterian Church and rescue the Mormons from priestly superstitions.⁶

After an arduous trip by rail, stagecoach, and mail wagon, during which McMillan described passing "beyond the limits of evangelical Christianity" into unexplored missionary territory, he arrived in Mount Pleasant on 3 March 1875.⁷ Finding no hotels or boarding houses, McMillan secured temporary lodging with a friendly postmaster, who offered him free use of a back room and introduced him to most of the leading citizens. After several rebuffs from wary residents, he later arranged temporary room and board in a Mormon household.⁸

Although clearly an oddity in Mount Pleasant, McMillan acknowledged to his family in Illinois that he had no fears about personal safety. Despite theological and cultural differences, Mormon Church authorities and townspeople with few exceptions treated him with cordiality and respect, although somewhat puzzled at why a Protestant clergyman would consider their remote village a prime missionary objective.⁹ Attending his first Mormon service, McMillan heard the bishop warn about "outsiders" and their spurious theology but also urged members to listen critically to what newcomers in their midst had to say. "All that even the gentiles bring that is good, let us receive," he said, "but let us be careful to sift out the bad."¹⁰ In an unsolicited courtesy, Bishop W. S. Seeley¹¹ invited McMillan to speak at several Mormon Sunday

⁸Ibid., 27; Duncan J. McMillan, letter to Sheldon Jackson, 16 August 1875, Sheldon Jackson Correspondence, Presbyterian Historical Society Archives, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (hereafter cited as Jackson Correspondence).
⁹McMillan's only overt opposition came from Patriarch Zebedee Coltrin who warned people to avoid contact with the Presbyterian "heretic." See Duncan J. McMillan, "Early Beginnings of Wasatch," typescript, n.d., 5-6, McMillan folder, Wasatch Academy Archives, Mount Pleasant, Utah.
¹¹William Stewart Seeley, first bishop of Mount Pleasant, served for about thirty years. Andrew Jenson, Latter-day Saint Biographical Encyclopedia, 4 vols.
evening meetings and even placed the meetinghouse at his disposal for Protestant services. Mormons listened politely to his sermons, which were brief, nonpolemical homilies on basic Christian doctrines. “Even the Bishop,” McMillan acknowledged, “thanked me for the sermon.”

McMillan soon became convinced that traditional evangelistic preaching would have little impact on Mormon adults whom he deemed “infidels” and “priest ridden serfs.” The wedge for evangelism should be quality education, through which McMillan would reach children and, through them, their parents. This approach had a practical side, since no free public school system existed in Utah and most small-town schools were understaffed and ill equipped. Former and lapsed Mormons were especially anxious to have McMillan open an alternative school and offered to sell their newly constructed hall below cost if McMillan would renovate it for educational purposes. Simultaneously signing a promissory note and praying for denominational funding, McMillan began an unsuccessful quest for qualified teachers willing to accept low wages and poor working conditions. Frustrated in these efforts, he reluctantly assumed the position of schoolmaster. A last-minute decision by local trustees not to lend him benches from an unoccupied ward schoolhouse forced a temporary delay, but McMillan borrowed hand tools and carved benches from rough lumber. Encouraged by a public endorsement from Bishop Seeley, McMillan commenced classes on 19 April 1875 with thirty-five students, marking the beginning of what later became the present-day Wasatch Academy.


15Duncan J. McMillan, Letter to Sheldon Jackson, 1 May 1875, Jackson Correspondence.

16Reported in Synod of Utah, Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., Minutes, 12 October 1901, Presbyterian Historical Society Archives. Since 1972, Wasatch
McMillan's school quickly proved to be popular. Even Mount Pleasant's mayor attended classes, boasting that the school was the best in the entire Sanpete valley. Considering the poor quality of local schools, McMillan made light of the mayor's remarks but indicated to Jackson that "it is a powerful lever for me to work with." By early summer enrollment had reached 109, with additional students clamoring for seats. A Sunday school, distinct from the day school, attracted fewer children. Nevertheless, McMillan's experimental ministry deep in Mormon territory appeared to be off to an exceptionally successful start.

McMillan's amicable relationship with Mount Pleasant residents came to an abrupt halt following a visit by Brigham Young with an entourage of Church authorities on 22-23 June 1875, an event later represented as life-threatening to McMillan. Young's extended tour of southern Utah was primarily to promote the newly organized United Order and to encourage support for the erection of temples in Salt Lake City, St. George, and Manti. The subject of McMillan's school apparently was an incidental item on Young's agenda, appearing only during the second day of speeches. Nevertheless, his remarks reflected a growing Mormon concern that denominational schools, ostensibly founded for educational purposes, were covertly envisioned as a subtle means of weaning children away from the family faith.

Academy has been an independent, interfaith boarding high school with a family-like atmosphere for meals and study. It enrolls about 125 students and has the reputation of being "an excellent academic preparatory school." James B. Crosby, "Wasatch Academy," Utah History Encyclopedia, edited by Allan Kent Powell (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1994), 619. It is affiliated with the Presbyterian Church (USA) by a covenant (nonlegal) relationship.

17 McMillan, Letter to Jackson, 1 May 1875.
19 For Mormon opposition to denominational schools, see "Morality and Religion in the Schools," Deseret Evening News, 4 March 1879, 2, and "Some Glaring Errors Corrected," ibid. 2 December 1879, 2.
The earliest account of Young’s address comes from a clerk’s on-site notes taken in Mount Pleasant. While not a verbatim transcript, they confirm Young’s hostility to “sectarian” education. On 23 June, according to minutes kept by an unidentified clerk, Young said:

I understand you are sending your children to a gentleman to some one here not in the Church, did you not have the religious bodies of the world when you were in the world to send your children to? What have you gathered out for? . . . I wish to counsel you to take some of your own families here and send your children to them to be taught that Joseph Smith was a prophet, not to Gentiles who always without exception teach that Brigham Young and the Apostles are not necessary. Though they are honest in teaching this & have a right to, we also have a right to keep away from their schools & meetings. . . . Take your children to some one who is full of the gospel and cast away your hypocrisy and be at peace, and in union, not as the pretended christians who contend and fight for their attainments. The Christianity of the world in its endeavors to evangelize the world is a failure, do we want it here and to be fooling with it when we have the truth. you want your children to be brought up in the path they should follow not alienated from the truth, and going astray into ways of wickedness.²⁰

²⁰“Mt. Pleasant Meeting, June 23, 1875” typescript, 6, Mount Pleasant Stake, Historical Department Archives of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (hereafter cited as LDS Archives); minutes supplied courtesy Ronald O. Barney, senior archivist. The notes do not name McMillan. Brigham Young, Jr., who accompanied the party, took rough notes of his father’s twenty-minute address: “Sending your children to gentile why did you gather out of babylon. You had all these sects and preachers there. these are what compose babylon. They teach our children Joseph Smith was no prophet. War between North & South was a religious war. Give your children good teachers least you bring sorrow to your hearts.” Brigham Young, Jr., Diary, 23 June 1875, (MS 1236, Box 2, folder 6). He later edited these notes into a shorter but more polished version: “Stop sending children to gentile schools. We came here to gather out of babylon. Modern christians [are] what compose babylon. They teach our children Joseph Smith was no prophet. War between North & South was a religious war. Give your children good teachers least you bring sorrow to your hearts” (MS 1236, Box
Less than two weeks later, McMillan wrote his account of this event to Sheldon Jackson. He relates how the Mormon president began by calling him “a wolf in sheep’s clothing, a serpent that charms only to devour” and warned townspeople to have nothing to do with him and to take their children out of school. Failure to take such action would inevitably lead to dire consequences. “This gentile devil,” he quotes Young, “will send sorrow and distress into many a mother’s heart, will bring irreparable disgrace and ruin upon your daughters.” McMillan claims Young chastised local Church authorities for allowing him to beguile people with promises of free education. “Why, what could you have been dreaming about? . . . Don’t you know that all gentile ministers are libertines and sodomites? Beecher, you know, is one of the best and purest among all of them and yet he keeps 28 mistresses. This man whom you have received in your midst and who is gaining the hearts of your children is, without the shadow of a doubt, of the same stripe.”

The obvious differences between the clerk’s account and McMillan’s account can be easily accounted for by the difference in emphases of the two men. The clerk would be focused on capturing the main points of his leader’s message, of which he no doubt approved, while McMillan would be sensitive to any message that might apply to him personally or which might impact on the success of his mission. It is important to note that, although offended by Young’s vitriolic language and attack on his character, McMillan did not accuse him of uttering any death threats. “The only thing that smelt very strongly of blood,” he added to Jackson, “was a speech made by Young’s son, Brigham Young, Jr.,” which McMillan dismissed as typical “Mormon rhetoric.”

According to the clerk who recorded Brigham Young, Sr.’s, speech, Brigham Young, Jr., had said: “I was surprised to learn

---

2, folder 5). Also accompanying the party were Franklin D. Richards, who did not give summaries of the addresses, and Erastus Snow, who has no journals for the period. Ronald O. Barney, Letter to R. Douglas Brackenridge, 17 April 1992.

that you have a Gentile school teacher, related how a Gentile in the north began to teach and the first thing he did was to say to the students, 'that I would open the school by prayer if I knew who to pray to.' expressed his preference to an infidel rather than a so called believer in Christianity. spoke with warmth respecting the influence the gentiles [the words “and apostates” follow but are lined through] teachers were trying to exercise over the young people to lead them astray, caring nothing for the older portion of the community."22

As with Brigham Young, Sr.’s, speech, both the clerk and McMillan were listening for different messages and recorded them differently. According to McMillan, Brigham Young, Jr., denounced McMillan’s motives and methods at length, then concluded: “We have a fraternity of such men in the northern part of the Territory. They live principally upon beef stolen from the Saints and I tell you the bullets are molded for their benefit, to be used at the proper time. San Pete look to your interests.” Following the public speeches, Mormon authorities held closed sessions with Mount Pleasant women where, according to McMillan, “most scandalous things were said about me,” and pledges to withdraw children from the day school were circulated for signatures.23

In the 3 July letter, McMillan complained that Church authorities were using “every means but physical to break up my school.”24 In fact, McMillan seemed mainly preoccupied with finances rather than physical safety. Despite threats of excommunication or disfellowshipment for parents who failed to withdraw their children from the Presbyterian school, however, only twenty-five departed, leaving an enrollment of ninety-four. McMillan remained optimistic. “I don’t believe it is possible for them to

22Mount Pleasant Meeting, June 23, 1875, 2 p.m. meeting, typescript, 11, Mount Pleasant Stake, LDS Church Archives.

23Jackson, Scrapbook, 6:151.

24An earlier letter described several occasions when youthful village “rowdies” pelted his living quarters with stones during late evening hours. McMillan deemed these to be isolated incidents, “annoying” rather than life-threatening. McMillan, Letter to Sheldon Jackson, 1 May 1875, Jackson Correspondence.
shake my hold upon the children. They may keep many away from me, but they cannot root out what has been planted in their hearts.” He contemplated a long ministry in Mount Pleasant, if the Board of Home Missions would cover mortgage payments on his schoolhouse and hire a female teacher. 25 These are hardly the concerns of a man fearing for his life.

McMillan’s narrative is generally substantiated by other eyewitnesses. Under the pseudonym “Traveler,” a Gentile who had heard Young speak summarized his assault on McMillan: “He declared him a violent, godless man, worse than an infidel; teaching sedition, infidelity, spiritualism and free-love, and he warned his people that unless they kept away from his meetings and withdrew their children from his school, sorrow and calamity would fall upon them and the pestilence would waste them at midday.” 26 A local Mormon apostate, A. O. Nyborg, later confirmed that Young had indeed warned Mormons not to attend the Presbyterian school and had made derogatory remarks about McMillan’s personal character but noted that “no threats were made or conspiracy formed against him, save what originated in his imagination.” 27

Whatever Young said in Mount Pleasant, either publicly or privately, he failed to dissuade residents from sending their children to McMillan’s school. After a summer recess spent touring the Sanpete Valley looking for prospective school and church sites, McMillan reopened the day school in September 1875. Enrollment soared to 150 students, and a reorganized Sunday school boasted 119 pupils. 28 With a grant from the Board of Home Missions, McMillan employed Delia Snow, a Mormon

25 McMillan, Letter to Sheldon Jackson, 3 July 1875.

26 Traveler (pseud.), “The Priesthood in San Pete,” Salt Lake Tribune, 3 July 1875, 4. Later accounts stressed Young’s coarse language and efforts to influence people from supporting the school but mention no death threats. See also “The Morality of Mormonism,” ibid., 16 July 1878, 2; and “Successful Missionary Work,” ibid., 21 March 1879, 2.


28 “A Dangerous Heretic,” Salt Lake Tribune, 29 November 1877, 2.
who shortly converted to Presbyterianism, to teach in both schools.29 Despite renewed opposition by Church authorities early in 1876 that resulted in another exodus of day school students, enrollment stabilized at about eighty pupils and then gradually increased.30 By December, McMillan reported to Jackson that "All the machinery is in gear, oiled and running there [Mount Pleasant] now, the priests are whipped and with their caudal extremities dropped, their fierce barking has given place to a melancholy growl."31

THE INITIAL SECONDARY ACCOUNT

McMillan's thriving schools and improving physical health confirmed his initial reaction that Brigham Young's visit would not seriously impede school work in Mount Pleasant. Finances, however, continued to be a nagging problem. On several occasions McMillan complained to Jackson about meager denominational support and inadequate publicity for his innovative educational ministry.32 In an effort to marshal support, Jackson wrote an article entitled "Persecutions on a Home Mission Field," which appeared in the April 1876 issue of the Rocky Mountain Presbyterian. With this narrative, McMillan's encounter with Brigham Young began its literary transformation.33

Jackson's article adhered closely to McMillan's letter of 3 July 1875 but contained additional narrative apparently obtained from McMillan along with his own editorial comments. Acknowledging

29Duncan J. McMillan, Letter to Sheldon Jackson, 19 December 1876, Jackson Correspondence.

30"Mission Life in Utah," Salt Lake Tribune, 23 April 1876, 2; "Mount Pleasant—Rolling Forward the Kingdom of Brigham," ibid., 26 May 1876, 4; and "School Work," ibid., 12 January 1878, 2.

31Duncan J. McMillan, Letters to Sheldon Jackson, 6 December 1876 and 8 January 1877, Jackson Correspondence.

32Duncan J. McMillan, Letters to Sheldon Jackson, 13 November 1876 and 22 April 1880, Jackson Correspondence.

33Sheldon Jackson, "Persecutions on a Home Mission Field," Rocky Mountain Presbyterian (April 1876): 2. Jackson's narrative was still being reproduced without citation as late as 1901. See Presbyterian Missions in Utah (Philadelphia: Woman's Board of Home Missions, 1901), 4-6.
that Mount Pleasant Church authorities initially welcomed McMillan, invited him to speak in their assemblies, and encouraged him to open a school, Jackson interpreted these gestures as “the first step of Mormon tactics” to “overwhelm a stranger with kindness, hoping thereby to make him a convert to the faith.” Next, they turned to persecution. Brigham Young’s speech was expanded to include this directive: “I command you to withdraw all patronage from him, and drive him from your midst, or you will go to hell. I speak the words of Jehovah, and you must obey the words of Jehovah.” His son’s veiled threat is repeated almost verbatim. To the account of the women’s meeting, however, is appended a notation that Mormon women signed the petition “under fear and compulsion,” a condition McMillan did not mention in his original letter.34

A new feature became the “persecutions” that McMillan faced in the aftermath of Young’s visit. According to Jackson’s account, forty (not twenty-five) students were immediately withdrawn from the day school, the Sunday school closed due to lack of students, and one fanatical Mormon father, finding that his children were secretly attending Sunday school, “told them that if they persisted in attending that school, he would be compelled to kill them in order to save their souls.” Nor is this all! Mormons avoid McMillan in public but try to lure him into temptation. One evening, related Jackson, McMillan was invited to an oyster supper. Several young men pressed him to drink wine or whiskey, which he politely declined. “At a concerted signal, two or three attempted to seize him, and force it down his throat; but he showing fight, the attempt was given up.” On other occasions, “the church” directed attractive young women to seduce McMillan under the pretense of receiving assistance in their studies. A tantalizingly brief description of an attempt on his life also became permanently attached to the story: “One night, hearing a rustling of the window-curtain, he found a masked man getting into his

34Jackson, “Persecutions on a Home Mission Field,” 2. Jackson and McMillan corresponded frequently and met occasionally in Utah and other locations. Unfortunately, not all of McMillan’s letters have been preserved, so it is impossible to trace all the information in Jackson’s article directly to McMillan.
Thrusting his revolver into the assassin’s face, he quickly fled.\textsuperscript{35}

Most important for future anti-Mormon extrapolations, however, was Jackson’s inclusion of yet another plot to silence McMillan, which he connected to the previous incidents only by a short transitional sentence, “Again and again has he been warned of his life.” With no clear chronological context (except having been consequent to Young’s visit), Jackson related how McMillan’s attempt to preach “in a certain city” was threatened by “a portion of the audience evidently intent on mischief.” Rejecting friendly advice to leave town immediately, McMillan proceeded to his preaching engagement bearing both a gun and a Bible. “Carrying his life in his hands, he goes thoroughly armed, even carrying his weapons into the pulpit—like Cromwell, ‘trusting in Providence, and keeping his powder dry.’” He then “read the scriptures, poured out his soul in prayer, and preached such a loving gospel that enmity for the time being was disarmed.”\textsuperscript{36} This confrontation became the most sensational and controversial addition to the literary tradition surrounding Young’s Mount Pleasant visitation.

Newspaper editors throughout the country avidly reproduced Jackson’s colorful account of McMillan’s persecution, thus reinforcing popular images of hostile Mormons. The Salt Lake Tribune, Rocky Mountain Christian Advocate, and New York Evangelist, for example, copied the article, supplementing it with sympathetic editorial comment. Even Harper’s Weekly found McMillan’s struggles newsworthy. Commenting that “a preacher going armed into the pulpit is an unusual style for the United States,” the editor concluded: “This is true courage; but is it not time that the laws of the United States were enforced in Utah?”\textsuperscript{37} The Herald and Presbyter observed that McMillan’s hardships “would seem incredible did we not know that Brigham Young and his followers are terribly bitter against

\textsuperscript{35}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{36}Ibid.

anything calculated to bring that people to a knowledge of the Truth" and ended with a plea for donations to the Presbyterian Board of Home Missions.  

SUBSEQUENT ACCOUNTS

Following Sheldon Jackson’s article in 1876, the retelling of the McMillan-Young story over time resulted in three major narrative transformations: First, Brigham Young, Sr.’s, speech became more inflammatory, with remarks originally attributed to his son affixed to the father. Second, the masked intruder episode acquired more detail and was linked directly to Young’s Mount Pleasant oration. Third, the Bible-and-revolver incident was dramatically heightened, both in narrative detail and in the level of overt confrontation between McMillan and his audience. Other incidents of Mormon harassment, not mentioned in Jackson’s account, appeared later as textual variants in a number of secondary sources. Chronological, geographical, and narrative modifications also emerged over a period of time. Some changes appear to be the creations of anti-Mormon newspaper editors or friends of McMillan. Other modifications can be traced to McMillan himself, although in many instances it is impossible to discern the precise origin of any specific quotation.

Brigham Young’s Speech

As the major protagonist, Brigham Young, Sr., figured prominently in every retelling of the narrative, so dominating the episode that other participants virtually disappeared. Remarks by various speakers were attributed to the Mormon president, and Brigham Young, Jr.’s, allusion to bullets and cattle thieves was transferred to his father’s lips and transmogrified into an explicit death threat. As early as 1879, a Salt Lake

---


39Jackson Scrapbook, 6:115.
Tribune editorial quotes Brigham Young, Sr., as having publicly urged his audience to kill the “corrupt outsider” (McMillan) who had recently come into their midst. “If a wolf should get among your sheep and begin to ravage and destroy, what would you do?” queried Young. Some in the audience shouted “Kill him!” Responding, Young said, “That would be his fate. And as the safety of the soul is so much more important than the safety of your property, it is your duty to use increased vigilance in guarding that.”

Young’s “death threat” modification engendered national attention in 1881 in a featured article in Harper’s New Monthly Magazine written by C. C. Goodwin, editor of the Salt Lake Tribune and perennial Mormon adversary. As one illustration of Mormon authoritarianism and callous treatment of “outsiders,” Goodwin described Brigham Young’s speech in Mount Pleasant:

Brigham Young and his nearest counselors repaired to San Pete, and before a full congregation on the Sabbath day Young instructed his hearers to kill the offending minister. George Q. Cannon . . . sat by and heard Young’s order, as did also the Rev. Mr. McMillan, against whom the order was directed, and who, despite three attempts upon his life, still lives and continues to teach and preach in San Pete.

Goodwin’s article evoked an immediate response from Mormon authorities who had previously dismissed such allegations as gross exaggerations or outright lies. Now they produced affidavits from Sanpete residents attesting to McMillan’s fair treatment and denying all charges of death threats and public displays.

42Mormons frequently argued that McMillan’s story was simply a rehash of one told by Methodist minister C. P. Lyford, who claimed that his life had been threatened while serving in Provo. See “Poor Creatures,” Deseret Evening News, 27 May 1879, 2; “Fathering Falsehoods,” ibid., 12 September 1881, 2; and “McMillan’s Munchausenisms,” ibid., 2 February 1884, 2.
of weapons. A sharp exchange of editorials appeared in the *Salt Lake Tribune* and the *Deseret Evening News*, with Goodwin and Charles W. Penrose trading verbal epithets. Young's bitter speech, proclaimed Goodwin, revealed the prophet's true nature. "He was a murderer at heart, a beast in daily practice, and his words were a mingling of blasphemy and filth." Goodwin countered Mormon testimonies by repeating a more detailed variation of Young's "wolf in sheep's clothing" speech that he had quoted in July 1879, purportedly from McMillan:

> He is a wolf in sheep's clothing. What would you do were a wolf to enter the field where your sheep are? Why you would shoot him down. Kill him on the spot. In as much as souls are more precious than sheep, it becomes you to be correspondingly more diligent in ridding yourselves of this intruder. I need not tell the Saints how this is to be done. They know well enough. Then with hands uplifted, he said, "You must obey me the same as though Jehovah had spoken, for my voice is the voice of Jehovah." 

**The Masked Intruder**

Anti-Mormon writers also used Sheldon Jackson's "masked intruder" story as evidence of Brigham Young's dictatorial power. Jackson's article provides no precise time frame, but later versions place the assassination attempt the night after Young's speech or shortly thereafter, and the story becomes

43Charles W. Penrose, "Fathering Falsehoods," *Deseret Evening News*, 12 September 1881, 2; "The Mormon Situation," 22 September 1881, 2; "Harper's Magazine and the 'Mormons,'" 24 December 1881, 1; and "Another Affidavit in the McMillan Case," 31 December 1881, (supplement), 1. The affidavit, signed by Canute Peterson, Henry Beal, Anthon H. Lund, C. C. Dorius (Mormons), and by Christian A. Larson (Postmaster and non-Mormon), affirms that they attended the meeting in Ephraim and "saw no weapon in his hand nor lying by his side as a defense against threatened danger, nor do we believe that threats against or attempts upon his life were ever made in this city."

44C. C. Goodwin, "Brigham Young and His Teachings," *Salt Lake Tribune*, 18 March 1881, 2.

encrusted with graphic details. It is about midnight, the witching hour, when the would-be assailant stealthily raises a window in McMillan's bedroom. Sleeping with a revolver under his pillow, McMillan awakens, thrusts the revolver directly into the man's face, and tells him "to git." Startled, the visitor scuttles away into the darkness. In a variant account, the intruder manages to get at least one foot inside the room. Following a scuffle, McMillan fends off his adversary who now reportedly brandishes a revolver.

Other variants conjoined several contemplated or unsuccessful attacks on McMillan either on the same or following night after Young's speech. Mormon women, impressed by Young's words, allegedly plotted to take McMillan's life, with the argument that no one would suspect women. One woman reportedly said, "Well, sisters, if you catch him and hold him, I'll cut his throat.

Several sources described how McMillan survived menacing Mormon mobs that surrounded his house. One account told how a taunting mob of young men unleashed "volley after volley of stones, the marks of which remain there still [1881]." In another narrative, McMillan retreats to a back room in the school house, securely bolts the door, and waits for the inevitable attack. "Along about midnight he heard a commotion immediately outside his door and a voice demanded him to open the door. He paid no heed, so a furious pounding arose. The door was a very thick one, and finding their efforts in vain to get in, the attackers withdrew, but not without shouting a threat that he had better leave town

---

46 Duncan J. McMillan, "Pulpit and Revolver," *Salt Lake Tribune*, 22 June 1879, 4, places the event "near the end of my first term of school," which would be subsequent to Young's visit but not during or immediately following it.

47 Wasatch Academy Archives, McMillan folder, no author, no date. This account also appears in McMillan's "Pulpit and Revolver," 4.

48 "The Work of Mission Schools," *Salt Lake Tribune*, 20 May 1879, 2; Goodwin, "Brigham Young and His Teachings."

49 Untitled and anonymous typescript, n.d., McMillan folder, Wasatch Academy Archives.

50 Goodwin, "Brigham Young and His Teachings." Compare Duncan J. McMillan, Letter to Sheldon Jackson, 1 May 1875, Jackson Correspondence.
and they would get him anyway." According to this writer, only twenty-four-hour vigils by protective apostates saved McMillan from the deadly hands of a Mormon mob.

The intruder story was also presented in a context unrelated to Young’s visit. One of McMillan’s colleagues, George Gallagher, informed eastern audiences in 1879 that the attack occurred on McMillan’s very first night in Mount Pleasant. According to Gallagher, “McMillan grabbed him [the intruder] by the hair and placing a revolver to his brain induced him to beat a quick retreat.” Gallagher also identified the assailant (now sans mask) as “a valiant member of the church militant, and now, when that cowardly assassin sees his intended victim coming, he slopes to the other side of the street.”

The Bible and Revolver Story

No episode associated with McMillan captured the imagination of nineteenth-century Americans more than his dramatic defense of religious freedom with a Bible and a revolver. Sheldon Jackson’s article in the Rocky Mountain Presbyterian specified only that McMillan entered the pulpit “in a certain city fully armed.” It claimed no public display of weaponry nor did it identify anyone other than McMillan. McMillan's sermon on love, rather than a display of force, momentarily tames Mormon aggression. However, from this enigmatic encounter gradually developed a colorful tale complete with location, names, and conversations.

In transmitting the story, some writers linked it to President Young’s speech and located it in Mount Pleasant even

---

51 Wasatch Academy Archives, McMillan folder, no author, no date.
52 “The Work of Mission Schools,” Salt Lake Tribune. A later version has “secret sympathizers” advising McMillan to “flee forthwith under the cover of night” to avoid his fanatical enemies. “Indeed, that same sleepless night he detected a would-be assassin stealthily attempting to enter his room.” See Freece, “Dividends From Utah,” 557. For a Mormon response, see “A Sample Presbyterian Bait,” Deseret Evening News, 13 June 1879, 2.
53 An early account embellishes Jackson’s narrative by stating that McMillan proclaimed prior to his pulpit presentation, “I always carry half a pound of lead with me, and can pull a trigger as quickly as the next man.” C. C. Goodwin, “Governor Murray Welcomed,” Salt Lake Tribune, 4 March 1880, 2.
though Jackson's article indicated otherwise. This evoked a flurry of denials from local residents and caused McMillan to issue a carefully worded clarification in the *Salt Lake Tribune*, one of the few times that he ever responded publicly to the controversial story. Affirming that the incident occurred in nearby Ephraim, "a noted hotbed of Mormon conservatism," McMillan praised Mount Pleasant residents for their hospitality and acceptance of his ministry.\(^{54}\) Despite this denial, the "Bible and revolver" story continued to circulate with a Mount Pleasant setting and evoked negative responses from residents who blamed McMillan for perpetuating a scandalous story that he knew to be untrue.\(^{55}\)

Timing as well as location varied from source to source. Jackson placed the confrontation after Young's visit to Mount Pleasant as do the majority of secondary sources. However, a letter from McMillan to Jackson confirms that the Ephraim incident occurred three months before Young's Sanpete visit.\(^{56}\) One account sets the dramatic event on McMillan's first night in Mount Pleasant rather than months after he had settled in the Sanpete Valley. "His first sermon [in Mount Pleasant] was delivered with a loaded pistol laid across the open Bible, for there were ten men in the place who had vowed to kill him."\(^{57}\)

\(^{54}\)"Pulpit and Revolver, The Rev. McMillan Explains How It Didn't Happen," *Salt Lake Tribune*, 22 June 1879, 4, and "The McMillan Affair," ibid., 21 March 1880, 3. McMillan later acknowledged "most gratefully the unfailing kindness of all the people of Mt. Pleasant... they were always personally kind and were most courteous in their treatment of me, so that I have most pleasant recollections for all who live there." Duncan J. McMillan, Letter to Mrs. H. F. Wall, n.d., McMillan folder, Wasatch Academy Archives.


\(^{56}\)Duncan J. McMillan, Letter to Sheldon Jackson, 31 March 1875, Jackson Correspondence. Referring to a preaching engagement in Ephraim that day, McMillan says, "It is the hottest Mormon hole in the realm. Bp. warned me not to attempt to preach there. I told him I fought under our flag and could preach wherever it could float; the result you shall soon hear."

\(^{57}\)George Gallagher, one of McMillan's ministerial colleagues, quoted in "The
audience also changes, first being "an undetermined number bent on mischief," then "ten men bent on killing" McMillan, and finally a "mob." After an interview with McMillan in 1879, the editor of the Chicago Interior reported that McMillan was a "missionary of the true-blue type. . . . When all protection against a mob who had gathered to assail him was refused, he drew his Bible from one pocket and laid it on the stand before him. Then he drew his revolver from another pocket and laid it down by the Bible, and he proceeded unmolested with his sermon."58

Two versions exist of how McMillan became aware of his imminent danger. One tradition, following Jackson’s account, states that McMillan was warned by a “liberal friend,” sometimes identified as an ex-Mormon, sometimes as a “Gentile,” to cancel his preaching engagement and leave town immediately under protective escort.59 Another tradition, supported by McMillan, attributes the warning to an anonymous Mormon bishop or specifically to Bishop Canute Peterson, a well-known Mormon official in the Sanpete Valley. In this context, the warning becomes an explicit death threat, to which McMillan replies that he is “a loyal citizen of the United States” and has “a right to preach wherever the flag of the United States can float.”60

The most disputed detail was McMillan’s display of a revolver. Mormons protested that no clergyman ever had to brandish a weapon to speak freely in a public meetinghouse while Presbyterians asserted that hostile audiences were not uncommon, especially in small towns like Ephraim. One thing is certain: on numerous formal occasions McMillan referred to the Ephraim incident. For example, at the 1877 Presbyterian General Assembly in Chicago, McMillan, in a typical emotionally charged message, pleaded for Utah mission funds. A reporter from the Chi-

---

58 “Church News,” Interior, 10 April 1879, 4.
60 “About Mission Schools,” Salt Lake Tribune, 4 March 1880, 2; “Utah and New Mexico,” 8-9.
Chicago Tribune detailed McMillan's description of "blood atonement," a Mormon doctrine of "cutting a man's throat in order to save his soul," and then related the following story: "On one occasion the speaker was warned by the Bishop that if he valued his neck he should not preach in that town. He asked the Bishop and the Mayor to accompany him on to the platform, but they refused. Finding himself in danger, he went into the pulpit with the sword of the spirit in one hand and a 'swamp-angel' [revolver] in the other, and thus protected, preached his sermon." At this point, commissioners interrupted his speech with sustained applause.

In subsequent public appearances, McMillan included animated renditions of his encounter with militant Mormons. In 1881, for example, the pastor of Denver's Central Presbyterian Church introduced McMillan as "a man who carried the Cross into the camp of the Danites in the face of death, and preached the Gospel of Christ with his hand on his pistol." The Denver Republican summarized McMillan's escape from death as follows: "An adventure was related where the Mormons threatened the speaker at Ephraim, but he talked back and talked shooting. At the meeting which took place, he was advised not to speak, but to plead illness. He asked the Bishop to go on the platform and announce to his friends that he was ready. He was armed and intended if there was trouble during the service to draw his revolver and hold the Bishop as a hostage."

The "Bible and revolver" story surfaced periodically well into the twentieth century as a classic example of Presbyterian struggles with "deluded Mormons." In 1931 Hans P. Freece, one of McMillan's student converts and later an anti-Mormon journalist, recounted a dialogue between Bishop Canute Peterson and McMillan. Fulsome in length and detail, Freece's narrative repre-

---


sents the culmination of a long period of literary development. Here is an extract:

Peterson: “Are you that damned Presbyterian devil who is preaching at Mt. Pleasant?”
McMillan: “I am the Presbyterian minister who is preaching in Mt. Pleasant.”
Peterson: “What do you want here?”
McMillan: “I came here by invitation of some good people.”
Peterson: “Who dared invite you?”
McMillan: “They are respectable gentlemen of good standing.”

McMillan then invited the bishop to hear him speak, assuring him that he would hear nothing unpleasant.

Peterson: “I don’t care what you preach. You can’t preach in Ephraim. If you step on to the platform, you won’t come off alive. I have been a true friend to you in giving you good advice. If you value your neck, do not try to preach.”
McMillan: “I have half a pound of lead here, [exhibits his revolver] and I can pull a trigger as quickly and put the bullet as near to the mark as any man in Ephraim. I’ll be ready for you.”
Peterson: “What can you do against a town of two thousand people?”
McMillan: “Nothing, I am at your mercy, but I will not be the first man to bite the dust. I hope you will be present at the service and I hope you will hear nothing that will be offensive to you.”

And so he preached. “With the Sword of the Spirit in one hand and ‘Swamp Angel’ in the other, he commanded the respect of Brigham Young’s ‘Destroying Angels.’”

While McMillan’s exact role in the expansion of this story remains enigmatic, some observations appear clear. First, in McMillan’s initial accounts his rhetoric is less expansive than later secondary accounts of the same events. At least some textual changes can be attributed to imaginative editors and colleagues. Second, McMillan apparently had a reputation among his peers for dramatizing events to highlight his personal missionary projects. On one occasion, fellow ministers in Salt Lake City confiscated and burned copies of the Rocky Mountain Presbyterian to conceal McMillan’s derogatory description of

63Freece, “Dividends from Utah,” 557.
life in Mount Pleasant which they believed would provide rich fodder for Mormon counterattacks. Josiah Welch, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church in Salt Lake City, warned McMillan to exercise better judgment in future articles.64

McMillan left Utah in 1883 to become a college president in Montana. In 1890 he moved to New York City where he spent the remainder of his career as a denominational administrator and pastor. Thus, despite lingering questions about the details of McMillan's story and sporadic repudiations by Mormon critics, he had fewer contacts with Utah. Improving relationships between Presbyterians and Latter-day Saints following official disavowal of polygamy (1890) and granting of statehood (1896) also diminished interest in the longstanding dispute.65 Old animosities revived at the turn of the century, however, when Presbyterians led crusades to invalidate the elections of Utah Representative B. H. Roberts (successful) and Senator Reed Smoot (unsuccessful) and to lobby for an anti-polygamy amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Polemical exchanges between officers of the Salt Lake Ministerial Association and Mormon spokesmen B. H. Roberts and Charles W. Penrose generated copy for regional and national newspapers. In 1903, McMillan, en route to the Presbyterian General Assembly in Los Angeles, lectured at the Presbyterian Collegiate Institute in Salt Lake City. Reviving the old story, he told his fascinated audience: "I can remember the time in this state when it was hardly safe for any person to admit that he was not a Mormon, and it is not so many years ago, either." Describing how Mormon officials had opposed his efforts to start schools and churches in the Sanpete

64Josiah Welch, Letters to Sheldon Jackson, 3 April, 16 April, and 3 May 1875, Jackson Correspondence. McMillan, "An Appeal to Christian Women," Rocky Mountain Presbyterian (April 1875): 2, described Mount Pleasant residents as "poor, ignorant, deluded, degraded priestridden serfs. The men stand about their customary loafing places with their hands up to their elbows in their pants pockets, their old hats on the backs of their heads and their mouths open, utterly incapable of comprehending an intelligent thought; the women are literally servants of servants, and the children are legion."

Valley, McMillan captivated his audience with a rendition of the Bible and revolver story. In response, Penrose challenged McMillan’s story the same afternoon in an address at the Mormon Tabernacle. McMillan countered in an evening lecture by denouncing Penrose as a biased and unreliable source of information and reaffirming the severity of Mormon opposition to Protestant missionaries.

Three major Salt Lake City newspapers—the *Salt Lake Tribune*, the *Deseret Evening News*, and the *Salt Lake Herald*—featured the Penrose-McMillan exchange. Mormons cited eyewitnesses who contradicted McMillan, some of whom were his former students and now distinguished physicians and educators. Affidavits first published in the 1880s also reappeared in print. Reporters intercepted McMillan at the Southern Pacific Station before he departed for Los Angeles, asking if he had stated that he had preached in Sanpete county “when it was necessary to carry a pistol in one hand and a Bible in the other.” McMillan affirmed, “I made the remark and it is so. They threatened me a great deal more, which I have not time to tell you now.”

Despite accusations and counter-accusations, decades of controversy regarding the veracity of the “Bible and revolver” story appeared to result only in a stalemate of “my word against your word.” Returning from Los Angeles, McMillan broke his journey in Salt Lake City to visit his brother, H. G. McMillan, a

---

68“Says Mormons Made Threats,” *Salt Lake Herald*, 7 May 1903, 8.
70“Says Mormons Made Threats,” 8. Salt Lake City newspapers continued to monitor McMillan’s activities in Los Angeles, especially his anti-Mormon statements: “Presbyterians Are After Apostle Smoot,” *Salt Lake Tribune*, 21 May 1903, 1; “Bitter Foe of the Mormons,” *Salt Lake Herald*, 21 May 1903, 1; and “Mormon Church Must Be Crushed,” *Deseret Evening News*, 26 May 1903, 1.
prominent community businessman. A reporter for the *Salt Lake Herald* again requested McMillan to verify his statement. Trustworthy witnesses, he asserted, both Mormon and non-Mormon, had testified that they had never seen McMillan carry a revolver into the pulpit. Were they lying or simply mistaken? Confronted with this choice, McMillan responded very directly. “That remark is a metaphor. I did not go into the pulpit with a drawn pistol, but I went armed. One of the officials of the Mormon church told me that my life was in danger, and advised me to go armed. I knew that I was in peril, and at the time this friend spoke to me, I had already taken the precaution to provide myself with a pistol. I was determined I would not bite the dust first.”

Following this admission, which he never repudiated, McMillan apparently stopped telling the “Bible and revolver” episode in public addresses: I have found no subsequent retellings of story. Nevertheless, McMillan continued to cite incidents of opposition to early Presbyterian missionaries and to charge Mormon officials with encouraging hostile behavior toward “outsiders.” His actions did not deter others from recycling accounts of the remarkable story. Even subsequent Mormon critics inadvertently sustained the legend by failing to cite McMillan’s admission of “metaphorical” language.

Most good adventure stories survive modification or even refutation. They become so ingrained in the literature that no one, not even their creators, can control their dissemination. Even at McMillan’s death, the story was featured in the *New York Times*. His obituary was accompanied by a photograph in

---

71 “Puts Blame on Brigham Young,” *Salt Lake Herald*, 17 May 1903, 8. See also “Who Was Attacked?” *Deseret Evening News*, 8 June 1903, 4.


73 B. H. Roberts, *A Comprehensive History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints*, 6 vols. (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1930), 6:36-40, Roberts devotes several pages to McMillan. He cites most of the nineteenth-century sources but is apparently unaware of McMillan’s admission that his Bible and pistol story was “metaphorical.”
full military uniform as a Civil War veteran who "had marched with Sherman through Georgia." It also noted that McMillan had travelled "to the heart of Mormon Utah, where no missionary had ever ventured, and where he often preached with his pistol on the pulpit." The one-time "metaphorical" event had become both memorialized as a frequent occurrence and, apparently, immortal.

The Mormon Relief Society and the International Women's Year

Martha Sonntag Bradley

INTRODUCTION

It is an advantage to most histories that distance allows events to be viewed with something like objectivity and analyzed with the inevitable advantages and clarities of hindsight. This essay is different. I lived through this history, and it transformed my life. Most of this essay's readers have also experienced these events. Therefore, I have taken the step, unusual in most historical papers, of documenting my participation and labeling my perspectives. On the basis of lengthy research, careful analysis, and prolonged reflection on my own experience, I feel that the IWY conference in Utah was, in many ways, a trauma from which women are still recovering. Almost a generation has passed, yet feminism is still a mistrusted term. The reader's experiences are equally valid to him or her. Shared research and analysis will, I believe, enrich the meanings we assign to those experiences. I
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have made every effort to be both fair and honest in my research and evaluations. To do less would trivialize my own experience; still, my conclusions may be disquieting to some. I do not apologize for that.

The historical event under examination occurred on 24-25 June 1977, the two-day International Women's Year Conference at the Salt Palace in Salt Lake City. In the fifteen years that have passed, I have heard many women in public forums or in private discussions refer to the IWY as a sort of a watershed in their lives. Underscoring its personal significance is its political and historical significance. I believe that it is, to date, the single most significant and most troubling event in Utah women's history.

The polarity, controversy, and emotion of Utah's International Women's Year Conference emerged directly from the battle of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints against the Equal Rights Amendment. In what began as a movement and turned into a war, feminists were unnecessarily pitted against homemakers as the single greatest threat yet posed to the integrity of the American family, a dichotomy that still exists.

THE INTERVIEWS

This study examines the IWY through forty oral histories conducted during 1990-92 with women who attended Utah's International Women's Year Conference and additional interviews conducted by JoAnn Freed in 1975. Those interviewed

1See D. Michael Quinn, "The LDS Church's Campaign Against the Equal Rights Amendment," Journal of Mormon History 20, no. 2 (Fall 1994): 85-115.

2The forty who participated in the oral histories (hereafter cited as IWY Project) were Ramona Adams, Belva Barlow Ashton, Marilyn Arnold, Cynthia Boshard, Inez Cooper, Daphne Dalley, Louise Degn, Katie Dixon, Christine Meaders Durham, Charlotte England, Gloria Firmage, Ruth Hardy Funk, Barbara Hales, Lisa Bolin Hawkins, Marilyn Holt, Chizuko Ishimatsu, Florence Smith Jacobsen, Reba Keele, Betty Kingsford, Kate Kirkham, Vivian Little, Dorothy Littrell, Esther Landa, Marilee Latta, Carol Cornwall Madsen, Norma Matheson, Cheryll Lynn May, Jackie Nokes, Jayne Ann Morgan Payne, Georgia Beth Bodell Peterson, Lois T. Pickett, Barbara Bradshaw Smith, Linda Smith, Jan Tyler, Valora Treshow, Naomi Udall, Amy Valentine, Lynne Van Dam, Dona Wayment, and Maggie Wilde. These oral histories and related materials will eventually be
represent four groups: (1) women who attended the conference and actively participated by voting, (2) interested bystanders who went to the conference but did not vote, (3) official delegates who represented the state at the national conference in Houston and could compare the state and national experience, and (4) those who helped plan the event.

I found interviewees by examining participation lists, committee rosters, and news accounts. Interviewers also routinely asked during each interview if the interviewee could suggest someone else who participated in the conference. We consciously worked for a variety of viewpoints. Everyone we asked agreed to be interviewed and most recommended others we should contact. This sampling method includes conservatives and liberals, proponents and opponents of the ERA, Mormons and those of other faiths. Further, interviewers made sincere efforts to understand the experience of each woman as she remembered it, rather than trying to fit the experience into her own categories of reference. Funding for expenses and for transcribing the tapes was provided by the Women's Research Institute at Brigham Young University, where the tapes and finished transcripts will eventually be housed.

A remarkable characteristic of most of these interviews is the still-vivid sensory memories: the pressure of the crowd, the clothes women wore, the intensity of the expressions on their faces, the babies, the men. Participants remember the emotional debates and the plenary session lectures where women like Lola Van Wagenen Redford and Esther Landa inspired them to community service. They remember how they felt, what they thought, and what they took with them when they left.

The interviewers were six bright students—Sara Knudson, Catherine Jorgensen, Ann Boyle, Marci Goodman, Leah Koldweyn, and Leslie Bates—whom I carefully chose for their maturity, for I was sure that at least some of what they heard would be troubling and that the women they interviewed would need their sensitive and intelligent response. My friend, Martha Dickey Es-

 deposited at the Women's Research Institute, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah.
plin, also conducted interviews in Southern Utah. (See Appendix A for the interview questions.)

**The International Women's Year, 1975-77**

In 1972, the United Nations created a commission on the status of the world's women. The United Nations proclaimed 1975 the "International Women's Year" because of rising demands for equal rights and responsibilities among women throughout the world. On 30 January 1974, President Richard Nixon officially called upon Congress, the people of the United States, government officials, and interested groups to observe the IWY with practical and constructive measures to advance the status of women, including the creation of a National Commission on Women.³

On 9 January 1975, President Gerald Ford issued Executive Order 11832 establishing a National Commission on the Observance of International Women's Year, 1975, and called upon it to plan "an agenda for the future." Ford challenged the American people to deal with inequities that still lingered as barriers to the full participation of women in the nation's social, economic, and political life. In April 1975, Ford appointed thirty-five women and men from the private sector with widely diverse backgrounds and experience, two senators appointed by the president of the Senate, and two Congresswomen appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives to serve on the commission. They were asked to facilitate and coordinate U.S. government participation in IWY and were specifically charged to examine the conditions of life and the status of American women and recommend future government and nongovernment action. The life of the commission was extended to 30 June 1976 to complete its fact finding, prepare its recommendations, and give its report to the President.

From 19 June to 2 July 1975, the U.N. International Women's Year Conference and Tribune, the world's first large-scale official international meeting devoted primarily to women's concerns,

met in Mexico City and recommended that the United Nations promote a "Women's Year." Forty-one Utah women were present as unofficial delegates among the 8,300 total attenders.4 "When I think of the conference, I think of this kaleidoscope of color and sound that . . . I had never heard before," Marie Scott, a community health therapist from Salt Lake City, remembered. "... I've been places where there were thousands of people, but this was 5,000 women, and that is a whole different experience. Atmosphere, sound, the pitch that you hear is a different kind of music . . . a qualitative aesthetic difference."5

The conference itself met at the World Conference Center where more than 1,300 official United Nations delegates and staff represented 133 countries. At the National Medical Convention Center, the IWY Tribune convened 7,000 unofficial nongovernmental observers, mostly women who attended at their own expense. On the agenda of both gatherings were four major items: (1) current trends and changes in the status and roles of women and men, (2) obstacles to equality of rights in both opportunity and responsibility, (3) the integration of women as co-equals in the development process with men, and (4) the adoption of a World Plan of Action.6 The resulting "Declaration of Mexico on the Equality of Women and Their Contribution to Development and Peace, 1975," articulates the consensus emerging from the conference:

4During July 1975 JoAnn Freed interviewed twenty-nine of the forty-one Utah participants including Sally Hess Barlow, Elouise Bell, Cynthia Boshard, Kelly Brailsford, Maxine Chabries, Joan Draper, Kathleen Flake, Pat Freston, Anita Gardner, Teri Holleran, Margaret Hoopes, Ann Hunter, Pat Jarvis, Jinnah Kelson, Leslie Kelson, Kitsy Keetch, Lorraine Killpack, Sharon Kreigher, Rex and Mary Lowe, Tina Martin, Anna Jo Martin, Anne Nicoll, Carol Lynn Pearson, Kelly Pennington, Barbara Pulsipher, Marie Scott, Jan Tyler, and Margaret Wilde. Transcripts for all interviews are located at the Utah State Historical Society, Salt Lake City.

5Marie Scott, Oral History, interviewed by JoAnn Freed, July 1975, 3, transcript, IWY Collection, Utah State Historical Society.

The World Conference on the International Women's Year,
1. Affirms its faith in the objectives of the International Women's Year, which are equality, development and peace;
2. Proclaims its commitment to the achievement of such objectives;
3. Strongly urges Governments, the entire United Nations system, regional and international intergovernmental organizations and the international community as a whole to dedicate themselves to the creation of a just society where women, men and children can live in dignity, freedom, justice and prosperity.  

This gathering of women from such diverse locales and cultures was for many a profoundly moving and consciousness-raising experience. There, women discovered a commonality of experience—discrimination among women, concerns about rape and spousal abuse, and the knowledge that women's issues transcend geographic barriers. The conference inspired many with the idea that women could begin to take control over their lives and, in the process, work for a better world with more humanist values. It was a heady dream.

On 9 January 1975, Gerald Ford issued an executive order creating a National Commission for the Observance of IWY, and the passage of Public Law 94-167 allotted $5 million for the state meetings and for a national conference to be held in November 1977 at Houston, Texas. The commission's mandate was to spread the word about IWY as widely as possible throughout the United States and to stimulate appropriate activities by nongovernmental women's organizations. Congress appointed Bella Abzug as head of the National Commission; Lieutenant Governor Mary Anne Krupsak of New York was assigned responsibility for the region that included Utah.

Rules for the state conferences and the national conference were set by the National Commission in Washington and varied somewhat from Robert's Rules of Order. The commission also

8 After hearings before Representative Abzug's House Government Operations Subcommittee and floor debate, Public Law 94-167 was passed by the House on 10 December 1975, by the Senate on 23 December, and signed by
established guidelines to recruit participants, run workshops, and organize other IWY activities, concentrating on involving women who had not been politically active or who might not be likely to attend such a meeting. IWY conferences were not to be gatherings of elite, sophisticated, politically savvy women but grassroots convocations that represented the diversity in a state’s women. Travel assistance, day care, and other support were authorized to facilitate attendance. The commission’s instructional manual informed state commissions of procedures to follow and issues that needed to be addressed in state meetings. “It is our hope that women in every State will view the Report as only a beginning,” it stated, “and that the State planning meetings will actively encourage a full exploration of any issue which women in the community identify as a barrier to their full participation.”

President Ford the following day. The appropriation was made in June 1976. Public Law 94-167 stated that “International Women’s Year, and its World Plan of Action, have focused attention on the problems of women throughout the world,” and said that the Bicentennial was a “particularly appropriate time” to evaluate the discrimination that American women face because of their sex. It directed the National Commission to convene a National Women’s Conference, to be preceded by State or regional meetings. The Conference, it said, shall: “recognize the contributions of women to the development of the country; assess the progress that has been made to date by both the private and public sectors in promoting equality between men and women in all aspects of life in the United States; assess the role of women in economic, social, cultural and political development; assess the participation of women in efforts aimed at the development of friendly relations and cooperation among nations and to the strengthening of world peace; identify the barriers that prevent women from participating fully and equally in all aspects of national life, and develop recommendations for means by which such barriers can be removed; establish a timetable for the achievement of the objectives set forth in such recommendations; and establish a committee of the Conference which will take steps to provide for the convening of the second National Women’s Conference . . . to evaluate the steps taken to improve the status of American women.”


Thus, although the National Commission presented each state coordinating committee with the national resolutions, the states were free to plan and execute their own plans. These resolutions, based on extensive research and hearings held throughout the nation in 1975-76, were published in its 1976 report: To Form a More Perfect Union. The report contained a "core agenda" including sixteen resolutions dealing with arts and humanities, battered women, child care, credit, education, elective and appointive office, employment, equal rights amendment, health, homemakers, international interdependence, media, offenders, older women, rape, and reproductive freedom. (See Appendix B for the national resolutions and Utah's IWY conference vote, and Appendix C for summaries of the resolutions drafted by the Utah IWY Committee's preconference task forces and how they fared in the conference workshops and plenary session.) This line-up represented the women's movement agenda for the 1970s and was broad enough to attract the interest of virtually all women. The manual for the planning and execution of the conferences provided guidelines for workshop discussion, available films and guest speakers, and other resources.

The National Commission's recommendations resulted from a year's investigation of the most pressing issues facing women in American society. They suggested that these recommendations form the substance of state IWY Conference workshops to determine consensus in each area. No state was limited to these particular topics, but the commission assumed that women nationwide would rally in support of these issues designed to improve the status and position of contemporary women.

The National Commission tried to strike a balance between being helpfully specific and allowing states considerable latitude. The guidelines within which Utah's committee worked were the same as those of other states: The National Commission empowered the State Coordinating Committee to plan and carry out a statewide women's conference. The instructions manual from the National Commission pointed out: "In some decisions you will have considerable latitude and choice; in others the law, Federal policy and overall conference goals necessarily limit that choice." However, the conference's purpose was to provide an "unprecedented opportunity for high visibility and serious public attention
to the unfinished business on behalf of women's rights." The enabling legislation required these meetings to:

recognize the contributions of women in the development of our country; assess the role of women in economic, social, cultural and political development; assess the progress that has been made toward insuring equality for all women; identify the barriers that prevent women from participating fully in all aspects of our national life; set goals and a timetable for the elimination of all barriers to the full and equal participation of women in all aspects of American life; and recognize the importance of the contribution of women to the development of friendly relations and cooperation among nations and to the strengthening of world peace.\textsuperscript{11}

Furthermore, the commission empowered each state committee to plan the logistics of the conference and its content.

The commission encouraged each state committee to make the conference as broadly based as possible and to choose delegates, committee members, and even workshop topics that truly represented the interests of the state's women. "Remember rural women," it said. "About one third of our population are non-metropolitan; they often are disproportionately poor, and are too rarely included in public meetings. Extension Home Economists, Agri-Women, migrant councils, church women's groups, Headstart Programs, local free health clinics, State departments of education, women's political caucuses, and farm organizations and unions are among those that could be helpful in rural outreach."\textsuperscript{12}

State committees should also sponsor orientation meetings to help educate those "not accustomed to taking part in conferences" about the purpose and conduct of such meetings and provide day care, financial assistance, and transportation to the site where necessary.\textsuperscript{13}

In terms of participation, the International Women's Year effort was a success. Most states in the union held IWY conferences between January and July 1977, involving more than 150,000 American women. For two days, they left their farms and

\textsuperscript{12}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{13}Ibid.
offices; they came from suburban neighborhoods and inner-city ghettos; they met on college campuses, in civic auditoriums, and in outdoor arenas.

Utah was not the only state to experience conflict. In each state, women who wanted change and women who saw more value in the status quo opposed each other. Women from both sides were energized—sometimes radicalized—by their efforts to present their case within the framework of the meetings. But the Equal Rights Amendment was the most volatile of all. The ratification roll-call on the Equal Rights Amendment had begun in March 1972. By June 1977, ratification votes in three more states were needed to constitute the required three-fourths majority.

In states that had not yet ratified the ERA, the IWY conferences were poisoned by emotional and impassioned confrontations and turned into forums for continuing the battle. State conferences in Missouri, Idaho, Utah, and Hawaii suffered particularly.

Almost every meeting heard from groups which presented an organized attack against the dangers of "feminism." The infinite varieties of feminist views were obscured, and feminism became a symbol that threatened traditional lifestyles for women and traditional assumptions about women. Anti-ERA groups, anti-abortion organizations, religious lobbies, and right-wing activists like the Eagle Forum and John Birch Society presented a united front to the feminist agenda.

Despite significant victories across the country, the most spectacular triumph of the conservatives was in Utah, which had soundly defeated the ERA on 18 February 1975. Utah's state convention was the largest in the nation, twice as large as California's. More than 14,000 women and men crowded into the Salt Palace to attend "The Voice of Womankind: Utah's First State-wide Women's Meeting on 24-25 June 1977." The overwhelming majority were Mormon women, mobilized by their Relief Society leaders, and convinced that they were defending "correct princi-

---

14 The ERA was approved by the House of Representatives in October 1971 and the United States Senate in March 1972. After this, the ratification process began.
pies." They came to fight federal funding of child care, abortion, sex education in the schools, employment "quotas," and equal opportunity for women.\textsuperscript{15} It was a fight with a clear victory but many, many casualties.

\section*{The Church and the ERA}

Few issues in recent memory have been as divisive politically and socially as the proposed Equal Rights Amendment. LDS Church leaders took the position that the ERA would threaten the family, the most basic unit of society; thus, its dangers justified institutional opposition. Former Relief Society General President Belle Spafford took a public stand against the ERA in December 1974.\textsuperscript{16} On 11 January 1976 an unsigned editorial appeared in the \textit{Church News} section of the \textit{Deseret News} quoting her address. The editorial, widely attributed to senior Apostle Mark E. Petersen, described the ERA as "not only imperfect but dangerous, . . . a confused step backward in time, so broad that it is inadequate, inflexible and vague; so all-encompassing that it is non-definitive." The piece concluded by saying that the ERA is "not the way" because "men and women are different, made so by a divine Creator. Each has his or her role. One is incomplete without the other."\textsuperscript{17} One cannot underestimate the impact of such a statement on its Mormon audience. In a \textit{New York Times} interview two years after the IWY, Relief Society General President Barbara Bradshaw Smith answered a reporter’s question on the predicted impact of the ERA. She didn’t fully understand all the implications of the proposed amendment, she said. "But the Prophet can so see. And if you know that, you know there is no further need for discussion."\textsuperscript{18}

The Church-owned \textit{Deseret News} showcased the Relief Soci-

\textsuperscript{15} National Commission, Manual, 51.


\textsuperscript{17} "Boycott over ERA Now Felt," \textit{Church News} section of the \textit{Deseret News} (hereafter cited as \textit{Church News}), 11 January 1975, 16.

ety as evidence of the Church's expansive attitude toward women. "From its beginnings, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints has affirmed the exalted role of woman in our society," asserted an unsigned *Deseret News* editorial on 22 October 1976:

In Utah, where our church is headquartered, women received the right to vote in 1870, 50 years before the 19th Amendment to the Constitution granted the right nationally.

There have been injustices to women before the law and in society generally. These we deplore. There are additional rights to which women are entitled. However, we firmly believe that the Equal Rights Amendment is not the answer. While the motives of its supporters may be praiseworthy, ERA as a blanket attempt to help women could indeed bring them far more restraints and repressions. We fear it will even stifle many God-given feminine instincts. It would strike at the family, humankind's basic institution—ERA would bring ambiguity and possibly invite extensive litigation. . . . We recognize men and women as equally important before the Lord, but with differences biologically, emotionally, and in other ways. ERA, we believe, does not recognize these differences. There are better means for giving women, and men, the rights they deserve.19

A decisive position appeared in a statement signed by the First Presidency, Spencer W. Kimball, N. Eldon Tanner, and Marion G. Romney, on 30 October 1976, under the unequivocal headline, "First Presidency Opposes ERA." The crucial paragraph repeated the editorial: "We firmly believe that the Equal Rights Amendment is not the answer. While the motives of its supporters may be praiseworthy, ERA as a blanket attempt to help women could indeed bring them far more restraints and repressions. We fear it will even stifle many God-given feminine instincts. It would strike at the family, humankind's basic institution."20

During December 1976, Barbara Smith met with Elders Gordon B. Hinckley and James Faust to discuss whether she should take a public stand on the ERA. "I told them," she later remembered, "that I had given it careful consideration and I would like to make that kind of statement if it would be in keeping

---


with the policy of the Church. They said they thought it would be very appropriate and that they would arrange for an audience for me to speak to."\(^\text{21}\) The audience was LDS Institute of Religion students at the University of Utah on 13 December 1974. Over the next several months, she spoke several times on the subject, establishing herself as a committed and dedicated player in the Church's efforts to defeat the ERA.

In addition, the Church recruited the help of nationally renowned legal minds to formulate a policy statement about the ERA. Rex E. Lee, former Solicitor-General of the United States but then dean of BYU's Law School, wrote a private paper, presumably upon invitation, arguing that the ERA would actually limit the rights of women. He summarized four drawbacks of the ERA, all of which appeared later in addresses by General Authorities or official statements by Church spokespersons:

1. By its [sic] nature, it will either do too little or too much.
2. The language of the proposed Amendment is so broad and so vague that it is impossible at this stage to determine whether in fact it will accomplish too little or too much.
3. Given our existing Constitutional guarantees of equality, there are serious problems with the adoption of a Constitutional amendment dealing solely with discrimination on the basis of sex that would accomplish either too little or too much.
4. In any event, the lessening of gender-based discrimination can be more effectively carried on under existing law, without the enormous drawbacks of the proposed Constitutional amendment.\(^\text{22}\)

The Church was armed and ready for a fight. Church leaders had made their position clear with a series of articles in the *Deseret News*. They had a sound and rational argument, largely developed by Rex Lee, strong moral leadership, and concerned Mormon

---

\(^\text{21}\)Barbara Bradshaw Smith, Oral History, interviewed by Jessie L. Embry, June-July 1977, 13, James H. Moyle Oral History Collection, Historical Department Archives of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (hereafter LDS Church Archives).

\(^\text{22}\)Rex E. Lee, "Thoughts Concerning the Equal Rights Amendment," typescript, ca. 1974-75, photocopy in the Ruth Hardy Funk Collection, which will eventually be housed in the Women's Research Institute, Brigham Young University; photocopy in my possession.
women who could be rallied to defend their Church's position in the arena of the International Women's Year conference.

Therefore, even as the state coordinating committee began planning Utah's IWY conference, the battle lines were drawn. Polarization over the ERA divided Mormons from non-Mormons and self-avowed feminists from homemakers; it made discussion in an atmosphere of good will problematic from the first.

**Planning Utah's IWY Conference**

In February 1976, Utah's Governor Calvin L. Rampton chose Jan Tyler, a BYU professor of education, to chair the state coordinating committee. Tyler was a member of the Governor's Commission on the Status of Women and had been involved in planning for IWY on the national level. During December 1976 and January 1977, she selected an executive committee who helped her choose a Coordinating Committee of bright, articulate, politically involved women. The executive committee included women she had worked with in the past or who had been recommended to her. In this process, Tyler herself wielded enormous power to shape the committee, and the discussion of names lasted for weeks. Considered were leaders of ecclesiastical women's organizations, women representing a diversity of ethnic groups, and women who had an established track record in public service. They were not a group reflective of a common agenda.

---

23 During the late 1970s, a person's attitude toward abortion rights, the ERA, and lifestyle choices determined his or her feminist stance.

24 Jan Tyler, Oral History, interviewed by Marci Goodman, 21 February 1992, Salt Lake City, 6, IWY Project.

25 The members of the coordinating committee consisted of Jan Tyler, chair; Katie Dixon, vice chair; Sharon M. Keigher, vice chair; Margaret Wilde, consultant and technical advisor; Dorothy Littrell, fiscal officer; Suzanne M. Grua, historian/recorder; Marilee Latta, public relations/media; and general members: Shauna Adix, Alberta Almada, Dolores Bennett, Zelma Brundage, Kathleen Butters, Etta Diamanti, Rita Eason, Janet Darley, Kathleen Flake, Afton Forsgren, Ruth Hardy Funk, Bonnie Hartley, Brenda Hancock, Beth Jarman, Dorothy Husband Jones, Alice Kasai, Gay D. Littleton, Dorothea Livingston, Norma Matheson, Maria Elena Perez, Lola Van Wagenen Redford, Bonnie Rogers, Belle S. Spafford, Georgia Beth Thompson, Valora Treshow, and Lynne Van Dam.
but rather of a common established presence in the community. Some were self-described feminists; some were not. They lacked some elements of diversity but in ways that mirrored the state's own profile. Eighteen came from Salt Lake City, three from Provo, four from Ogden, two from Granger, and one each from Helper, Roy, Kearns, Sunset, Cedar City, and Logan. All but two were white, LDS, and middle class. Alice Kasai was Japanese American and Baha'i; Maria Elena Perez was Hispanic and Catholic. One woman was in her thirties, nine were in their forties, four were in their fifties, and five were sixty or older. Critics accused the committee of being liberal and pro-ERA, but Tyler defended her choices as representing at least the geographic diversity of the state. Furthermore, the committee meeting minutes reveal a significant lack of homogeneity in opinions about the organization of the conference and the issues that needed to be addressed. For example, the minutes on 9 June 1977 record:

Kathleen Flake, Program Committee member, next reported on the proposed Utah Women's Meeting AGENDA for June 24-25, the same being written on the blackboard. Georgia Beth Thompson inquired as to why the AGENDA had been prepared in such a tardy manner so as to make the Coordinating Committee just a rubber stamp rather than properly fulfilling their role under Public Law 97-167; why Belle Spafford, former General Relief Society President of the LDS Church, was a speaker specifically without the consent of the Coordinating Counsel and was advised that this had been done several months previously by Jan Tyler and Katie Dixon of the Executive Committee; Gaye [sic] Littleton inquired as to the separation of Church and State in planning for this meeting and the lack of prior consent being sought from the Coordinating Committee; Dorothea Livingston inquired as to the possibility of the prayer and the posting of the colors being offered by the Native Americans (giving a short explanation of same), and was advised by Katie Dixon that Alice Kasai had already been requested to give the prayer (Bahi) [sic] and the Girl Scouts had already been requested to post the colors; Sharon Keigher inquired into how the Program Committee had put in many hours planning this AGENDA and pled that the same might be accepted as set forth; Janet Daley noted that Esther Landa was President of the National Council of Jewish Women and that no one here had protested her place on the AGENDA as Presiding Officer.26

26Utah State Coordinating Committee Minutes, 9 June 1977, Valora
Ruth Hardy Funk, general president of the Young Women and a member of the Coordinating Committee, remembered welcoming the diversity of voices the women brought to the coordinating committee. "It was a marvelous opportunity to see the greatness in all women and what they put up with and what their problems were. I'll always be very grateful that I was with this very heterogeneous group. I felt that we had great respect for one another and with vastly different philosophies in many instances."27

The Coordinating Committee took on two basic tasks: working out the mechanics of the conference and planning the program itself. The committee described its purpose as creating a full-spectrum forum for the discussion of women's issues. In a grant application for additional funds, the committee stated:

Unlike other women's rights activities in Utah, neither the Coordinating Committee, its subcommittees, or the State Meeting itself is designed to endorse any given political or social position. Individuals on the Committee and activities within the State Meeting represent the entire spectrum of views on all women's rights issues. The sole purpose of the Meeting is to provide an environment where women and men from all parts of the State and cultures within the State may meet to articulate their positions on a variety of social, political, and legal questions facing women today. All participants in the Meeting are not only free to but encouraged to develop their own opinions and come to their own conclusions on all issues treated by the workshops. While the Committee is soliciting help from women and men who are interested in and sympathetic to questions related to the roles of women in our society, participation in the State Meeting or its program committees does not imply, much less require, a particular feeling about or answer to these questions.28

Norma Matheson, a long-time community service participant

Treshow, Notebook; photocopy in my possession.

27Ruth Hardy Funk, Oral History, interviewed by Catherine Jorgensen, 29 August 1991, Salt Lake City, Utah, 4, IWY Project.

28Grant application to the Utah Endowment for the Humanities "To Form a More Perfect Union . . .": Justice for American Women," April 1977, 1; emphasis in original. The conference was funded with a federal appropriation of $25,000, a grant of $14,000 from Utah Endowment for the Humanities, and $6,000 from private funding. There was support from the state but no appropriation per se.
from Salt Lake City whose husband, Scott, would be elected governor of the state in 1985, later acknowledged that "everyone on that planning committee was sensitive to the fact that there were extreme viewpoints" but also mirrored the committee's assurance, wistful in retrospect, that "this was a great time to get a dialogue with the various interests in the state." Speaking of the group's desire, she described how they hoped for a "bringing together and examining of the issues—almost an educational effort. Having everyone know where each other were coming from and in a meaningful dialogue. The hopes were very high."²⁹

During their initial meetings in January 1977, members of the coordinating committee took assignments and began research on key issues, local experts, and available resources. The group met weekly or biweekly for six intense months before the conference. By April 1977, members of the resolutions committee had drafted a list of resolutions that they felt represented a consensus of women's interests throughout the state for presentation at the conference. Some of these resolutions, such as more just treatment of the victims of spousal abuse or rape, mirrored those of the National Commission, but eleven contradicted the National Commission's. For example, addressing the National Commission proposals, the resolutions committee first submitted to the state committee a strongly worded alternative:

WHEREAS: Five million dollars of our tax money has been spent on IWY Conferences, we ask that federal, state, and local government deny further funds to the IWY Commission or any other group which promotes ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment.
WHEREAS: We reject any movement to eliminate from children's textbooks, Gender. This includes Mother, Father, Miss, Mrs[.], Man, Woman, in that they are separate and autonomous, each in his own right.
WHEREAS: We reject Title IX with its' [sic] 20,000 words. We believe in equal opportunities and facilities but we also believe one sex should not be given preferential treatment over another. We request HEW to withdraw Title IX Regulation from all education including undergraduates and especially private schools.
WHEREAS: We wish to go forward to Basic Education Concepts with

Math, American History, World History, Free Enterprise Economics, English, Grammar, Spelling, Writing and Music back in the schools. [sic] We deplore the progressive education that is now present in our schools.

WHEREAS: We deplore showing pornographic films in classes on sex education. We desire to have the schools free from any sex and family life education. We reserve that right to ourselves as parents of those children.

WHEREAS: We recommend that the religion of Humanism be eliminated from school curriculum and that Evolution be taught as theory and not fact.

WHEREAS: We deny there should be civil rights for homosexuals; these become special privileges. We affirm our approval of Anita Bryant's philosophy that our children should not be taught by homosexuals.

WHEREAS: We reserve the right to bring about Liberty and Justice for all. We declare that equality is a false concept and a fraud because no one is equal, no thing is equal.

WHEREAS: We believe that sexual assault should remain a crime against the victim and that it not be lessened to any extent under the common law.

WHEREAS: We affirm that marriage must be based on mutual respect and communication. Any act of sterilization is not a private matter. It is for both spouses to decide.

WHEREAS: We believe in equal pay for equal work but we reject preferential treatment for women over men—or quotas.30

As it turned out, this document did in fact represent the consensus of the Mormon women who were mobilized for the IWY conference; but it did not represent the consensus of the Coordinating Committee. The resolutions that were introduced at the task force workshops resulted from considerable debate and compromise. Valora Treshow, a businesswoman from Salt Lake City, remembered the diversity of opinions that marked every meeting of the committee. "Well, . . . not everybody on the Coordinating Committee was focused on having an open forum. There were a lot of private agendas, I think." She saw three different working styles: "very vocal" women whose positions were immediately clear, others who were "very subtle" but

30Presented at the 14 April 1977 meeting of the Coordinating Committee, State Capitol Building, Salt Lake City, Utah, Ruth Hardy Funk Collection; photocopy in my possession.
who had equally strong agendas, and some who were so awk-
ward at "working with other women" that "you wonder how in
the world they got the appointment." 31

In April, the chairs of the twenty-two task forces began
planning their conference workshops. 32 The task forces were
"our major program tool," Jan Tyler told their chairs. "You will
make the first cut at formulating these issues, so that the entire
conference can take hold of them and express its opinion about
them. You will make the first sifting through the national issues
(in the Report of the National Commission) and the first attempt
to identify these same issues in Utah for our State Plan of Action. " 33

The chairs and the task force committees had four assignments:
to brainstorm issues, obtain data from multiple resources, assign
members to research specific areas, and train mass meeting coor-
dinators about the issues so that they could provide information
to groups of participants before the conference. At the confer-
ence itself, each two-hour workshop would include a facilitator,
a recorder, a reporter, and a self-chosen number of resource
persons. The workshops should be information oriented and
focus on National Commission's resolutions. (See Appendix C for
these resolutions.)

RELIEF SOCIETY INVOLVEMENT

During the spring of 1977, Tyler worked hard to generate
community support and interest. She and other committee mem-
bers met with the Council of Church Women, the Utah Federa-
tion of Women's Clubs, and other women's organizations, in-
cluding the LDS Relief Society. At Tyler's first meeting with

31 Valora Treshow, Oral History, interviewed by Catherine Jorgensen, 14
 August 1991, Salt Lake City, Utah, 3, IWY Project.
32 The twenty-two were aging, arts and humanities, basic needs, child
development, education, employment, enforcement of laws, equal rights
amendment, family violence, health, international interdependence, legal status
of homemakers, lifestyles, media, men, minority women, polarization, power,
rape, women offenders, women in Utah history, and young women.
33 IWY Task Force Chairs, Minutes, 18 April 1977, Valora Treshow notebook;
photocopy in my possession.
Barbara Smith, in January 1977, they discussed issues of concern to Utah women and how to make them part of the national agenda as described by the National Commission’s list of Recommendations. Tyler asked Smith to invite Mormon women to attend the mass meetings scheduled for May and also asked her to prepare a fact sheet on the national recommendations so that Mormon women would not come to the meetings uninformed; Smith and her counselors decided not to provide the sheet.

According to Belva Ashton, then a member of the Relief Society General Board, the Relief Society had been hearing disturbing stories about IWY conferences in other states:

We started getting reports from Church women, like in Hawaii and Colorado and in New York and in other places, saying that they had their IWY state meetings before ours and telling Barbara Smith, “Hey, it was railroaded. We went there, and they would not allow us to participate. They would not allow us to nominate people from the floor.”

During the spring of 1977, Barbara Smith assigned two members of her general board to each of the fourteen national resolutions (as summarized in To Form a More Perfect Union) and asked them to present information on that topic to the entire board. One General Board member, Amy Valentine, was assigned to “make studies on jobs for women in Utah and was it difficult for women to get jobs at that time and all. I collected a lot of material.” These presentations took place during the spring of 1977. The general board did not try to reach a consensus on all of the recommendations. According to Smith, this activity was an

---

34 Belva Ashton, Oral History, interviewed by Martha Dickey Esplin, 30 August 1991, Salt Lake City, IWY Project, 7. Nominations of delegates to the national convention to be held in Houston became particularly important as the way to express state opinion on particular issues such as opposition to the ERA. As Michael Quinn noted in “The LDS Church’s Campaign Against the Equal Rights Amendment,” 112, the Utah conference occurred before the IWY meetings in Hawaii and New York; concern about events in those conferences could not have provided the motivation for the Relief Society’s concern about Utah’s IWY conference.

35 Amy Valentine, Oral History, interviewed by Catherine Jorgensen, 10 August 1991, Salt Lake City, Utah, 9, IWY Project.
educational and informational one that they saw as a model for other Mormon women: "It was just left free that people should make up their own minds that they should use the same method that we did," she said in a later interview. She explicitly rejected the idea that the board agreed women should vote no on all recommendations. Also that spring, board members conducted informal surveys among Mormon women, asking what issues they thought were most important and what they hoped the conference might accomplish.

It was natural for Barbara Smith to see the tremendous potential that such a gathering could have in strongly opposing the ERA. Moreover, the national resolutions challenged many Mormon beliefs about the family, about the value of a human life, and about certain moral codes of behavior. Therefore, although Barbara Smith and other Church leaders attempted to be impartial, in substance it appears that their actions supported a particular point of view. It was also natural for Smith to use her influence as a leader of thousands of Mormon women in support of issues she felt so foundational to her faith. Thus, she is technically accurate in asserting that the Relief Society did not direct a vote. However, its position against the ERA, abortion, and homosexual lifestyles was consistent with its belief system. Not to have taken a public position on these important issues facing all American women would have been a form of dishonesty, a denial of her own values as the leader of Mormon women. Furthermore, Smith and her counselors, Janath Russell Cannon and Helen L. Goates, recognized the need for diversity at the meeting. It would be "folly for the state of Utah to be represented only by nonmembers or by inactive members of the Church. . . . The issues to be discussed needed to be addressed by all Mormon women."  

---

36 Barbara Bradshaw Smith, Oral History, interviewed by Leah Koldweyn, 14 October 1992, Salt Lake City, 9, IWY Project.
37 "Response to Deseret News Questionnaire," and "Questions by Relief Society Presidency to International Women's Year Officials Concerning the IWY Utah State Meeting," both in the Ruth Hardy Funk Collection; photocopy in my possession.
For many LDS women, whether the Relief Society directed their votes or not was irrelevant. Many Mormon women were so grounded in their beliefs that they knew what the Church's position would be without official guidance. Florence Smith Jacobsen, former general president of the Young Women's Mutual Improvement Association, remembered, "They did not tell us what to say or do. We were women with our own opinions. We had been, of course, members of the Church and knowing the doctrines of the Church and what we believed to be right and what we believed to be wrong couldn't help but influence us in our voting in the decisions we made regarding the various issues."39

It is also not inconsistent with Smith's claim of impartiality for her to maintain that she was surprised by the misuse of Relief Society networks by the conservative interest groups. Apparently, women on both sides of all issues, planners, and attenders were surprised by the response to issues, by the massive attendance, and by the heat of participants' emotions. The intensity of virtually all aspects of the conference surprised, even astonished, virtually everyone involved. Smith was not being ingenuous or naive; across the board, women were unprepared for what happened at Utah's IWY.

Smith faced a quandary. She felt that if the Relief Society planned information meetings per se they would be accused of indoctrinating Mormon women. So instead they opted for a broader method of disseminating information. They asked the Deseret News to publish a series of articles explaining the key issues. "And when we sent the letter out inviting wards to have women from each stake come, we also asked them to read the information that would be in the paper so that they would be apprised of the issues because we felt they should come knowledgeably participating in the conference."40

The letter which Barbara Smith says "we" sent out became one of the sorest points of the conference. The Relief Society

---

presidency met with their priesthood leaders requesting permission to send a letter to every stake Relief Society president in Utah that would tell them to encourage the women in their wards to attend the conference. The men agreed that the letter was a good idea and asked how they intended to educate the women about the issues. The Relief Society leaders suggested that they write editorials for the *Deseret News* and other newspapers and publish pamphlets. But the Relief Society did not send this letter.

Promptly after the meeting, Regional Representatives received a telephone call from the office of Ezra Taft Benson, then president of the Quorum of the Twelve, to inform them about the IWY Conference and the Church’s proposal that each ward recruit ten women to attend. This call was followed almost immediately by a letter, also from Benson’s office, dated 3 June 1977, and addressed to “All Regional Representatives in Utah.” It read:

This is a follow-up on the phone call you received from President Ezra Taft Benson’s office, and here is what should be done:

Stake Relief Society presidents in Utah will be asked to:

1. encourage LDS women in their stake to read the *Deseret News* articles in order to become informed regarding the rules of the IWY meeting: voting times, procedures, recommendations, and how delegates are selected, including how nominations from the floor should be made;
2. select one capable and experienced LDS woman who could speak from the floor at the convention, as a concerned citizen;
3. encourage at least ten women and hopefully many more from each ward to attend the convention workshops as “registered participants” ($2 fee). This will enable them to vote and be in a position to support good recommendations, and to file a minority dissenting report if necessary.
4. encourage LDS women to call friends, neighbors or women affiliated with other churches who share mutual concerns, and ask them to attend the convention also.

You will find enclosed enough copies for all of your stake presidents. Your presidents should receive this no later than June 9, 1977. Enough copies are also enclosed for the bishops in your region. Would you please request the stake presidents to see that the bishops in their stakes receive the copies.

Your help in this matter is greatly appreciated.

We hope Mormons everywhere will participate in the [IWY] meetings and become part of the decision making process by register-
The letter, on Relief Society letterhead, had a typed line but no signatures at the bottom of the page: “RELIEF SOCIETY GENERAL PRESIDENCY.”

The Relief Society promptly sent out a follow-up letter to “All Stake Relief Society Presidents in Utah” on 7 June 1977. The cover letter read:

Enclosed is a copy of the letter we are sending to your stake presidents under priesthood direction.

The Deseret News will shortly be carrying a series of articles with information on the state IWY meeting, which should be of great help to you and other Latter-day Saint women in becoming knowledgeable about the meeting.

Your help in this matter is greatly appreciated.

Again, the signature line was “THE RELIEF SOCIETY GENERAL PRESIDENCY” with no individual signatures.

In some wards, Relief Society presidents selected women whom they felt might be interested in attending the conference. In others, bishops handled the “calls” themselves and filled the quota. News of the conference also spread by word of mouth.

During the week of 11 May, local mass meetings were held in more than fifty Utah communities. Kathleen Flake, member of the Utah Coordinating Committee Executive Committee, described the diversity of women who attended:

What does a woman from urban Salt Lake City have in common with one from rural Helper or Thistle, or the Utah Equal Rights Coalition share with STOP ERA of Utah, or a Mormon Relief Society president with the president of Salt Lake’s NOW chapter? You might rightly answer “not very much,” but I would have to add from recent experience “more than they or we ever knew.”

---

41Photocopy in the Ruth Funk Collection; photocopy in my possession.
42Copy in the possession of the Equal Rights Coalition of Utah, Utah Historical Society; also quoted in Barbara Smith, A Fruitful Season, 106-7.
43Draft of an article for the NCW Bulletin, Kathleen Flake, Executive Committee, Utah State IWY Coordinating Committee, Valora Treshow notebook, copy in my possession.
Mass meetings, sponsored by the Outreach Subcommittee for the State Meeting, were held in seventy centralized school districts on 16, 17, and 18 May. Their purpose was to involve women from rural communities, from every identifiable ethnic and racial group, and from all economic levels "to help them," in the words of one committee member, "understand that the State Meeting is a democratic gathering where their opinions and experience will be valued and recorded as resolutions for the National Conference are drafted." Furthermore, the committee hoped that women who had never attended a women's issues conference would become involved, and that senior women, welfare mothers, ethnic minorities, or rural women would see the conference and mass meetings as an opportunity to speak to the issues that concerned them. On the whole, the turnout was disappointing; but meeting leaders circulated information sheets about the conference and about national issues; they led discussions about the concerns of women in each locale, and had women sign up for carpools to the June conference.

In order of importance, the ERA, abortion, and education ranked highest. Kathleen Flake, a member of the Coordinating Committee, summarized the splits in these mass meeting discussions:

Responses ranged from a group who demanded immediate ratification of the ERA as the only solution to discrimination to the group whose second priority was "preserving more of the status quo." There were women who felt that most battered wives "got what they deserved" and those who wanted the establishment of half-way houses for homemakers who were victims of family violence. Some wanted government subsidy of reentry programs for women and others were against any Federal assistance whatsoever. Despite the diversity of opinion, the anger usually generated by such issues was never a factor in the discussion. This, perhaps, was the most rewarding aspect of the mass meeting experience. For the first time in Utah's recent history, women

45"Priority List," emerging from the Mass Meetings, Ruth Hardy Funk Collection; photocopy in my possession.
of opposing viewpoints met in a truly open discussion on these issues with which they strongly identify. In fact, an apt description of mass meetings might be "never have so many disagreed so strongly about so much with so little rancor." 46

Clearly, mass meetings helped inform many women about IWY, encouraged them to become informed on the issues, and helped women make practical arrangements for attendance at the conference. But not all meetings were as rancor-free as Flake reported. Barbara Hales, who attended a mass meeting in Provo, was stunned by the level of tension in the meeting as women, unable or unused to discussing issues that impacted their lives, resorted to angry accusations and debate. She remembered thinking, "What are we getting into here? I had had great expectations for it [IWY], but that tempered them a bit that night because one of the women, when we got to the childcare issue said, 'I don't believe in childcare. Mothers ought to be home taking care of their own children.'" 47

GEARING UP FOR THE CONFERENCE

It became apparent to observers that a great deal was at stake. Barbara Smith described the next catastrophic step frankly:

By leaving it [so] broad and telling other people they could do whatever they wanted to do, most of them took that as sanction to go ahead and unite different groups. So they would call many Relief Society groups together and give them information themselves. It looked like the Relief Society would be sponsoring certain things and we were not. That was bad, because I think it gave extremist groups and anybody who took the opportunity to use any method they wanted to get to the women. 48

After the mass meetings, there was only a month until the conference. During this time task force preparation continued. During the next five weeks, Smith and her counselors continued

46Kathleen Flake, "Draft of an Article for the NCW Bulletin," Valora Treshow, Notebook; photocopy in my possession.
47Barbara Hales, Oral history, interviewed by Leah Koldweyn, 8 February 1993, Provo, Utah, 6, IWY Project.
to meet with their priesthood leaders to discuss the IWY. Because of these weekly meetings, Benson and other male Church leaders were informed about the IWY conference but, according to Smith, did not take a part in a visible way.\(^\text{49}\) Others believe that some Church leaders, maneuvering behind the scenes, contacted groups like the John Birch Society to educate Mormon women about political issues.\(^\text{50}\)

An organization called Let's Govern Ourselves (LGO) emerged in late May from these pre-conference meetings between Relief Society leaders and General Authorities. According to Georgia B. Peterson, a state legislator from Salt Lake City who became LGO's president, the objective was to elect a chosen list of delegates, the "Let's Govern Ourselves Caucus." After this, the men disassociated themselves from the group, but it was widely understood among insiders that Peterson's group represented the Church's position.\(^\text{51}\) Peterson spent the two weeks before the conference speaking across the state at various meetings, promoting Let's Govern Ourselves and its candidates.\(^\text{52}\)

Partially as a result of Peterson's leadership, representatives of numerous conservative political groups came to Smith and her counselors, asking for permission to hold instructional meetings about the resolutions and workshop topics.\(^\text{53}\) According to Barbara Smith, the Relief Society presidency consistently refused to assign Mormon women officially to attend these preconference meetings sponsored by independent groups:

> We would only give them information through the newspapers. We said that we would not even tell them what they could or could not do. But there were those who contacted friends and held meetings to


\(^\text{51}\)Peterson, 19 January 1992, 37.

\(^\text{52}\)Georgia Peterson, "Calendar of Events," holograph notes written on the back of a Let's Govern Ourselves Caucus file, 16-21 June 1977, original in Peterson's possession, photocopy in my possession.

tell the women of the dangers that they would face and how they might be railroaded into accepting proposals that would not really represent their beliefs.  

Speaking after the IWY conference, Church public communications spokesman Don LeFevre was open about Church involvement: “The Church has always been concerned with threats to the stability of the family and the home,” he told the New York Times. “We don’t make any excuses for our women’s participation. We’re proud of them. Other women’s groups could probably take a note from their book.”

Even though Church leaders did not explicitly instruct Relief Society members how to vote, LeFevre admitted that the Church did provide informational material on the Church’s positions on ERA, abortion, and other key issues “in case they had any questions.” Primarily, this material appeared in the Deseret News as planned.

According to Georgia Peterson, Belva Ashton coordinated plans during May and early June for the conference with the Special Affairs Committee, a high-level and quasi-confidential Church committee that discussed Church policy on social issues. Ashton’s husband, Wendell Ashton, was then a member. Ruth Hardy Funk also met with various ecclesiastical leaders in preparation for the meetings. During one meeting on 6 June 1977, Elder Robert B. Hales asked for a copy of Belle Spafford’s prepared address.

Beginning on Thursday, 16 June, Smith met daily with Georgia Peterson, who was then engaged in informal meetings with Moana Ballif Bennett (a member of the Relief Society general board), Oscar McConkie, Jr. (a partner in the Church’s law firm,

---

54Ibid.
55“Mormon Turnout Overwhelms Women’s Conference in Utah,” B-2.
56Ibid.
57Peterson, Oral History, 37.
58Ruth Hardy Funk, Memo to John Madsen, 6 June 1977, Ruth Hardy Funk Collection; photocopy in my possession. Elder Hales was then a member of the First Quorum of the Seventy; I do not know what assignment he had that brought him into contact with Funk’s committee.
Kirton & McConkie), Wendell Ashton, and others and drew up a list of desirable delegates for the national convention, mapping out strategies for the conference.\(^{59}\)

Two of these potential delegates were involved early. Friends approached Norma Udall, a prominent Mormon woman, as early as the first week in May and encouraged her to run. “Different people contacted me,” she said. “People got interested in what I had said and . . . asked me to run, and several people just sort of got behind me and pushed it, I mean, more than I was prepared for, really.”\(^{60}\)

Belva Ashton decided to run for delegate on her own initiative. She saw an “announcement . . . in the paper,” as she recalls. “No one . . . suggested to me, ‘Why don’t you go and submit your name to be a delegate to Houston?’ But I decided I would, . . . And I didn’t talk with anyone, Wendell or anyone else. I just thought, ‘This is something I’d like to do, I ought to do, [because] I feel strongly about some of the issues.”\(^{61}\) Ashton’s personal commitment typified many Mormon women who similarly felt compelled to participate as a morally serious act.

In the effort to push their agenda, non-Church political right-wing organizations like the Eagle Forum and the Conservative Caucus, led by Dennis Ker, a businessman from Salt Lake City who was also an LDS bishop, manipulated the organizational structure created by the Mormon Relief Society. According to Ker, he began organizing Mormon women to participate in Utah’s IWY because of “horror stories” that had filtered out of other state IWY conferences like Idaho, which had held its IWY conference during May. The Conservative Caucus had two simple objectives: stop ERA and disrupt the feminist agenda of IWY.\(^{62}\) The group never disclosed the source of its funding, but it had enough money to sponsor fourteen informational meetings, publish handouts, and

---

\(^{59}\)Peterson, Oral History, 37.

\(^{60}\)Norma Udall, Oral History, interviewed by Catherine Jorgensen, 8 August 1991, Salt Lake City, 7, IWY Project.

\(^{61}\)Ashton, Oral History, 6.

publicize in the monthly *Utah Independent*, one of the official voices of the John Birch society, which circulated not only in Utah but also nationally.\(^6^3\)

During the first two weeks of June, using the same calling tree established by the Relief Society to invite women to the meeting, Ker and his group warned women about lesbian take-overs, unfair voting practices, and being subjected to pornographic films. During these weeks they began to organize “informational” meetings to tell women what would happen at the conference. These women had already been enlisted through Relief Society channels.\(^6^4\) But the Conservative Caucus used these same lines to bring the women to their own informational meetings. Recreating the telephone tree was a simple matter of contacting bishops, listed in local phone books, and encouraging them to contact Relief Society presidents, who then contacted the women who already planned to attend the meeting. Religion and politics became inextricably fused, and many LDS women were confused about what line, if any, divided the two. These informational meetings were advertised in the conservative *Utah Independent* throughout the two weeks preceding the conference.\(^6^5\)

For example, Dixie Snow Huefner of Salt Lake City describes the case of an East Bench neighbor who had been asked by her official Relief Society “recruiter” to attend the conference as a ward representative, to vote down the ERA and other feminist resolutions, and to attend an informational caucus at Highland High School the night before the conference.\(^6^6\) Still, both Ker’s group and Church representatives later denied the connection between the informational meetings and their agendas and the LDS ecclesiastical system.


\(^6^5\) See *The Utah Independent*, 23 June 1977, 4.

The instruction to vote no on all recommendations on the ballot, a ballot believed by many to be the agenda of liberal feminists, came from these meetings held by the Conservative Caucus, the Eagle Forum, and Let's Govern Ourselves—not from the Relief Society or the Mormon Church. This tactic reflected the belief that the national IWY was staging the conferences to pass a national agenda, including ERA and pro-abortion laws.

Mormon women were told that the recommendations had been deceitfully written and baited with hidden hooks. They were also told to vote only for the delegates on a list circulated at these meetings and to refuse to attend any movies at the conference. During this conference and in the literature circulated by the Relief Society and Let's Govern Ourselves, feminists were pitted against homemakers who were portrayed as the guardians of the home and family values, an unfortunate and inaccurate dichotomy that stuck throughout the conference and tainted debate on virtually every issue.

By the time Relief Society leaders realized how profoundly these outside groups had misused the network of Mormon women they had created, the damage had been done. Smith later described Dennis Ker's role in the preconference maneuverings: "I was a little afraid when he came in of his political stand, and so I did not give him approval even though I did listen to what he had to say and did tell him, as I have told you, that he could do whatever he wanted. But I didn't even think about him doing some of the things he did."67 When Smith discovered that Ker was using her name and the name of the Church she immediately notified him that it was not appropriate and misrepresented the Church's position on these issues.68 Nevertheless, the impression had been made. For many, the Church's agenda and that of the conservative right were one and the same.

Barbara Smith blamed much of the subsequent conference hysteria on those with political agendas who preyed on the fears of uninformed but faithful LDS women who were anxious to protect their families: "By the time these groups had contacted

68 Ibid.
those who would represent the Mormon women, fears and anxieties arose and walls of defense were built. A vacuum was created because the Church and the Relief Society wanted to remain impartial."69

After Jan Tyler heard about Ker’s organizational efforts during the first week in June, she telephoned him and said, “It’s come to my attention that you seem to have some concerns about what you think this whole conference is going to be about. And I’d really like to respond to any questions you have, share any information, I want you to be informed.”70 Four members of the Coordinating Committee traveled to Ker’s home to meet with him; but when they arrived at his house, only Tyler was willing to go in. Tyler spoke first to Ker’s wife, then “I gave him some information and I was a little confrontational with him, not in an argumentative way, but in that ‘Look, quit trying to twist things’ [way].”71 But in retrospect, it was already too late.

Yet another Mormon member of the Conservative Caucus, Senator Orrin Hatch, made numerous telephone calls to Tyler giving what she felt was heavy-handed advice and attempting to “take complete control of the conference.”72

The largest single preconference gathering was held at Highland High School on 23 June, the night before the conference began. An estimated 1,000 women attended the meeting. There, Ker, Erma Christensen of the American Party, Doris Wilson of the Conservative Caucus, Georgia Peterson representing Let’s Govern Ourselves, and others again instructed women to vote against all national resolutions.

Utah’s I W Y Conference, 1977

The women who flooded into the Salt Palace on the morning of 24 June came with all kinds of motives. Some came grimly determined to do battle for their righteous cause. Some came

69 Ibid., 14.
70 Tyler, Oral History, 8.
71 Ibid.
72 Ibid., 15.
because they were genuinely interested in women’s subjects. For example, Daphne Dalley, a resource manager from Cedar City, was already a supporter of ERA and active Democrat. She saw the IWY as a way to become better informed, “to converse with other women about women’s issues.” She learned about the conference primarily from the League, and with friends from the League of Women Voters, “decided that we would go up. . . . So about four or five of us got up at about four o’clock in the morning and drove to Salt Lake.”

Others reluctantly attended out of a sense of duty to their leaders. Belva Ashton remembers talking with a young neighbor after the conference who told her: “I was told to go, or asked to go, but I felt totally out of my element. I didn’t know the issues. I went totally ill-prepared. I went to vote no on practically everything.” Overall, it was not a pleasant experience for her even though she “thought she was defending hearth and home.” They went down there, Ashton continued, “thinking they were fighting some big, evil monster from the outside.”

I was a last-minute participant and even less informed than Ashton’s neighbor. I was twenty-six years old and totally absorbed in the first three of my six children, all under the age of three. I contentedly spent the better part of each day playing with them, washing their clothes, picking up after them, and reading on the floor while they crawled over me as if I was a jungle gym. My husband and I were both happily active in our ward. I was living the Mormon woman’s dream in Provo, Utah, and I loved it.

Then on Thursday afternoon, 23 June, I received a call from my mother-in-law. She said her Relief Society president had asked her to attend the state International Women’s Year Conference. She really didn’t want to go; but if I did, she would tend my children. It sounded interesting, so I packed up my three small children and their paraphernalia and drove up to Salt Lake City early the next morning. Saying good-bye was a protracted process and relaying full instructions for the day to my mother-in-law was

---

74 Ashton, Oral History, 9.
time-consuming. She had time for just one piece of information about the conference as I walked out the door: “Have fun, and remember to vote no on everything.”

Esther R. Landa of Salt Lake City, national president of the National Council of Jewish Women, presided over the conference.75 Plenary session speakers included Helvi Sipilia, the Secretary-General of International Women’s Year and Assistant Secretary General of the United Nations for social development and humanitarian affairs; former Relief Society General President Belle S. Spafford; Lola Van Wagenen Redford, director of Consumer Action Now; and Mary Anne Krupsak, Lieutenant Governor of New York State.

The Coordinating Committee had prepared for a crowd of between 2,500 and 4,000 women. By the end of the conference, 13,800 women had registered and hundreds of others came to watch and lobby in workshops.76 The double-sessioned ERA workshop topped attendance records for the conference with more than 4,000 women crowding into the room. A shortage of written materials, hot and crowded rooms, and inadequate voting booths generated tension and confusion. Participants could attend twenty-two films77 and twenty-one workshops—sessions that

75Much of Esther R. Landa’s public service work was for equal rights and the advancement of women. From 1964 to 1969, she was director of Women's Programs in the Division of Continuing Education at the University of Utah and director of its first state-wide women’s conference. She chaired a faculty-community committee to survey the entire field of equal educational opportunity for women at the university; as a result its Women’s Resource Center was established. She also served as the National Council of Jewish Women’s representative to the Equal Rights Amendment Coalition.

76Registration records, IWY Collection, Utah State Historical Society. Two excellent articles have been written detailing the IWY conference. See Sillitoe, “Women Scorned: Inside Utah’s IWY Conference”; and Huefner, “Church and Politics at the Utah IWY Conference.”

77The films available at the IWY “Film Festival” included: Time Has No Sympathy, Woman to Woman, Womanhouse, ERA and the American Way, What I Want, Jane’s Jane, Chris and Bennie, Men’s Lives, Joyce at 34, Day Care Today, Mothers After Divorce, Children as People, The Black Woman, Does Anybody Need Me Anymore, I Is for Important, When Women Get to Hurting, and Images of Country Women. The majority of the films addressed issues to be
stirred up emotions and ideas like nothing else in the state’s history.

Shauna Adix, who chaired the Lifestyles workshop, reported her harrowing experience:

Long before the scheduled meeting time, people were lined up in front of the door. The assigned room had a state capacity of 72. We allowed as many extra persons in as we dared and just barely had open aisles to the doors, front and back in the room. There was much concern from the people on the outside about wanting to come in and we were late in starting from trying to explain that we simply had no more room in the inn. The outside noise was so great that we could not hear, but each time we opened the door to ask for quiet, the annoyance and anger seemed only to heighten. At one point, someone banged so vociferously on the door that one of the task force members opened it to ask for quiet—and was immediately flung against the wall as two women forced their way into the room. . . . I explained that we were going to make no recommendations, which was met by many with complaints and challenges as to the legality of such a stand, but it did cause some people to leave. As they left, others pushed their way in until we had close to a hundred women in the room. One of the members of the task force went to find another space and returned with the report of a larger available room. The women in the room refused to leave (fearing, I suspect, that they would lose their front row seats) and finally, in an attempt to compromise, two task force members offered to go with the overflow group to the new room while the original group stayed. Because of the general confusion and time lost in organization, we ignored the photography and went at first to the song amidst much concern and suggestion that the women had not come to be entertained.

The workshop continued until a speaker at the open microphone called lesbians “degenerates.” The next speaker was a woman who identified herself as a lesbian. At this point, bedlam broke out with some women leaving in noisy protest and others refusing to leave.78

Daphne Dalley was present in that session. When the woman discussed in workshops. Although some touched on sexuality, the majority were not offensive to the general population and none of them could reasonably be called “pornographic.”

who spoke about being lesbian was attacked with shouts, hisses, and verbal abuse,

I guess I was just shocked. I had perceived myself to be a very traditional Mormon woman up to that point. . . . If this was traditional Mormon womanhood in this conference, in this room, I was not a traditional Mormon woman, and I had no desire to be one. I just thought, "This woman deserves to be listened to. She had value as a human being. There's no reason to make her feel less because of her choices." I'm sure it took a lot of courage to stand up there and say what she did. 79

Betty Kingsford, a homemaker from Cedar City, remembered the confusion that reigned in all workshops. "That was the learning experience," she said. "Being able to observe the actions of the participants and people in the crowd because the panelists, many times, were not even able to complete a sentence without being interrupted. . . . People shouting and booing and shouting them down." The anger displayed was unsettling, surprising, and forced Kingsford and others to reconsider why they were there. "I was astounded to see how rudely treated some of the women [were] who were just merely trying to communicate a point a view, merely to express themselves. They were unable to finish sentences until it was just staggering to me to observe that and think, 'What is going on here?'" 80 Chizuko Ishimatsu, a member of the Coordinating Committee, was astonished at the women's rudeness—"inconsiderate kinds of things and the absolute cheating that went on during the workshop." 81

Lisa Bolin Hawkins, who cochaired a workshop on education, was frightened by what she described as the "mob psychology" of the conference. Women impassioned by the fight acted in ways that seemed uncharacteristic of normally decorous LDS women. "They were being rude to other people. Shouting other people down, interrupting, not following the rules that had been

79 Dalton, Oral History, 5.
80 Betty Kingsford, Oral History, interviewed by Martha Dickey Esplin, 16 August 1991, Cedar City, Utah, 5-6, IWY Project.
81 Chizuko Ishimatsu, Oral History, interviewed by Sara Knudson, 8 August 1991, Salt Lake City, Utah, 4, IWY Project.
made up for large gatherings of this kind so that different people
can state their case."  

Florence Jacobsen was far more fortunate in her choice of
workshops. "They were, I thought beautifully handled," she re-
called. "... Some of them were very negative and some of them
were positive. But even the negative ones were handled well."

Attending the conference was an overwhelming experience
for me. The Salt Palace was bursting with women, all of whom, it
seemed to me, knew where they were going and had something
specific to accomplish. I remember the experience with micro-
scopic clarity even though it was eighteen years ago. Crowds of
women filled rooms hot from too many bodies pressed into too
small a space. I remember being astonished at the number of
children that accompanied their mothers, carried in back packs,
pushed in strollers, or simply wandering behind them in the halls.
I felt dazed, as if I were spinning around in circles. The atmosphere
was much more like a circus than a conference. I attended the
"Women in History" workshop and was inspired by Maureen
Ursenbach Beecher, Kathryn MacKay, and Jill Mulvay. I was
dazzled by women like Cheryll Lynn May whose deep voice and
clear articulate way of expressing herself made me want to be
better informed.

Although the conference was for and about women, many
of those interviewed commented on the conspicuous presence
of men. According to Reba Keele, then director of the Honors
Program at BYU, "They were there to help coordinate and make
sure that the right people got elected. Now, I didn't see any of
these men at our small group session—"she was conducting a
workshop on education—"but in the large group, they were ubiq-
uitous. They were everywhere. Always around the margins. Al-
ways with these walkie-talkies, always having certain women
going to talk to them and then they'd bark into the walkie-talk-
ies."  

82Lisa Bolin Hawkins, Oral History, interviewed by Catherine Jorgensen, 7
August 1991, Provo, Utah, 4, IWY Project.
83Jacobsen, Oral History, 5.
84Reba Keele, Oral History, interviewed by Marci Goodman, 28 February
Within hours after the conference began, polarization wiped out any opportunity for dialogue. One of the organizers, Cynthia Boshard, a newspaperwoman from Salt Lake City, felt betrayed:

I thought, this is not what is supposed to happen. [Yet] we're prepared to do what is expected of us in the guidelines set down for every state. We have done all of those things. You people are trying to change that. You're taking the information out of context, twisting it around to meet your own sick need that comes out of paranoia, fear, or whatever the hell it was. . . . You are being directed by men, and you don't even know about the issues that we are talking about. And as I got with other members of the organizing committee and other people who had been in some of the sessions, it was just like we'd been run over, like we'd been hit; the life had been knocked out of us, and what's going on? I was so disgusted, I walked across the street from the Salt Palace to the Dead Goat Saloon. 85

Barbara Smith, who attended the conference, deplored the frightened reactions of many of the LDS women who participated:

The women themselves came ready to block anything that was said, for they did not want to be falsely persuaded to accept attitudes or actions that could be damaging to them or to the Church. Some had been told that they would be safe if they voted no on everything. The Latter-day Saint women came by the thousands. They attended the workshops and defensively participated. I was told that sometimes they would not even listen to those who were presenters. 86

Committee member Cynthia Boshard remembered the dismay of the organizers:

The first night we all got together to sort of talk about the process about what had just happened and [we] were dumbfounded. "What is going on?" "When we all vote in the big session tomorrow what is going to happen?" Well, we started to see that people were beginning to crowd their way into workshops that were already overcrowded. We had people at the door holding the crowds because of fire codes. People just got nasty and they were mean and vicious. They were critical of our attempts to make compromises. 87

1992, Salt Lake City, 6, IWY Project.
Other women were confused by the discrepancy between the information they had received before the conference and that presented in the individual workshops. Reba Keele and Lisa Bolin Hawkins had organized the workshop on education for women. They had spent long hours carefully drafting the language of the recommendations and preparing the supporting materials. The most painful moment of the entire conference for them came when they presented the recommendations of the education workshop before the large session. Both Keele and Hawkins were stunned when a woman who had been present in their workshop took the microphone: She said, "I thought that we had learned some good stuff in education, but I have just been told that to vote in favor of any of these educational proposals will be a vote in favor of the ERA.' And that was it. That's all she said." Hawkins stood and passionately spoke into the microphone, "That's not true. That's not true. It has only to do with education." Too shaken to continue, she sat down. Then, Keele remembers:

A woman in front of us with a garment line under her blouse turned around and with the most hatred I have ever seen in a person's eyes and voice, looked at Lisa and me and said, "We don't need women like you in this state. Why don't you leave?" And we just sat there stunned. All those months of work, all the attempts to be empathetic toward the conservative positions. All those attempts to make sure that this was carefully discussed and that we didn't do any railroading.89

To Cheryll May, a political science special instructor at the University of Utah and an active Mormon, fear dominated the participants. "I remember," she later told an interviewer,

how mobbed the place was. And that these dear sisters . . . seemed to feel that they were sort of in a dangerous foray into enemy territory. And that they had been commissioned to squash some kind of dangerous conspiracy and they were sort of whispering to one another, [with]

88Special underclothing is worn by Mormons who have participated in temple ceremonies; because access to the temple depends on passing worthiness interviews with one's bishop and stake president, temple-going Mormons are usually considered to be among those who are most faithful about their Mormonism and, presumably, about living Christlike lives.

89Keele, Oral History, 7.
very concerned looks on their faces.

My impression was that the great majority of them were lovely Relief Society sisters who knew very little about politics and did not care much about politics. But by golly they received orders from headquarters and they were going to be where they were supposed to be. Their confusion was only exceeded by the consternation of the conference organizers. . . . These [Relief Society] sisters had a sense of serious threat. They were [weren't] quite sure what it was but it was heavy stuff.90

Self-proclaimed anti-feminist Margaret Mahoney, a Winchester, Massachusetts, attorney, received resounding applause for her assertion in a plenary session Friday afternoon: “Has the pedestal become a cage? To the feminist, yes. To the anti-feminist, the pedestal has never been a cage. It never has been and it never will be.” She further maintained that she was “philosophically and morally” opposed to the Equal Rights Amendment and suggested that it would “introduce a feminist philosophy into the United States that is against the nation’s viewpoint that the male is the head of the household.” The crowd again burst into cheers after she said, “We believe in taking care of our husbands, families, for love. We don’t want to do it for money.”91

Four separate votes were conducted at the conference. The first secret vote took place all day Friday on the national resolutions in voting booths throughout the Salt Palace. During the workshops, state resolutions and task force recommendations were presented and voted upon. (See Appendices B and C.) Resolutions that made it successfully through the task force workshop vote were presented before the Saturday plenary session, where votes were given by the raise of hands. Some women (not all) held yellow cards as they voted down the resolutions that came originally from the National Commission. Yet another secret vote elected fourteen delegates out of two hundred nominations to attend the national IWY in Houston.

By law, any bona fide female resident over age sixteen could vote. (Members of state coordinating committees could vote

regardless of age.) Large numbers of women came to the conference convinced that it had been rigged to disenfranchise a majority view, yet these women and their allies emerged as overwhelming victors in the balloting, electing the fourteen anti-ERA delegates who appeared on the Let's Govern Ourselves list to the national conference and defeating every national resolution submitted before the convention.92

When the plenary vote for the ERA was called, thousands of yellow voting cards flashed in the air, and women's voices cheered its defeat.93 Coupled with the resolution against Congress's appropriating any more tax dollars for IWY, Utah's women had taken a position squarely against the women's movement. Charlotte England, a full-time homemaker with a large family, remembered sitting among thousands of women raising their hands repeatedly in negative votes. She said, "Wait a minute! Listen to what that issue is, are you sure you want to vote on that?" And they said, 'Well this is what they wanted us to do, we want to vote against these things, because they're very dangerous.' And I said, 'I don't feel right to vote that way, because . . . it sounds like some pretty good things that they're saying.'94

Christine M. Durham, a Salt Lake attorney and active Mormon who later became Utah's first woman Supreme Court justice, was also distressed by the willingness of so many women to cast negative votes without considering the issues:

It seemed to me that in every session that I attended or heard about they automatically voted down any proposal put forth by any proponent. There didn't seem to me to be any give and take, there didn't seem to be any depth of consideration or thinking. It was basically [as if they were thinking that] these issues—these issues affecting women . . . threaten our conventions and our traditions, and we are going to

---

92This slate, titled: "Pro-Life-Anti-ERA Slate" was supported by Utah Right to Life, Eagle Forum, and Let's Govern Ourselves; photocopy in my possession.
93Salt Lake Tribune, 26 June 1977, A-1. The final act of the Coordinating Committee was submitting a full report to the National Commission. The resulting publication, "Utah State Plan of Action," The Utah Women's Meeting, 24-25 June 1977.
roll them down without looking at their merits independently. And I found that very depressing.\textsuperscript{95}

Georgia Peterson, who had played such a key role in mobilizing participation and directing the vote, was similarly dismayed at how many women functioned politically in this very emotional environment:

Women were coming up to me, saying "Tell us how to vote, tell us how to vote!" And I said, come to the caucus (the medium-size Salt Palace room allocated to LGO) and the room was packed, women sitting on the floor, all around the outside of the room . . . . I was really saddened that women were so totally uninformed about what was going on. And I remember giving a speech at that particular time where I said, "Think, think, you decide what you want! And think, you have a God-given mind, use it!" And I know that women thought I was very harsh; there were many women whose feelings were hurt when I said that. I was totally dismayed that women did not know, because [they] needed so desperately to learn what effect they can have on politics and government.\textsuperscript{96}

The results of the balloting indicate how effective the preconference meetings had been. The women of Utah voted by overwhelming majorities of seven or eight thousand against all national recommendations including women's participation in the arts, day care, nondiscrimination in education, and extending Social Security to homemakers. (See Appendix B, "Utah IWY Conference Votes on the Twenty-six National Recommendations.")\textsuperscript{97}

The women who had attended the informational meetings and those who had received instruction by word of mouth fully believed they were defending the family by casting negative votes on all the national agenda items. I understand their feelings. When I entered the voting booth Friday afternoon, I was fully prepared to likewise cast a negative vote. As a woman who was trying to be a righteous, obedient Latter-day Saint, I believed that a negative vote was in support of righteousness and the family. Then I began

\textsuperscript{95}Christine Meaders Durham, Oral History, interviewed by Leslie Bates, 16 August 1991, Salt Lake City, 4, IWY Project.
\textsuperscript{96}Peterson, Oral History, 5.
\textsuperscript{97}Ballot tabulation, IWY Collection, Utah State Historical Society.
reading the recommendations. I was stunned. They dealt with access to more and better day care for public workers, museums for women and children, and better legislation to protect women who had been raped or molested by relatives or strangers. I found myself suddenly sobbing. The tears running down my cheeks were tears of rage, betrayal, and dismay. I felt I had been tricked—not by my mother-in-law or even by her good-hearted Relief Society president—but rather by some larger force that I didn’t quite understand and couldn’t quite name.

This was the moment of my feminist awakening. This was the moment that I realized I must think for myself, that I could no longer passively wait for instruction from those around me. I wasn’t sure what I was going to do, but I felt deeply ashamed that I had allowed others to be in charge of my life, my mind, and my destiny.

I carefully read each resolution and voted my conscience on them all. I did not vote yes on the ERA, nor did I vote in support of abortion. Nothing I did at that stage, of course, would have affected the eventual outcome. Reba Keele, as she waited in line to vote, saw the women ahead of her entering holding their LGO lists. She overheard “one woman say to the woman in the next booth, ‘I can’t find so-and-so on the ballot.’” Another triumphantly announced her progress through the list: “Well there are ten down and right over with.” Numbly, Keele realized “they were just going down their list and marking.”

Justification for the rejection of the national resolutions revealed certain themes. A distrust of big government was the most prominent. These proposals were not repudiated only because they were feminist in their orientation but also because they allowed the federal government to take responsibility for a larger part of the private lives of its female citizens. Dorothy Littrell, fiscal officer of the Utah IWY Coordinating Committee, voted “no” with the vast majority in attendance, based her negative vote on thoughtful objections to federal interference in her private life. “I object to women being classified as a minority in order to receive special benefits,” she later explained. “I object to a quota
system for jobs for women without regard to qualification. I also object to being part of a world plan of action which my government and my tax dollars are subsidizing." Expanded social services programs fell into this general category. Beyond that, a general satisfaction with their lives on the part of the majority of women in attendance prevented them from empathizing with those who were different from them or whose situations were more challenging.

**THE HOUSTON CONFERENCE**

Some members of the Coordinating Committee expressed their dismay at the elected slate of delegates because they felt the whole process had been manipulated and was not a true representation of the population at large. Committee member Lynne Van Dam “moved that this body file an official complaint on this delegation because we feel it is not representative of the people of Utah.” Of the fourteen delegates and five alternates, seventeen were Republican, two Democrats. Eighteen were LDS, one was Catholic. Eighteen were Euro-American, one was Hispanic. All nineteen listed their incomes as middle class. All listed opposition to the ERA as their principal reason for serving as a delegate. Belle Spafford, Belva Ashton, Elaine Cannon, Jennie Duran, and Gloria Firmage were Relief Society leaders. As a group they were bright and capable, united by a strong commitment to traditional religion as the source of their political beliefs.

Despite their overwhelming state victory, Utah’s delegates found themselves a despised minority at the national convention, probably fulfilling many of their worst fears about a feminist takeover. When individual members tried to voice the Utah opinion, they were shouted down, openly criticized in the press and in plenary sessions and generally treated disrespectfully. After the conference, Ruth Funk wrote the IYW Commission making a formal complaint about the treatment they had received.

---


100 Utah IYW Coordinating Committee, Minutes, 29 June 1977.
It is our opinion that the IWY National Commission is a pressure group whose purpose is to secure passage of the Equal Rights Amendment and Reproductive Freedom [abortion] recommendations. It is not an open forum for the discussion of women's problems and concerns. The purpose of the Houston Conference, as designed by the National IWY Commission, is not to allow the free input of ideas and proposals of women across the nation, but rather it is a massive demonstration of political sentiment in favor of the Equal Rights Amendment, designed to intimidate state and national legislatures in support of the amendment. We believe the IWY National Commission, as the recipient of public funding should provide a forum for the free discussion of a wide range of issues facing American women, rather than perform the function of a federally-funded lobbyist group for a predetermined and unpopular end.\(^\text{101}\)

After the IWY, the Relief Society General Board held a series of meetings with stake Relief Society presidents in Utah. According to Barbara B. Smith:

> It was strongly expressed that Mormon women wanted more information, help with skills in parliamentary procedures, and a clear understanding of the expectations so that they might participate more effectively in future community and state meetings. We decided to provide instruction in the curriculum and to encourage Relief Society members and leaders to constantly strive to be more knowledgeable about, and responsive to, the issues involved in each community, not just those pertaining to the IWY. Women were encouraged to learn how to conduct themselves in public forums, how to have influence as individual citizens, and how to use parliamentary procedures in public meetings.\(^\text{102}\)

The Relief Society had learned some potent lessons from IWY. Perhaps the most important of these was the value and importance of having an informed, politically sophisticated female membership.

Why did the dream of a dialogue among Utah's women about the issues that impacted them fall so flat? Two factors seem particularly important: (1) The participants were politically inex-

\(^{101}\)“Open Letter to the National IWY Commission,” n.d., Ruth Hardy Funk Collection; photocopy in my possession. The delegation also sent a telegram to President Jimmy Carter protesting the course of events at the Houston conference. See Deseret News, 27 October 1977, B-2.

experienced, uninformed women who were overly dependent on a patriarchal religious structure for direction; (2) The paranoia over the ERA that preceded the conference poisoned the atmosphere from the first. Feminists had already been convincingly portrayed as the enemy of the family and religious values. Feminism became the scapegoat for much that was awry in American society. It is not possible to separate the story of the IWY in Utah from the Church’s successful efforts to defeat the ERA. Thousands of Mormon women, mobilized through a structure they trusted, hearing language that was familiar, truly believed that they were defending the truth, the family, and traditional values against a destruction-bent conspiracy by the feminist left.

Many women felt proud of their contribution to the conference. Jayne Ann Morgan Payne, a Provo homemaker, was thoroughly conscious that she represented the traditional viewpoint of homemakers. "We were representative of more of the mainstream women of Utah than the Governor’s Commission on the Status of Women. . . . There was a fear that the ideas that came out of the conference would not be representative but inimicable to the values of home and family," Payne later remembered. She considered the polarization unfortunate, but overall the effect of the conference was "beneficial" to the women of Utah.103

Florence Jacobsen, a delegate to the National Conference, was also positive in her assessment of what transpired at the Utah Conference. The opportunity for dialogue was unique in the state’s history, and she saw the conference’s principal value as a forum for that dialogue—disturbing though it became at times. She felt that truly listening to others’ viewpoints was extremely useful, the only way one can grow and learn. It is important, she said, to "put yourself in their shoes, really find out what they’re saying because many times . . . we make up our minds about issues without really listening to the other side. . . . We already have a set opinion." She summarized: "I think this was the great thing that came out of the conference: . . . —we listened to each other

and tried to address the problems that we perhaps were not as aware of as we came [to be] by going to the conference.\textsuperscript{104}

Ruth Funk couched her evaluation of the conference in religious terminology. "This is marvelous," she remembered thinking, "that people have a forum whereby they can express themselves. I do believe in agency. I believe in free agency above, over everything else. For that reason I thought it was good. But it grieved me that they were using their agency without being informed. That's really what it amounted to. By and large though, I think that some good came out of that."\textsuperscript{105} For committee chair Jan Tyler, the most significant part of the conference was:

\ldots the vision of the opportunity. It was an opportunity that wasn't matched [by reality], in my honest opinion. But the vision of the opportunity. I still feel that. \ldots This is the largest political meeting this state has ever had. \ldots The other thing was the opportunity, maybe the first opportunity, at least in modern times in this state for women to come together around something that was theirs [even though] it had been highly politicized, and I \ldots function with no illusions about how that had happened.

It was like I was watching fourteen births at once. Even [for] those of us who had our own earlier awakenings it was a \ldots jolting consciousness of a different kind. Without exception every woman who was there was radicalized, either very conservatively or, if you already had some kind of awareness, you were radicalized—more radicalized. \ldots and it was painful to watch those births that were mishandled. There was not a natural process of discovery and joy and information and learning and being able to process this yourself.\textsuperscript{106}

Christine Durham saw that even the negative experience had a positive side:

The IWY had the effect, partly because it was so awful and so negative, of getting that message out to a lot of people in a big hurry. And the net result within five years was that there were far more well-informed, involved activist women around the community who were saying, "There have got to be changes. Things have got to be done."

There were hundreds, thousands of women who were sensitized

\textsuperscript{105}Funk, Oral History, 10.
\textsuperscript{106}Tyler, Oral History, 19.
as a result of the IWY conference who started looking around them—looking around in their schools and their neighborhoods and their communities and their offices and their professions and saying, "Gee, I never quite saw the world before. It doesn't look quite right to me. What needs to be done about it?" And they got active and started doing things about it. I think there's a direct correlation. I'm hopeful that would have happened without IWY, but as I said, I think IWY enhanced the process in our state.\textsuperscript{107}

Yet even when the IWY was a victory, hurt lingered. Ruth Funk felt the same let-down, the same sense of discouragement and fallen dreams, as liberal members of the Coordinating Committee: "There I sat with all these women that I have come to love and really believed—even though they felt, most of them, differently than I on many issues and they knew it and I knew it—but we had such a respect for each other that it was—oh, it was painful."\textsuperscript{108}

Cynthia Boshard summarizes her feelings in 1977 this way:

> I put those feelings away a long time ago and try not to go back to it because they are so painful and so hurtful. It was such a bad experience for me about this state and the leadership of the Mormon Church who I think, or thought then, were well-intentioned... When it was all over [I felt that]... it was cruel, and it was dirty handed, and there was not one ounce of Christianity in any of what they were doing because they were acting so much out of fear. I started to understand how Christian wars get started.\textsuperscript{109}

As these women's voices express, the IWY conference was marked above all else by diversity of experience. It was different for us all. My own experience typifies the reasons the conference failed to materialize the hopes of its planners. I came to the Salt Palace ill-prepared, uninformed, certainly well-intentioned but inexperienced in political activity. But as the idealistic mother of two daughters I wanted my community to more effectively address the issues facing women. For me, distinctions of feminist/non-feminist had little meaning. But issues that affected my family did. For me, my membership in the Church was not what

\textsuperscript{107} Durham, Oral History, 8.
\textsuperscript{108} Funk, Oral History, 7.
\textsuperscript{109} Boshard, Oral History, 13.
caused me to vote one way or the other, but what I believed would impact my daughters' lives for good or evil. My decisions were largely intuitive, rather than grounded in information and were likely as suspect as those women who voted with the bloc. Too many of us were unready for the conference.

The plan of the Conservative Caucus, of Let's Govern Ourselves, and of the Eagle Forum worked because it so nearly matched the objectives of the Church as expressed in the position of the Utah delegation and the Mormon majority in attendance at the conference. To many women, this instruction to vote no on every issue felt right because we had not become sufficiently informed about the issues.

Yet the task of understanding the IWY conference is far from completed. One woman described IWY as a catharsis for the women's movement. Another said she waited seven years before she talked publicly about it. One described it as her Vietnam. Still another wrote a novel during the following year which she considers her best work but which she will likely never publish because the private pain it expresses is so intense.

Aileen H. Clyde of Springville, Utah, who attended the conference and who later became second counselor in the Relief Society general presidency, immediately wrote a letter to the editor of the Provo Herald encouraging further reflection: "The meaning and importance of the Women's Conference held in Salt Lake City this past weekend invites continuing study," she wrote. "I hope that both the women participants and the women they are credited with having represented will examine carefully their own understanding of the 22 issues presented there so that they can have a constructive influence as our society continues to focus on the rights of women as persons." She continued by expressing her dismay at the lack of participation in the mass meetings during May and at the manipulation of Mormon women by Dennis Ker and the Conservative Caucus. She continued:

May I suggest some inferences I could make from this. (1) Mr. Ker found these women easy to mislead. (2) Mr. Ker found the women had misled themselves. (3) These women were so full of pre-conceived notions that such group participation clouded their judgment about the difference between church and political sponsorship. (4) These women forgot temporarily the counsel of their Church that they should
never use their Church callings for political purposes. . . . That Utah had the largest Women's Conference participation in the United States is noteworthy to the extent that it was Utah women representing themselves. To the extent that the large attendance resulted from political manipulation of Utah women's Church loyalty, it might not be so exemplary.110

A letter to the editor that appeared in the *Salt Lake Tribune* on 2 December 1977 commented on the irony of this dichotomy:

> Anti-ERA women call themselves "pro-family"—as if they consider the rest of us to be anti-family. How can widowed and divorced women, who are fighting to gain the benefits and wages that only men have enjoyed in the past, be labelled "anti-family," when many of them are the sole support of their families? These women (my daughter is one of them) work long, hard hours at a daytime job, then go home to clean, cook, sew, etc., for several hours more. After they pay babysitting or nursery fees for the care of their children, most of them find it difficult—if not impossible—to make ends meet. Certainly, they have to forego all of the luxuries their more fortunate sisters take for granted. After reading the list of names and backgrounds of Utah's elected delegates to the IWY conference, I realized the majority of these women, as wives of prominent and/or well-to-do men, have never had to depend upon their own earnings for their families' livelihood; they've had the time and the money to pursue the careers they wanted, instead of wasting their talents in a stenographers' pool, a department store sales force, or a restaurant's waitress crew, at a salary most men would scorn. And what makes the anti-feminists think pro-ERA women are all in favor of abortions and lesbians' rights? There are many of us who believe [that] proper sex education in our schools (because most youngsters aren't getting it in their homes) and the availability of free family planning in our communities would do much to eliminate both of these problems in the future. The Utah elected delegation's indignant reaction to the appointment of at-large delegates to the national IWY conference was amusing, since their arguments that it was a biased, unrepresentative group could also have been applied to them.111

A second letter to the editor that appeared in December, after the Houston conference, correctly identified the gridlock

---

created by seemingly unreconcilable and equally inflexible viewpoints. "As a loyal Mormon with liberal politics," Alan Rasmussen, from Salt Lake City, wrote, "I believe that both the IWY committee and the Utah delegation are guilty of over generalization and self-righteousness. When two groups so violently disagree, one faction rarely has a corner on truth or goodness." 112 The year 1997 will see the twentieth anniversary of the IWY conference, but the struggle to understand its meaning still continues.

APPENDIX A

ORAL HISTORY INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Your name?
2. Your address?
3. Tell me about your background, where you were born and raised and where you were educated.
4. What type of education/training do you have?
5. Please explain the work that you do.
6. What political party do you belong to?
7. Do you belong to any civic organizations or clubs?
8. The purpose of this interview is to gather personal information about the International Women's Year Conference held in Salt Lake City in June of 1977. What role did you play?
9. How did you hear about the conference?
10. Did you attend the conference in a group or take part by yourself?
11. What were your expectations as you attended the IWY conference?
12. Did you attend the conference in an official capacity?
13. Did you serve on any committees? If so:
14. What were your responsibilities as a committee member?
15. What was the objective of your committee?
16. What forces would you say shaped the success or failure of your committee's goals?
17. Did you stay at the conference the entire time? Did you attend the meetings held on Saturday as well?
18. Which workshops did you attend? What is your memory of the presentations you heard?
19. What part of the conference had the most impact on you?
20. Could you sense or did you feel that you were a part of something important?
21. Others have expressed a feeling that the institutional part of IWY was less important than the interpersonal relationships that devel-

oped. Was this your experience? If so, let's talk about that dimension of the conference.

22. Some women have mentioned that the IWY conference led to a polarization between LDS and non-LDS. Did you recognize such a split? If so, why do you think it occurred?

23. In your opinion, did the IWY conference slow down women's issues in Utah or cause recognition to grow?

24. Many who attended the conference have expressed the idea that it was a sort of watershed in their lives, a feminist awakening, or at least a re-dedication to the work of women's issues. Did the IWY conference affect you in a similar way?

25. Do you think that the IWY conference had an enduring impact on the position of women in the State of Utah in any sense? And if yes, how?

26. If you could have changed anything about the conference, what would you have done differently?

27. What relationship did the IWY have with the women's movement at large?

28. Would you have described yourself as a feminist in 1977?

29. How has your view of yourself and your beliefs in women's issues changed since 1977?

30. How do you define feminism?

31. Do you feel it is more difficult to admit feminism in the State of Utah? If so, to what do you attribute this? If not, what are your thoughts on the subject?

32. What changes in the position of women in today's society have you observed in the years since June of 1977?

33. To what do you attribute these changes?

34. What advice would you offer to women who want to improve the status of women in our society?

35. What type of action would you suggest?

Finally, we asked for other names for interviews and whether the interviewee had kept any files or other material that might be useful in this project.

APPENDIX B

UTAH IWY CONFERENCE VOTES ON THE TWENTY-SIX NATIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Arts and Humanities

1. The President should take steps to require that women (1) have equal opportunities for appointment to managerial and upper level posts in Federally-funded cultural institutions, such as libraries, museums, universities, and public radio and TV; (2) are more equitably represented in the staffing of grant-awarding agencies; (3) benefit more fairly from
government grants, whether as individual grant applicants or as members of cultural institutions receiving Federal or State funding. *Agree 1,486; Disagree 8,041; Don’t know 73.*

2. Judging agencies and review boards should use blind judging for musicians, singers, articles, and papers being considered for publication or delivery, exhibits, and grant applications, wherever possible. *Agree 2,091; Disagree 7,199; Don’t know 130.*

B. Child Care

1. The federal government should assume a major role in providing universal voluntary child development programs with ability-to-pay fee schedules and with direct parental involvement in operation. *Agree 693; Disagree 8,424; Don’t know 67.*

2. Employers and labor unions should be encouraged by tax policies of federal and state governments to establish nonprofit child care programs. *Agree 1,020; Disagree 8,424; Don’t know 75.*

3. Education for parenthood programs should be improved and expanded by local and state boards with technical assistance and experimental programs provided by the Federal government. *Agree 1,020; Disagree 8,424; Don’t know 75.*

C. Credit

1. The Federal Equal Credit Opportunity Act should be vigorously, efficiently, and expeditiously enforced by all the Federal agencies with enforcement responsibility. *Agree 2,021; Disagree 7,485; Don’t know 152.*

D. Education

1. The President should direct the vigorous and expeditious enforcement of all laws prohibiting discrimination in education, including sports, and oppose any amendments that would weaken the protections. *Agree 670; Disagree 8,860; Don’t know 132.*

2. Federal surveys of elementary and secondary schools should gather data needed to indicate compliance with federal anti-discrimination laws, and these data should be collected by sex and race or ethnicity. *Agree 657; Disagree 8,910; Don’t know 115.*

3. The Civil Rights Commission should conduct a study to evaluate the enforcement of laws prohibiting sex discrimination in physical education and athletics. *Agree 1,666; Disagree 7,864; Don’t know 148.*

4. Bilingual vocational training and education programs should be significantly expanded. *Agree 1,148; Disagree 8,326; Don’t know 177.*

5. Leadership programs for working women in post-secondary schools should be upgraded and expanded, and private foundations are urged to give special attention to research on women in unions. *Agree 1,148; Disagree 8,326; Don’t know 117.*

E. Employment

1. The President should direct the vigorous and expeditious enforcement of all laws, executive orders, and regulations prohibiting discrimina-
tion in employment, including discrimination in apprenticeship and in construction. Agree 1,197; Disagree 8,455; Don’t know 85.

2. The Executive Branch of the federal government should abide by the same standards as private employers. Agree 2,217; Disagree 7,227; Don’t know 223.

3. Protections and privileges afforded minority business owners should be extended to women business owners. Agree 2,043; Disagree 7,473; Don’t know 131.

4. All enforcement agencies should follow the guidelines of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. Agree 1,304; Disagree 8,137; Don’t know 222.

5. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission should be expanded to cover discrimination in job evaluation systems. Agree 1,108; Disagree 8,357; Don’t know 199.

6. Unions should review the impact on women of all their practices and correct injustices to women. Agree 1,724; Disagree 7,838; Don’t know 1,020.

7. The President should take into account in appointments to the National Labor Relations Board and in seeking amendments to it the obstacles confronting women who organize in traditionally nonunionized employment sectors. Agree 1,241; Disagree 8,221; Don’t know 252.

8. Extra attention should be given the employment needs of minority women, especially blacks, Hispanics, Asian-Americans, and Native Americans. Agree 951; Disagree 8,624; Don’t know 144.

9. Enforcement of the Fair Labor Standards Act and the Social Security Act as they apply to household workers should be improved. Agree 1,297; Disagree 8,149; Don’t know 255.

10. All statistics collected by the federal government should be gathered and analyzed so that information concerning the impact of federal programs on women and the participation of women in the administration of federal programs can be assessed. Agree 1,210; Disagree 8,334; Don’t know 158.

F. Female Offenders

1. Federal and state governments should cooperate in providing more humane, sensible, and economic treatment of young women who are subject to court jurisdiction because they have run away from home, have family or school problems, or commit sexual offenses (“status offenders”). Agree 1,831; Disagree 7,678; Don’t know 154.

2. Disparities in the treatment of male and female juvenile offenders should be eliminated. Agree 1,591; Disagree 7,910; Don’t know 195.

3. States should review their sentencing laws and their practices relating to women in penal facilities with a view to eliminating discrimination and reforming treatment. Agree 1,591; Disagree 7,910; Don’t know 195.

G. Health

1. The President should direct a review of whether women and their
mental and physical health needs are being treated equitably in the health related functions of the federal government. Agree 118; Disagree 8,452; Don't know 135.

2. Women should be represented in all aspects of health-related federal programs, including policy, administration, research design, research populations, and general service availability to women. Agree 1,729; Disagree 7,825; Don't know 105.

H. Legal Status of Homemakers

1. Federal and state laws relating to marital property, inheritance, and domestic relations should be based on the principle that marriage is a partnership, in which the contribution of each spouse is of equal importance and value. Agree 1,281; Disagree 8,202; Don't know 208.

2. Homemakers should be covered under Social Security. Agree 1,405; Disagree 8,039; Don't know 247.

3. Alimony, child support, and property arrangements at divorce should be such that minor children's needs are first to be met and spouses share the economic dislocation of divorce. As a minimum the economic provisions of the Uniform Marriage and Divorce Act should be enacted in every state. Agree 1,405; Disagree 8,039; Don't know 247.

4. More effective methods for collection of support should be adopted. Agree 1,145; Disagree 8,282; Don't know 232.

5. Homemakers displaced by widowhood or divorce should be helped to become self-sufficient members of society through programs providing job counseling, training, and placement; advice on financial management; and legal advice. Agree 2,091; Disagree 7,442; Don't know 101.

I. International Interdependence

1. The President and the foreign affairs agencies of the federal government should see to it that many more women participate in the formulation and execution of U.S. foreign policy, including greater consultation with women in citizen voluntary organizations which are concerned with international affairs. Agree 1,364; Disagree 8,200; Don't know 135.

2. More women should be appointed to U.S. delegations at international conferences and to governing bodies of international organizations. Agree 462; Disagree 8,093; Don't know 141.

3. The U.N. Commission on the Status of Women should be continued and should meet annually. Agree 1,463; Disagree 7,949; Don't know 259.

J. Mass Media

1. The mass media should employ women in all job categories and especially in policy-making positions. Agree 1,371; Disagree 8,214; Don't know 111.

2. Affirmative efforts should be made by the media to expand the portrayal of women to include a variety of roles and to represent accurately
the number of women in society. Agree 1,371; Disagree 8,214; Don't know 111.

3. Appropriate federal agencies, such as the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, the Federal Communications Commission and the Department of HEW, among others, should vigorously enforce those laws which prohibit employment discrimination against women working in the media. Agree 1,433; Disagree 8,089; Don't know 146.

4. Federal agencies should continue studying the impact of the mass media on sex discrimination and sex-role stereotyping in the American society. Special consideration should be given to media which are publicly funded or established through acts of Congress. Agree 918; Disagree 8,577; Don't know 141.

K. Equal Rights Amendment
The Equal Rights Amendment should be ratified. Agree 666; Disagree 8,956; Don't know 84.

L. Older Women
1. Public and private women's organizations should work together to give publicity to the positive roles of women over fifty and to provide the services that will enable elderly women to function comfortably in their own homes instead of moving to institutions. Agree 1,591; Disagree 7,896; Don't know 224.

M. Rape
1. State and local governments should revise rape laws to provide for graduated degrees of the crime, to apply to assault by or upon both sexes; to include all types of sexual assault against adults; and to otherwise redefine the crime so that victims are under no greater legal handicaps than victims of other crimes. Agree 2,296; Disagree 7,235; Don't know 164.

2. Local task forces to review and reform law and practices of police, prosecutors, and medical personnel should be established where they do not now exist. Agree 2414; Disagree 7,008; Don't know 173.

N. Teenage Pregnancy
1. The IWY Committee believes that the moral decisions relating to production are rightfully the responsibility of individual women and that every woman, regardless of her economic circumstances, education, race or ethnic origin, age, rural or metropolitan residence, is entitled as a basic human right to have readily available the means of controlling reproduction. The IWY Commission: Supports the series of Supreme Court decisions guaranteeing reproductive freedom to women; Urges all branches of federal, state, and local governments to give the highest priority to complying with these Supreme Court decisions and to making available all methods of family planning to women unable to take advantage of private facilities; Condemns any interference, open or subtle, with a woman's right to control her reproduction; and Urges organizations concerned with improving the status of women to monitor how government complies with these
principles. Particular attention should be paid at all levels of government to providing family planning services for teenagers, education in responsible sexuality, and reform of laws discriminating against illegitimate children and their parents. Agree 627; Disagree 9,048; Don't know 66.

O. Women in Elective Appointive Office

1. The President, governors, political parties, women's organizations, and foundations should join in an effort to increase the number of women in elective and appointive office, including especially judgeships. Agree 1,463; Disagree 8,057; Don't know 121.

APPENDIX C

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS DRAFTED BY PRE-CONFERENCE TASK FORCES, DISCUSSED IN WORKSHOPS AND VOTED ON IN PLENARY SESSION AT UTAH'S IWY CONFERENCE, JUNE 24-25, 1977

Aging. Recommendations: Reform present Social Security guidelines as follows: (1) Make provision for individually maintained social security accounts without regard to marital status. (2) Raise the earning limitations. This would permit women and all other retired persons to earn more without reducing benefits. (3) Repeal any mandatory retirement provisions. (4) Eliminate or shorten the six months waiting period when separated couples cannot be eligible for individual benefits under the supplemental security income programs. (5) Permit SSI benefits to continue during periods of temporary institutionalization.

Passed in the plenary session were items 2, 3, and 5. All three recommendations fulfill the substance of the national recommendations.

Arts and Humanities. Recommendations: (1) The Arts and Humanities Task Force recommends that agencies offering grants to arts and humanities-related projects more publicly announce the availability of grants and educate the residents of the state on the procedure of applying for grants. (2) We further recommend that the state legislature allocate funds for a public information person attached to the Utah State Division of Fine Arts to achieve this end. (3) Special consideration is due the communities away from large, metropolitan areas.

The first recommendation passed in the plenary session. The others did not. All other discussion of the national recommendations did not persist past the workshop.

Employment. Recommendations: The governor should direct the Utah Anti-Discrimination Division to (1) develop training programs for employers, employees, and public regarding fair employment practices, (2) fill the UADD position of Division Coordinator (required by statute)
and hire other staff representing the interests of women, (3) develop a more efficient and timely investigation/conciliation process. The Utah Legislature should (1) change the name of the UADD to the Utah Office of Fair Employment Practices, (2) change the Utah Anti-Discrimination Act of 1965 as amended to conform with federal law. The workshop also recommended that (1) MEDCU and SBA should consider women as another economically disadvantaged group and develop outreach and technical assistance programs for women, (2) the governor should issue an executive order requiring that women be invited to bid in purchasing activities of the state and agencies contracting with the state, and should direct Development Services to develop programs to attract women business owners to Utah. The governor and local elected officials should (1) develop management training programs for women and awareness training programs for current administrators, (2) make affirmative efforts to appoint qualified women to high-level administrative jobs, (3) designate funds, including present special CETA funds, to allow women job opportunities, (4) direct detailed study of merit and civil service systems to remove barriers to women's advancement in state, city and county jobs. The final group of recommendations included the following ideas. (1) WIN and CETA programs should redirect programs and support services to train more women in nontraditional occupations. (2) The governor should earmark a portion of existing state and federal discretionary funds to develop and test pilot programs for women entering nontraditional occupations.

The recommendations coming out of the workshop reflected the national agenda but were all rejected by the plenary session.

Equal Rights Amendment. Recommendations: (1) Because the women of Utah are opposed to ERA, we propose that all proponents or opponents of ERA from this time forth finance their causes with whatever privately sponsored funding they may obtain. We oppose the use of our public monies to promote or oppose the ERA. (2) We go on record as being opposed to the Equal Rights Amendment. (3) Resolved that, we, the participants of the largest IWY Meeting in our Nation's history, direct the Congress of the United States to appropriate no new funds for International Women's Year.

No task force resolutions made it through to the plenary sessions.

Women in Utah History. Recommendations: (1) That women be included in the history of Utah as it is written in textbooks and monographs, as it is taught in the public schools and institutions of higher learning, and as it is ritualized in programs, pageants, and monuments. (2) That history departments, historical societies, museums and archives
hire more women as managers, actively collect women's materials, and conscientiously promote the inclusion of women in Utah history.

The workshop recommendations were passed in the plenary session.

**Child Abuse.** Recommendations: (1) Increase public education and expand treatment and prevention in all existing outreach programs. (2) Appoint more juvenile court judges to deal with the cases in a more expeditious manner. (3) Expand the State Advisory Committee on Child Abuse to effect better coordination of existing resources and conduct a public awareness program. (4) Establish within the Division of Family Services an effective central registry in coordination with hospitals, pediatricians, other medical personnel and related agencies. (5) Follow through with the State Plan on Child Abuse and Neglect (June 1975) which received approval of the governor. Provide adequate funding for increasing, not only the number of social workers in the Division of Family Services, Protective Service, but provide specific training programs in neglect and abuse prevention.

Four task force recommendations (1, 2, 4, and 5) passed the plenary session.

**Child Development.** Recommendations: The total local community must make a commitment to improve, expand and coordinate parent education classes at the junior high, high school, and post high school levels. We support the Utah State Board of Education policy in recommending training for responsible adulthood and parenthood classes for all students in the secondary schools subject to community approval as per type material taught. This education should be provided by teachers who have proven competence in the areas of child development and family relationships.

No task force recommendations survived the plenary session, a rejection of national recommendations.

**Wife Abuse.** Recommendations: Establish a network of emergency safety haven shelters for physically and emotionally battered wives to be sponsored by local organizations and the Division of Family Services. Furthermore, they recommended (1) that the legal system be encouraged to be responsive to battered wives cases, (2) that information on legal alternatives must be made readily available, (3) that the legislature encourage the adoption of stronger state laws for the punishment of wife abusers and protection of wives, (4) that the state establish and enforce laws requiring that a husband have a legal obligation to provide financial compensation for losses suffered by a battered wife: i.e., medical expenses, child care during recovery and compensation for missed employment, (5) that all city, county, and state law enforcement bodies be
encouraged to maintain separate statistics on wife-abuse incidents, (6) that churches, volunteer groups, civic organizations, and the media be encouraged to educate the public to the existence of wife abuse and available alternatives for victims.

This category of recommendations matches the spirit of the national recommendations. All task force recommendations survived both the workshop and the plenary session.

**Rape.** Recommendations: (1) Enact a statute which would limit the introduction of evidence of the victim's past sexual conduct or general sexual reputation to specific incidences where it is clearly relevant and where the court, after a closed hearing, makes a determination as to relevancy and admissibility. (2) Eliminate all language in Utah's laws which discriminate on the basis of gender of attacker or victim. (3) Bring rape and sexual assault laws into harmony with other criminal statutes by including spouses as victims. (4) Provide counseling for victims of sexual assault by individuals specifically trained to deal with this unique problem, and increase medical sensitivity to the needs of the sexual assault victim. (5) Insure the victim of rape freedom of choice in terminating or sustaining pregnancies resulting from rape. (6) Provide compensation to victims for property damage, loss of income, and medical and counseling expenses.

Defeated in the plenary session were items 2, 3, 5, and 6.

**Minority Women.** Recommendations: (1) Adequate funding for child care services for low-income women. (2) Improved multi-cultural educational opportunities. (3) Bilingual and multi-cultural education in educational institutions.

All recommendations defeated at the workshop stage.

**Health Education.** Recommendations: (1) Ask that the Federal Drug Administration compile and distribute a table of bioequivalent drugs. (2) Remove taxes from eye-glasses and hearing aids. (3) Improve existing school health programs with qualified teachers. (4) Place more women in decision-making bodies at policy-making levels in health areas. (5) Abolish discriminatory acts by insurance company. (6) Establish local boards of interested and eminent health professionals to review, research, train, and educate women and the public on pertinent health issues.

The plenary session approved 1 and 2.

**Mental Health.** Recommendations: (1) Implement in the secondary school system a curriculum which includes the teaching of parenting and child development skills. Credit for these classes should be allowed toward graduation. (2) Launch an educational program by utilizing existing community organizations and agencies through which
classes and support systems may be available to those citizens desiring them. (3) Provide training and services through local rather than federal funding which includes job skills development, job preparation, job preparation, financial management, availability of cooperative day care and temporary welfare programs.

The plenary session modified and passed versions of all three recommendations.

**Legal Status of Homemakers.** Recommendations: (1) Recommend the establishment of a mandatory family court system of Utah. (2) Recommend tax reform to allow tax deductions for expenses accrued by the disability of full-time homemakers. The provisions of the Internal Revenue Code and state legislation relating to estate and gift taxes should be amended to eliminate taxation on all transfers of property between husband and wife at death and on all gifts between husband and wife during their lifetimes. (3) Recommend that the Social Security Act benefits presently accruing to the spouse employed outside the home accrue equally to the homemaker and the spouse. (4) Support the Utah Parentage Act. (5) Recommend and urge women in Utah to become aware of and to cooperate with State and County Recovery Services.

All task force recommendations survived the plenary session except 3. None of the task force recommendations addressed key issues in the national agenda including divorce law reform, job counseling, training and placement after divorce or widowhood, or property.

**International Interdependence.** Recommendations: No recommendations were prepared in advance of the workshop, but recommendations emerged against foreign aid, international interdependence, and "any world government body which attempts to dilute our national laws and personal sovereignty." The plenary session adopted all the resolutions except the one against foreign aid. The recommendations did not address the specific issues in the national agenda, although this should not be seen as a rejection of the ideas but rather as a different focus.

**Media.** Recommendations: (1) The media should support as an ultimate goal the employment of women in policy-making positions, special efforts to employ women who are knowledgeable, employment of qualified women at all job levels, support of equal pay, opportunity, training and promotion of women. (2) Content changes to avoid the exploitation of women or to broaden subject matter to include stories about women. (3) The media should educate the public about the violence of rape rather than its sexual aspects. (4) A person's right to determine her or his own title should be respected. (5) Television and radio should withdraw all commercials concerning women's personal health products.
Items 1, 2, and 4 were rejected in the plenary session, a rejection of the national agenda's emphasis on placing women in key positions.

**Men.** Recommendations: (1) Stringent enforcement of current anti-pornographic legislation and even stronger control of the distribution of pornographic materials, recognizing that pornography is as damaging to men as to women. (2) Alternative living accommodations for victims of family violence. These accommodations can be private through members of churches and other organizations volunteering their homes as a refuge, or through public funding for facilities. (3) Parenting skills training mandatory for all secondary high school students.

These three recommendations emerged from the workshop. The plenary session passed an amended version of 1.

**Reproductive Health.** Recommendations: (1) The distinction between male and female gender not be taken out of textbooks but stressing that although there are differences in gender there should be equality in opportunities. (2) Sexual training in textbooks and in classrooms is not allowed, with the exception of basic anatomical natural reproduction. (3) No sex education before the sixth grade. (4) Unnatural sex acts such as homosexuality and self-stimulation are not to be taught in public schools. On the issue of abortion: (1) All state and federally funded abortions should be ruled unlawful. (2) “We, the people of Utah, propose that it be on record that we support the Right to Life Amendment.” (3) Funds now used for abortion should be used for medical research to eliminate birth defects and to assist those who place their children for adoption. On the issue of sex education: (1) Steps should be taken to strengthen the family unit. (2) Sex education is the sacred responsibility of all parents, thus classes should be made available through local religious and civic organizations to teach parents how to teach their children about sex and its responsibility.

All task force recommendations were rejected at the workshop stage, a rejection of national recommendations.

**Young Women, Life Span Planning.** Recommendations: (1) Families and schools should train young women in making conscious life choices to receive training both to be self-supporting and to prepare time to be adequate wives and mothers, if and when either option arises. (2) The increase and improvement in sex education for parents. 3) Better sex education for the medical profession, clergy, and professional counselors so they can better counsel adults and young people.

No task force recommendations survived the plenary session, a rejection of the national recommendations.

**Teenage Pregnancy.** Recommendations: (1) Schools should pro-
vide vocational training for pregnant students or students who are also parents. (2) Schools should sponsor education programs to prevent teenage pregnancy.

Recommendation 1 passed the workshop and plenary session.
As a small child, I lived in a tiny town in southern Utah, usually driving to northern Utah where my parents grew up for our holidays. There were no freeways, and the trip lasted far into the night. I loved the long rides and, in those pre-seatbelt days, would press my forehead against the window of our little Ford and watch carefully as we progressed through towns and villages. I was especially curious whenever we would pass a lonely farmhouse with lighted windows. Who lived behind those curtains? Was there a mother who played the piano in the evenings like mine? Did she write in her journal? Was there another little girl about my age there? What was she doing? Could she ever guess that I was watching and wondering about her life? This book takes me not into those farm houses of long ago, but back further to a Nauvoo log house into a room with firelight flickering from yellow to red, and then down to a single ember.

In Their Own Words: Women and the Story of Nauvoo, compiled by Carol Cornwall Madsen, of BYU’s Joseph Fielding Smith Institute for Church History, is a feminine interpretation of the story of Mormon Nauvoo which began when a gathering of believers brought their dream of Zion to a Mississippi swamp village in early 1839. Madsen retells the familiar Nauvoo story using appropriate vignettes from the diaries, letters, and reminiscences of women participants who in general had a testimony of Mormonism and a sense of mission. Madsen organized her book according to these three formats, introducing each section and each individual writer carefully. The segments were then discussed chronologically within the Nauvoo period. Though I knew exactly how the tale would end, reading the book became a powerful emotional experience as Madsen’s artful organization, graceful and poetic prose,
and moving introductions to each section, enticed me step by step deeper into the Nauvoo experience. Madsen explains her focus:

Though these women were preoccupied with the continuous challenges of housing shortages, scarcity of commodities, and ubiquitous disease, they wrote predominantly religious narratives, recorded accounts of lives mandated and justified by the spiritual epiphany that brought them to Nauvoo. It is as though in the recital of their daily struggles they gave testimony to the greater truth that informed their lives, the restoration of the Gospel of Jesus Christ and their own part in that important movement. (pp. 45)

The Nauvoo idyll was brief. By mid-1841 Thomas Sharp was aiming barbs at the Mormons in his *Warsaw Signal* with John C. Bennett’s exposés following in July 1842. Joseph Smith was arrested in June 1841, again the next summer, and finally, fatally, in June 1844. Yet judging from the women’s writings, Nauvoo was no uncertain sanctuary. They struggled physically to build homes and to beautify their environment, making improvements that breathed permanence. A June 1842 letter by Ellen Briggs Douglas reassured her parents in England: “Scores of houses have been built since we have come here and they still continue building & it is 8 weeks this night since we came in. . . . We have got our garden plowed and planted. . . . We have planted corn, potatoes, beans, peas, onions, punkins, melons, cucumbers. . . . I think we are far better here than in old England” (p. 110).

The Latter-day Saint Marys and Marthas pooled their talents to introduce refinement and grace, developing visiting rituals of friendship which became the basis of health and welfare services, cultural and educational programs, and social and recreational needs; and which would be transferred with them to the Utah territory (p. 16). The Prophet Joseph Smith himself was a powerful and central beacon in their midst as he revealed gospel truths. Nancy Tracy describes him on one occasion as “so full of the Spirit of the Holy Ghost that his frame shook and his face shone and he looked almost transparent” (p. 26). He trained selected sisters to minister certain of the ordinances of the now rising Nauvoo Temple. These “holy” women became the nucleus of a “sisterhood of temple workers that expanded with the building of each new temple in the West” (p. 18). Madsen’s interpretation of the role of women and the Nauvoo Temple was more insightful and moving than anything I have previously seen in print.

The sisters cultivated and shared healing powers. Often left alone with a farm and small children, they acquired independence, organized a Relief Society, and wrote a brilliant defense of the Mormon cause to Governor Thomas Carlin of Illinois, which Emma Smith and Eliza R. Snow delivered with the signatures of a thousand women (p. 130). And some of them prayerfully accepted the challenges of plural marriage, revealed at this time to a chosen few. To quote Madsen, “Life for them was an experience of the soul as well as the body” (p. 95).
By 1844, however, diaries and letters revealed subtle apprehensions that further tests awaited them. Phoebe Carter Woodruff reassured her husband, Wilford, in a charming and innocent letter written from Nauvoo eleven days before the mob murders of Joseph and Hyrum Smith. She chatted easily about the forebodings of John Taylor who was “waiting for Joseph to say go to him, but there is much excitement here at present and he thinks he better wait” (p. 136).

The Nauvoo women, who have long been mythic figures to the Church, might have escaped the destiny of the final exodus. Ellen Cheney spoke for many of her sisters when she wrote to her parents that she would not abandon the Saints: “I did not embrace this work hastily. . . . I know the consequences of every step I take” (p. 95). In a similar vein, Vilate Kimball wrote courageously to her husband, Heber: “The blood [of Joseph Smith and Hyrum] is yet plain to be seen. he [William Law] has got two and if he gets nine more [the Apostles] it will make eleven but I submit all things into the hands of God. . . . fare you well my love” (p. 139). She, like the other women of Nauvoo, endured the “Days of watching and nights of terror” (Mary Jane Mount Tanner’s phrase, p. 28) until they began the evacuation.

The final section, the reminiscences, lacks the immediacy and apprehension of the other sections. But these writings allow the participants to review and give meaning to their Nauvoo ordeal. As Madsen explains, “Some human experiences are so intense and life-changing that memory returns not only the event in its fullness, but also the emotions that surround it” (p. 158).

Psychologists and folklorists describe a phenomenon known as “putting a house in dying order.” As someone who occasionally observes this custom before leaving my own home, I wept when I read that, before fleeing Nauvoo, Drusilla Dorris Hendricks “went to work and washed everything and cleaned the house thoroughly as I [Drusilla] said to myself, If I die I will die clean” (p. 163). Bathsheba Wilson Bigler Smith wrote somberly:

We left a comfortable home, the accumulations of four years of labor and thrift and took away with us only a few much needed articles such as clothing, bedding and provisions. We left everything else behind us for our enemies. My last act in that precious spot was to tidy the rooms, sweep up the floor, and set the broom in its accustomed place behind the door. . . . Now I was going into the wilderness. . . . I had heard a voice, so I stepped into the wagon. (p. 213)

I was thankful for every word in this collection, but I look forward to the time when the writings of individual Mormon women will be published in their entirety. Though Madsen chose her subjects thoughtfully to fit a specific purpose and introduces us to several unfamiliar players in the Nauvoo scene, the collection emphasizes the articulate elite women of Mormonism, identified by Madsen as from the “leading fami-
lies" (p. 5). We have met many of the same Mormon women and their writings in earlier anthologies. Nevertheless, they shared equally the sacrifice and suffering which all Nauvoo believers experienced and they should continue to be heard.

This book is a chronicle of courageous women as they lived through a period of history basic even today in determining the choices of many of their descendants—and most satisfying to the curious little girl who will always wonder who lives in a farm house behind the flickering night windows.

LYNNE WATKINS JORGENSEN recently retired as a reference consultant from the U.S./Canada Unit of the Family History Library, Salt Lake City, and as an instructor in history and religion at the BYU Center in Salt Lake City. She has an M.A. in history from BYU.

---


Reviewed by Paul R. Spickard

How is a non-Mormon scholar to approach the task of reviewing a book on Latter-day Saints and racial issues? Gingerly, to be sure. One does not wish to be shot as the bearer of bad news. Happily, there is good news along with the bad, and *Black Saints in a White Church* gives ample occasion for comment on both. Jessie Embry, an eminent oral historian with a long list of contributions to Mormon studies, has written a fine account of African American Latter-day Saints and their relationship to the Church. This is an important, intelligent, clearly written book. It is methodologically conscientious, if somewhat unsophisticated intellectually. Inevitably, its very topic raises delicate questions about the Church, its relationship to its own history, and its potential for witness among people of African descent.

When Jessie Embry set out in 1984 to study LDS African Americans, she did so at the suggestion of Alan Cherry, a black Mormon who joined the Church in 1968 and later wrote a spiritual autobiography, *It's You and Me, Lord!* (Provo, Utah: Trilogy Arts Publication, 1970). Prior to beginning the study, by Embry's own admission, she had little firsthand knowledge of African Americans, and many misconceptions. *Black Saints* is testimony to her ability to learn. The study she and Cherry undertook had two parts: 226 interviews with black Mormons, nearly all collected by Cherry, and a standardized questionnaire designed by Cherry, to which about two hundred LDS African Americans responded.
It is not clear why Cherry is not listed as co-author of *Black Saints*, since so much of the research was his, although it was Embry who did most of the analysis and all of the writing.

Embry is conscientious about methodological issues. She and Cherry secured expert help in constructing and analyzing the survey. She is careful to seek out relevant comparisons with other population groups through such sources as the National Opinion Research Center’s General Social Survey. She frequently and appropriately notes the methodological limitations inherent in her sample. She does not, however, always follow through on her methodological promises. For instance, in a chapter on religious commitment, she promises to compare her black Mormon sample to white Mormons, the general white population, and the general black population. In fact, through most of the chapter she makes the comparison only with white Mormons, even in cases where the issue in question begs for comparison with one of the other groups.

The great strength of Embry’s account is in the stories that Cherry collected. Embry uses the oral histories wonderfully, weaving them into her analysis theme by theme, rather than crudely setting down one boxed life story and then another as so many oral historians do. The result is a rich tapestry of human experience brought to the service of intelligent analysis. If *Black Saints* achieves nothing else, its life stories will give white readers a feel for the lives and experiences of black Mormons—at least those who stayed in the Church. That is one methodological problem that Embry and Cherry did not find a way around. Their data do not include blacks who joined, then left, nor those who were attracted to Mormonism but chose not to join; thus, their account is in some critical respects incomplete.

Embry’s analysis is also unsatisfying in some respects. Her opening chapter, which deals with African American religion in general, is very simplistic and her notes cite only a single source on the subject. Her analysis of LDS white-black interaction uses categories of integration, segregation, prejudice, and discrimination—in short, the language of race relations in the 1950s and 1960s. She is not in touch with the power-conflict and internal colonialism models of the 1970s, much less with the Afrocentric and postmodernist perspectives of more recent years. Such analytical modes are not critical to her approach, but it would be a richer book had she read more widely. By contrast, she seems to have a very thorough knowledge of LDS scholarship.

The book is also marred (mildly) by a few typographical errors and mistakes of syntax and usage. For example, the column headings of Table 5.1 on page 98 are misplaced, and therefore confusing. She writes of a “mute issue” (p. 22) when she means a “moot issue.” And on page 39, she writes that Elijah Abel “died in December 1884” and then “continued to participate in quorum activities.” A careful copy editor should have caught these and similar errors.

These are, however, only minor flaws. *Black Saints* is still a fine book.
Embry's analysis turns on two major issues relating to African Americans in the Church: the cultural question and the political question. One issue of central importance for Mormons contemplating the evangelizing of African Americans (and that is surely the subtext of the book) is the question of cultural fit. Because "the Mormon church comprises a distinctive new culture" (xii), to what extent can African Americans fit that culture? Which African Americans best fit? How might the LDS culture reasonably change to accommodate African Americans? These and related questions take up most of Embry's analysis.

She finds, for example, that it is largely educated, upwardly mobile African Americans who have joined the Church, perhaps because they have less cultural distance to cross than working-class or underclass blacks. A parallel might be black Baptists or Pentecostals joining the Lutheran or Presbyterian Church as they move up the social ladder. Most of the interviewees describe making a successful cultural adjustment to a white Mormon social network, except for a sense of isolation in a sea of whiteness and intermittent despair at the relentless ignorance of many white Mormons about people of color. Although Embry does not make the point, these are also common complaints among black Lutherans and black Presbyterians.

Embry diligently explores several aspects of the social and cultural interaction between African American Mormons and the LDS Church: religious commitment (she finds black Mormons somewhat more committed than white, on the average), cultural interaction, public acceptance, social acceptance, organizational issues, and the relationship of black Mormons to the African American community at large. On the whole, she is sanguine about the present situation and the future of African American Mormons. However, she points out several shortcomings in the Church's current ministry to African Americans, including the need for more black missionaries and for more programs targeted specifically to reach African Americans.

Embry spends less time on the political question, offering a clear and competent account of the Church's early acceptance of African Americans and their later relegation to second-class status by denying them priesthood, then summarizing vicissitudes in practices up to the restoration of priesthood access in 1978. In this account she follows quite closely the writing of Newell G. Bringhurst, *Saints, Slaves, and Blacks* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood, 1981) and Lester E. Bush, Jr., and Armand L. Mauss, *Neither White nor Black* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1984), and her rendering of the prelude to the 1978 decision is especially vivid. Like them she takes pains to describe pre-1978 theology ("the seed of Cain," the "curse" on Ham, and positions taken by various prophets) and thus avoids confronting the conclusion that will inevitably be reached by any non-Mormon observer: Mormon leaders were not immune to the racial ideas of other Midwestern and Western whites of their time.
Joseph Smith and Brigham Young seem to have believed that they themselves were both prophets and human beings with limitations, that their ideas were in part conditioned by or mediated through their environment, and that it was the responsibility of the individual believer to make some judgments for him- or herself. Joseph Smith explained to a couple from Michigan, “who thought that ‘a prophet is always a prophet’ . . . that a prophet was a prophet only when he was acting as such” (Joseph Fielding Smith, ed., *Teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith* [Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1938], p. 278). Brigham Young preached in 1862:

I am more afraid that this people have so much confidence in their leaders that they will not inquire for themselves of God whether they are led by Him. I am fearful they settle down in a state of blind self-security, trusting their eternal destiny in the hands of their leaders with a reckless confidence that in itself would thwart the purposes of God in their salvation, and weaken that influence they could give to their leaders, did they know for themselves, by the revelations of Jesus, that they are led in the right way. Let every man and woman know, by the whispering of the Spirit of God to themselves, whether their leaders are walking in the path the Lord dictates, or not. (*Journal of Discourses*, 9:150)

Yet later Mormons, Embry among them, constrained by more current views of prophetic infallibility, seem unable to take a position that might possibly be viewed as critical of a prophet. I have no wish to criticize Mormon doctrine nor any prophet, but it need not be seen as criticism to suggest that even Joseph Smith and Brigham Young may have expressed sentiments that derived in part from their intellectual and social contexts. The essence of the common LDS interpretive gambit on the subject of LDS racial history can be boiled down to this contention: “It was true then, but it’s not true now.” This line of reasoning may satisfy the faithful, but it is not likely to win converts. A more successful apologetic might be built around an admission: “We made a mistake,” coupled with a reminder that only Jesus is perfect. Non-Mormon whites have belatedly come to terms with racism in their heroes, even those like Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln who loom larger than life. Perhaps a theological accommodation could be made in the Mormon case as well.

Embry is driven by her theology to minimize the racism that underlay the denial of the priesthood. She concludes, contrary to her own evidence, that “in actuality the Mormon policy was not much different from that of other white churches” (p. 35). There were, to be sure, prejudice and discrimination in almost all white churches, and there were white churches such as the Southern Baptists who pursued a segregated situation parallel to that of the LDS Church. Even so, few churches denied fundamental blessings of the faith to blacks, and churches generally had a better record of interracial inclusion than the rest of American society.
For example, the RLDS Church, with common Mormon roots, has a more positive record on black participation and civil rights than the LDS Church.

The danger in an apologetic like that embodied in *Black Saints* is that it will drive thinking African Americans away from the Church. This is apparent in Cherry’s interviews. One black member, answering a question about the pre-1978 policy, concluded, “I think it was just plain out racism, however else it may be justified by the Church” (p. 62). My own conversations with scores of African Americans on this subject make it clear that the largest stumbling blocks for most of them to hearing and accepting the restored gospel are the former priesthood denial, the unwillingness of most Mormons to see that denial as racism, and their conclusion, therefore, that the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints must be a racist church. The truest statement in Embry’s book may be her conclusion that white “Mormons have not been hostile as much as ambivalent—and sometimes intimidated—by racial differences” (p. 78).

Nonetheless, Embry rightly notes that Mormon African Americans must deal with more than political questions. Many have become members, more surely will in the years to come, and the dynamics of their experiences are worth examining. Embry’s emphasis on the cultural question between African Americans and the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints suggests that it has received too little attention. Her point, tacitly expressed though it be, is a good one. Solving the political question is essential if the Church is to have a significant ministry among African-derived people, Americans and others. Yet, though necessary, solving the political question is not sufficient. There are also a number of cultural issues to be resolved. The strengths of Embry’s contribution are in pointing out the importance of those cultural issues, and in offering hope for their resolution.


Reviewed by Kenneth W. Baldridge
During 1994, Church periodicals have celebrated the 150th anniversary of the introduction of the gospel into the Pacific and the establishment of the first foreign-language mission of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. *Seasons of Faith and Courage: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in French Polynesia, A Sesquicentennial History, 1843-1993* is a less ephemeral memorial. George Ellsworth, now professor emeritus of history at Utah State University, edited *The Journals of Addison Pratt*, best-known of the three LDS missionaries who arrived in that beautiful group of islands in 1844. Ellsworth's gracious wife, Maria, is a descendant of Addison and Louisa Pratt. Coauthor Kathleen Perrin has lived in French Polynesia for seven years; her husband, Yves, presided over the Tahiti Papeete Mission (1989-92). Although ideal authors might be French Polynesian Mormons, the authors' sensitivity for the culture, affection for the people, and seriousness about this history are unquestioned.

Ellsworth covers the first hundred years in seven chapters and Perrin the next fifty in another twelve chapters. An appendix includes inspirational stories by eight former missionaries and Perrin. Since the authors refer several times to oral histories conducted with island Saints, it seems particularly unfortunate that not even one native voice is included among these narratives in the manner of Eric B. Shumway's *Tongan Saints: Legacy of Faith* (Laie, Hawaii: The Institute for Polynesian Studies, 1991). Tahitian words are used in many situations; their translations, unfortunately, do not appear as frequently. Especially disappointing was the omission of the translation of titles of many Tahitian books to which reference is made (p. 55).

The historical narrative includes careful scholarship enlivened by dramatic moments of atolls lashed by fierce hurricanes with courageous missionaries and members fighting to stay alive. I particularly appreciated the explanation of how the center of Church membership shifted from the Tuamotus to Tahiti and the ups-and-downs of relations with the French government, often mirroring Franco-American politics.

The book, however, will disappoint scholars in some respects. There are no footnotes, and the three-page "Sources and Acknowledgments," while helpful, falls short as a bibliographic essay. I frequently wanted more thorough identification about who said what in certain instances. The authors' use of U.S. consular records, London Missionary Society sources, and Tahiti newspapers provides additional insights about which more information would often have been welcome.

Perhaps even more serious was the decision to limit the index to "major events, locations, and other topics developed in some detail" (p. 393). The omission of personal names was a most unfortunate decision, since one of the book's strengths is the highly personalized approach by which the players are identified. Not being able to find other references to the person about whom one is reading was most frustrating.

Another discouragement was the number of minor errors or inconsis-
tencies. Taumata Mapuhi, Tahitian Church stalwart mentioned often in
the book, did not attend Church College of New Zealand (p. 68) which
did not open until 1958; instead, he attended the Maori Agricultural
College at Korongata, New Zealand, in 1930, where he attracted consid-
erable attention as an outstanding rugby player in regional competition.
The confusion might have resulted from the “inspirational story,” found
in the appendix, of C. Jay Larson, former Tahiti missionary, mission
president, and temple president. Larson mentions “the Church College
in New Zealand” (p. 341), when he was actually referring to the Maori
Agricultural College. Wendell B. Mendenhall is first misidentified as “the
Pacific building inspector” (p. 134), then correctly identified twelve
pages later as “chairman of the Church Building Committee” (p. 146).
Labor missionary Haydn Andrew’s name is misspelled as “Andrews” (p.
147). In November 1965, LDS officials called on Jean Sicurani, governor
of Tahiti (p. 198), who “was invited to attend the opening of the
Polynesian Cultural Center in Laie, Hawaii.” The PCC had opened two
years previously in October 1963.

Considering the impact on French Polynesia of the Reorganized
Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, Ellsworth’s and Perrin’s
treatment here is decidedly skimpy. Perhaps nowhere in the world have
the RLDS “Josephites” so successfully challenged LDS proselyting efforts
as in French Polynesia. A notable triumph was the RLDS success in the
late nineteenth century in persuading French and Tahitian authorities
that they were the rightful owners of property initially acquired by earlier
LDS missionaries from Utah. For a discussion of RLDS history in the
islands, see F. Edward Butterworth’s Roots of the Reorganization (Inde-
pendence: Herald Publishing House, 1977). Furthermore, French Poly-
nesia continues as an RLDS stronghold to this day.

Identifying RLDS founders merely as followers of Joseph Smith “who
did not go west” (p. 35) without any reference to the names of their
church, does a disservice to readers. Although the authors identify
Charles W. Wandell, former LDS missionary to Australia, as one of the
RLDS missionaries who arrived in Tahiti in 1873, they do not name his
companion, even though the information (it was Gloud Rodger) is readily
available in R. Lanier Britsch’s Unto the Islands of the Sea ([Salt Lake

Ellsworth mentions (p. 38) that the success of the mission in the
Society Islands “led to the expansion of the Church into the Hawaiian
Islands in 1850.” It would be interesting to know why he thinks so. It is
an assertion I have seen nowhere else. Charles C. Rich, the LDS apostle
who called the first ten missionaries to Hawaii, did travel part of the
southern route to California with Addison Pratt in 1849, who was then
returning to Tahiti with new missionaries James Brown and Hiram
Blackwell. (Blackwell never went past California, however, where Pratt
carried out his threat to leave him if he didn’t give up his use of tobacco.)
Neither Leonard Arrington’s biography, Charles C. Rich (Provo, Utah:
Brigham Young University Press, 1974), nor Ellsworth’s edition of The Journals of Addison Pratt record any conversations on Tahiti that might have influenced Rich to call missionaries to Hawaii. Admittedly, it is a possibility, although without documentation it cannot be considered definitive.

The authors also chose to organize the book thematically rather than chronologically. Although thematic history can be very satisfactory, authors must be extremely cautious when the same events and same people are referred to in widely separated chapters. Several times I found myself asking, “Didn’t I just read about that?” but without cross-references, footnotes, or a name index, finding the first mention was an exasperating process of having to look back page by page.

Despite these shortcomings, some of which are serious and others less so, Faith and Courage is an important book. As a microhistory of the LDS Church’s first foreign-language mission, it is essential. I hope the Saints of French Polynesia will read it often and deeply, gaining an understanding of the faith and courage possessed by their ecclesiastical forebears. Other Latter-day Saints should also adopt it as part of their heritage, a record of faith and perseverance that was being made even before the Mormons reached Utah.

KENNETH W. BALDRIDGE, professor emeritus, retired from BYU-Hawaii in 1993 after teaching in New Zealand and Hawaii since 1960. Founder of the Mormon Pacific Historical Society, he has written and lectured on LDS history in the Pacific. He is now completing a history of BYU-Hawaii where he taught for twenty-five years.


Reviewed by Thomas G. Alexander

Clearly Armand Mauss believes that Mormonism has changed dramatically since the 1960s. He lays out those changes in a summary statement, in which he critiques what he perceives as the attitudes of the average contemporary Mormon. “After all,” he argues, “a hostility toward scientific theories like evolution, a dependence on scriptural literalism and inerrancy, or a resort to unquestioning obedience are no more inherently Mormon than are a reliance on higher criticism, on liberation theology, or on the ACLU for legitimating one’s beliefs. Nor is a family of twelve with a full-time mother [in the home] any more authentically Mormon (for that
fact) than a modern two-career couple with only two children, at least not from a doctrinal point of view" (p. 201).

In *The Angel and the Beehive* Mauss draws on sociology and history to try to explain how the Mormon people have changed over time. Particularly in his discussions of the transformation of Mormon society since the 1960s, Mauss uses a number of sociological studies, including several that he completed himself. It is in the addition of the sociological data on changes since the 1960s and in the symbolism that Mauss uses to characterize those changes that he has provided his most original contribution.

He begins by symbolizing the spiritual and religious side of Mormonism with the angel and by contrasting those features with the temporal and worldly side, which he characterizes with the beehive. Then, drawing principally on previously published historical studies, Mauss argues that in the seven decades from about 1890 and the Manifesto to about 1960, the Church leadership and membership moved toward accommodation with mainstream American society. Members joined both the Republican and Democratic parties in approximately equal numbers, students migrated from the Mormons’ Rocky Mountain empire (to borrow Samuel W. Taylor’s phrase) to study at major universities, and Mormons held majority attitudes about racial relations and other political and social questions.

By the 1960s Mormons “were all generally quite close to their non-Mormon neighbors. In the specific domestic and foreign policy issues of the time, there was much diversity among Mormons, as among others, suggesting that civic and political attitudes were not much informed by religious beliefs or commitments” (p. 58). On the whole Mormons were generally “quite centrist and moderate” (ibid.) except in lifestyle, where they were unabashedly conservative since they eschewed alcohol, drugs, and sexual relations outside marriage.

Since about 1960, however, Mauss argues, a decidedly rightward push has driven Mormon society and culture. The average Mormon has become more hostile to scientific theories like evolution, more comfortable with the views of conservative evangelical Protestants, more politically conservative, and more authoritarian.

Mauss believes that the change in course resulted in part from the calls of a number of General Authorities with “different backgrounds from those of earlier generations,” who became “increasingly uncomfortable with the assimilation of Mormons” and who were “determined to resist . . . assimilation through a deliberate policy of retrenchment.” This agenda emphasizes distinctive elements of Mormon group life such as “continuing revelation and obedience to modern prophets,” genealogy and temple work, a standardized proselyting program, a new and more conservative program of religious education, and “indoctrination rather than intellectual reconciliation” (p. 99). Mauss believes that we ought to view many of these attitudes, particularly on the role of women in
society, "as more Victorian than Mormon in [their] . . . origins," since
they are "not a necessary or inevitable derivative of Mormon doctrine,
scripture, or other ecclesiastical imperatives" (p. 119).

Nevertheless, except in the field of spousal roles, Mormons have
retrenched to a surprisingly high degree and reaped a significant number
of practical consequences as a result. One has been a folk culture that
borders on Protestant fundamentalism including the belief in "scriptural
inerrancy and literalism, salvation by grace [though Mormons have
tempered this by a traditional emphasis on works] . . . , authoritarian
leadership; and strict obedience to pastoral injunctions" (p. 158). Mauss
also argues that these changes have resulted in the increasing alienation
of Mormon intellectuals from religious educators whom they see as
"obsequious allies of certain fundamentalist church leaders" and intensi-
fied acrimony between those educated Mormons who hew the funda-
mentalist line and those who prefer "intellectual independence" (p. 172).
For the international Church, Mauss believes that the emphasis on
fundamentalism has made it difficult to address the needs of people
raised in cultures outside the United States. In his view, such problems
may continue unless Latter-day Saints begin to sort out more seriously
what features of Mormonism really result from the adoption of the
attitudes from the conservative side of American culture.

To what degree is Mauss right? Clearly some things have changed over
the past thirty-five years. University of Utah Professor Sterling McMurrin
relates the story of undergoing a series of interviews with his bishop over
his heretical beliefs and being surprised to receive an unsolicited offer
from President David O. McKay to be his first witness if there were a
Church court. If currently available evidence is correct, no leader offered
to defend any of those excommunicated in 1993-94. On the feminist
scene, right-wing cadres convinced nearly 12,000 Relief Society dele-
gates that the Church wanted them to attend Utah's International
Women's Year Conference in 1977 and to oppose measures designed to
promote equality for women in the workplace. Currently, the Eagle
Forum seems powerful enough to secure a majority of votes in the Utah
legislature for virtually anything it chooses to support, including an
ill-advised law that prohibits public school teachers from discussing
political and social beliefs with their students. Many in Church education
reject rigorous research on the Church's past, particularly if it involves
an analysis of change over time.

On the other hand, Church leaders have probably never exhibited a
higher degree of ecumenism. The Church donates money and supplies
for Catholic relief agencies to help the poor and starving throughout the
world. Church leaders encourage members to volunteer at homeless
shelters and soup kitchens. The Church expects missionaries to contrib-
ute part of their time to community service. Church leadership encour-
gaged the Tabernacle Choir to perform at the rededication of the Cath-
dral of the Madeleine in Salt Lake City, and last year Muslim leaders were
invited, for the first time, to participate in the traditional interfaith Thanksgiving service hosted by the Church in the Tabernacle on Temple Square. Even the cooperation by conservative Church members with evangelical Protestants—the Church’s most determined theological enemies—in political and social matters can be seen as increasing openness with outsiders.

Moreover, in some matters Mormons are quite like other Americans. Research, especially by sociologists (see Marie Cornwall, Tim Heaton, and Lawrence A. Young, eds. Contemporary Mormonism: Social Science Perspectives [Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1994]) shows some parallels. Mormon women work outside the home at approximately the same rate as other Americans. The decline in the birthrate among Mormons has paralleled the remainder of the nation, though at a slightly slower rate. The divorce rate for all Mormons during the first three years of marriage is actually higher than the national average, although the divorce rate for temple marriages is much lower.

Moreover, the shift in politics among Mormons parallels to a great degree the changes in the nation, particularly in the ascendency of right-wingers who engineered the Reagan Revolution and the Republican victories in November 1994. This rightward drift has become most pronounced throughout the American West, not only in areas with large Mormon populations. In fact, it is least pronounced in Hawaii, a state with a sizeable Mormon population. Studies by political scientists, particularly by University of Utah professors Ronald J. Hrebenar and Robert C. Benedict in Politics and Public Policy in the Contemporary American West, edited by Clive S. Thomas (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1991), have shown that the West in general has become increasingly conservative and more Republican in recent years. On political and social policy, then, Mormons may still be quite close to their neighbors.

Moreover, contrary to Mauss’s argument, such increasing political conservatism may well derive less from the efforts of selected General Authorities than from the grass roots. That is, members who have bought into conservative American political and social values, which are really not informed by gospel principles, may bear the responsibility for the shift.

On balance, however, I believe Mauss is right about the new directions in Mormon society, and I see Mauss’s book as a significant contribution to our understanding of recent changes in the Mormon Church and culture. His work is particularly helpful in filling in the angel side of the picture—our understanding of current Mormon religious culture. Mauss’s analysis shows, rightly I believe, that Mormons have become increasingly more religiously conservative and authoritarian. We probably need a more thorough comparison between the secular side of Mormon and general American society to provide a complete picture.
Mauss's study should provide an instructive launching pad for such a study.


Reviewed by Glenn Willett Clark

A historian of science and technology would be struck, reading the biography of Harold Farnes Silver, by the numerous parallels between his life and that of Isambard Kingdom Brunel. Brunel was the greatest engineer of Victorian England; Silver, the Mormon engineer whose works transformed three separate global industries during the twentieth-century Pax Americana: sugar-beet processing, coal mining, and cane-sugar production.

Brunel greatly advanced the technology employed to build bridges, tunnels, viaducts, and railroads. His biographer, L. T. C. Rolt, quotes a couplet from Yeats—"The intellect of man is forced to choose / Perfection of the life, or of the work"—to encapsulate Brunel's driving passion.¹ Exploiting the Brunel Tunneling Shield, one of the many inventions of his father, Marc Isambard Brunel, the son dug beneath the Thames, designed Paddington Station in London, and built the Great Western Railroad. He is best known, however, for designing the first transatlantic steamer in regular service, the first large screw-driven ocean-going steamship, and the largest steam vessel in the world at the time. (*The Great Eastern* could make the round trip to Australia without recoaling.) This vessel, a "Great Leviathan," was, in his biographer's phrase, "underpowered, oversized, and excessively ambitious," the concluding effort of a highly productive life—and a freak. Still, Brunel's biographer called him "the last great figure of the European Renaissance" (Rolt, p. 325).

A parallel in Silver's life is his "Silver Stock Index"—renamed "Markedex" and given to Brigham Young University. This concluding effort of Silver's life, futile, grandiose, and very much frowned upon by the Wall Street Journal because it would also have raised eyebrows at the Securities and Exchange Commission, is treated very gently by Arrington and Alley (p. 202). In this, the writing of history was less well served; all else in the book rings insightful and true.

Harold's polygamous grandfather, William John Silver, was an English ironworker who cast the oxen for the baptistry of the Salt Lake Temple. During the polygamy raids of the 1880s, he went "on the underground" in Denver. Harold Silver's father, Joseph Askie Silver, was born to the first wife, Mary Askie Silver, the daughter of an English iron manufacturer, when the couple lived in New York City for a few years before completing their journey to Utah. In Salt Lake City, Joseph and his two brothers, John and Hyrum, created the Silver Brothers Iron Works. He was also a polygamist; the first wife, Mary Eleanor Watson Silver, and the second, Elizabeth Farnes Silver (Harold's mother), were always friendly, but both of these families bitterly resented Joseph Askie's marriage, well after the Manifesto, to an attractive young widow, Laura Clark Cook. This decision resulted in his excommunication, departure from Salt Lake City under duress, and the family's financial ruin.

Joseph Askie Silver took Laura to New York City in 1915; the first two wives joined him there only briefly. Harold left high school early to support the family by toiling at the Ogden Iron Works; he worked briefly for his father in New York City in 1920 but lived in Manhattan for two years more, driving himself furiously to achieve. In his singular will, Yeats's couplet also applies to him, for his toil toward "perfection of the work" was unremitting. As a college student he mucked brass in Hoboken by day, manually drawing off the dross ("muck") from the molten metal; by night he studied at Columbia University, where he had persuaded the dean to admit him, conditionally, without a high school diploma. Silver triumphed as a student, notably excelling in trigonometry. He never studied calculus nor took any college course in engineering but always had amazing intuitive skills. Graduate engineering students at Stanford, having laboriously calculated the magnitude of stresses in a metal plate through which three holes had been drilled, asked Silver to specify on the spot what they were. He did (pp. 67-68).

Once again, Silver left school without graduating. In 1922, learning from his sister Eleanor (then a student at the University of Utah) that Madelyn Cannon Stewart, whom he had worshipped from afar, thought him "a swell fellow," he abruptly returned to Utah. Only incidentally could he continue his own studies after that point. He later contributed lavishly to college endowment funds and to scores of charities in Denver.

Madelyn, likewise a Salt Lake native and a descendant of Mormon pioneers, agreed to marry Harold seven years later in 1929, forming an unusually effective partnership. In my experience, nobody knew just one
of them. They were two, yet they were one. In 1930, Elizabeth, the first of four children, was born, followed by Barnard, Judith, and Brian.

Silver seemed intuitively to sense that Utah was too small a stage for his talents. Leaving Salt Lake City, the young couple moved into the more egalitarian and meritocratic social structure of Denver, becoming luminaries in a non-Mormon community. In large part, this biography is a story of their rise in Denver.

Their relation to the Mormon community was complicated. Madelyn was wholly committed to the Church, but Harold gave it only diffident allegiance. Even when called, he would not serve on a high council; he would, however, chair the building committee, which permitted him, according to his son Barnard, to reach out to members of the Church who were, for one reason or another, at least partially alienated (interviewed by Clark, 5 October 1994). As Barnard saw it, Harold had hard feelings toward his own father and meant to be warm and caring, not so selective in bestowing love and praise as he felt his father had been. God is all that Joseph was not; with that God, Harold had “an understanding,” his son says, an understanding which led him to “talk with God somewhat as he talked to me, with a familiarity that would surprise most Latter-day Saints.”

That familiarity, Barnard avers, extended to the process of mechanical invention. Harold, recovering from an illness just when Barnard returned from serving an LDS mission, confided that he could discuss even the details of engineering problems with his God and expect answers. Some ideas came to Silver full-blown, almost in an instant. His conception of the continuous ring diffuser for sugar cane, for instance, is an invention which his biographers can date precisely: 26 May 1960. This organizationally unenthusiastic Latter-day Saint was confidently guided by his own “inner light.”

Another example of Harold’s confidence: During a point so low that he was facing bankruptcy and professional disgrace, Silver left his family on Christmas Eve 1946 and went to Nyssa, Oregon, to make his first industry-transforming invention function. There was no instantaneous miracle, but he refused to give up and ultimately perfected it (pp. 85-86).

Near the close of Harold’s life as a working engineer, Madelyn died in 1961 of a cerebral hemorrhage; during the preceding six years, she had suffered grievously and stoically from a spinal injury incurred in a fall. In 1964, Harold married Ruth Stanlie Smith in a happy second marriage. Despite his intention of being a warmer father than his had been, Harold became estranged from his younger son. Brian, graduating from Harvard, went on to study in India in 1964 on a Fulbright grant, made something of a career of playing the sitar, and, in 1969, married a vivacious and cultivated African American graduate student at the University of Chicago. Harold disinherited him and died in 1984 without being reconciled.

In this biography, the family history is well told, but the heart of the biography is a concrete account of the process of mechanical invention.
Arlington and Alley have made a brave attempt, and a remarkably successful one, to translate engineering into English. The authors neither say how they allocated their labors nor whether one, more than the other, deserves credit for making a series of arcane technological developments comprehensible to a lay reader. Its essence is a step-by-step account of the conception and development (among other things) of the heated-water continuous diffuser now used, almost universally, to extract sugar from diced sugar beets and (more recently) shredded sugar cane. This blow-by-blow description of the process of invention is exactly what the reader needs to encounter if he or she is to understand how Harold Silver continually sought “perfection of the work.”

Both the original Silver continuous diffuser (built for sugar-beet processing in St. Hilaire, Quebec) and the original Silver ring diffuser (built for sugar-cane processing at Lahaina, Hawaii) were products of the minds and hands employed, always on hurry-up overtime, at those cramped engineering works on Blake Street in Denver. The former evolved, in iteration after iteration, from a multiple-cell monster into a more authentically continuous “slope” configuration; the latter appeared to emerge fully developed. Only after the fact does one see the genesis for both in a commonplace bank of discontinuous Robert diffusing cells (named after a European chemist).

Silver is best described as a manufacturing engineer, but he did not manufacture his most noted invention, the continuous coal-mining machine. The editors of a Time-Life series chose to feature it in their volume on machines, and Fortune commissioned seven famous contemporary visual artists to interpret its dramatic dragon-like slithering and mauling, much as Brunel’s dramatic suspension bridge over the Avon Gorge near Bristol, England, has become a subject for artistic interpretation.

Honest and considerate biographers, Arrington and Alley concentrate on Silver’s drive, insight, and “catholicity of intellect.” Still, one might suggest that in describing Silver as a “western inventor, businessman, and civic leader,” they unnecessarily limited themselves. Silver’s business and civic activities were centered in Denver, but his engineering achievements took place on a much larger stage. Wherever sugar is processed and refined, wherever the mining of coal has been mechanized, the name of Harold Silver is known. The machines he invented or manufactured were used mostly in the Mississippi River Valley, in the Red River Valley of the North (especially in North Dakota), in Canada, California, Hawaii, and South America. Ironically, they were least used in the Great Basin.

---

To focus on Harold Silver as a business entrepreneur also overlooks the main significance of Silver's life for Mormon history. The industries Silver once revolutionized are now in decline everywhere. Their history will not hold our attention in the same way that Arrington's and Alley's description of Silver's process of invention will. Their success lies in describing the process of inventive engineering creation.

Brunel's biographer, seeking to explain why the likes of this engineer would never be seen again, made a statement that also describes the problem men like Silver pose for their biographers. Brunel arose, Rolt claims, during a "brief heroic age of engineering," in which one mind could encompass art and architecture, along with both civil and mechanical engineering:

He and his generation bequeathed a sum of knowledge which, like his great ship, had become too large and too complicated to be mastered any longer by one mind. . . . The process of specialisation has . . . destroyed that catholicity of intellect without which civilisation cannot survive. . . .

Our descendants will . . . be astounded to discover that our literary world displayed no interest whatever in these engineers . . . Yet the historian of the future will assuredly see Isambard Brunel as the key character of his century, a archetype of the heroic age of the engineer and the last great figure to appear in this, the twilight of the European Renaissance. . . . He will wonder how such a man arose at such a time and . . . from what vital spring of the spirit he derived his prodigious creative powers. (Rolt, 318-21)

This is a question equally applicable to Harold Farnes Silver.

GLENN WILLETT CLARK, a securities law professor and consulting economist living in McLean, Virginia, educated first at MIT, lived and worked in Denver when Silver was a manufacturing engineer and, near the close of his life, a would-be securities analyst.
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