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WHAT'S NEW IN LATTER-DAY SAINT CHURCH HISTORY?

Editor's note: The three participants delivered this joint presentation at a plenary session of the Mormon History Association annual conference in Tucson, Arizona, on 17 May 2002. It has been minimally edited for stylistic consistency, reviewed by the authors, and updated, where appropriate, to accommodate developments between May and the typesetting deadline in August 2002. Richard Turley's remarks to conclude the session have been integrated into the conclusion to his own presentation.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN THE FAMILY AND CHURCH HISTORY DEPARTMENT

Richard E. Turley Jr.

MOST PERSONS WHO ATTEND the annual conferences of the Mor-

RICHARD E. TURLEY JR., managing director of the Family and Church History Department, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, is the author, among other works, of “The Provenance of William E. McLellin’s Journals,” in The Journals of William E. McLellin, edited by Jan Shipps and John W. Welch (Urbana: University of Illinois Press/Provo, Utah: BYU Studies, 1994), 257-61; and Victims: The LDS Church and the Mark Hofmann Case (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1992). He is general editor of the The Journals of George Q. Cannon series and a senior editor of The Papers of Joseph Smith, both series joint imprints of (Deseret Book/Brigham Young University Press). GLEN M. LEONARD, director of the Museum of Church History and Art, is past associate editor of the
mon History Association come to learn what's new in Latter-day Saint Church history. Anxious to learn all we can, we experience angst as we're forced to choose among many excellent concurrent sessions. My remarks today aim at giving you information you likely won't get in other sessions about what's new in Church history among my colleagues in the Family and Church History Department of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints and associates at Brigham Young University and elsewhere. I will quickly survey several significant projects in which we have recently been engaged, then share the podium with two associates to announce in greater detail the forthcoming publication of a new book on which we have been laboring for some time.

Before I delve into these topics, however, I thought I might just say something briefly about a subject that received considerable news coverage late last year and earlier this year: the collection of historical materials donated by late Church Historian Leonard J. Arrington to Utah State University. As my good friend Jan Shipps put it in a conversation several weeks after the news coverage, the discussion between the Church and Utah State University over the ownership of some items in the collection was not a contest between good and evil. It was a discussion between two good institutions seeking the best way to resolve an apparent conflict of laudable goals.

Those goals were perhaps best framed in a news release issued during the negotiations. It stated, "The University and the

Journal of Mormon History. His publications include A History of Davis County, part of the twenty-nine county series published for Utah's centennial (Salt Lake City: Utah Historical Society, 1999), (with James B. Allen) The Story of the Latter-day Saints, 2nd ed. rev. (1976; Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1992); and most recently his long-awaited Nauvoo: A Place a Peace, a People of Promise (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 2002). RONALD W. WALKER, a professor of history at Brigham Young University, is a past president and council member of the Mormon History Association. He is the author, coauthor, or editor of more than sixty articles and books, many of them on Heber J. Grant, social history, and the Godbeites, including the prizewinning Wayward Saints: The Godbeites and Brigham Young (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1998) and (with James B. Allen and David J. Whittaker) Studies in Mormon History, 1830-1997: An Indexed Bibliography (Urbana: University of Illinois Press in cooperation with the Joseph Fielding Smith Institute for Latter-day Saint History, 2000).
Church, which have a longstanding relationship of cooperation and goodwill, remain optimistic that these issues can be resolved in a way that will preserve the Church’s right to materials that it owns, provide the public with access to important research information, respect Dr. Arrington’s desire to further the study of Church history, and fulfill the University’s obligations to serve the academic community.” Operating in good faith, representatives of both institutions and the Arrington family worked toward and achieved these goals.

I would just like to add a footnote to this matter by emphasizing that we all very much value Leonard Arrington and his contributions to the history of the Church. Besides adding greatly to the corpus of serious published works on Latter-day Saint history, Leonard contributed by serving as a teacher, a mentor, a colleague, and a friend to many people in the universe of Church history researchers and writers. As one gauge of his accomplishments, I would invite you to step into our library or any other with major Latter-day Saint holdings and survey the dedications, forewords, and acknowledgments of serious Church history works published over the last three decades since he entered Church employ. You will find that Leonard’s influence extends far beyond the works he personally published. For all these contributions, we will ever be grateful.

Family History Tools for Church History Research

The family history side of the department has produced some powerful products of value to those doing Church history research. On 1 June 2000, the Historical Department and the Family History Department were officially merged. In announcing the merger, the First Presidency stated, “We are confident that this organizational change will optimize Church resources and result in other positive benefits to the Church and its members and friends.” Many seasoned scholars who have spent significant time in Church history


research have discovered the gold mine of information that our family history collections provide. If you have not yet discovered these resources, may I encourage you to do so. To illustrate their value, I would like to describe briefly just a few of these new tools.

- Three related products, all now available on compact disk, are the 1880 U.S. Census, the 1881 British Census, and the 1881 Canadian Census produced by our staff and thousands of volunteers in collaboration, respectively, with the Minnesota Population Center at the University of Minnesota, the Federation of Family History Societies in Great Britain, and the Institute of Canadian Studies at the University of Ottawa. The 1880 U.S. Census and 1881 Canadian Census have been collectively described as “an unprecedented resource for social historians.” The 1880 U.S. Census Project received support from the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health, and the 1881 Canadian Census from the University of Ottawa Research Partnerships Programme. In a ceremony at Robinson College, Cambridge, the 1881 British Census won the Besterman/McColvin Award from the Library Association of Great Britain. These tools deserve greater attention from those interested in Latter-day Saint history, biography, and demographics.

- Also useful in Latter-day Saint history research is the Mormon Immigration Index, a database of approximately 93,000 immigrants who traveled from various international ports to the United States between the years 1840 and 1890. Prepared in cooperation with Professor Fred Woods of Brigham Young University’s Department of Church History and Doctrine, this compact disk includes each immigrant’s age, country of origin, port of departure and arrival, the company leaders assigned to each voyage, and general voyage information. It also contains

---


transcriptions of autobiographies, journals, diaries, and letters of approximately a thousand passengers. These immigrant accounts are linked to over five hundred known Latter-day Saint companies and provide a composite account of those who crossed the Atlantic and Pacific oceans to gather in Zion. People who took part in these voyages but were not members of the Church also appear in this product. If you’re interested in the transoceanic migration of early Saints, individually or collectively, check out this source.

**Museum and Historic Sites**

On the Latter-day Saint Church history side of the department, the Museum of Church History and Art in downtown Salt Lake City includes a major permanent exhibit on the history of the Church, as well as related exhibits, including a permanent exhibit on Church presidents. Over the last decade, the museum has mounted important temporary exhibits on such historical topics as the founding of the Relief Society, the building of the Salt Lake Temple, and the development of the Church welfare system.

The museum also sponsors smaller exhibits on topics that span the history and geography of the Church. At present, the museum is offering the largest exhibition ever of Sutcliffe Maudsley portraits; early photographic, artistic, and architectural images of Nauvoo and its temple; and an interactive exhibit for children and families on the Mormon trek. In the near future, it will provide exhibits featuring historic samplers; honoring the 150th anniversary of the Primary organization; and displaying historic art and objects related to sacrament services from the museum’s collections.

Much of our energy of late has been focused on historic site restorations. On 9 September 2001, two miles south of Palmyra, New York, the frame home and other features of the historic farm of Joseph and Lucy Mack Smith were dedicated by Elder M. Russell Ballard, following years of painstaking historical, architectural, archaeological, and ecological research. Included in this restoration are the log home where the Smith family was living when Joseph had the First Vision and where Moroni initially appeared to the young Prophet; a revitalized Sacred Grove, which will be allowed to expand over the next several decades to more closely resemble its historic size and appearance; the frame home where Joseph first hid the Book of Mormon plates in 1827 after finally receiving them from
Moroni; a portion of Old Stafford Road; and a barn, cooper's shop, fencing, animal enclosures, orchard, fields, and meadows. Last year, the frame home received a Project Excellence Award from the Preservation League of New York State for "the careful restoration of the building . . . to its original appearance."5

In 2000, we began an ambitious project in northern Ohio to supplement the restored Newel K. Whitney Store, which received a President's Historic Preservation Award for excellence in privately funded historic preservation for the decade of the 1980s, an award presented in conjunction with the President's Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the Department of the Interior. Last fall, the John and Else Johnson Home in Hiram, Ohio, was dedicated by President Gordon B. Hinckley. In that home, Joseph received such significant revelations as "the Vision" with its description of the three degrees of glory, the direction to publish modern revelation as scripture, and the "Lord's Preface" to the Doctrine and Covenants. It was also there that Church leaders planned the publication of the revelations, first as the Book of Commandments and later as the Doctrine and Covenants. Here Joseph Smith and Sidney Rigdon were tarred and feathered.

This summer [2002] we will complete three structures in historic Kirtland and open them to the public: the John Johnson Inn, the home of Newel K. Whitney and Elizabeth Ann Smith Whitney, and a new visitors center. In spring 2003, three additional historic reconstructions will open to the public: the schoolhouse where the Saints met for Sunday worship, the ashery that Bishop Whitney consecrated to the United Firm, and the sawmill that produced dimensional lumber and fine woodwork for the temple. All of these historic structures are the result of extensive historical, architectural, and archaeological research by museum staff and other experts. We hope that during next year's MHA meetings in Kirtland, many of you will avail yourselves of the opportunity to visit these sites.

The Church History Library

The Church History Library, located in the east wing of the Church Office Building, currently houses and preserves the world's largest collection of rare and contemporary Latter-day Saint publications, including books, pamphlets, periodicals, newspapers, maps,

microforms, and audiovisual materials. Materials range from first edition copies of the Book of Mormon to the most recent pamphlet of *The Prophet Joseph Smith's Testimony* published in Twi, a West African language. The library collects everything the Church currently publishes or has ever published in over one hundred languages. Its collections also include anti-Mormon literature, schismatic materials, theses and dissertations on Church topics from many colleges and universities—even Tom Clancy novels with Latter-day Saint characters. Though focused primarily on the history and doctrines of the Church, the library also contains general reference works, including theological reference materials, publications on religious history and beliefs of other denominations, and a secular collection on the history of the West.

Although I can't possibly describe all of the library's recent acquisitions in the time available today, I can offer a sampler to give you a taste of the collection's richness. They range from an 1834 government document showing the land occupied by Native American tribes at the time of the early mission to the Lamanites, 1840s vintage newspaper ads for Church publications, an 1854 French poem on crossing the plains to Zion, a Civil War era song about the Saints being safely situated in the West, a set of fan-shaped cards poking fun at plural marriage, a bound volume of early Icelandic tracts, an 1867 Pacific Coast business directory with a wealth of information about Utah, Idaho, California, and Nevada, and maps used during the 1997 sesquicentennial trek.\(^6\)

The library has also created or obtained resources to better assist visitors and staff, including a variety of indexes and other

---

\(^6\)These are, in the sequence listed, *Regulating the Indian Department, 23rd Congress, 1st Session, House of Representatives* (Washington, D.C.: Gales and Seaton, 1834); *Vox Populi*, 11 vols. (Lowell, Mass.: S. J. Varney, 1842-43); Louis Alphonzo Bertrand, *Les Prairies* (Isle of Jersey: L. A. Bertrand, 1854) (we have translated the French text to make it more accessible to researchers); "Polygamy Story Cards" (N.p.: n. pub., ca. 1880); Jon Johannesson, Icelandic tracts (Reykjavik: Prentsm Gutenberg, ca. 1911); Henry G. Langley, comp., *The Pacific Coast Business Directory for 1867* (San Francisco: Henry G. Langley, 1867); and a sequence of twelve maps, published by the U.S. Bureau of Land Management in Cheyenne, Wyoming, each designated with a separate place name but catalogued as "Maps Used During Sesquicentennial Trek."
finding aids, both in electronic form and print. One example is an on-line database of pioneer rosters created in the last few years that continues to be updated. We hope to make this database widely available to the general public later this year or early in 2003.

Archives, Family and Church History Department

The LDS Church Archives, also in the east wing, houses the world’s finest collection of Latter-day Saint historical manuscripts and is generally well known to serious Church history researchers. Between 2000 and the present, staff members have recorded over seven hundred oral histories and acquired over fifteen hundred collections from Saints throughout the world. During that time period, they have traveled extensively through the United States, as well as in Denmark, England, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Hong Kong, Japan, Germany, Kenya, Malawi, Malaysia, Mongolia, Mozambique, Poland, the Russian Far East, Singapore, South Africa, Switzerland, Taiwan, Uganda, and Zimbabwe. They have also received numerous histories from branches, wards, districts, stakes, missions, and areas, as well as from Church headquarters departments.

The archives has also undertaken, in recent years, a major and on-going publishing effort:

- **THE JOURNALS OF GEORGE Q. CANNON.** In 1999, the department began publishing the journals of George Q. Cannon. The first volume, *To California in ’49*, edited by Michael Landon of the archives staff, has been well received, and archives staff members are currently at work on subsequent volumes. Volume 2, *Hawaiian Mission, 1850-1854*, has been edited by Chad Orton and is nearly ready for the press. As I observed in the general introduction to the journal series, Cannon’s “five decades of writings rank among the best extant records of Latter-day Saint history during the second half of the nineteenth century.” David J. Whittaker noted in his review of the first volume: “While such a project poses a number of challenges, . . . the projected series . . . will surely become one of the great published diaries of the Mormon experience.”

---

• Manuscripts on Disk. Since January 2001, camera teams in the Family and Church History Department have been digitizing many important collections of early Church history manuscripts as part of a project to publish those collections in an electronic form by December 2002. The project is proceeding well and has two goals: one is to extend copyright protection for these materials for an additional term provided by law; the other is to make these materials widely available to serious researchers. In December, we plan to offer these disks for sale to the public. They should prove a real boon to scholars, making readily available some two hundred thousand images of significant early writings. The disks will be issued by Brigham Young University Press, which is currently in discussions with other university presses that have expressed interest in copublication.

The Joseph Smith Papers Project

As members of the Mormon History Association know well, the Joseph Fielding Smith Institute for Latter-day Saint History at BYU grew out of the former History Division of the Church Historical Department. The missions of the Smith Institute and our department overlap: Both share a commission to use the Church's historical resources to better understand Latter-day Saint history and heritage, and a commitment to research, write, and publish that history for our own people and for others.

Though the two organizations are no longer under the same direct administrative umbrella, we have maintained ties that allow us both to better pursue our work. These ties have recently been strengthened and formalized. Scholars from both organizations meet regularly to review projects and to coordinate resources to advance them. To enhance ongoing work between the institute and the department, the university recently established a high-level executive committee to formalize relationships that have long existed.9 Now the dean of the College of Family, Home, and Social Science, the dean of Religion, and the academic vice-president of BYU meet regularly with institute leaders and me to ensure that necessary re-

9For additional details, see the Web site of the Joseph Fielding Smith Institute for Latter-day Saint History: http://fhss.byu.edu/jfsinst/
sources are in place to advance shared research, writing, and publication priorities.

Institute and department personnel collaborate on a range of significant projects. As the Smith Institute has enhanced its publishing capabilities in cooperation with John W. Welch and the BYU Studies editorial teams, the institute and the university have become a preferred publishing outlet for many department projects. BYU Studies now regularly features manuscripts from the Church’s collections, and future volumes of THE JOURNALS OF GEORGE Q. CANNON will be published in connection with the institute and BYU Press.

Perhaps no project more fully exemplifies the ongoing cooperation between the two organizations than the expanded effort to publish THE PAPERS OF JOSEPH SMITH, which, when completed, will be a monumental achievement with far-reaching impact on our understanding of early Latter-day Saint history and its effect on succeeding generations. Both institutions have long been committed to the project, and each is providing vital resources for the current collaborative effort aimed at finally accomplishing this large undertaking.

Work on this project goes back to the 1970s when the institute was still part of the department. At that time, Dean Jessee had assistance in pulling together many of the papers that are now being prepared for publication. Soon after the institute moved to BYU, Dean published The Personal Writings of Joseph Smith, a subset of this larger project, which will be available in an updated second edition later this year. Over the next decade, two volumes of THE PAPERS OF JOSEPH SMITH were published, and work advanced on other volumes. But by 2000, when Dean formally retired from the institute, it was clear the project required a higher commitment of personnel and resources if Dean, despite high energy and good health, was to be around to see it finished. Since that time, the institute and the department have prepared a detailed plan to publish the whole body of materials and have assembled a team of more than two dozen scholars and editorial assistants to carry it out.

This is, in every sense, a collaboration between the department and the institute. Personnel are drawn from both organizations and beyond, as are other resources, including historical sources and funding. We are confident that this broad participation and opportunity for input from the best scholars in both institutions will result in a quality product within a reasonable time frame.
So what might you expect to see and when? As part of the expanded project, Volumes 1 and 2 have been improved and will be republished under the joint imprint of Deseret Book and Brigham Young University Press according to an updated style guide. All text, notes, and sources have been rechecked and new notes added. These volumes will go to the publisher later this year. Volume 3, which completes the diaries series, should be ready for the press late this year. Volume 4 launches a new series that integrates chronologically the letters, sermons, revelations, minutes, and other key documents. This volume is well underway, with a completed draft due by the end of the year. It should pass through our rigorous editorial stages in time to see the light of day next year. Volumes 5 through 9 are similarly underway. We expect most of them to be at the press before the 200th anniversary of Joseph Smith's birth in December 2005.

That concludes my survey of some of our recent projects. Now I would like to focus more deeply on a single subject, a book on which some colleagues and I have been working for some time that I think will be of interest to you.

Tragedy at Mountain Meadows

The Mountain Meadows Massacre has long been, in the eyes of many historians, the darkest chapter in Latter-day Saint history. Over the last few years, considerable publicity has attended efforts at reconciliation and healing on the part of Church leaders and descendants, both of those who died in and of those who carried out the massacre. During this same time period, we have seen a veritable outpouring of research and writing on the massacre. My own serious interest in the subject began over a decade ago when I joined with Ron Esplin in preparing an article on the massacre for the Encyclopedia of Mormonism.¹¹ I have continued to study the topic since that time.

Recently, several major works with a Mountain Meadows theme have been announced or published. Among them are historian and Salt Lake Tribune columnist Will Bagley’s long-anticipated volume *Blood of the Prophets: Brigham Young and the Massacre at Mountain Meadows*[^12] (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press), which appeared on 1 August 2002; investigative reporter Sally Denton’s book, tentatively titled *American Massacre* (New York: Knopf, forthcoming); two novels, Judith Freeman’s *Red Water* (New York: Pantheon, 2001) and Marilyn Brown’s *The Wine-Dark Sea of Grass* (Springville, Utah: Salt Press, 2001).[^13] As interest continues in this subject, we welcome a variety of perspectives on it and encourage open, balanced scholarship.

It has long been apparent that many of the best historical resources for writing about the massacre are in the collections of the Family and Church History Department. I am pleased to announce today that two of my colleagues and I, with the assistance of a veri-


table host of associates and friends, have been combing through these resources and others in public and private collections across the United States to prepare a book on the Mountain Meadows Massacre tentatively titled *Tragedy at Mountain Meadows* which will be published by Oxford University Press, probably in 2003 or 2004.

The massacre was a horrible tragedy; yet open, candid evaluation of that tragedy can produce catharsis—a cleansing spiritual renewal and healing among those who still feel the wounds from this mid-nineteenth-century event. To this end, our goal has been to locate all the sources that throw any light on the massacre and to present the evidence as we find it—honestly, openly, and candidly. When our volume is published, we plan to make available for public use the new sources we have discovered.

My two coauthors on this project are Dr. Glen M. Leonard and Dr. Ronald W. Walker. I want to thank these colleagues for their participation and for the untold hours of painstaking research and writing that have already gone into this project. I would also invite any of you who have access to any new information about the massacre to share it with us.\(^{14}\) We believe there are yet important materials in private hands, and we are anxious to tell the story of the massacre fully and completely.

---

\(^{14}\)In an effort to be as complete and accurate as possible, the authors have continued to solicit information. See, for example, “Information Sought about Mountain Meadows Massacre,” *Church News*, 1 June 2002, 7; “Mountain Meadows Information Request,” *Church News*, 13 July 2002, 12. As of late August 2002, efforts to locate information have proved successful. We have now built the world’s largest and most complete collection of information on the massacre, which we intend to make available through the LDS Church Archives after the publication of their book. One minor discovery garnered surprising media attention. Church archivists aiding in research for the book discovered original court documents related to the John D. Lee trials in county offices in Beaver, Utah. Although copies of these documents had been available to researchers for years, the originals had proved somewhat elusive. The originals turned out to include bits of information not found in the copies and were valuable, in any case, as artifacts. State officials later transferred the documents to Salt Lake City for microfilming to enhance public access. Joe Bauman, “Media Get Look at Lee Papers,” *Deseret News*, 24 July 2002; Greg Burton, “Massacre Documents Displayed,” *Salt Lake Tribune*, 24 July 2002.
IN PURSUIT OF ANSWERS TO DIFFICULT QUESTIONS

Glen M. Leonard

A CENTURY AGO, Basil G. Parker published an account of what he called "that awful atrocity" at the Mountain Meadows. Parker asserted that he had discovered "some facts never before made public." In one way or another the desire to find something new has motivated nearly every attorney, journalist, novelist, and historian who has tackled the intriguing questions surrounding the massacre. In addition, Parker recognized the great barrier facing all who seek the truth: "It is doubtful," he said, "whether a full account of the massacre will ever be had, as the rescued children were too young to remember much, and the Mormons will not tell what they know."15

It is well known to students of the subject that the participants pledged not to reveal who planned and carried out the massacre. Despite these commitments, claims and counter-claims circulated almost immediately. Initial reports of Indians as the instigators were challenged by information implicating Mormon militiamen, their leaders, and others in positions of authority in the Church. Over the years, various investigators have pursued answers to difficult questions. Too often, misleading allusions and accusations, personal agendas, and popular opinions have clouded the truth. Due to an environment of mistrust, some documents of importance were sequestered by institutions or individuals and kept from researchers.

Beginning with the landmark work of Juanita Brooks16 and proceeding at an increased pace during the past dozen years, a spirit of openness, reconciliation, and healing has unfolded. Projects to

---


remember the victims have involved hundreds of people from many states. These efforts have enjoyed the support of President Gordon B. Hinckley of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, members of the Mountain Meadows Association, officials of the State of Utah, and other organizations and individuals. Among the products of cooperative endeavors are two memorials and several plaques commemorating the Arkansas emigrants. In 1990, at dedication ceremonies for the first of the recent memorials, Rex E. Lee, a descendant of John D. Lee and president of Brigham Young University, joined hands with descendants of the Arkansas emigrants and the Utah militia in a symbol of reconciliation and forgiveness. He suggested that in the future the meadows should symbolize for those now living “not only tragedy and grief, but also human dignity, mutual understanding, [and] a willingness to look forward and not look back.” Because of these memorializing efforts, bridges of trust are gradually closing the gap between the descendants of the victims and of the perpetrators and others who share their concerns. It has become easier to talk about and to write about “that awful atrocity.”

Our friend Larry Coates, a history professor at Brigham Young University–Idaho, recently noted that, despite the suspicion and guilt that still lingers among a few descendants on both sides, an environment now exists where honest inquiry can take place. As Coates suggested, we no longer need to be “driven by the fear of tarnishing the image of the church.” More productive, he said, is a willingness to face the facts. Judge Roger V. Logan Jr. of Harrison, Arkansas, who counts twenty-two victims and five survivors in his


19Lawrence G. Coates, “President Hinckley’s Dedication at Mountain Meadows: Behind the Scenes,” 2000, 21-22, photocopy of typescript in my possession, used by permission.
ancestral lines, observed in 1999 that "while great strides have been made in recent years, until the church shows more candor about what its historians actually know about the event, true reconciliation will be elusive."20 California attorney Robert H. Briggs, a descendant of a Cedar City militiaman, also encourages those studying the massacre to narrow the gulf between entrenched positions and to "introduce some much-needed rigor into the process of evaluating the statements of witnesses."21

In this spirit of frankness and healing, Richard Turley, Ronald Walker, and I have pooled our separate research of several years in a cooperative effort to learn the truth about the Mountain Meadows Massacre. We are striving to understand the people, the surrounding events, and the immediate circumstances. Our employers support this comprehensive inquiry and have made available the help of research specialists in the LDS Church Archives and elsewhere. Seventy years ago, B. H. Roberts identified the massacre as "the most lamentable episode in Utah history, and in the history of the church," and the most difficult topic he had to deal with in writing the history of the Church.22 His challenges were not unlike those noted by Basil Parker and faced by Major James H. Carleton, Elder George A. Smith, Judge Jacob S. Boreman, and every other inquirer seeking accurate data—ourselves included. This topic remains a demanding foe. Any attempt to clarify significant questions and to resolve specific details in this tragic event encounters a scarcity of clear evidence and an overabundance of shaded innuendo, selective reminiscence, and partisan rhetoric.

Regardless of the challenges, the questions must be asked and answered. For instance:

- What can we learn by exploring the internal conflict and exter-

---

nal challenges of the large, unwieldy, and ever-changing Baker-Fancher company?

- What do we make of the disagreements within the complex decision-making councils of southern Utah during that fateful week?
- How did the backgrounds, personalities, and individual experiences of the key players in the drama at the Meadows contribute to misunderstanding, misinformation, indecision, and personal vendettas?
- What factors in an already volatile decade in American and Mormon history colored perspectives and decisions?
- What was the effect of the inner fears and fragile sense of safety that overtook the people of Utah Territory when they learned that federal troops were marching westward to quell a reported rebellion?
- How were the southern Utah Saints impacted in their feelings and actions by George A. Smith’s preaching and Brigham Young’s strong rhetoric and aggressive military strategy?
- What of the imperfections of the good people of southern Utah and the emigrant train as they dealt individually with threats of arrest, murder, rape, retribution for old and new offenses, and unfriendly interactions along the route south?

These are just a few of many questions surrounding the massacre. As we examine, discuss, and ponder the traditional evidence along with fresh details and newly available documents, we are discovering some plausible answers to these and other questions faced by a long list of investigators, past and present.23

If the Latter-day Saints in Basil Parker’s time were reticent to tell what they knew, we are not. Our generation desires to confront the evidence, all that can be found, that we may become free from ignorance of the past with its unhealthy feelings of uncertainty and mistrust. It is our hope that a candid examination and a balanced account of this terrible and tragic event will contribute to a greater understanding of the past and increased forebearance toward others in our own day.

PART OF EACH ONE OF US

Ronald W. Walker

Historians began telling the story of the Mountain Meadows Massacre in 1871 when the anonymous “Argus” penned a half-dozen letters to the Corinne Reporter, a newspaper known for its vituperative anti-Mormon edge. “Argus,” apparently LDS malcontent Charles Wesley Wandell, framed many of the issues that my colleague Glen Leonard has just cited. The most important of these, then and now, involve culpability: What role, if any, did James Buchanan, Brigham Young, and George A. Smith play in bringing about the massacre? How do we measure the responsibility of groups such as the Baker-Fancher emigrants, the Paiute Native Americans, and the Iron County settlers, especially their respective leaders?

In the years since the publication of “Argus’s” letters, these issues have been repeatedly discussed. On the one hand, Church spokesmen have, not surprisingly, defended their institution from the charge of high-level conspiracy in the massacre. However, although often candid in suggesting important sources and details, these writers have been relatively neglected, as it were, because of their credentials, if not their message. Quite a different view of the massacre was provided by T. B. H. Stenhouse, John D. Lee as edited by William W. Bishop (1877), and Josiah F. Gibbs (1910), whose works carried a Church-indicting tone. The resulting welter of defenders and attackers is one reason why the more neutral, historical judgment of H. H. Bancroft (1889) and especially the unflinching honesty and interpretive balance of Juanita Brooks (1950) were so well received. Nor has the stream abated. During the past ten years,

27 Bancroft, History of Utah, 1540-1886, 543-71; and Brooks, The
a dozen important articles or chapters concerning the massacre have appeared. As already mentioned, other major studies are looming.

Why then our book? We answer by mentioning our tentatively chosen title, *Tragedy at Mountain Meadows*. The massacre of 11 September 1857 was a tragedy that brought many victims: the horrifically killed men, women, and children of the Baker-Fancher party; the slain and wounded Paiutes who participated in the attacks; and the Anglo and Native American families who grieved over their loved ones. But the list does not end there. The killers themselves, along with their families and their church, were also victims—in a lesser way—but victims still. For guilt haunts and maims, whether directly or merely by association, and the bitter harvest may last for generations. Like the Horseman of the Apocalypse: Death came, but “Hell followed with him” (Rev. 6:8).

One of the reasons that we are writing this book is to ease the human emotions that this tragedy has provoked—to serve, in some small way, as a catharsis. But the cleansing of anger, hate, fear, guilt, and shame can only come after a full disclosure, something that we believe we are in a position to provide. As we have searched for every relevant document dealing with the massacre, we report both failure and success. While some key pieces of evidence have been lost or destroyed over time (what would we not give, for instance, to see Isaac Haight’s letter to Brigham Young, written on 7 September, explaining the situation in Iron County and asking for counsel?), we are pleased with what we have found. These “new” documents include government documents, emigrant diaries, and newspaper reports. They also include affidavits of men who participated in the massacre and the field notes of Assistant Church Historian Andrew Jenson, who forty years after the event tried to preserve as much of

---

the historical record as he could. In addition to these new discoveries, we have combed the holdings of more than three dozen research institutions for contextual material. An event like the Mountain Meadows Massacre can best be seen by a broad view.

What kind of a book may you expect? First of all, do not look for it to end all controversy. The human past is opaque, begrudging, and even willful with its secrets; and no amount of new data or hard research will bring a readily accepted truth. However, we also believe that the heavy weight of evidence on some points is clear. For instance, the charge that Brigham Young ordered the massacre remains the canard that it always has been. Nor do we believe that George A. Smith carried secret orders during his August tour of southern Utah that set in motion the crime at Mountain Meadows.

Second, you may expect a volume that seeks to promote understanding rather than to defend or to attack. The partisan, polemical mood that has afflicted so much of Mormon historical writing—the finger pointing, the rhetorical flourishes, and the spirit of exposé and debate—has seldom added to human understanding, and we are certain that such an approach will not explain the atrocity of Mountain Meadows. Frankly, as we have sought understanding, we have seen a great deal of human frailty. As authors and researchers, we hear strong, inflammatory words from the Mormon pulpit; we despair because some rank-and-file Saints failed to forgive past persecution; and we acknowledge that those typically peaceful Mormon villages had troubling, extralegal crime. We also observe that President James Buchanan dispatched troops to Utah without proper notice; that President Young sought a risky alliance with Native Americans; and some members of the Baker-Fancher party behaved poorly as they passed through the Mormon Corridor. Yet, in each case, because of the circumstances of the time, we understand the reason that motivated such acts.

Third, you may expect a volume that tries to move beyond some of these issues. Here we return to our theme of tragedy, which of course has several meanings. The massacre had all the elements of a classical tragedy: flawed heroes, great issues, uncontrolled emotion, mistaken loyalties, and even an important element of accident or fortuna. Those incendiary charges of cattle poisoning that the emigrants and settlers threw at each other were likely the result of unusual and misunderstood disease. It was as though the fates had intervened to drive an already negative situation into catastrophe.
Seen as classical tragedy, the story of the massacre moves beyond Mormon history to human experience. On this larger stage, we see the exposition of human universals—the realization that some part of each one of us was at the massacre. How else can we come to grips with John D. Lee, whose share of the responsibility for the massacre grew in our minds as our research went forward? Could an Aeschylus or Sophocles have found a more likely protagonist? Lee was a man of action, but far too certain of himself. He deceived others but first deceived himself. He had kaleidoscopic and extreme drives, the result perhaps of horrid childhood abuse. By his own admission, sex for him was an almost uncontrollable torrent. Yet, notwithstanding these flaws, and perhaps in part because of them, there were offsetting virtues, too. He had larger-than-life generosity, piety, and even religious force. According to one account, in a grand gesture, he treated those who had just arrested him to Dixie wine and submissively came to regard his younger captors as father-figures. And although he had chances to escape his execution, he made no attempt to do so. Lee had enough humanity for all of us.

Let one thing be clear. The search for understanding and the desire to find human values in a terrible catastrophe does not excuse the need for judgment. While we believe that the massacre was made possible by inflammatory events in a setting of extreme excitement and fear, the tinder need not have ignited. Even as the Baker-Fancher party came under attack, Utahns elsewhere in the territory acted to preserve the lives of other troublesome emigrants. Unfortunately, the militia and Church leaders of Iron County made different decisions, and their acts demand the strongest condemnation. Circumstance may explain their acts; nothing can justify them.

However, as the historian renders Olympian judgment, we have attempted to keep in mind a caution offered many years ago by Elder Charles W. Penrose. Speaking of historians of the massacre, Penrose reminded us that “we are apt to measure other people’s cloth by our yard-stick.” As we conclude our writing and send our book to its publisher, we hope that our “yard-stick” includes, along with our censure, pity, and compassion.

Penrose, Mountain Meadows Massacre, 63.
INHERITING THE “GREAT APOSTASY”: THE EVOLUTION OF MORMON VIEWS ON THE MIDDLE AGES AND THE RENAISSANCE

Eric Dursteler

THE IDEA OF A UNIVERSAL APOSTASY is one of the foundational elements of Mormonism; indeed, it is often privileged with an uppercase A and designated as the “Great Apostasy.” In this context, the term refers specifically to what Mormons perceive as the “falling away” from Christ’s original church and his teachings in the centuries immediately following his crucifixion. It is no exaggeration to say that the concept of an apostasy is one of the
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linchpins of the Mormon faith: Without an apostasy, there would have been no need for Joseph Smith or for the Restoration. "The apostasy is," according to Apostle Bruce R. McConkie, the great doctrinal commentator, "the first great sign of the times." Among the Mormon faithful, the explanation and justification for this pivotal moment are historically based; indeed, as one acute observer has commented, "for Mormonism more than other religions, history evolves as part of the church's canon."³

The concept of a historical apostasy was most fully developed in the works of three influential LDS doctrinal commentators and General Authorities—B. H. Roberts of the First Council of Seventy, Apostle James E. Talmage, and Apostle and future Church President Joseph Fielding Smith—who wrote around the turn of the twentieth century. For each of these scholar/authorities, the key moments of the apostasy were the first Christian centuries when innumerable "plain and precious truths" were lost. In their divine chronologies, however, the Middle Ages and Renaissance also play an important if relatively brief role in the historical evolution that led ineluctably to the Restoration. All three writers point to the darkness of medieval times as the fullest expression of the effects of apostasy in contrast to the light that the Renaissance revival of learning reflected into the world. The Renaissance set the stage for the Reformation, which, in turn, acted as a prelude to the Restoration. While this binary vision of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance was common in the intellectual world of the late nineteenth century, over the intervening century scholars have come to see this historical paradigm as obsolete and outdated. This essay historically situates these influential commentators' viewpoints on the Middle Ages and Renaissance within their broader vision of the "Great Apostasy" as well as the

²Bruce R. McConkie, A New Witness for the Articles of Faith (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1985), 626.
enduring appeal of their views for the LDS community. The question of the historicity of the Mormon view of apostasy or the specific events it purports to describe, while important and suggestive themes, are beyond the scope of this essay.

**THE APOSTASY IN MORMON THOUGHT**

Given the importance of the “Great Apostasy” in Mormonism, the sparse attention it has received lately from the pulpit and in official publications is striking. During Mormonism’s first century, discussions of apostasy were very much a part of the faith’s dialogue. Apostasy, of course, figured centrally in the mission and teachings of Joseph Smith, particularly in his accounts of the First Vision, in which he was told that Christ’s church had been lost from the earth and that the existing sects “were all wrong . . . [and] all their creeds an abomination” (JS-History 1:19). These early narratives present the Church as a light bursting through the spiritual darkness that had reigned for almost two thousand years, a metaphor to which subsequent LDS writers repeatedly returned. This theme resonated strongly among the first generation of converts and gradually evolved in the writings and discourses of many leaders. Brigham Young, for example, briefly reflected on apostasy as did Parley and Orson Pratt in several important early treatises. The most extensive

---

4An on-line search of the LDS Church’s official adult publication, the *Ensign*, since 1971, reveals an article on apostasy published every two to three years. Perhaps inspired by the end of a millennium, 1999 saw two notable mentions of the historical apostasy, including one by Church President Gordon B. Hinckley, “At the Summit of the Ages,” *Ensign*, November 1999, 72-74; and Arnold K. Carr, “Preparing for the Restoration,” ibid., June 1999, 34-45. In *Gospel Principles*, an official publication intended to present basic doctrines to new converts to Mormonism, the apostasy merits two short pages. *Gospel Principles* (Salt Lake City: Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1997), 105-6.


7Surprisingly little has been written about early Mormon views on apostasy; indeed, I hope to make this topic the focus of a future study. For some sense of these views, see Benjamin Winchester, *A History of the Priesthood from the Beginning of the World to the Present Time* . . . (Philadelphia:
early treatment was Benjamin Winchester’s *A History of the Priesthood from the Beginning of the World to the Present Time* (1843).

Building upon these earlier works, the last decade of the nineteenth and the first decades of the twentieth centuries saw the publication of a number of important, more systematic treatments of the apostasy. The most consequential were those of Roberts, Talmage, and Joseph Fielding Smith, three of Mormonism’s most influential doctrinal and theological thinkers. These writers all attempted to historicize the nature and progress of the “Great Apostasy” in specific detail. They, in turn, influenced a flurry of works at mid-century on the historical apostasy, which were developed for use as manuals in Church instruction. In 1944, the apostasy was the subject of an Institute of Religion manual, in 1950 a Sunday School manual, and in 1952-55 and 1960 Melchizedek Priesthood manuals. The 1950s thus saw the institutional validation and recognition of a his-

---


historical view in which the apostasy directed the whole of western history toward the culminating event of Joseph Smith’s 1830 restoration of Christ’s original church.

The quantity and scope of the works produced from 1900 to 1960, however, were followed by a decline in attention to the apostasy among Mormon thinkers. The causes are not entirely clear, but they may have been linked in part to the expanding LDS missionary effort and ongoing efforts to fit more squarely within mainstream American culture and society, evidenced in attempts to find common ground with former religious antagonists.10 As part of this trend, the missionary lessons, which were recast in the early 1970s, shifted the apostasy from its privileged position immediately following the recounting of the Joseph Smith story to a less conspicuous position in one of the later lessons. The general trend toward emphasizing the teaching of commandments over doctrinal exegesis certainly played a role in this declining interest as well.11 Clearly, the strident anti-Catholic undercurrent which informed certainly earlier Mormon views on apostasy was tempered,12 and even disavowed.

This form of Mormon ecumenism has been particularly evident of late in the speeches of the present prophet, Gordon B. Hinckley, who has on several occasions called for tolerance and respect for other religious groups, as well as for increased cooperation with them on humanitarian, social, and similar issues. See for example, “Latter-day Counsel: Excerpts from Recent Addresses of President Gordon B. Hinckley,” Ensign, April 1999, 71, and “Our Testimony to the World,” ibid., May 1997, 83. See also Craig L. Blomberg and Stephen E. Robinson, How Wide the Divide? A Mormon and an Evangelical in Conversation (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1997). On Mormon assimilation in general, see Armand L. Mauss, The Angel and the Beehive: The Mormon Struggle with Assimilation (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1994); Gordon Sheperd and Gary Sheperd, “Mormonism in Secular Society: Changing Patterns in Official Ecclesiastical Rhetoric,” Review of Religious Research 26 (September 1984): 28-42.


B. H. Roberts’s radio addresses in 1929 were so blatantly anti-Catholic that they elicited a passionate response published nationally in 1930: “Among the Mormons in Utah, by an Observer,” Extension Magazine of the National Catholic Monthly, January 1930, 23, 36-37. This
This shift is most evident in the controversy over the repeated identification of "the church of the devil" and "the great and abominable church" of 1 Nephi 13-14 with Roman Catholicism in the first edition (1958) of Bruce R. McConkie's *Mormon Doctrine*. These references were subsequently expurgated from the second edition (1966). Exceptions to this general pattern of ignoring the apostasy are Milton V. Backman's *American Religions and the Rise of Mormonism*, and elements of McConkie's *A New Witness for the Articles of Faith.*

While often rich and suggestive, a perusal of the Mormon literature of apostasy reveals a marked homogeneity, despite its span of almost 150 years. A comparison of the reflections of Orson Pratt in 1857, of James E. Talmage in 1909, and of Bruce R. McConkie in 1985, for example, shows striking similarities between these generations of LDS thinkers. Some of these resemblances stem from their dependence on the same sources and their tendency to self-refe-
These characteristics are especially true of the foundational doctrinal works of Roberts, Talmage, and Smith, in which the LDS theories of apostasy were codified in the first decades of the twentieth century as part of an extremely fertile theological era of definition and reconciliation with secular learning, described by Arrington as “the stage of creative adaption.”

These three scholar/authorities of the second generation of Mormonism were most responsible for systematizing LDS theology. All wrote widely and perceptively on many of the doctrinal issues of the day. While Smith and Roberts disagreed fiercely about evolution and other issues, Talmage often staked out something of a middle ground between them. In marked contrast, their historical theologies were virtually identical, particularly in how each understood the place of the Middle Ages and Renaissance in the apostasy, and their relationship to the Restoration. The Church leadership

---


16In their number must be included John A. Widtsoe, another influential theologian-apostle; however, because he wrote little about apostasy, I do not discuss him in this article. Alexander, “The Reconstruction of Mormon Doctrine,” 28. Most scholars emphasize the importance of the triumvirate of Roberts, Talmage, and Widtsoe in the development and definition of Mormon doctrines at the turn of the century, but ignore Smith's importance. Perhaps this is because of his conservative rather than progressive doctrinal positions or because of his opposition to the other three scholar/authorities over key theological issues. Arrington, “The Intellectual Tradition of Mormon Utah,” 358-62, reports a survey of “some fifty prominent L.D.S. intellectuals” who ranked Roberts first, Talmage fifth, and Widtsoe sixth among the twelve most influential Mormon intellectuals. Smith does not appear on the list.

and membership alike generally embraced the “priestly narratives” of Roberts, Talmage, and Smith as authoritative in their day. Unquestionably, they have provided the foundation for all subsequent discussions of the apostasy. In many ways, this trio’s conceptualizations still inform how Mormons think about the apostasy.

**The Middle Ages and Renaissance in Mormon Writings on Apostasy**

The first comprehensive treatment of the apostasy was that of B. H. Roberts, whom philosopher Sterling M. McMurrin has called “the intellectual leader of the Mormon people in the era of Mormonism’s finest intellectual attainment.” In his *Outlines of Ecclesiastical History*, first published in 1893 as a Seventies quorum manual, with five subsequent editions following over the next thirty years, Roberts developed a wide-ranging and all-encompassing view of the apostasy. He restated and amplified these views—though not substantially altering them—in a 1929 series of radio lectures published in 1931 as *The Falling Away*. At its core, Roberts’s position centered on the

---

18The quotation is from Shipps, *Mormonism*, 2.


view of the apostasy, common since Joseph Smith's time, as primarily the loss of priesthood authority—that is, the loss of divine sanction to act in the name of God in conducting such saving ordinances as the sacrament, baptism, and temple sealings—and the end of continuing revelation. In these foundational works, however, Roberts attempted to historicize the process of apostasy. He focused particularly on historical and doctrinal developments in late antiquity, changes in ordinances, the infiltration of pagan philosophies, the rise of the Mass, and variations from the original organization of Christ's church. For Roberts, the first three Christian centuries were the key period in the "Great Apostasy." By the time of Constantine, the church that Christ had organized had ceased to exist. More than any other Mormon scholar, Roberts's ideas and approach effectively set the parameters and pattern for all subsequent discussions of apostasy; indeed his oeuvre provided the basic outlines of "a Mormon theology of history, nearly Augustinian in its vision."21

While Roberts's chief emphasis was on the first Christian centuries, the Middle Ages and the Renaissance were important transitional moments in the lockstep evolution from apostasy to Reformation to Restoration. In his discussion, he concentrates on what he considered evidence of both the omnipotence and the depravity of the papacy, and the "state of morals" within the church.22 Roberts also identifies a number of medieval events which he sees as preparing the ground for the all-important Reformation. He traces "the progress of popular liberty" to the rise of a "commercial class" around 1200, which financed the crusading movement in return for grants of "political privileges" from cash-strapped monarchs. This development, according to Roberts, led to the breakdown of the "Feudal Land Tenure System" and the ultimate weakening of the ecclesiastical stranglehold on European society. Despite these seemingly positive developments, however, Roberts's Middle Ages are painted overwhelmingly in murky, monochromatic tones. These are the Dark Ages, a backward bookmark between New Testament Christianity and the beginnings of its revival with Martin Luther.

and "historically naïve."


22Roberts, Outlines of Ecclesiastical History, 202-14; and his The Falling Away, 90-128.
This was, in his words, an “Age of Darkness,” the “midnight period of our world.” He exclaims: “A period of fifteen hundred years! In which a famine for the word of God existed; a period when men wandered from sea to sea, and ran to and fro to seek the word of the Lord, and found it not. How pitiful the picture of it!”

In Roberts’s theological chronology, this fifteen-hundred-year “Age of Darkness” was not only spiritual, but also intellectual, blighting all aspects of European life: “The intellectual stupor of Europe had been as profound as spiritual darkness had been dense.” Into this spiritual and intellectual obscurity, however, a ray of light began to break through with the “Revival of Learning” in the latter part of the fifteenth century, which set the stage for Luther’s theses, and eventually Joseph Smith’s vision. Roberts points to a number of significant innovations in this period of awakening: the inventions of gunpowder, the compass, paper, and printing; the discovery of the Cape of Good Hope route to India, Columbus’s discovery of the Americas, innovations in art, and “a greater knowledge of antiquity” spread by Greek refugees fleeing the fall of Constantinople after 1453.

Although B. H. Roberts effectively set the parameters of what came to be the view of apostasy most widely held in the Mormon community, the most recognizable and noted work on the topic is not his, but rather James Talmage’s slender volume, The Great Apostasy, written in 1909 before his call as an apostle, for use in the Mutual Improvement Association. Though in many ways quite derivative of Roberts’s earlier Outlines, Talmage’s is the book still in circulation and still regularly referenced today. Indeed, it often still appears on approved reading lists for Mormon missionaries. Like Roberts,

23Roberts, The Falling Away, 144-45; and his Outlines of Ecclesiastical History, 231-32. Roberts borrows this picture of benighted wanderers from Amos 8:11-12.

24Roberts, Outlines of Ecclesiastical History, 229-30; and his Falling Away, 146-47.

Talmage emphasizes the nexus of apostasy and loss of priesthood authority; he devotes the bulk of his historical exegesis to the initial stages of apostasy on the early Christian church, emphasizing both external and internal causes. In his final chapter, "Results of the Apostasy: Its Sequel," however, he briefly surveys medieval resistance to the church in Rome as a bridge to a discussion of the Reformation. When Talmage describes revolts against the "tyranny . . . [of] the thoroughly apostate and utterly corrupt . . . Church of Rome," he uses language reminiscent of Roberts's in describing the Middle Ages:

The awakening of intellectual activity . . . began in the latter part of the fourteenth century. The period from the tenth century onward to the time of the awakening has come to be known as the dark ages—characterized by stagnation in the progress of the useful arts and sciences as well as of fine arts and letters, and by a general condition of illiteracy and ignorance among the masses.

This era of darkness was enlightened by "the revival of learning" which opened "the struggle for freedom from church tyranny."  

In his widely respected Jesus the Christ (1915), Talmage makes even more explicit the relationship of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance:

Under the tyrannous repression . . . [of] the Roman church, civilization was retarded and for centuries was practically halted in its course. The period of retrogression is known in history as the Dark Ages. The fifteenth century witnessed the movement known as the Renaissance or Revival of Learning; there was a general and significantly rapid awakening among men, and a determined effort to shake off the stupor of indolence and ignorance was manifest throughout the civilized world. . . . [I]t was a development predetermined in the Mind of God to illumine the benighted minds of men in preparation for the restoration of the gospel of Jesus Christ.

---


27Talmage, The Great Apostasy, 150.

28James E. Talmage, Jesus the Christ (Salt Lake City: Deseret News,
The lockstep linkage of the three R’s—Renaissance, Reformation, and Restoration—at the center of Roberts’s depiction of the “Great Apostasy” is abundantly evident in Talmage’s writings.

The influential writings of Roberts and Talmage culminated in the work of Joseph Fielding Smith, the third prominent Mormon theologian of the apostasy in the early twentieth century. Smith was a son of President Joseph F. Smith, grandson of Hyrum Smith, called by his father as an apostle in 1910 at age thirty-three and, in 1970, at age ninety-four, ordained the tenth president of the LDS Church. Called a “soldier of truth” by his biographer-grandson, Smith was also one of the most important doctrinal thinkers and probably the most influential conservative force of Mormonism’s second century. He published more books and articles than any other Mormon president, and President Heber J. Grant considered him “the best posted man on the scriptures of the General Authorities.”

Smith’s views on the apostasy first appeared in his 1922 Essentials in Church History. His introduction includes a general overview of the “Falling Away,” which serves simply to set the stage for the real focus of his treatise, the restoration of all things by Joseph Smith and the subsequent history of the church he founded. A decade later, Smith returned to the apostasy and published a much more extensive study, The Progress of Man (1936). This rich study was commissioned by the board of the Genealogical Society of Utah, which because of the “grave conditions” of the day, “thought it would be timely to have a course of study giving a brief outline of man’s history on the earth.” Smith’s text was no ordinary universal history, however; it was “an outline history of man interpreted in the light of revelation. It tells of . . . [the] everlasting conflict between good and evil, light and darkness, freedom and oppression, [and] . . . the final

1915), 749.


and destined triumph of truth." Smith's striking litany of binary oppositions foreshadows his treatment of the medieval apostasy.

Smith devotes more attention than Roberts or Talmage to the Middle Ages and the Renaissance as they relate to the Mormon understanding of the apostasy. In his discussion, he links the Renaissance's revival of learning to Europe's increasing encounters with Islam and the rest of the world through the Crusades, Mediterranean trade, and the travels of Marco Polo. Despite Smith's greater detail, however, he does not depart significantly from the path outlined by Roberts and Talmage. Like both of them, he finds divine technological intervention in the invention of the compass, paper, gunpowder, and printing, though in each case he goes into greater detail than the other writers. The Middle Ages for Smith, as for Roberts and Talmage, are the "Dark Ages [which] ... commenced with the fall of Rome and continued during the greater part of the next thousand years." It was an era characterized by a "condition of mental and spiritual stupor and stupidity." 

As with his precursors, Smith also sees the "Springtime of the Renaissance" beginning to stir in the dark medieval winter. This thaw for him began in the twelfth century, when "the world was like a great giant who gradually began to stir from a long drunken stupor." The real awakening, however, occurred during the Renaissance of the fourteenth century—the age of Petrarch, Giotto, and Boccaccio. Smith even appropriates Roberts's language in describing this era as "The Revival of Learning." He departs from his predecessors in generally avoiding their often virulent anti-Catholic stance (especially characteristic of Roberts), and he also suggests that, despite what he perceived as the terrible darkness of the medieval era, "the Spirit of the Lord was working among the people," preparing the way for "the day in which the fulness of freedom and religious liberty was to be ushered in." This time of preparation, for Smith, was the Renaissance.

31Joseph Fielding Smith, The Progress of Man (Salt Lake City: Genealogical Society of Utah, 1936), 1, 4.
32Ibid., 192-95, 201-5, 211-15.
33Ibid., 197-98, 200, 206. Because of his long life, Joseph Fielding Smith's views, while first expressed in The Progress of Man in 1936, reappeared over the next three decades in a number of the prolific author's other writings, including Essentials in Church History, Seek Ye Earnestly (Salt
From the writings of Roberts, Talmage, and Smith, several key features of the Mormon view of the historical apostasy emerge. All three emphasize that, at its core, the apostasy consisted of a loss of priesthood authority on the earth. All three devote most of their discussion to the early Christian centuries which they see as the pivotal age of apostasy. In their often brief treatments of the Middle Ages and Renaissance, all three resort quite strikingly to the metaphor of light and dark. While their exact datings may vary slightly, in general the period from approximately 500 to 1500 is characterized as an undifferentiated mass, and labeled the Dark Ages.\textsuperscript{34} The Middle Ages, for these LDS observers, were an age of abject backwardness, of obscurity and apostasy. For Roberts, this is the "Age of Darkness," the "midnight period of our world." For Talmage it was a "period of retrogression."\textsuperscript{35} Other contemporary Mormon authors embraced this language as well. Hugh B. Brown, who would be called as an Assistant to the Twelve in 1953, gave a discourse in 1941 revealingly entitled "The Night of Darkness." He terms this period "the Dark Ages, a time which has been designated as the midnight of time, . . . in which not only the artificial lamps of men burned low, but also the celestial lights of God's inspiration were extinguished."\textsuperscript{36}

The darkness of the era is two-fold in Mormon apostasy literature. On the one hand, there is the spiritual darkness of apostasy created by the absence of direct revelation and priesthood authority. The roots of this view can be traced back to Joseph Smith's accounts of his first vision, in which the spiritual darkness of his day is due to absent priesthood authority, but which is penetrated by the light of God and Christ breaking through to him in his moment of despair (JS-H 1:16-17).\textsuperscript{37} On the other hand, there is the innovation by

\begin{itemize}
  \item Shipps, \textit{Mormonism}, 2.
  \item Roberts, \textit{The Falling Away}, 145-46; \textit{Outlines of Ecclesiastical History}, 229; Talmage, \textit{Jesus the Christ}, 749.
  \item Hugh B. Brown, \textit{Continuing the Quest} (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1961), 385-86. For an earlier example of this view, see Pratt, \textit{Key to the Science of Theology}, 115.
  \item Shipps, \textit{Mormonism}, 2-3.
\end{itemize}
Roberts, Talmage, and Smith which expands this metaphor of darkness beyond the purely spiritual realm. In their depictions, the Dark Ages are not only spiritually benighted but the backwardness and degeneration of the spirit are also accompanied by an absolute decline in western civilization. For Talmage “the dark ages [are] characterized by stagnation in the progress of the useful arts and sciences as well as of fine arts and letters, and by a general condition of illiteracy and ignorance among the masses.” In “this period of retrogression” in Europe “civilization was retarded and for centuries was practically halted in its course.” For Smith, it is an age characterized by intellectual and spiritual “stupor and stupidity.”

In contrast to the darkness of the Middle Ages, these Mormon writers emphasize the light of the period immediately preceding the Reformation, the Renaissance, which is a privileged age in this holy history. For Talmage the intellectual revival of the late fourteenth century is part of a general trend of rebellion against tyrannical ecclesiastical power. This “rapid awakening among men, and a determined effort to shake off the stupor of indolence and ignorance” was predetermined by God “to illumine the benighted minds of men in preparation for the restoration of the gospel of Jesus Christ.” For Roberts, “the intellectual stupor of Europe had been as profound as spiritual darkness had been dense. But with the close of the fifteenth century, literature, science and art seemed to spring into active life.” Similarly, Smith writes of the Renaissance that “the Lord never intended that man should be kept in ignorance as existed in the Middle Ages. The time had to come when the minds of men were to be freed from the chains that enslaved them.”

In sum then, the historical narrative of the “Great Apostasy” generated by these Mormon thinkers during the fertile doctrinal and intellectual atmosphere of the early twentieth century emphasized a

---

38Talmage, The Great Apostasy, 150; and his Jesus the Christ, 749; Smith, Progress of Man, 194.
39Talmage, Jesus the Christ, 749, and his The Great Apostasy, 150; Roberts, Outlines of Ecclesiastical History, 229, and his The Falling Away, 146; Smith, Progress of Man, 197. Hugh B. Brown recycled this language of convergence and Roberts’s line of argument almost word for word in his 1941 address: “Divine Prophecy and World Events,” Tabernacle Address, No. 5, Church News, 5 April 1941, quoted in Brown, Continuing the Quest, 385-86, 389-90.
generalized view of the period between 500 and 1500 as a time of spiritual and intellectual darkness in which all revelation and, indeed, progress of any sort disappeared. About 1500, the revolutionary changes associated with the Renaissance opened heaven’s door a crack and allowed a beam of light to penetrate the gloom, thus setting the stage for the Reformation, which in turn blazed the trail for the restoration of all things by Joseph Smith. What I hope to show in the remainder of this paper is that the generally monochromatic discussion presented in LDS historical surveys of the medieval bridge between the “Great Apostasy” and the “Restoration” is firmly planted in historical assumptions of the nineteenth century and earlier. These ideas, while embraced in their day by many—perhaps even most—scholars, have for the most part been superseded by the scholarship of subsequent generations.

**THE SOURCES OF MORMON APOSTASY LITERATURE**

An examination of the citations of these three influential Mormon writers shows clearly that they relied chiefly on two types of sources in crafting their viewpoints: the highly polemical, popular, confessional, historical literature of the nineteenth century, and the anticlerical literature of the eighteenth century Enlightenment. While these authors often did not cite their sources, as was common in their day, still a survey of their references is revealing. Roberts seems to have roamed most widely with his research, relying on a range of Protestant, Catholic, and Enlightenment authors. His chief historical source was Protestant theologian and historian Johann Lorenz von Mosheim, especially his 1755 work, *Institutionum historiae ecclesiasticae antiquae et recentioris*. Roberts used the 1764 English translation, *Institutes of Ecclesiastical History, Ancient and Modern*. Roberts supplemented Mosheim with other Protestant histo-

---


41 Because Roberts’s books were preserved in the “B. H. Roberts Memorial Library,” LDS Church Archives, it is possible to get some sense of the range of his reading. For an illustrative selection of Roberts’s library holdings, see John W. Welch, ed., *The Truth, the Way, the Life*, 2d. ed. (Provo, Utah: BYU Studies, 1996), 743-52.
ries, including the evangelical Joseph Milner’s *The History of the Church of Christ* (1794-97), and the Swiss theologian Jean Henri Merle d’Aubigné’s *Histoire de la Réformation en Europe au Temps de Calvin* (1862-78). Roberts also referenced several Catholic sources, though these were used to support his ultimately anti-Catholic position: these include the English Catholic vicar John Milner’s *The End of Religious Controversy* (1818), and *Discours sur l’histoire universelle* (1681), translated by the Bishop of Meaux, Jacques Bénigne Bossuet.43

Roberts’s chief sources, however, were Protestant histories, and these were often infused with post-Reformation polemics. As Richard Bushman has rightly observed, Talmage’s and Roberts’s ideas were conceived “with the liberal assistance of Protestant scholars who were equally committed to belief in the apostasy of the Roman Church.” He adds, “It would be interesting to know if . . . [they] have added anything to the findings of Protestant scholars.”44 Mormon apostasy literature also owed a great debt to the anti-Catholic polemics which dominated turn-of-the-century historical writing in Protestant America.45

Beyond these Protestant works, Roberts, as well as Talmage and Smith, was influenced by Enlightenment and Romantic historians and trends. Mormon theologians, like many Romantic writers, tended to view history as drama, “the unfolding of a vast Providential plan,” and generally shared the Romantic belief that a historian’s task was “to arrange apparently disconnected events in their proper order.”46 Influential in a different way were the great Enlightenment

---

42Winchester, *History of the Priesthood*, 85-91, also drew many of his arguments from Mosheim.

43For a useful contextualization and explanation of Bossuet and the tradition of universal histories, see Orest Ranum’s introduction to Jacques Bénigne Bossuet, *Discourse on Universal History* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976), xiii-xliv.


histories of Edward Gibbon and David Hume, which were tempered, however, with the English theologian and utilitarian philosopher William Paley’s compendium of orthodox arguments in refutation of deist philosophies, View of the Evidences of Christianity (1794). It was common in the universal histories of the philosopher-historians of the Enlightenment, such as Voltaire, Henry Bolingbroke and Hume, to see “nothing but barbarism, ignorance, superstition, violence, irrationality, and priestly tyranny” from the fall of Rome to the Renaissance, which they viewed as the birth of the rational, secular, modern era—that is, their own day. The Middle Ages provided them the perfect irrational foil for their own, enlightened age. This philosophe history of progress posited the “dark centuries” of the Middle Ages as the gloomy backdrop against which the first stirring of modern progress, the light of Renaissance Italy, burst forth.\footnote{Karl Dannenfeldt, ed., The Renaissance: Basic Interpretations (Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath, 1974), vii-viii. For a discussion of Enlightenment historical thought and the place assigned to the Middle Ages and Renaissance, see Wallace K. Ferguson, The Renaissance in Historical Thought: Five Centuries of Interpretation (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1948), 78-112; also Paul F. Grendler, “The Renaissance in Historical Thought,” in Encyclopedia of the Renaissance, edited by Paul F. Grendler (New York: Scribner’s, 1999), 5:260-61.}


While the sources they cited tended toward outdated, polemi-
cal religious and philosophical works, our three Mormon scholar/authorities also relied to a degree on more recent general works, particularly of a historical nature, to flesh out their understanding of the historical continuum of the apostasy. Roberts, as mentioned previously, discusses briefly a number of significant technological innovations associated with the Renaissance “Revival of Learning,” including the invention of printing, the compass, and gunpowder, a list that Smith reprises: Both erroneously attribute the invention of gunpowder to a certain Schwartz. 49 In Roberts’s case, his discussion of Renaissance innovations is drawn almost word for word from a passage in François Guizot’s popular History of Civilization in Europe (1828); Smith effectively accepts Roberts’s findings, though he buttresses them with more recent general histories.50 Neither Roberts nor Smith cites a source for their discussion of the invention of gunpowder, but it likely came from John J. Anderson, A Manual of General History: Being an Outline History of the World from the Creation to the Present Time. This work was part of a wide-ranging series of general histories that Anderson wrote on a variety of topics intended for use in “Colleges, High-Schools, Academies, Etc.” Roberts cites it in both his Outlines and his Falling Away.51 Interest-

49Roberts, Outlines of Ecclesiastical History, 229-30, and The Falling Away, 146; Smith, The Progress of Man, 201-5.
50Roberts, Outlines of Ecclesiastical History, 229-30: “The invention of gunpowder had completely revolutionized the modes of warfare; the employment of the mariners’ compass made ocean navigation less dangerous; . . . Painting in oil came into vogue about this time and filled Europe with masterpieces of art; engraving on copper, invented early in the century, multiplied and diffused them. Paper made of linen also came into common use; and finally, between 1436 and 1452 A.D., printing was invented.” M. Guizot, History of Civilization in Europe from the Fall of the Roman Empire to the French Revolution (Boston: Estes and Lauriat, n.d. [ca. 1880]), 216: “Gunpowder changed the system of war; the compass changed the system of navigation. Painting in oil was invented, and filled Europe with masterpieces of art. Engraving on copper, invented in 1406, multiplied and diffused them. Paper made of linen became common. Finally, between 1436 and 1452, was invented printing.”
51John J. Anderson, A Manual of General History: Being an Outline History of the World from the Creation to the Present Time (New York: Clark & Maynard, 1874), 231-32. For the most recent scholarship on this, see
ingly, Anderson also uses the light/dark metaphor in describing the passage from the Middle Ages to the Renaissance, which is so characteristic of Mormon apostasy literature: "The epoch at which Modern History commences is the dawn of intelligence that broke upon Europe in the latter part of the 15th [sic] century. . . . [T]he West, emerging from the night of medieval ignorance, began to glow with the first beams of an intellectual and social illumination."\textsuperscript{52}

This element, among others, of Roberts's, Talmage's, and Smith's thought seems clearly to have been influenced by the work of one of the great nineteenth-century historians, Jacob Burckhardt, and by the less innovative though widely influential English scholar John Addington Symonds. This link may seem at first glance rather tenuous, since none of the authors makes direct reference to Burckhardt and only Smith explicitly cites Symonds.\textsuperscript{53} All three, however, appropriate directly both the concept and wording of the title of the second volume of Symonds's Renaissance in Italy, \textit{Revival of Learning}, in their histories.\textsuperscript{54} Despite this, it seems clear that Burckhardt's germinal vision of the Renaissance permeated the views of these three Mormon thinkers. Some evidence can be found in their sources, but it is even more evident in their conceptualization of the medieval and Renaissance periods in relationship to the "Great Apostasy."

Roberts, Talmage, and Smith were apparently quite unaware of the burgeoning, professional, historical literature of their age; and

\textsuperscript{52}Ibid., 231.

\textsuperscript{53}Smith, \textit{Progress of Man}, 197.

\textsuperscript{54}John Addington Symonds, \textit{Renaissance in Italy}, 4 vols. in 1 (New York: Modern Library 1935), 1:327. "The Revival of Learning" is the title of a section in both Roberts's \textit{Outlines} and his \textit{Falling Away}, as well as Talmage's \textit{Great Apostasy}. Smith composed an entire chapter with the same title.
indeed it would be unfair and unrealistic to expect them as nonprofessional historians to have been up to date on current historiography. In their discussions of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, all three relied entirely on popular, general history textbooks of their day: Roberts favored Anderson; and though neither Talmage nor Smith explicitly cite him, Anderson’s ideas are apparent in their works as well. At the very least, Roberts may have served as a conduit to his colleagues writing in the decades following his important *Outlines*. Further, all three extensively cite another popular turn-of-the-century historian, P. V. N. Myers. Myers’s principal publications were a number of widely used general history texts for high school and college students, including *Mediaeval and Modern History* and *General History for Colleges and High Schools*. In these synthetic works, Myers’s discussion of the Middle Ages and Renaissance is significantly more nuanced than those of Roberts, Talmage, and Smith. It is also clear that his thinking was influenced by the day’s prevailing scholarship. Indeed, his list of recommended readings on the Renaissance includes “Symonds ... the best extended history in English,” as well as “Burckhardt ... the most philosophical and suggestive work on the subject.”

It seems clear that, through Myers’s work, Roberts, Talmage, and Smith obtained their Burckhardtian and Symondsian vision of the Renaissance.

**BURCKHARDT, SYMONDS, AND THE RENAISSANCE**

An examination of the ideas of Burckhardt and Symonds clearly reveals Mormon apostasy literature’s debt to their work. Jacob Burckhardt was born in Basel in 1818, where he taught until his death in 1897, except for his studies in Berlin (1839-43) under Leopold von Ranke and Johann Gustav Droysen. A cultural historian, Burckhardt was in many ways unique among the military and political historians who dominated nineteenth-century historiography. After an initial work on Constantine, Burckhardt turned his attention to an entirely different era. The result was his great masterpiece, *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*, published in 1860.

---


56 Initially published in 1860 as *Die Cultur der Renaissance in Italien*, it
With this work Burckhardt made his name. More importantly, he created a widely influential paradigm which must be dealt with by students of the Renaissance to this day. As Karl Brandi wrote, "Our conception of the Renaissance is Jacob Burckhardt's creation." 57 Before Burckhardt "the Renaissance was uncharted territory," and he created "a new field of study... Burckhardt elaborated in animated and persuasive detail... an autonomous historical epoch with its own physiognomy, its rich articulation and inner coherence, its unmistakable mental style." 58 This is not to say that Burckhardt's ideas were created ex nihilo. He brought together many preexisting strands in a concise, convincing paradigmatic statement, a "coherent masterpiece," which crystallized all subsequent discussions of the era. 59

*The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy* is a varied and rich work, which has often suffered from overly reductive treatments, so a summary of its ideas is challenging. At its core, however, is a simple question, Whence modernity? This query resulted from the monumental political, economic, and social changes of the nineteenth century, which caused intellectuals to question the relationship of

---


the past to their present. As Burckhardt said: "The [French] revolution has created a connected unity that distinguishes our time from earlier times." He felt compelled to find the roots of modernity and, in his greatest work, argued that he had traced them back to Renaissance Italy: "The Italian Renaissance must be called the leader of modern ages."

Burckhardt identified a number of Renaissance developments that signaled a departure from the medieval and the birth of the modern. The Renaissance saw the rise of modern states (Burkhardt termed them famously as "a work of art") characterized by institutional complexity, bureaucracies, foreign policy, and military organization. The Renaissance represented the rediscovery of antiquity, the last great era in western history, which had almost been lost in the gulf of the Middle Ages. However, the defining element of the Renaissance for Burckhardt, and the most significant element of his thesis, was the discovery of the individual: "Awareness of individuality... is the novel and distinguishing feature of the Renaissance, and of modernity." As Burckhardt put it, in the Middle Ages "man was conscious of himself only as a member of a race, people, party, family, or corporation—only through some general category. In Italy this veil first melted into air... man became a spiritual individual."

Important changes derived from the discovery of the individual, including a sense of human capabilities and "a shift from absorption in the world above to concern with the world below." In the Renaissance, Burckhardt argued, social classes became increasingly equalized, and aristocratic birth had less influence on destiny. Another key element of modernity was a general disintegration of belief and a secularization of society. The Renaissance man was rational and disinclined to medieval superstition and obscuratism. This greater rationalism produced a more secular society.

62Burckhardt, *Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*, 3.
64Burckhardt, *Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*, 100.
Burckhardt was no Whig historian, however; and unlike his philosophe predecessors, his history was no tale of inexorable progress. Thus the Italian Renaissance with its discovery of the individual represented paradoxically a cultural high point in European history, but also the beginnings of the creation of “a culture that became cheap, corrupt and amoral”—all characteristics, according to Burckhardt, of modernity.

To make his case for a dramatically changed Renaissance world, Burckhardt had to contrast it clearly from the Middle Ages. Thus he resorted to a language and metaphor that should ring familiar to readers of Mormon apostasy literature: “In the Middle Ages both sides of human consciousness . . . lay dreaming or half awake beneath a common veil. The veil was woven of faith, illusion, and childish prepossession.” This was true for all of Europe, except in Italy where “this veil first melted into air.” Italian Renaissance culture freed itself “from the fantastic bonds of the Middle Ages” and saw a perfecting of the individual. The era was marked by a spirit of self-discovery, a recognition of human worth, and especially a dynamic outpouring of artistic activity by individualist geniuses, which emphasized the profound changes of nascent modernity and marked a sharp break with the past. In short, for Burckhardt, the Renaissance marked the end of the Middle Ages and the beginning of the modern world.

Burckhardt’s Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy made such a powerful, paradigmatic statement that only a few posited any competing interpretations. Instead, most scholars devoted themselves to supplementing and fleshing out elements of the master’s vision. For English-speaking readers, one voice rose above the others—that of John Addington Symonds, an English gentleman-scholar and poet, whose multi-volume Renaissance in Italy (1875-86) developed a similarly broad and engaging portrait of the age. Symonds’s vision of the Renaissance was not as conceptually sophisticated as Burckhardt’s. Indeed, he openly acknowledged his debt to the Swiss historian. However, while Burckhardt’s reputation grew slowly in the English-speaking world, Symonds’s stylisti-

65Gilbert, History: Politics or Culture?, 59, 66-68.
66Burckhardt, Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy, 100, 132.
67Ferguson, Renaissance in Historical Thought, 290.
cally “embarrassingly exuberant” if accessible prose was much more widely read; and it was ultimately through him “that the Burckhardtian Renaissance came to life in the minds of generations of students.” And it was Symonds’s exaggerated emphasis on the light/dark metaphor to characterize the medieval/Renaissance dichotomy that came to permeate late nineteenth-century views in the English-speaking world.

While Symonds was certainly a fine literary stylist, as a historian he was often derivative and tended toward exaggeration, hyperbole, and high drama. In contrast to Burckhardt’s more subdued and careful tone, Symonds characterized the Renaissance as “the most marvellous period that the world has ever known.” With similar hyperbole, he announced:

The history of the Renaissance . . . is the history of the attainment of self-conscious freedom by the human spirit . . . The arts and inventions, the knowledge and the books, which suddenly became vital at

---


70Molho, “The Italian Renaissance: Made in the USA,” 265; Ferguson, Renaissance in Historical Thought, 204. The nuances of Burckhardt’s view are evident in his defense of the Middle Ages from overzealous “enemies.” He writes, one can “misjudge the Middle Ages, to be sure, but in the long run one could not despise the period . . . Our existence had its roots in it, even though modern culture was derived predominantly from antiquity . . . The Middle Ages were the youth of today’s world, and a long youth.” Jacob Burckhardt, Judgements on History and Historians, translated by Harry Zohn (Boston: Beacon Press, 1958), 25-27, 61-62.

the time of the Renaissance, had long lain neglected on the shores of
the Dead Sea which we call the Middle Ages. . . . The intellect of the
Western races awoke as it were from slumber and began once more
to be active. . . . The real quality of the Renaissance was intellectual.
. . . It was the emancipation of the reason for the modern world. . . .
The mental condition of the Middle Ages was one of ignorant
prostration before the idols of the Church—dogma and authority and
scholasticism. . . . The Renaissance shattered and destroyed . . . the
thick veil which they had drawn between the mind of man and the
outer world, and flash[ed] the light of reality upon the darkened
places of his own nature. . . . The Renaissance was the liberation
of the reason from a dungeon, the double discovery of the outer and
the inner world.\textsuperscript{72}

This passage suggests both the similarity of Symonds’s interpreta-
tion to Burckhardt’s, as well as his expansion and exaggeration of
it. In contrast to Burckhardt’s ultimately negative view of his age,\textsuperscript{73}
Symonds sketched a historical trajectory that celebrated the trium-
phant march of progress, connecting the Renaissance to the Ref-
ormation and eventually to the English Revolution—all three acts
in the “drama of liberty” so dear to the nineteenth century, liberal
Protestant historiographical tradition.\textsuperscript{74} In this drama, the Middle
Ages were a time of intellectual backwardness, of darkness, a world
in which the individual was limited by the corporate tethers of
community, guild, family, and especially church. The Renaissance
that began in Italy flashed brilliant illumination into this dark,
medieval world, waking (and creating) the independent, free-think-
ing, modern individual.

\textbf{THE APOSTASY IN RECENT LDS LITERATURE}

This nineteenth-century view expressed most influentially by
Burckhardt and Symonds but shared and expanded by many others
should seem very familiar. The treatment of this transitional era in
Mormon literature of apostasy is clearly shaped by these views, which

\textsuperscript{72}Symonds, \textit{Renaissance in Italy}, 1:4-6, 9.
\textsuperscript{73}Gassman, \textit{Basel in the Age of Burckhardt}, 226-49; Gay, \textit{Style in History},
144-49.
\textsuperscript{74}Symonds, \textit{Renaissance in Italy}, 5-6. Philip Benedict, “Between Whig
Traditions and New Histories: American Historical Writing about
Reformation and Early Modern Europe,” in Molho and Wood, \textit{Imagined
Histories}, 299.
were generally widely accepted in nineteenth-century historiography. As Anthony Molho has persuasively demonstrated, American historians and the public in general from the late nineteenth through much of the twentieth century were fascinated by the Italian Renaissance. Americans saw their new land as the culmination of the historical process, the epipome of modernity. Thus, they enthusiastically embraced Burckhardt’s genealogy tracing the roots of the modern world—*their* roots—to the city-states of Renaissance Italy. Burckhardt’s depiction of the Renaissance as the birth of the modern individual also resonated deeply within American culture, which celebrated individualism as an essential element of the national character.\(^75\) America embraced the Renaissance because it assured the young nation a pivotal role in the great drama of Western civilization characterized by Edward Muir as “that curious American curricular artifact,” which was created by the American historical community in the years before and after World War I to provide the public with a “usable past.” In this vision of the European past, Muir notes, the Renaissance was “Scene One of the turbulent Act Three, ‘The Modern World.’”\(^76\) That Mormon authorities like Roberts, Talmage, and Smith should embrace this vision, then, is not at all surprising; their vision of the Middle Ages and Renaissance was in many ways entirely harmonious with the prevailing view of the contemporary historical community.

What is revealing is that, while scholars of the past century have increasingly distanced themselves from this Burckhardtian para-


digm, Mormon treatments of the apostasy since the time of Roberts, Talmage, and Smith have often retained much of their binary vision of the Middle Ages and Renaissance. The persistence of this view is most evident in the writings of Bruce R. McConkie, perhaps the best-known and most influential LDS doctrinal commentator of the last half of the twentieth century. McConkie’s rich and varied ideas span a wide body of work. He initially developed his views on the Middle Ages and the Renaissance in relation to the apostasy in the first edition (1958) of his ambitious and authoritative *Mormon Doctrine*, but his most detailed exposition on apostasy appears in his final work, *A New Witness for the Articles of Faith* (1985). In the context of a discussion of the eleventh Mormon Article of Faith, McConkie addresses the rise of religious freedom, the apostasy, and the Middle Ages as a critical prelude to the Reformation and the Restoration in ultimately familiar terms. For him, the period from Constantine until 1500 was the “The Black Millennium,” in which “the world lay in darkness”:

> It was a black and abysmal night; the stench of spiritual death poisoned the nostrils of men; and the jaws of hell gaped wide open to welcome the sensual sinners who loved darkness rather than light because their deeds were evil. In our more enlightened day, it is difficult to conceive of the depths to which government and religion and morality, both private and public, sank in what men universally describe as the dark ages. . . . [This was] such a decadent age that man, made in the image of God, was more like an animal than a divine being. Morality, culture, literacy, learning in general, even theological inquiry—all these were at a low ebb.

In contrast to this gloomy medieval world is the Renaissance, “A Day of Awakening:"

---

77 McConkie, the son-in-law of Joseph Fielding Smith, often cited Smith’s works, including *The Progress of Man*, in developing his own views on the apostasy. He also regularly cited *Doctrines of Salvation*, 3 vols. (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1954-56), a collection of Smith’s sermons and writings that McConkie himself compiled. See also Quinn, *The Mormon Hierarchy: Extensions of Power*, 697.


The Black Millennium must end. A few hundred years thereafter, the gospel is to be restored. . . . Let the earth spin and the darkness pass, and a few rays of light will soon dawn in the eastern sky. . . . Then during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries and the first part of the sixteenth, there came an awakening. It began in Italy, where the darkness was deepest, . . . and resulted in "achieving freedom from the intellectual bondage to which the individual man had been subjected by the theology and hierarchy of the Church. . . . The Renaissance insisted upon the rights of the life that now is, and dignified the total sphere for which man's intellect and his aesthetic and social tastes by nature fit him."80

Clearly, the vision, not only of Roberts, Talmage, and Smith, but also of the nineteenth-century scholars, has survived intact. The Middle Ages are still the Dark Ages, their inflated span lasting from 500 to 1500. The spiritual retardation of this age is still accompanied by material and intellectual backwardness. And the Renaissance is still privileged as the turning point in this history, the staging ground for the Reformation and Restoration. McConkie is not unique among Mormon writers and authorities in his continued embrace of this dichotomous view; indeed, even today many within the broader Mormon community probably still accept the image that Roberts, Talmage, and Smith created almost a century ago.81


THE MIDDLE AGES AND THE RENAISSANCE IN
TWENTIETH-CENTURY HISTORIOGRAPHY

Although the nineteenth-century view seems to have been remarkably durable in the LDS historical vision of the Middle Ages and Renaissance, the broader historical community now sees it largely as a problematic paradigm. The suggestive formulae of Burckhardt and his followers set the parameters for a fruitful and energetic debate that emerged after 1900 over what many saw as his teleological, oversimplified, and binary depiction of history. Trying to summarize the very rich historical literatures of medieval and Renaissance Europe that have evolved in the past century would be impractical. Still, a suggestion of several dominant trends may illuminate the chasm that has arisen between Mormon scholars of the apostasy and the work of the larger historical community.\(^{82}\)

In the Burckhardt/Symonds portrait, the Middle Ages do not appear in a particularly sympathetic light; consequently, medieval scholars were among the earliest to challenge the description of their age as “one long, dreary epoch of stagnation, of insecurity, of lawless violence.”\(^{83}\) This “revolt of the medievalists” became increasingly vocal after 1900 when medieval studies underwent a dramatic expansion that produced a significantly altered understanding of the period, leading one eminent medievalist to recently observe that “no book written about the European Middle Ages before 1895 or so is still worth reading except for curiosity’s sake.”\(^{84}\) While perhaps a bit hyperbolic, this statement is revealing for what it suggests about Mormon reliance on views that the broader historical community considers obsolete and dismissive of this important era. Where Mormon authors often emphasize the backwardness and darkness of this age, medievalists since 1900 “have sought to reveal and celebrate the ideas and institutions of the high Middle Ages.”\(^{85}\)

\(^{82}\)For a recent general overview of many of the themes and important figures of Renaissance historiography, see the excellent *Encyclopedia of the Renaissance*, especially Grendler, “The Renaissance in Historical Thought,” 5:259-67, and “Interpretations of the Renaissance,” 5:286-305.

\(^{83}\)Ferguson, *Renaissance in Historical Thought*, 329 and passim.

\(^{84}\)Ferguson’s phrase, “revolt of the medievalists,” *Renaissance in Historical Thought*, 329, is quoted in Cantor, *Inventing the Middle Ages*, 44.

\(^{85}\)Cantor, *Inventing the Middle Ages*, 28, 44; see also Ferguson,
Not only have medieval scholars emphasized the complexity and diversity of medieval civilization but they have also insisted on its direct relationship to the developments that Burckhardt situated in the Renaissance. At its core, the medievalist response has argued for continuity, rather than radical change. Johan Huizinga elegantly stated this position in his 1919 classic, *The Waning of the Middle Ages*, which argued that the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries “are much more suited to give us a sense of the end of the Middle Ages . . . than they are to demonstrate to us the awakening Renaissance.”

Huizinga’s emphasis on the evolutionary rather than the revolutionary relationship of the Middle Ages to the Renaissance was also at the core of Charles Homer Haskins’s influential 1927 work, *The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century*, which argued that many Renaissance characteristics—the revival of classical Latin literature, Greek science, and Greek philosophy—had medieval roots. Haskins attacked the Burckhardtian paradigm head on: “Do not the Middle Ages, that epoch of ignorance, stagnation, and gloom, stand in the sharpest contrast to the light and progress and freedom of the Italian Renaissance?” His response:

The continuity of history rejects such sharp and violent contrasts between successive periods. . . . Modern research shows us the Middle Ages less dark and less static, the Renaissance less bright and less sudden, than was once supposed. The Middle Ages exhibit life and color and change, much eager search [sic] after knowledge and beauty, much creative accomplishment in art, in literature, in institutions.

---

*Renaissance in Historical Thought*, 330.

86 First translated into English as Johan Huizinga, *The Waning of the Middle Ages* (London: E. Arnold and Co., 1924). The quotation is from Rodney J. Payton’s and Ulrich Mammitzsch’s retranslation, published as *The Autumn of the Middle Ages* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996), xxi, which points out problems in the original, abridged translation. As Cantor, *Inventing the Middle Ages*, 216, points out, the influential C. S. Lewis was among those who viewed the Renaissance as only a late “chapter in the history of medieval culture, not the dawn of a new era.” See also Wessel Krul, “In the Mirror of van Eyck: Johan Huizinga’s *Autumn of the Middle Ages*,” *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 27 (Fall 1997): 353-84; William J. Bouwsma, “The Waning of the Middle Ages by Johan Huizinga,” *Daedalus* 103 (Winter 1974): 35-43.
Huizinga and Haskins led the frontal assault on the Renaissance, but others joined them, defending the Middle Ages by making explicit links to modern institutions. Frederic William Maitland, for example, traced English common law and the jury system of trials—instutions still in use in the United States and Great Britain—to the thirteenth century. Joseph Strayer emphasized the construction of rational, centralized governmental institutions and the rise of national identities during the medieval period. More recently, scholars influenced by R. W. Southern, perhaps the greatest medievalist of the twentieth century, have traced, “a continuous rising stream of rationality from the military advances of feudal technology and the organization of urban commerce in the tenth century, through the classical recovery and dialectical capacity of the twelfth century, to the culminating anticipations of the scientific revolution in the fourteenth century.” They have argued, with some exaggeration, that “the Middle Ages were the most dynamically progressive moment in the history of this planet.”

The work of the medievalists in the first half of the twentieth century was primarily devoted to demonstrating the continuity and relevance between medieval and modern times. Since the sixties, this “highly overdetermined . . . discourse of continuity and progress” has been replaced by a rich and more particularized field which does not lend itself to easy categorization. Recent scholarship, influenced by postmodernist, anthropological, and feminist theories, has “de-modernized” and “defamiliarized” the Middle Ages, emphasizing the period’s fundamental alterity. To be sure, these new interpretations have not gone unchallenged; but as Norman Cantor has recently observed, “The one conclusion that everyone can agree to is the great complexity of high medieval culture, society, government, law, economy and religion.”

This refashioning of the Middle Ages as Other has been mirrored within the community of Renaissance scholars who have chal-

---

88 Cantor, Inventing the Middle Ages, 66, 182, 251, 368-69. See also Gabrielle M. Spiegel, “In the Mirror’s Eye: The Writing of Medieval History in America,” in Molho and Wood, Imagined Histories, 243-47.
89 Spiegel, “In the Mirror’s Eye,” 247-51; see also Cantor, Inventing the Middle Ages, 27.
lenged the position posited by their intellectual forefather Jacob Burckhardt. While his views still inform debates within the field, it is probably safe to say that, during the past century, scholars have effectively revised the majority of Burckhardt's most evocative hypotheses. Burckhardt is generally no longer read to understand the history of the Renaissance but rather as an important figure in the historiography of the idea. For example, in contrast to Burckhardt's vision of the progressive secularization of Italian society—and indeed its irreligiousness—scholars have emphasized the complex and profound religiosity of the Renaissance. With the medievalists, they have convincingly shown that Burckhardt's revival of antiquity, evidenced in humanist thought, had deep medieval roots, and that so-called medieval philosophies persevered in popularity throughout the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and beyond.  

The Renaissance state, which Burckhardt characterized famously as a work of art, has been shown to have been a far cry from modern, centralized, rationalized, bureaucratic nation-states. And finally, in the area of Burckhardt's most suggestive hypothesis—the rise of the individual—scholars have convincingly shown the importance of networks of relationships, patronage, and kin groups in the definition of self and in the construction of late medieval and early modern identities.  


91 On the Renaissance state see, among many important scholars, Giorgio Chittolini, Formazione dello stato regionale e le istituzioni del contado (Turin, Italy: Einaudi, 1979), and his Città, comunità e feudi negli stati dell'Italia centro-settentrionale (secoli XIV-XVI) (Milan, Italy: Edizioni Unicopli 1996); also Julius Kirshner, ed., The Origins of the State in Italy, 1300-1600 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996).  

Where Burckhardt and subsequent generations of scholars sought to trace and link the Renaissance to the modern world, the most recent generation of Renaissance scholars, paralleling similar trends among medievalists, have generally abandoned the search for modernity in fourteenth and fifteenth century Italy. Inspired by the work of anthropologists such as Clifford Geertz, Victor Turner, and Mary Douglas, they have sought to “defamiliarize the Renaissance” by emphasizing its alterity rather than the modernity of Renaissance Italy.93 They describe the age as a “distant and alien reality,” which must be penetrated and studied in much the same way that anthropologists study the equally exotic Balinese or Berber cultures.94 The elaborate ritual life of the Renaissance, its criminality and its violence, its witchcraft and its superstitions, are but a few of the areas of “alienness” or “premodernity” to which anthropologically inclined historians have turned their attention.95 So complete, indeed, has been the refashioning of the Renaissance, that the label itself has become a source of debate. Increasingly the less ideologically evocative label “early modern” has come into favor.

The century since Burkhardt published The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy has seen a considerable change in how the Renaissance is understood and in its relationship to the Middle Ages. The Renaissance is no longer seen as the cradle of modernity, nor is it separated by a chasm from the medieval world. Warren Hollister’s assessment seems a fitting epitaph:

A few generations ago the medieval centuries of European history were widely regarded as “The Dark Ages.” Western man was thought

93Muir, “The Italian Renaissance in America,” 1096. For a somewhat melancholy description of the waning of Renaissance studies, see William Bouwsma’s 1978 presidential address to the American Historical Association, “Renaissance and the Drama of Western History.”


to have dropped into a deep slumber at the fall of the Western Roman Empire in A.D. 476, awakening at length, like Rip Van Winkle, in the bright dawn of the Italian Renaissance. . . . It was . . . a millennium of darkness—a thousand years without a bath. Today this ungenerous point of view stands discredited, although it persists among the half-educated. Several generations of rigorous historical scholarship have demonstrated clearly that the medieval period was an epoch of immense vitality and profound creativity. The age that produced Thomas Aquinas and Dante, Notre Dame de Paris and Chartres, Parliament and the university, can hardly be described as “dark” or “barbaric.”

CONCLUSION

What implications do these historiographical developments have for Mormon visions of the “Great Apostasy,” the Middle Ages, and the Renaissance? It seems clear that Roberts’s views of medieval darkness and Renaissance brilliance were formed in the bosom of nineteenth-century scholarship and religious polemics, and that Talmage and Smith inherited his vision in large measure. Theirs is, as Davis Bitton has written, a “conception of history . . . of the past century.” Though diverse opinions certainly persist among students of the Middle Ages and Renaissance, one would nonetheless be hard pressed to find any historian who would argue that the Middle Ages were a period of political, technological, social, or cultural backwardness, or that the Renaissance was a moment that brought light back into a dark world. Yet curiously, this view has often persisted in LDS narratives of the “Great Apostasy.” Ideas clearly have remarkably long half-lives.

Despite the persistence of the turn-of-the-century paradigm of Roberts, Talmage, and Smith, recent years have seen the stirring of a more expansive and balanced view of the apostasy among some Mormon authorities and scholars. Though the familiar light/dark metaphor has not disappeared entirely, there have been some efforts

96 C. Warren Hollister, *Medieval Europe: A Short History*, 2d ed. (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1968), i. For a clever examination of the enduring misconceptions of the Middle Ages in modern culture, see Fred C. Robinson’s presidential address to the Medieval Academy of America, “Medieval, the Middle Ages,” *Speculum* 59 (October 1984): 745-56; also, Mommsen, “Petrarch’s Conception of the Dark Ages,” 226-42.

97 Bitton, “B. H. Roberts as Historian,” 43.
to emphasize the spiritual nature of the apostasy without embedding it in an ahistorical context of accompanying intellectual and moral decline. Mormon Apostle M. Russell Ballard, for example, has written that the darkness of the Middle Ages refers to the absence of “the light of the fulness of the gospel of Jesus Christ, including the authority of His holy priesthood,” yet good Christians also lived during this time. Apostle Dallin H. Oaks likewise affirmed that, during the apostasy “men and women . . . kept the light of faith and learning alive” and that “we honor them as servants of God.”

Indeed, despite his affinity with the work of Roberts, Talmage, and Smith, McConkie too acknowledged that “many good and noble souls lived during the dark ages, . . . and they received guidance from th[e] Spirit.”

While none of these recent entries can fairly be compared with the all-encompassing, early historical narratives of apostasy, still they suggest perhaps the first stirrings of a change that may bridge the disjuncture between traditional Mormon and contemporary scholarly views of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. These and some other recent works are moving away from necessitating and justifying the Restoration by depicting the apostasy as an age of complete degradation, of moral stupor, and of intellectual stagnancy. Instead, the apostasy is depicted simply as an age in which priesthood authority did not exist, a view which may be closer in some ways to those of the apostasy in Mormonism’s earliest days. By emphasizing the spiritual nature of the apostasy, Mormons may be able to acknowledge the historical complexity and richness of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance without challenging the need for God to call Joseph Smith to restore priesthood authority. In this new picture there is no disjunction between the accepted historical understanding of the age and Mormon ideas on apostasy. If justification for such a reevaluation is necessary, historical precedent and inspiration for further research into other vintage views of apostasy can perhaps be found in John Taylor’s 1873 statement:


99McConkie, New Witness for the Articles of Faith, 477.
I have a great many misgivings about the intelligence that men boast so much of in this enlightened day. There were men in those dark ages who could commune with God, and who, by the power of faith, could draw aside the curtain of eternity and gaze upon the invisible world . . . have the ministering of angels, and unfold the future destinies of the world. If those were dark ages I pray God to give me a little darkness, and deliver me from the light and intelligence that prevail in our day.  

GEORGE PRINCE, 
CONVERT OUT OF AFRICA

Stephen L. Prince

There are few events in one’s life that are so indelibly etched in the memory that they can be recalled in detail many years later. When George Prince wrote his autobiography in 1875, he had no trouble remembering the day—21 June 1841—that he and his family departed from England for their voyage to South Africa. But even this date was second in importance to the day he met two Mormon missionaries, whose message changed his life and took his family to their third continent in as many decades.¹ This article traces the life of an ordinary man whose destiny, and consequently that of his descendants, took an extraordinary turn because of the Mormon message. The context for his life also includes the romantic and bloody colonization of South Africa, and the LDS Church’s missionary efforts there in the 1850s.

South Africa was not supposed to be their destination after they
George Prince Sarah Bowman Prince decided to emigrate from England. Thousands of emigrants were granted free passage to Australia and New Zealand, financed by the sale of enormous quantities of almost uninhabited lands that were available for settlement: In 1841, nearly 15,000 English men and women emigrated to Australia and New Zealand (in addition to 30,000 to America and 24,000 to Canada). In sharp contrast, only 55, including the Prince family, went to Port Elizabeth, South Africa. Why? George Prince was a shepherd. He had originally been drawn to Australia, but the burgeoning merino sheep industry of South Africa tugged harder. The merino herds of South Africa had sprung from six sheep that the Spanish crown had presented to the House of Orange in Holland. Six had been imported to the Cape Colony in 1789. They were known for especially fine wool, their coats thicker and curlier. The woolen mills of the Industrial Revo-

---

3Ibid., 4:391.
Indian Ocean

South Africa's Eastern Cape
olution, in full spate in England by the 1840s, created an important market. Thus, on that fair June day in 1841, twenty-five-year-old George, his twenty-two-year-old wife, Sarah Bowman Prince, their eleven-month-old son Francis, and George’s eighteen-year-old brother John set off together on what they thought would be the greatest adventure of their lives but which, as it turned out, was the prelude to one still greater.5

The South African coastline is notable for its scarcity of good natural harbors, and Port Elizabeth, where the ship carrying the Prince family docked, was the only port in the Eastern Cape. Given such a natural monopoly, shipping commerce was the town’s lifeblood. But for the hopeful immigrant, fresh from England, the town was a disappointing shock. One immigrant who had landed at Port Elizabeth just a few months earlier wrote: “As we approached land, and saw the little town of Port Elizabeth before us, I certainly thought I had never beheld so miserable looking a place... The first glance—nay the second and the third—by no means improved my previous impressions of the place.”6 Several years of growth did not apparently bring much improvement. Archdeacon Nathaniel James Merriman, arriving with his wife, Julia, eight years later in 1849, confided candidly in his diary: “A more dreary looking place than Port Elizabeth I hardly ever saw.”7

Fortunately, the Prince family did not linger in Port Elizabeth but set off by wagon for Grahamstown, about eighty miles to the east. The countryside improved rapidly after leaving the barren, treeless environs of Port Elizabeth. The trip to Grahamstown was long, but the Merrimans, passing over the same countryside, responded appreciatively to the “charm of jolting along through

4Reader’s Digest Illustrated History of South Africa: The Real Story (Cape Town, South Africa: Reader’s Digest Association, South Africa, 1988), 130-31.
6Alfred W. Cole, The Cape and the Kafirs: Or Notes of Five Years’ Residence in South Africa (London: Richard Bentley, 1852), 60.
woods filled with flowering mimosa and cactus and aloes of various kinds, and many other strange and beautiful shrubs."8

Grahamstown, founded as a garrison village in 1809, had scarcely a dozen houses in 1820, when the first British settlers received their land grants. However, by 1841 it had grown into a thriving town and was, by all descriptions, immensely more attractive than Port Elizabeth. It was the center of all activity in the region, and it was there that nearly all of the new immigrants first traveled before either settling down or moving on. The new settlers, including the Prince family, had been so carefully matched with the work which awaited them that there was no call upon them to act as pioneers or to be pressed by adversity to cut out a new career for themselves.

Apparently the Princes stayed for three or four years in Grahamstown, where their daughter, Mary Ann, was born in June 1843. By the time their third child, Richard, was born in May 1846, they had moved to Oliphant’s Hoek,9 an area about twenty miles northeast of Grahamstown near the confluence of the Kat and Great Fish rivers. This area had once been home to great herds of elephants. However, long before the Prince family settled there, ivory had “tempted many an adventurous spirit to enter upon the perilous but exciting life of a hunter. Thousands of these animals were slain.”10

8Ibid., 19.

9Mary Ann Prince was born in Grahamstown on 3 June 1843, while six more children were born at Oliphant’s Hoek, an Afrikaans term that means Elephant’s Hook, referring to the landform shaped by Fish River. The family thus consisted of Francis (born 31 July 1840 at Sterford, Cambridge, England; he was named for the couple’s first son, born in 1838, who died at eleven months), Mary Ann, Richard (born 26 May 1846), William (born 23 October 1848), and Sophia, born 15 November 1850. They were followed by George, born 26 January 1854, (exact location not known), South Africa; Susanna, born 14 November 1855, at Mancazana, South Africa; Sarah Ann, born 16 May 1858, (exact place not known), South Africa; and Lucy Naomi, born 29 December 1861 at Kaysville, Utah. There also was a District of Oliphant’s Hoek (name changed in 1856 to Alexandria), southwest of Grahamstown on Algoa Bay, but William Prince said he was born on the Kat River, which is part of the northeastern Oliphant’s Hoek. Cecil Prince Reid, “Biography of William Prince,” typescript, n.d., Library, Daughters of Utah Pioneers Museum, Salt Lake City.
Though a few elephants and lions reportedly still inhabited the more remote areas, these magnificent animals were rarely seen. Springbok, a species of African antelope, had also dwindled to virtual extinction in the area. The farmers, whose crops they fed on, did not lament their passage. The largest mammal to be seen regularly was the baboon; despite its often irritable disposition, however, it posed no great danger to the settlers.

Here the Prince family settled down to raise children and sheep. It is possible that they moved onto land that had already been cultivated and which included a home and outbuildings. Beginning in 1836, the Dutch settlers in the area, resistant to British rule, launched their Great Trek northward into the interior of the Eastern Cape and Orange Free State. More than 10,000 left from the Eastern Cape, leaving their farms to be taken over by nature or cultivated by the next settlers. However, the numerical majority of settlers in Oliphant's Hoek were Dutch and young Francis grew up speaking Afrikaans in preference to English, much to his father's dismay.

The subtropical climate was considered very healthful, with hot summers and mild, dry winters. With no heavy industry in the entire country, the skies were much brighter and more beautiful than those in England. Nighttime also could be spectacular, leading Alfred Cole, an Englishman who had immigrated to the Eastern Cape a few months before the Prince family, to rhapsodize: "And now for a glorious night in the magnificent climate of South Africa! Can anything be more beautiful, more enchanting? The sky is of that deep, dark blue, which we never see in northern climates: the moon is shining as she can only shine in such a sky; the stars [are] . . . beautifully bright and distinct; perfect stillness rests on everything around." The land was lush and fertile. The Merrimans found this region delightful on their 1849 travels:


11The Cape Colony is the area originally settled by the Dutch and enlarged through the successive Frontier Wars. By 1798, the conquered territory had reached the Fish River as its far eastern boundary and, by 1850, the Great Kei River. The Eastern Cape was bordered by the Indian Ocean.

After our return from Mancazana, we took a journey to Bathurst together and subsequently to Oliphant’s Hoek. This latter ride afforded us great pleasure. The novel sight to us in this land of large forest trees, the novel smell of a moist atmosphere with a most luxurious vegetation of ferns and other plants under the boughs of the huge forests and the constant charm of birds around us singing their evening song, though not in the most musical notes, seemed to transport us back to England in a way that I have not before experienced in the Colony.\(^\text{13}\)

Ironically, this English-seeming landscape of the Eastern Cape was overwhelmingly populated by the Dutch, whose Dutch East India Company had established a colony at Table Bay, site of the future Cape Town, in 1652; and their *trekboers* (pioneers) had moved into this area in the 1750s and 1760s. For the next twenty years, they enslaved and dispossessed the Khoikhoi (known to the Europeans as Hottentots), but treated the Xhosa (whom they called Kaffirs) with healthy respect, mainly due to the fact that they were greatly outnumbered. In 1781, they ordered the Xhosa to move east of the Fish River, to leave them in undisturbed possession of the territory, then assassinated the resistant Xhosa leaders during a parley. This was the first of nine frontier wars (1780-1878), each one of which had ended with driving the Xhosa further east. The British had acquired Cape Town and the rest of South Africa in 1796, restored it briefly to Holland in 1801, but took it back again the next year.\(^\text{14}\)

It had been part of the British Empire ever since. An annual reminder was the celebration of Queen Victoria’s birthday on 24 May, but as Merriman noted critically, the conquered Boers were not necessarily enthusiastic. “There was not much spare loyalty in this part of the Colony,” he observed. “... The military demonstration of Parade, Band and feu-de-joie [fireworks] seemed to excite no great attention from the civilians.”\(^\text{15}\)

In 1846, approximately the time the Prince family moved to Oliphant’s Hoek, a sudden conflict blew up, all the more surprising because the Eastern Cape had experienced peace for a decade, a welcome respite from the frontier wars, the sixth of which had ended

\(^{13}\)Merriman, *Cape Journals*, 60.
\(^{15}\)Ibid., 50.
in 1835. The War of the Axe began when a young Xhosa helped himself to an axe in a store near Fort Beaufort, apparently without any intention of paying for it. He was apprehended and transported with three other prisoners under the guard of four armed Khoikhoi policemen to Grahamstown to stand trial. Along the way, forty Xhosa warriors attacked the party. The Khoikhoi to whom the accused Xhosa was handcuffed was stabbed to death. One of the rescue party hacked off the manacled hand of the dead Khoikhoi, and the young Xhosa made his escape, apparently still wearing the handcuff. The British demanded the escapee’s return, but the Xhosa chief steadfastly refused and attacked the British column sent to compel his obedience. Thousands of warriors crossed the Fish River to attack the European settlements in the Eastern Cape Colony.

In their own conflicts, the Xhosa did not kill women and children; however, in the War of the Axe, they also targeted British boys who might grow up to become soldiers. According to another fragment of family history, Sarah Prince hid five-year-old Francis under a pile of dirty laundry, although it is not clear when, under what circumstances, or for how long she employed this ruse.

Under ordinary circumstances, Thomas Baines, an English naturalist and artist, reported in his journal two years later, the Xhosa were not a bloodthirsty people but possessed many traits of “honor and good faith.” However, in war they used practices that were meant to terrorize the enemy, such as one described by Alfred Cole: “The culprit is rubbed all over with grease, he is then taken to an anthill, against which he is placed and secured to the ground; the anthill is then broken, and the ants left to crawl over him and eat his flesh from his bones, which they do in time most effectually. I doubt whether the Inquisition ever invented a torture so horrible and lingering as this must be.”

After the war was over, wheat was cultivated in the fertile land of Oliphant’s Hoek on an even larger scale than before. It was once thought to be the finest wheat in the world; but for nearly thirty years, farmers had to contend with “rust,” a fungus. Rust had been a periodic problem since the early 1820s, but now it seemed to ravage the entire crop. The English settlers, generally unwilling to learn from the longer experience of the Dutch, were unprepared to

---

grow anything other than wheat and other grains, which were also vulnerable to rust. Thomas Baines noted ruefully: “It became a proverb that an Englishman could not succeed till he had thrice ruined himself.”\(^{18}\) Merriman, who observed the devastation wreaked by this widespread fungus agreed: “Had they commenced sowing pumpkins and Indian corn instead of wheat much misery would have been saved, but it takes an Englishman a long time to learn anything that is un-English.”\(^{19}\)

The next crisis was, again, a military one. In 1828, Sir Andries Stockenström, commissioner-general of the Eastern Cape had set aside about four hundred square miles of fertile land on the Kat River for the Khoikhoi. The Xhosa, who had formerly held the land, resisted being dispossessed, and the Sixth Frontier War broke out in 1834.\(^{20}\) In both this war and the seventh (the War of the Axe), which started in 1846, the Dutch and Khoikhoi of Kat River fought beside the British army and colonists. The Xhosa, as we have seen, were defeated in both. In December 1850 the British Governor, Sir Harry Smith, who had distinguished himself in India (1845-46) during the war with the Sikhs, sent troops to evict the Xhosa from Kat River, deeming that the land was too good for nonwhites.\(^{21}\) High-handedly the British military forces deposed and humiliated a senior Xhosa chief, igniting the Eighth Frontier War, which lasted for three years and was the bloodiest of them all.

This time, some of the Dutch and the Khoikhoi took the field with the Xhosa, against the British. At the outset, the Xhosa took the offensive, forcing many colonists to abandon their farms. Although there is no published record of the exact location of the attacks, it is reasonable to assume that Oliphant’s Hoek suffered several at-


\(^{19}\)Merriman, *Cape Journals*, 82. I have no information on what the Prince family did during the late 1840s.

\(^{20}\)Leonard Thompson, *A History of South Africa* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1990), 60, 62. Stockenström, the son of a Swedish immigrant to Cape Colony in the service of the Dutch, was sympathetic to the Khoikhoi cause and advanced for his time. He had been instrumental in passing an ordinance in 1828 that made “Hottentots and other free people of colour” equal before the law with Whites.

\(^{21}\)Reader’s Digest Illustrated History of South Africa, 134.
tacks, since it was located right on the boundary of the colony. 22 Richard Prince, who was five at the time of the 1851 war, later told his family tales of this experience that a descendant recorded:

[Richard] was stationed on a hill overlooking the valley. It was his duty to watch for the Negroes. When he saw them approaching, he notified the people. They gathered in a block house for safety, which had port holes in. [sic] The men shot through these portholes [sic] at the Negroes. When the battle was over, hundreds of Negroes were laying around dead. They buried them in trenches. John (Prince), a brother of George, was killed in the last battle. 23

Ultimately the British forces reverted to the tried-and-true strategy of systematically destroying Xhosa supplies; again faced with possible starvation, the native people were forced to surrender in 1853. As part of the spoils of this ruthless war, the British government confiscated the fertile grazing and farming lands on the Kat River from the rebel Dutch and Khoi, awarding them to British farmers. 24 Stockenström, greatly disheartened by the war and the failure of his policy concerning the Khoikhoi, returned to his vast farm on the western edge of the Kat River Settlement where poverty forced him to sell off considerable portions of it. 25 The town of Bedford was founded here, and the western portion of the Kat River Settlement, including former rebel land, was designated as the District of Bedford. Eli Wiggill, who lived in the District of Bedford, recalled that after the war ended, "All the farmers were notified to

22 These events further confirm that the Prince family lived at Oliphant's Hoek at the Kat and Fish rivers, not in the district of Oliphant's Hoek farther south. The Eighth Frontier War started at the eastern boundary of the Cape Colony, which at that time was the Kat River, while there is no evidence that the conflict extended southward as far as Oliphant Hoek's District.


24 Reader's Digest Illustrated History, 137.

make lists of their losses and, as compensation, were given farms." 26

Henry Talbot, another close neighbor, wrote that "the government
gave father and myself a farm for services done in the war of 1851." 27

It is not known whether Prince was awarded land as compensation
for his military service or whether he was simply attracted by its
promising prospects and purchased his farm.

George returned to his farm and sheep. By late 1853 when
Sarah was pregnant with her sixth child, due in January 1854, George
had a dream (he would later call it a manifestation) that was so real
that he felt compelled to share it with Sarah. Two strange men
appeared, dressed in black broadcloth suits and high hats. George
knew neither who these men were nor what message they were
carrying. Nor did he know that their message was a result of an event
which took place in a far distant land more than two decades earlier,
or that the men in the dream were not yet in South Africa. 28

Sarah reportedly responded, "You're as visionary as Abraham of Old,
George." It is not clear whether she spoke with amazement or amuse-
ment, but her statement was, in fact, literally true.

These messengers were Mormon missionaries William Walker

26Wiggill, Diary, 189.

27Henry James Talbot, "The Life of Henry James Talbot in South
Africa," microfilm of holograph, #990390, item #1, Family History Library
of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City.

28According to daughter Sophie W. Schurtz, "South Africa's
Contribution to Utah," in Treasures of Pioneer History, comp. by Kate B.
Carter, 6 vols. (Salt Lake City: Daughters of Utah Pioneers, 1958-77) 6:270:
"One evening at the end of a hard day's travel as he was making his rounds
to see that everything was all right for the night, someone called him by the
name of 'George.' He turned and beheld a personage clothed in a long
white robe, who told him that the Gospel had been restored and would be
brought to him by two men, warning him to heed their teachings and accept
them. He was told that he would know the men immediately upon seeing
them. The gathering of Israel was also explained to him and urging that it
should be done speedily lest part of his family be left behind. When he
returned home he related the incident to his wife." However, the story he
always related to his grandchildren, was less glamorous. In a dream, he
merely saw two men, but they did not speak to him. This version seems
more likely to be what actually happened. This is the version that Juanita
Kossen, the granddaughter of Francis Prince, recorded.
and John Wesley, named for the greatest Methodist missionary of all time. Their story begins in the general conference of August 1852 in Salt Lake City, where Orson Pratt publicly preached on plural marriage for the first time and Brigham Young called and set apart 159 missionaries, assigning them to blanket the globe. Only twenty-two were called to stateside missions, while the rest scattered to India, China, the islands of the Pacific, South America, Europe, Australia, and South Africa. Thirty-three-year-old William Holmes Walker, who had joined the Church in September 1835 was assigned to his field of labor with two other elders: thirty-nine-year-old Jesse Haven, baptized in April 1838 in Missouri, and twenty-eight-year-old Leonard I. Smith. Haven recorded in his journal that Apostle George A. Smith, with gallows humor, told them: “We are going to send you on a short mission not to exceed seven years.” Haven added, “So I expect if I live as long as that, I then shall be permitted to go home.”

Two weeks later on 15 September, Haven, Walker, and Smith departed for the East with about seventy other elders. They reached the Missouri River in about six weeks, then proceeded by steamer to St. Louis, Missouri; Cincinnati, Ohio; and Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, then took train to Philadelphia and New York. They embarked for Liverpool, then took another steamer to Cape Town, where they landed on 19 April 1853, thankful to come to the end of their seven-months’ journey. Walker, who had left behind his two wives and children, expressed both faith and apprehension: “We left our homes without purse or scrip and have no other dependence, only in God. We are now landed in a strange land amongst strangers. Without home and without friends and without money, which gives me feelings not easy to express when I reflect upon my feelings and qualifications.”

The arrival of the Mormon elders went unannounced and unnoticed. Within a week, however, they had created a stir through their proselytizing and encountered a mob that shouted, made

---

30 Jesse Haven, Journal, 1856, Family and Church History Department, Archives, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City (hereafter LDS Church Archives).
“hideous noises,” and threw stones at the trio. The Cape Town Frontier Times, on 26 April, published a report of their arrival and activities. News of the Mormon elders, often sensationalized or absurd, soon reached other areas, including the Eastern Cape, nearly four hundred miles from Cape Town. According to Eli Wiggill, an Englishman who had moved to South Africa with his parents at age eight in 1819 and was now farming, “In the year 1853, all the newspapers of South Africa were filled with stories of a strange doctrine being preached in Cape-town by men from America. It was making a stir in that city, and a few had accepted and been baptized. One story was to the effect that a man had been baptized who was so wicked his sins made the water so heavy as it flowed past a waterwheel, it had broken several of the cogs.” One of these Cape Town converts was John Wesley, a young former Methodist minister whom Walker had baptized and who was ordained an elder, at some point before August 1855.

Walker and Wesley arrived in Grahamstown on 27 December 1853. Here the missionaries met with “great opposition, birchbats [sic] and rotten eggs being hurled at them.” William Walker had a carriage (it is not clear how he had acquired such an expensive item), which a mob pushed into the Kat River, never to be recovered. Despite this opposition, they worked for almost thirteen months in Grahamstown and Fort Beaufort before pressing farther into the interior.

By this point, George and Sarah Prince had moved their family about fifty miles northwest of Oliphant’s Hoek to the District of Bedford. Their exact location is not known, but it was near the base of the Kagaberg Mountains, near—or perhaps in—the valley of the Mancazana River. Dominated by the impressive 7,800-foot Winter-

---

32South African Mission Historical Report, 26 April 1853, LDS Church Archives.
35Ibid.
berg Mountain, the entire area was renowned for its rich grazing land, ideal for sheep raising. Thomas Pringle, a Scottish poet who was among the area's earliest white settlers, described the Mancazana Valley in 1825:

The aspect of the country, though wild, was rich and beautiful. It was watered by numerous rivulets, and finely diversified with lofty mountains and winding vales, with picturesque rocks and shaggy jungles, open upland pastures, and fertile meadows along the river margins, sprinkled as usual with willows and acacias, and occasionally with groves of stately geelhout. It appeared like a verdant basin, or cul de sac, surrounded on all sides by an amphitheater of steep and sterile mountains. . . . But the bottom of the valley, through which the infant river meandered, presented a warm, pleasant and secluded setting, spreading itself into verdant meadows, sheltered and without being encumbered, with groves of mimosa which we observed in the distance [and] herds of wild animals—antelopes and quaggas—pasturing in undisturbed quietude.

The two Mormon missionaries made their way north in the opening weeks of 1855. On 30 January, they separated for a week's work, met again at Winterberg to hold a Sunday meeting, and then planned to separate again, but Walker's horse had died, preventing him from returning to Fort Beaufort as planned. This day's delay allowed the fulfillment of George Prince's dream of being visited by two men bearing an important message. According to the family story, George and Sarah were sitting in the shade of their thatched house one afternoon when two men approached. George identified them at a distance as "the two men" he had seen and went to greet them. He was converted immediately and baptized with a few days, as were Sarah and fourteen-year-old Francis. Although Mary Ann and Richard were over age eight, they were not baptized, for reasons that have not been preserved. William Walker recorded in his diary:

---

38 Walker, *Life Incidents*, 44.
[11 February 1855] Held meeting and had a good attendance and good attention, after which Mr. and Mrs. [George] Weigle [Wiggill] had offered themselves for baptism. ... When Mr. James Wm. Tomson presented himself. ... we confirmed them as members of the Church. George Weigle and wife, James Wm. Tomson and Br. Prince, who had previously been baptised by Br. Wesley.

[12 February 1855] Instead of returning to Fort Beaufort I went with Br. Wesley to Mancazana. We found Br. Prince's children sick with whooping cough, one very bad. By request we administered to him.

[13 February 1855] After giving instructions we confirmed Sarah Prince, age 37 years. Also her son [Francis], age 14 years, as members of the Church. We also blessed 5 of Br. Prince's children. ...

[14 February 1855] ... We administered to all Br. Prince's children. Were much better.

Gathering out of Babylon to Zion was an urgent part of the restoration message. Three months earlier in November 1854, Jesse Haven had organized a Perpetual Emigration Fund at the Cape of Good Hope and admonished the South African Saints to sell their possessions and move to Utah. The rare wealthy convert was especially valued for the help he or she could provide to the cause. A year later, Leonard Smith reported that seventy had been baptized in the Eastern Cape Conference, “though some have fallen away. I have baptised one man worth $15[,]000 or more. I counseled him to buy a ship to take the Saints from this land. He's quite willing to do it, and has tried to buy one but has not been successful as yet.”

The missionaries' personal plans were changed in 1855 when a letter from the First Presidency arrived, stating that elders who labored in countries where the climate did not agree with their health were at liberty to return home when they pleased without awaiting replacements. In March 1855, Haven, still in Cape Town, inquired about booking passage to England but decided to first visit his fellow missionaries in the Eastern Cape. In June, the three

---

39 Walker, Life Incidents, 45. George Prince and Eli Wiggill were distant neighbors.
41 Wright, “History of the South African Mission,” 106. Wright does not quote the letter or give an exact date.
elders from Zion met in Port Elizabeth and decided to leave in autumn. They redoubled their efforts to accomplish as much as possible in the time that remained, concentrating on the areas around Grahamstown, Fort Beaufort, and Port Elizabeth. In late August, Haven departed for Bedford in the company of John Wesley, who had been “appointed to preside over the Saints in and about Bedford, Winterberg, and Mancazana districts.” For Haven it was a memorable, if not entirely positive experience, but it provides a candid snapshot of the Prince family:

[31 August 1855] Spent the day at Bro. Prince. Not a very pleasant place to stay at. He had a large family but little room. They appear kind and friendly in their way. Bro. Wesley says they were brought up in the country where they had not much opportunity to learn manners.

[1 September 1855] Spent the day in Bedford. Not a very agreeable place to stay at. I am anxious to get away.

On 6 September Haven departed for Grahamstown, accompanied fourteen miles on his way by fifteen-year-old Francis Prince, who guided him by an indirect route over a mountainous trail to avoid a mob that was rumored to be gathering. William Walker also took steps to avoid potential harm as he returned from Fort Beaufort to Port Elizabeth. On 3 October he came within sight of a place where he had been burned in effigy a short time before. Fearing for his safety, he hid until dark so that he could make his way past unobserved. He recorded:

I concluded that I was safer among wild beasts than to stop in town. About the time I got into the edge of town it clouded up very thick and black, every appearance of a heavy storm. I could hardly see my hand before me. . . . I travelled on twelve miles through a country inhabited by wild beasts, and over a crooked road with a forest of Mimossee [mimosa] thorn trees on each side. . . . Arrived at the Inn at twelve o’clock. In calling the Landlord, when I told him, he said he would not have undertaken it for $1,000.

By this time most Church members had moved to Port Eliza-

---

42Haven, Journal, (no day) March 1855.
43Jesse Haven, Letter to Willard Richards, 21 August 1855, Millennial Star 17 (1856): 781-82.
44Haven, Journal, 28 August-1 September 1855.
45Walker, Life Incidents, 52.
beth in anticipation of emigrating to Zion, though the Prince family remained at Mancazana, probably because Sarah was within six weeks of giving birth to her eighth child, Susannah, who was born in mid-November. At this point, 176 people had been baptized in South Africa; 121 were in good fellowship, 36 had been excommunicated, and a few had emigrated elsewhere. Three South African members—Charles Roper, Thomas Parker, and John Stock—purchased the *Unity* for £2,500; but when it departed from Port Elizabeth on 28 November, only eighteen Mormon passengers, including Leonard Smith and William Walker, were on board. Seventeen days later, on December 15, Jesse Haven boarded the *Cleopatra* in Cape Town to sail to Liverpool. Apparently no other Latter-day Saints sailed on this ship. As he departed, he recorded the wistful concern of the remaining members: “When do you think we shall have more Elders from Zion?” Haven did not have an answer for them. All of them except those baptized in Port Elizabeth were displaced from their homes and jobs. It was not clear how or when they could emigrate. Some of the male converts had been ordained to the Melchizedek Priesthood, and at least six branches had been organized. Nor does a record seem to exist of the post-missionary period.

In fall 1857, Ebenezer Richardson and James Brooks, both of whom had served missions in England, arrived in South Africa and labored for another six months, then left together, unaccompanied by any other members, aboard the *Gemsbok*, departing on 24 April 1858. Once again the South African members were left with little leadership. Apparently John Wesley continued his missionary labors. Robert Bodily, a stonemason and wheelwright of the countryside between Port Elizabeth and Grahamstown, received a visit from a friend, John Stock, accompanied by John Wesley. Bodily had not been impressed by what he had heard of this “peculiar people or sect”; but after a thorough examination, his family of ten joined

---

46The record created when Susannah was married in the Endowment House in Salt Lake City on 2 December 1872 gives her birth place as “Mankazana” on 14 November 1855. According to LDS Church membership records created at her death, she was born in Bedford on 15 November. In either case, the family was indubitably still in Africa.


49Jesse Haven, Letter to the *Millennial Star*, 17:780-83.
the Church. 50 Henry Talbot, a thirty-one-year-old farmer from Winterberg, joined the Church after reading a tract passed on to Talbot by a neighbor named Taylor who had received it from Joseph Humphrey, a South African member. 51 William Walker had taught George Wiggill, Eli Wiggill’s brother, the gospel in 1855. In February 1858 Eli, his wife, and a daughter were baptized in Winterberg by John Green, a South African elder. 52 After Henry Talbot visited Wiggill in November 1858, they went out separately and baptized another seven. 53

Meanwhile the members, many of whom had made great sacrifices to support the Perpetual Emigrating Fund, were becoming increasingly anxious to emigrate, but lacked direction from American missionaries. Finally, five members sailed in early 1859 for America aboard the James Buck while another twenty-eight followed aboard the Alacrity. A year later, the Mary Pearce sailed from Port Elizabeth with eleven members, followed in late March or early April 1860 by the Alacrity. 54

The Alacrity paused in Cape Town, where another company of Saints boarded, bringing their total to seventy—the largest Mormon group of the era to emigrate from South Africa. 55 Among them were George and Sarah Prince and their eight children. From Cape Town the five-masted ship sailed to the Isle of St. Helena, to which Napoleon had been banished in 1815 and lived until his death in 1821. 56

52 Wiggill, “Diary,” 195. Wesley rebaptized Wiggill’s family in June 1858, apparently as part of the instructions about the Reformation, then going on in Utah. Baptized for the first time at that point were four of Wiggill’s daughters and a son-in-law.
53 Ibid., 196.
54 The Alacrity was a sailing ship built in 1856 at Sunderland, England. It was 111 feet long, had five masts and was built of white oak with copper and iron fastenings. It went aground and was destroyed in a gale in May 1865 at Table Bay near Cape Town. Conway B. Sonne, Ships, Saints and Mariners: A Maritime Encyclopedia of Mormon Migration, 1839-1890 (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1987), 64.
They reached Boston in mid-June 1860, seventy-three days after their departure from Port Elizabeth. The docks were crowded with the curious who expected to see a shipload of black Africans, an event that was duplicated when Eli Wiggill arrived aboard the Race Horse the following year, who, blandly ignoring the entire indigenous population of Africa, commented a little huffily: “Some people, hearing that we were from Africa, stared at us, surprised to see that we were white like ourselves, ignorant of the fact that South Africa was settled by people from England in the same way America was.”

By train the immigrants passed through Chicago to the railhead at St. Joseph, Missouri, by boat to Florence, Nebraska, and then by wagon and ox team across the plains.

After their years of yearning for Zion, probably most of them had unrealistic expectations. After their six-month journey to Utah, George and Sarah Prince discovered that it was not the paradise that they had anticipated, and George could not refrain from saying, “Sarah, I wish we were back in Africa!” They spent three years in Kaysville, about fifteen miles north of Salt Lake City. Their first home was a dugout in the side of a hill, shared with insects and spiders. The next year they moved to a more comfortable home. Their tenth child, Lucy Naomi, was born on 29 December 1861. The family then moved in the fall of 1862 to Middleton, halfway between St. George and Washington in the Cotton Mission.

On 13 July 1875, fifteen years after arriving in Utah, Sarah died at age fifty-six. Two years later, George married Frances Wilkins, and fathered two more sons. Late in life, he moved to Escalante, Utah, where he died at age ninety on 22 January 1905, leaving dozens of grandchildren to strengthen southern Utah’s Mormon families.

Back in South Africa, after the Race Horse sailed in February

---

57Wright, “History of the South African Mission,” 154; Wiggill, “Diary,” 201. Ironically, Wiggill’s group included a Xhosa boy, Goge. At Hannibal, Missouri, they were accused of having a slave and disguised Goge in girl’s clothes with a “huge sunbonnet to hide his black face.” Ibid., 202.
59Henrie and Redd, Life History of William and Louisa E. Lee Prince, 60.
60Robert Bodily, Henry Talbot, and Eli Wiggill also were among those who settled in Kaysville.
1861, the Cape Conference had only one remaining branch with twenty-seven members and no missionaries. At year’s end, William Fotheringham, Henry Dixon, and John Talbot (a son of Henry) arrived in Cape Town as missionaries. Dixon and Talbot had both been born in Grahamstown. Disappointingly but not surprisingly, they found that Port Elizabeth’s Saints were largely indifferent. The three labored diligently but without great success until they were replaced by Miner G. Atwood in 1864. When he sailed away in April 1865, he took with him forty-six Saints—nearly all that remained in South Africa. It was the beginning of a thirty-eight hiatus for the South African Mission, until it was officially reopened in 1903 by Warren H. Lyon.
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63 Ibid., 177.
64 The most recent estimate of the number of converts who emigrated from South Africa to Utah from 1855 to 1865 stands at 278 (“A Time Line of the Church in South Africa,” http://lgcy.com/users/m/mlesiw/sa/timeline.html). A list compiled by Evan Wright from missionary journals, family histories, and Church records of all known Church members in South Africa from 1852 to 1890, though incomplete, contains 255 names. When the mission was reopened in 1903, the new missionaries found fewer than a dozen scattered missionaries.
IN OCTOBER 1933, J. Reuben Clark, first counselor in the First Presidency of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, disapprovingly cited general conference reports that able-bodied Mormons were accepting government relief and rebuked them: "The thought that we should get all we can from the government because everybody else is getting it is unworthy of us as American citizens. It will debauch us."¹ In the years that followed, the attitude of the First Presidency toward the New Deal grew, if anything, progressively more hostile.² "Leaders of the dominant

church are strongly supporting [Republican presidential candidate Alfred] Landon under the effective leadership of former Ambassador J. Reuben Clark," reported Democrat William Hornibrook in 1936. Three years later, when Utah Governor Henry Blood vetoed legislation that would have allowed local communities to take advantage of U.S. Housing Authority facilities, Darrell Greenwell wrote: "The charge is freely made that the governor vetoed this legislation through pressure brought by [LDS Church President] Heber J. Grant. A newspaper reporter informed me that President Grant privately boasts that he was responsible for the veto and would like to see more New Deal foolishness thrown out the window."  

The New Deal meant many different things to different people. Economically, it represented a dramatic development of the machinery of central government for the purpose of restoring a nation racked by economic catastrophe. For certain sections of the nation, most notably the American West, a dramatic explosion of federal spending served to bring not only relief but ultimately economic development to the rural hinterland. The documentary record suggests that many Utahns failed to share the First Presidency's alarm at the New Deal's course. Another aspect of the New Deal, however, was a cultural vision of how Americans should relate to each other in the new industrial economy. This vision focused on large units of production, stressed class-based forms of association, advocated the

---


4Darrell Greenwell, Letter to Robert H. Hinckley, 5 April 1939, Robert Hinckley Papers, Box 28, Special Collections, Marriott Library, University of Utah, Salt Lake City.


speediest possible acculturation of racial and ethnic minorities and, most importantly for Utah, favored the relegation of religious values and personal morality to the private sphere. In contrast with their counterparts during the Progressive Era at the turn of the century, federal bureaucrats now showed a strong reluctance to legislate morality. For this aspect of federal policy, less publicly proclaimed but no less fervently desired by many liberals, few Latter-day Saints had much sympathy. This paper seeks to illustrate the ways in which ordinary members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints engaged with New Deal policy and reshaped their community during the Great Depression, while still upholding cultural and religious norms.

At the local level, many LDS leaders approved of federal relief programs. “It is my opinion, and that of many other Bishops, that without the aid of the present government relief projects it would be impossible to care for the unemployed members of our Church,” wrote Bishop Gordon Hyde of Salt Lake City’s Ensign Ward in 1938. “I feel a deep sense of gratitude for the government assistance which has been rendered to the unemployed.” Partisans of the New Deal in Utah went so far as to tie contemporary political debates to those of the Mormon past. “One would think that the Mormons of the eighties and nineties were the original New Dealers,” insisted Dean

---


9Gordon T. Hyde, Letter to Franklin S. Harris, 25 October 1938, Franklin Harris Papers, Box 21, L. Tom Perry Special Collections, Harold B. Lee Library, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah.
Brimhall in 1937. "No New Dealer ever said as harsh things about the Supreme Court as the Mormons of those days did."\(^\text{10}\) As the New Deal’s reach extended into agriculture, promoting efficient land use, water conservation and reclamation,\(^\text{11}\) Elbert Thomas, Mormon, Democrat, and U.S. Senator, told his constituents that New Deal agricultural policy “belongs more to Brigham Young [and] to early Utahns, than it does to the New Deal Administration.”\(^\text{12}\) This study focuses on the solidly Mormon community of Orem in rural Utah County, fifty miles south of Salt Lake City. Latter-day Saints in Utah County did not have to look far into the past for reassuring examples of religious intervention in individual economic activities. During the 1860s, inspired by President Brigham Young’s quest for Mormon economic self-sufficiency, Mormons throughout Utah Territory established a host of cooperative mercantile and manufacturing enterprises, generally operating on a barter principle. A higher form of cooperation, the United Order, drew its inspiration from short-lived experiments launched during Joseph Smith’s lifetime, adapted to Utah conditions. During the 1870s, the Utah County towns of Spanish Fork and Pleasant Grove established such orders, within which farmers pooled labor, draft animals, tools, and machinery for the order’s use. The order also ran such commercial enterprises as sawmills and dairy farms on a profit-sharing basis. While none of these enterprises represented a sustained economic success, they left a memory of institutionally sponsored cooperation among the Mormons of Utah that some twentieth-century reformers invoked.\(^\text{13}\)

\(^{10}\) Dean R. Brimhall, Letter to Marriner Eccles, 28 August 1937, Robert Hinckley Papers, Box 52.


\(^{12}\) Elbert D. Thomas, “Digest of Remarks before a Democratic Rally,” 5 November 1938, Tooele, Utah, Elbert Thomas Papers, Box 21, Utah State Historical Society, Salt Lake City. To compare the agricultural policy of the New Deal with that of the LDS Church in the 1930s, see John A. Widtsoe, “Agriculture and the Church Security Program,” *Improvement Era* 41, no. 1 (January 1938), 8-9; Donald H. Dyal, “Mormon Pursuit of the Agrarian Ideal,” *Agricultural History* 63, no. 4 (Fall 1989): 19-35.
LDS cooperatives constituted only one element of the Church's economic and political power—power that throughout the nineteenth century provoked resentment among non-Mormons, some of whom demanded federal action to disincorporate the Church. Under the guise of a war against polygamy (practiced by a significant minority of Mormons as a religious principle), the federal authorities undermined the cooperative movement by forcing the LDS Church to divest itself of most of its commercial holdings and accept the prevalence of a market economy. After 1890 as Utah's economy became more thoroughly connected to outside markets, it proved harder to keep the cooperative dream alive. Over the next thirty years, some Mormons proved extremely successful at operating within the market economy. To non-Mormon eyes, it seemed as if the Latter-day Saints embodied all the virtues of the Protestant work ethic, including a Calvinist concern with individual progress and economic success.14

Such appearances were deceptive. While Mormons were certainly hard working and efficient, their culture generally eschewed material success for the individual in favor of corporate achievement. While this corporate element was obscured during the early years of statehood, it became more visible as national attitudes to-

13Thomas F. O'Dea, The Mormons (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957), 189-215; Leonard J. Arrington, Feramorz Y. Fox, and Dean L. May, Building the City of God: Community and Cooperation Among the Mormons (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1976), 90-93, 101-2, 107-8, 203-12; Alexander, Utah: The Right Place, 171-73. Local historian Emma N. Huff, comp., Memories That Live: Utah County Centennial History (Springville: Daughters of Utah Pioneers of Utah County, 1947), 28, dismissively concluded: "The heavily settled Utah County areas were not a fertile soil for such developments." In contrast, Dean L. May, Three Frontiers: Family, Land, and Society in the American West, 1850-1900 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 246-9, 258-61, 270-76, studied the village of Alpine in Utah County and found that, although market forces significantly eroded community cohesion at the close of the nineteenth century, Mormon communities maintained much closer communal relations than the non-Mormon communities in his study.

ward centralized political activity became more favorable. When the federal government began to engage in programs that won LDS approval, the latter responded accordingly. After 1910, the LDS Church proved willing to work closely with state and federal agencies and programs operating in Utah. The association between the Church and the federal government became particularly pronounced in 1914, when the LDS National Women’s Relief Society agreed to serve as local agents for the Red Cross and began to adopt a more professional and integrated approach to social work. During the 1920s, the Relief Society lobbied in support of the Sheppard-Towner Act to increase federal-state support for health care for mothers and children and publicized government-sponsored health conferences and clinics. The Church also supported federal land reclamation and encouraged its members to participate in such projects.\(^\text{15}\)

With the onset of the Great Depression, the federal government took a greater role in relief efforts throughout the nation. Between March 1933 and September 1939, it expended $289 million in Utah and the total bill ranked the state twelfth in overall federal expenditures, even though federal taxes in Utah never exceeded $20 million. The largest single item was loans from the Farm Credit Administration totaling $42 million. Federal activities included land reclamation, the erection of many public buildings and the laying of new sewer and water systems by the Works Progress Administration, and extensive flood control measures undertaken by the Civilian Conservation Corps.\(^\text{16}\)

The LDS Church fully supported federal work relief programs and feared that, if such programs were to be curtailed, the burden on Church charity would become insupportable.\(^\text{17}\) The federal government’s announcement in 1935 that it intended to “shift the bur-


den of relief to the states and localities)—an obvious expedient of desperation—was, however, an important motivation for the Church to intervene more directly and more systematically in providing relief. Another motivation was a demographic shift in Church leadership. As Thomas G. Alexander has observed, Anthony W. Ivins of the First Presidency, Apostles Stephen L. Richards and Joseph F. Merrill, and Seventy’s president B. H. Roberts had praised the New Deal in 1933. However, by 1936, “the views of Richards and Merrill had changed, and Ivins and Roberts had died. At the same time, Church president Heber J. Grant and his first counselor J. Reuben Clark vigorously opposed the New Deal.” Clark especially took the lead in calling for the development of Church-centered relief programs that would end the need for a secular state role in the lives of ordinary Mormons. In so doing, he clashed with Sylvester Q. Cannon of the Presiding Bishopric, who was more sympathetic to the idea of cooperation with the state and federal authorities. Garth Mangum and Bruce Blumell conclude:

The Clark-Cannon clash, more than a difference between two individuals, can be perceived as a parallel to a transition in government—from a localized system of cooperating private and public charity agencies to a nationalized welfare state. Social welfare leadership was inevitably shifting to the federal government, and separation of church and state in welfare matters would become essential. Clark’s solution was the Church Security Plan of 1936 (renamed the Church Welfare Plan in 1938). Unemployment dropped from
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18Church History in the Fullness of Times (Salt Lake City: Church Educational System, 1989), 511.
21The program’s goal, as announced by the First Presidency, “was to set up, in so far as it might be possible, a system under which the curse of idleness would be done away, the evils of a dole abolished, and independence, industry, thrift, and self-respect be once more established among our people. . . . Work is to be re-enthroned as the ruling principle of . . . Church membership.” Conference Report (October 1936), 3, quoted in Glenn L. Rudd, “Welfare Program,” *Encyclopedia of Latter-day Saint
its high in 1933 of 35.8 percent (the fourth highest in the nation) to 6 percent, thanks to government projects; yet “even with reduced unemployment, the Church could not provide enough work and relief for needy members through its newly inaugurated Welfare Plan.” Furthermore, this plan ironically ended much of the autonomy that local Church leaders had previously used in administering relief by imposing the same sort of central direction on LDS Church relief efforts that bureaucrats in Washington, D.C., were attempting to achieve for the national government, despite the fact that local autonomy, with each stake “act[ing] independently in aiding members within its boundaries” had produced some “truly innovative programs.”

The Church Security Program was intended to give jobs to unemployed Mormons through Church-operated enterprises and to generate products that would be useful to other needy Saints. Through a nationwide system of storehouses, to which Church members made donations in kind, ward bishops had access to food, clothing, soap, and other necessities, while surpluses of commodities produced in one region of the United States could be traded for those in another. Despite the Church’s best efforts, however, the Welfare Plan failed to remove all able-bodied Mormons from the state welfare rolls. In fact, as McCormick notes, “Federal non-repayable expenditures in Utah for . . . 1936 to 1940 were ten times as great as the accountable value of church-wide Welfare Plan actions.” Only

History, 1321.

23Allen and Leonard, The Story of the Latter-day Saints, 521. See the discussion of tensions between the Presiding Bishopric and the Relief Society on the one hand and the Church Welfare Committee on the other in Mangum and Blumell, The Mormons’ War on Poverty, 142-47.
24Mangum and Blumell, The Mormons’ War on Poverty, 130-49. In addition to this scholarly treatment, see also Glenn L. Rudd, Pure Religion: The Story of Church Welfare Since 1930 (Salt Lake City: Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1995), a reminiscence by a former manager of Welfare Square which focuses almost exclusively on Salt Lake City.
25McCormick, “The Great Depression,” 137. After two years of operation (1938) approximately 22,000 Mormons were no longer receiving
with the outbreak of World War II and the coming of new industries to Utah was the unemployment problem solved.

Fundamental to the Welfare Plan was the belief of organizers like Harold B. Lee that it was not an innovation but an adaptation to modern conditions of an old idea. No new church auxiliary was established to administer it, responsibility at the local level being vested in the priesthood quorums and the Relief Societies. The new climate, however, led to some remarkable innovations in thinking that went far beyond a simple agriculture-based relief system to embrace such contemporary concerns as public health and recreation. One unlikely architect of this altered focus was Arthur V. Watkins, president of Sharon Stake in Orem, whose postwar career as a Republican politician has overshadowed his Depression-era role as a civic leader. A graduate of Columbia Law School, Watkins had been Salt Lake County's assistant attorney from 1916 to 1918. After three years of farming west of Lehi, Watkins moved to Orem. A founder (and later president and director) of the Utah Coldpack Corporation—which sought to organize the strawberry growers of Utah County and ship the berries to eastern markets—he also belonged to the local branch of the Farm Bureau. In 1929, he was called as president of the newly created Sharon Stake. Although he was always a strong political partisan, Watkins proved to be a great innovator during the 1930s, often responding positively to initiatives and programs emanating from Washington, D.C.27

federal aid, more than 30,000 others had received some kind of assistance, and jobs had been found for an additional 2,400. Allen and Leonard, The Story of the Latter-day Saints, 525.


27Arthur V. Watkins, Enough Rope (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1954), 6-9; American Fork Citizen, 4 August 1928; Arthur R. Watkins, son of Arthur V. Watkins, interviewed by Jeremy Bonner, 25 May 1998, notes in my possession. The Arthur Watkins Papers at Brigham Young University provide disappointingly few details of Watkins's career before 1940, but his reputation as a conservative stems primarily from his 1950s efforts to end the federal relationship with Native Americans in Utah during the 1950s. This view must be balanced, however, against his moderate stance in chairing the Congressional committee considering censure of Joseph McCarthy and his support for the Colorado Valley Storage Project. Indeed, he lost his bid for reelection in 1958 after outraged
In August 1933, the stake newsletter, the *Voice of Sharon*, began publication. Its first issue carried Watkins’s editorial: “Should God Speak Again.” In it, Watkins combined a not surprising denunciation of the New Deal’s restrictions on production with a far from conventional indictment of the actions of the nation’s business leaders, Mormon and non-Mormon alike. Such “gamblers with other people’s money,” he wrote, had through “the human weaknesses of greed, of selfishness,” contributed to the current crisis. To solve today’s problems, Latter-day Saints—and, by implication, all Americans—needed to look back to the legacy bequeathed by those Mormons who had helped establish the cooperative system of the 1870s. “The law of stewardship of wealth,” Watkins concluded, “or as it is known among you, the ‘United Order’ was once given to the world, but because of selfishness it had to be abandoned. When you have had sufficient training it will come again because you want it and are ready for it.”

The town of Orem, rather than being one of the headquarters-directed settlements of Mormonism, had grown up during the 1870s as residents from Provo and Pleasant Grove established homesteads along the road connecting their two communities. The emerging village, as historian Richard Neitzel Holzapfel comments, was “long and narrow” with dwellings facing the highway and rectangular farms stretching behind them. In 1919 these residents petitioned the city commission for a charter, which was granted, “with the express purpose of consolidating the water resources for irrigation purposes,” and named after Walter Orem, one of the residents. While industry was flocking to other parts of Utah County during the pre-


28*Voice of Sharon*, 31 July 1933. The *Voice of Sharon* evolved into a more community-oriented newspaper, especially after the *Utah Valley News* took over printing it in 1937. It ceased publication in 1945.

vious decade, Orem remained largely rural. Originally encompassed by Provo’s city limits, Orem, did not incorporate until 1925 and was called Utah’s “Garden City” because of its lush orchards and vegetable gardens. A newcomer to Orem in 1925 described it as “one vast orchard,” and in 1930 most of Orem’s 1,915 inhabitants were classified as rural farm population.

Possibly reflecting outmigration from Provo, the town grew rapidly in the 1930s. Although 60 percent of Utah County residences in 1940 had been erected before 1920, the same percentage of Orem’s dwellings had been constructed after 1920. Housing construction also continued during the Depression, even though housing construction throughout the nation was declining dramatically. Orem saw the erection of 244 new buildings, a number exceeded only by Springville (303) and Provo (816) among Utah County towns with 2,500 or more residents. Orem’s population grew from 1,915 in 1930 to 2,914 in 1940—a rate of increase (52 percent) that far exceeded that of Utah County (17 percent). Orem also had a consistently more youthful population than Utah County; 43 percent in 1930 and 38 percent in 1940 were under fifteen.30

Utah Stake had originally been organized in the mid-nineteenth century with boundaries that corresponded to the county’s. By 1924, Utah County’s 15,000 Mormons were living in approximately fifty wards that were still organized into just three stakes, an unwieldy arrangement.31 During the next six years, five new stakes were organized in the county, with an average population each below 6,000. Sharon Stake, organized in 1929, had seven wards, four of


31Wards are ecclesiastical units of roughly 800-1,000 members, presided over by a bishop and his two counselors. Five to ten wards make up a stake, presided over by a three-man stake presidency and a twelve-man high council. Alexander, Mormonism in Transition, 94-5, 107-8; O’Dea, The Mormons, 174-85.
them within the town of Orem (Sharon, Timpanogos, Edgemont, and Grandview) and three (Lake View, Pleasant View, and Vineyard) in outlying rural areas. Local LDS Church leaders showed entrepreneurship in attempting to move local produce to distant markets. James Clark, bishop of Sharon Ward (1924-42), operated a trucking line that hauled Orem fruit to several western states.  

The prosperity of the 1920s disappeared as the stock market crash of October 1929 had its domino effect throughout the nation. Increased unemployment and poverty led to a decreased rate of tithing by Church members that steadily undermined the local relief structures on which the LDS Church had previously prided itself, while sometimes bringing less appealing community responses to the surface. In June 1930, when unemployment was beginning to make itself manifest, thirty-five Orem residents shocked the community by marching on a local farm to evict ten Filipino workers employed to harvest berries and thin beets. The migrant workers produced knives and guns and were with difficulty restrained from turning them on their assailants.  

The early years of the Depression demonstrated the ability of secular and religious authorities to cooperate in alleviating human suffering. As Thomas G. Alexander has astutely pointed out, Utah’s governors and “probably a majority of Utahns” believed that national policies had caused the Depression and therefore “saw nothing wrong with insisting on strict economy in Utah while at the same time demanding massive expenditures from Washington to provide relief and to put people to work.” While many citizens in Vineyard Ward turned to local charities for assistance, solutions to the un-

---

34Provo Evening Herald, 12 June 1930.  
35Alexander, Utah: The Right Place, 319. Federal programs were frequently administered through state agencies, and the state naturally operated its own broad spectrum of meliorative programs. Studying the interface of federal, state, and community programs lies outside the scope of this article, which focuses primarily on one community’s response.  
36Sharon Stake, Manuscript History, 31 March 1933, Family and
employment problem in Pleasant View came more in the form of federal grants for the construction of roads and sidewalks. By December 1933, some twenty men there had been hired by the Civil Works Administration at fifty cents per hour.\(^37\) In Orem, where many residents defaulted on their water bills, the town council took the responsibility of providing for and distributing food and clothing to the needy.\(^38\) In contrast with Orem, in Sharon Stake’s more rural localities, untrained ward bishops found themselves elevated to the status of federal relief administrators by New Deal agencies, under an agreement worked out in March 1933 whereby “the LDS Church assumed responsibility for all relief cases where the head of the household was Mormon.”\(^39\) Not every bishop proved equal to the task. Spencer Madsen, overconscientious bishop of Lake View, neglected to delegate to already existing Church structures. “I took it as a personal job,” he explained over forty years later. “I should have called in the Relief Society Presidency and everybody who was concerned with welfare and had a meeting. . . . Some that did need [assistance] I didn’t know, and others that didn’t need it very badly was right there after it.”\(^40\)

The depression altered the political balance of power in the Orem community quite as much as in the rest of the nation. Utah County swung heavily to the left in 1932, contributing substantively to the defeat of U.S. Senator Reed Smoot, and electing Democrats to most local offices. During the 1930s, Orem gave Franklin D. Roosevelt between 64 percent and 70 percent of the popular vote, while Democratic Senate candidates secured between 61 percent and 68 percent. Grant Ivins, president of Sharon’s Cooperative, Educational and Recreational Association (SCERA) campaigned strenuously for the Democratic Party and favored closer ties between

\(^37\)Sharon Stake, Manuscript History, 31 December 1932, 31 December 1933, LDS Church Archives.

\(^38\)Weeks, Sagebrush to Steel, 40.

\(^39\)Holzapfel, A History of Utah County, 213.

\(^40\)Spencer Madsen, interviewed by Glenys Belt, Fall 1978, 2, Oral History Program of the Sharon West Stake, LDS Church Archives. Madsen secured a contract with the local sugar beet factory which hired his ward members to haul beets for ten cents a ton (4-5).
Church and national agencies. Earl Foote, a Democrat and a member of the Sharon Stake high council, likewise declined to see an inherent incompatibility between national social reform measures and Mormonism. In a 1934 editorial in the *Voice of Sharon*, he came close to sounding a critical note about the Church hierarchy:

> Is it possible for us as leaders and members of the “only true religion” to assume the role of the reformer, catch the spirit of Christ and become interested in the oppressed and unfortunate to the extent that we will raise our voices in class room and pulpit, in writing and verse, against unjust taxation, high interest rates, profiteering, high salaried public and private officers, injustice [sic] in courts, unemployment and insecurity?... Religion that I cannot experience, that does not tend to satisfy the present needs—the rewards of which must come in the next world—that is built upon a crystalized dogma, making it static instead of dynamic, is not filling its purpose.

Though Foote was released from his position the following year, on the grounds that, as the stake’s manuscript history puts it, he was “out of harmony with the Council and the Authorities of the Church,” he was not disfellowshipped. In any case, only three years later, county electors sent him to the state legislature, suggesting that his views were not out of harmony with those of local Latter-day Saints.

Political and economic liberalism did not extend to the loosening of social and moral values. The First Presidency bitterly lamented Utah’s part in repealing the Eighteenth Amendment, and throughout the 1930s Sharon Stake leaders continued to express a concern about their community’s moral health. “We desire to caution our MIA workers from rehearsals [sic] on Sunday,” warned the stake

---

41 Isaac M. Stewart, Letter to President Heber J. Grant, 12 October 1932, Reed Smoot Papers, Box 48, L. Tom Perry Special Collections, Harold B. Lee Library, Brigham Young University; Kristen Smart Rogers, “Another Good Man’: Anthony W. Ivins and the Defeat of Reed Smoot,” *Utah Historical Quarterly* 68, no. 1 (Winter 2000): 55-75.

42 *Voice of Sharon*, 23 February 1934.

43 Sharon Stake, Manuscript History, 30 September 1935, LDS Church Archives.

Young Men’s Mutual Improvement Association in February 1936. “It doesn’t seem consistent, does it, to preach and teach a sacred Sabbath and then turn the day into a day of activities for drama, dancing and music.” Alpine School District acted in November 1935 to limit the duration of school dances and require “music of a higher standard than that now played,” while the stakes of the East Central Utah Region opposed slot machines and other games of chance and launched a campaign in March 1938 for tighter enforcement of laws prohibiting liquor and tobacco sales to minors.45

The Latter-day Saints of Orem, like community members throughout the United States during this decade of crisis, had to meet the challenge of finding a workable synthesis between the competing secular visions of non-Mormon liberals and the varied but coalescing-toward-conservatism of LDS Church leaders. Their success or failure would determine how viable Mormon tradition could be in the modern world. Central to this synthesis was the Church Welfare Plan. “Hundreds of thousands of workers in the Church are to be called as a great army,” wrote Arthur Watkins in April 1936, “in a huge cooperative effort to remove all Church members from the relief rolls, and once removed, to keep them off the rolls.” In his *Voice of Sharon* article, Watkins outlined the broad array of initiatives under consideration by Harold B. Lee and his associates, including farm and orchard projects, canning and lumber enterprises, community sewing centers, and consumer cooperatives. Although stressing that this was a Church initiative that allowed members to work cooperatively but retain their independence from excessive government interference, Watkins also observed that the action could be seen as a response to Roosevelt’s encouragement of local communities to engage in “social pioneering.” 46

Orem residents had had experience of barter arrangements organized under Church auspices since 1930, when Orem had exchanged locally grown surplus peaches for mutton raised in neigh-

---

45Sharon Stake, Young Men’s Mutual Improvement Association, Minutes, 23 February 1936, LDS Church Archives; *Voice of Sharon*, 26 November 1935, 4 March 1938.

boring Sanpete County. At that time, however, such activities were ad hoc arrangements, designed principally to dispose of a perishable unsellable surplus. The Welfare Plan promised to bring more rational planning into the disposal of surpluses and to provide for their preservation in a nonperishable form. An essential ingredient in this new scheme was the network of regional storehouses. In July 1936, using a loan from the General Church Security Committee of $1,750, Sharon Stake purchased a school building in Edgemont and canning machinery from the state mental hospital in Provo. In August, Sharon Stake began a joint canning project with Utah Stake. Local farmers donated 715 bushels of fruit and 171 bushels of tomatoes, and the project had produced 50,000 cans at the end of the year. The following year, the Sharon-Utah Cannery prepared nearly 25,000 cans for the Church's regional storehouse and 50,000 for private customers. So successful was the venture that it proved possible to provide a small allowance to some of those who had previously been volunteering all their labor. In 1939, the Church Welfare Budget established formal quotas of crops for each ward to supply to the storehouse, with a concentration on fruit from Sharon, Timpanogos, and Edgemont, potatoes and parsnips from Lake View, corn from Grand View and Pleasant View, and tomatoes from Vineyard.

Significantly, in his 1936 article, President Watkins had gone further than the bare bones of the Welfare Plan blueprint in calling for Church life insurance policies for tithe payers, recreational facilities, and hospital and medical cooperatives—a reflection of how the crisis of the 1930s had stimulated a new understanding of community needs. The health care issue would be a significant one in Utah Valley during the 1930s. In 1932, the National Committee on the Costs of Medical Care produced a report that favored group health practices organized around a local hospital to provide community health care. While rejecting the idea of a single national

47Peter C. Peterson, Letter to John Whitaker, 5 September 1930, John Whitaker Papers, Box 21, Special Collections, Marriott Library, University of Utah.

48Sharon Stake, Manuscript History, 31 December 1936, 31 March 1939, LDS Church Archives; Voice of Sharon, 19 November 1937; Utah Valley News, 17 December 1937.

49Voice of Sharon, 30 April 1936.
blueprint or compulsory health insurance, the committee endorsed the idea of group payments funded by insurance or taxation and supplemented by state expenditure for low-income groups.\footnote{Medical Care for the American People: The Final Report of the Committee on the Costs of Medical Care (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1932), 103-44.} The committee report included a recommendation that “organized groups of consumers,” whom it defined as “industrial, fraternal, educational, or other reasonably cohesive groups,” should lead out on the insurance issue.\footnote{Ibid., 121.} An unlikely Canadian harbinger of this trend toward group health insurance in the Utah Valley occurred when the Young Men's Mutual Improvement Association in the town of Cardston, Alberta, resolved to establish a cooperative medical plan with the city's doctors for an annual charge of $25 per family. Prominent in this campaign was D. O. Wight, editor of the \textit{Cardston News} and leader of the Adult Class of the YMMIA in the Second Ward.\footnote{Harrison R. Merrill, “Cardston Adult Class Leads the Way,” \textit{Improvement Era} 36, no. 5 (March 1933): 288-89.}

In the mid-1930s, Wight moved to Utah County to edit the \textit{Utah Valley News} and joined Arthur Watkins in his quest for health insurance. Both men had been exposed to the arguments concerning health care and wished their community to participate.\footnote{For examples of pro-insurance arguments, see Michael M. Davis, “Change Comes to the Doctor,” \textit{Survey Graphic}, 23, no. 4 (April 1934): 163-66, 205; John A. Kingsbury, “Mutualizing Medical Costs,” \textit{Survey Graphic}, 23, no. 6 (June 1934): 285-86, 295; Joseph Slavit, M.D., “The Challenge of Socialized Medicine,” \textit{Survey Graphic}, 23, no. 12 (December 1934): 596-57, 636. For developments in medicine during the 1930s, see Daniel M. Fox, \textit{Health Policies, Health Politics: The British and American Experience, 1911-1965} (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986), 74-93.} In January 1938, John Johnansen of Cardston, who had moved to Canada with his wife thirty years earlier and been active in the United Farmers of Alberta (the reformist party that antedated the radical Social Credit movement of the 1930s), addressed a premedics class during the university’s Leadership Week on the subject of hospitalization and health insurance under the free hospitalization movement in Alberta—the birthplace of Canadian Social Credit and home to a clus-
ter of three or four predominantly Mormon towns established at the turn of the century. Johnansen described how Wight's negotiations with Cardston's doctors had led to a "medical contract," which ensured free treatment and drugs for all members of any family that paid $25 a year in advance. The only cost to the patient was a dollar a day to cover meals. Arthur Watkins probably had the Cardston Plan in mind when he addressed a Cooperative Education Conference at Provo a week later. How, he wondered, could a family with an income of only $500 per year obtain adequate medical attention? For Watkins, health associations that stressed preventive medicine and patient control (rather than management-run programs) benefited not only patients but also physicians, who often failed to collect fees from up to one-third of their clients.

In June 1938, Sharon Stake established a Medical and Hospital Cooperative Insurance Group. Having made a study of group insurance, they proposed to inform the community through a lesson plan to be distributed to the Melchizedek Priesthood classes. Six months later, the Cooperative Insurance Group introduced its version of the Cardston Plan, advocating medical contracts that focused on prevention and that charged for hospitalization on a cost basis within


55Utah Valley News, 14 January 1938.

56Voice of Sharon, 21 January 1938. John Kingsbury, president of the Milbank Memorial Fund, had argued in 1934 that European compulsory insurance schemes had neglected preventive medicine and wished any American system not to make the same mistake. Kingsbury, "Mutualizing Medical Costs," 286.
the reach of the average citizen. The indigent and the unemployed, the plan’s authors concluded, should have their membership dues paid for them by the state or the LDS Church; dues should, in any case, be in the region of $25 per family. Similar initiatives proposed by organized labor and the American Farm Bureau Federation were based on the assumption that the insured person was employed, and the stake plan obviously proposed a more inclusive membership. D. O Wight set his own seal of approval on the proposal with a November 1938 editorial in the Utah Valley News: “People rest easier in their minds knowing doctor bills are paid for the year,” he wrote, “and they do not hesitate to call the doctor at any time sickness may threaten. A call in time saves an operation, and Health Insurance is just that—preventive medicine.”

The Utah Medical Association responded with a rather less expansive proposal. Hospitalization for up to twenty-one days and cash reimbursement on a percentage basis for expenses caused by one major and one minor illness per individual per year were offered as separate options, and a family that chose both would pay a total of $48. Certain diseases—most notably cancer and tuberculosis—were excluded from coverage, and reimbursement was further restricted in cases of “catastrophic medical emergencies.” In February 1939, the Utah County Cooperative Health Council was established, chaired by J. T. Weaver of Orem. Its members included Arthur Watkins, D. O. Wight, and Farm Security Administration county supervisor, D. I. Eames. Over the next year, council members struggled to accommodate the Utah Medical Association, asserting their belief in private medicine and the right of a doctor to choose his own patients, while at the same time seeking to give patients some assurance of security at a time when they were most vulnerable. On 18 September 1939, the Sharon Medical and Hospital Cooperative Insurance Group incorporated and drafted a medical contract that was somewhat closer to the stake draft than the UMA proposal, but in January 1940 it was still fighting to have doctors accept it.

57Utah Valley News, 17 June 1938; Voice of Sharon, 16 December 1938.  
59Voice of Sharon, 16 December 1938.  
60Voice of Sharon, 17 February 1939, 8 and 21 September 1939; Utah Valley News, 26 January 1940.
While the fight for health cooperatives came only late in the decade, recreational cooperatives had a greater record of success. In Orem, Sharon’s Cooperative, Educational and Recreational Association (SCERA) represents a symbol that still endures of Arthur Watkins’s call to revive the United Order. Initially stake-sponsored, SCERA was incorporated in September 1933 as a state-registered, nonprofit cooperative intended to provide educational opportunities at an affordable cost. Prior to this date, some community entertainment had been provided, most notably showing movies in the local high school auditorium, but these had been strictly stake affairs. Attendees had to show a pass signed by their bishops indicating that they had paid their share of the ward budget. Within the new organization, although good moral character was still required of participants, LDS membership was not, a fact SCERA administrators continually stressed throughout the 1930s. Annual dues were set at $1 for heads of families and single adults over eighteen, with additional assessments based on the degree of individual participation. Thus, for a program of five dances, a play, a road show, subscription to the stake newspaper, and fifty-two movies, the annual cost ranged from $7 for a single person to $13 for a family. The advantages, contrasted to an estimated $40 charged for the same activities by comparable commercial enterprises, were obvious. The new cooperative took over the movies (it purchased a new sound projector in 1934) and published the Voice of Sharon. An active solicitation campaign secured the enrollment of 250 families by the end of October 1933, including 73 (59 percent) in Timpanogos Ward and 61 (49 percent) in Sharon Ward. Arthur Watkins and Victor Anderson, a teacher at the LDS Seminary, persuaded the Portland Cement Company to take bonds rather than cash to supply building materials for a new recreation center. Local residents volunteered their labor in constructing a building to house a revived form of cooperative endeavor in Orem. By offering practical and affordable educational and recreational alternatives, SCERA provided at least a partial solution to the problems of the depression. It also represented a return to the neo-Progressive position that the Church had adopted at the turn of the century.61

61Ferron Jones, Oral History, interviewed by Lyle Bingham, 7 February 1979, Charles Redd Center for Western Studies, Harold B. Lee Library, Brigham Young University, and the Labor Oral History Project,
By 1937, SCERA had the active support of 3,000 members and enjoyed the interest of publications ranging from the Church-distributed *Improvement Era* to the worldlier *Reader's Digest*. It served a community of 5,000 people on a nonprofit and nonsectarian basis. It embraced political leaders as diverse as Arthur Watkins (Republican) and Grant Ivins (Democrat). Much of the $15,000 spent on its construction came from the federal government, though in the climate of the 1930s, this was a necessarily pragmatic act. SCERA raised money for the Boy Scouts, gave moral support to the application of local school districts for WPA-funded swimming pools, backed community drama and concerts, cooperated with the National Youth Administration in a survey of young people between sixteen and twenty-five in the Lincoln High School District, and later served as a bonding agent for war bonds during World War II, since Orem, at that point, had no banks. 62

By 1937, too, the rhetoric surrounding SCERA had grown increasingly evocative. An editorial, possibly penned by Watkins, encouraged community involvement, condemned manifestations of apathy, and, in the process, revealed an inclination toward social engineering that most New Deal liberals would have enthusiastically embraced:

Have you felt the crying need for social reform? Have you been thrilled by the stories of brave adventurers in social experiments who have tried to improve man's social life? . . . What wonderful story could then be told to the world of a community which really cooperates, in which personalities are submerged, small town jealousies are forgotten and the common good of the entire group is all important; where practically everyone, young and old alike, participates in the cooperative program. 63

When charges were leveled against SCERA in 1938 that it was primarily a religious organization, SCERA President Grant Ivins ardently repudiated this assertion. Citing his organization's close ties to the Works Progress Administration and the city of Orem, as well

---


to Sharon Stake, he forthrightly declared that SCERA “belongs to all the people.”

During the late 1930s, Orem’s economic infrastructure of the 1940s, like that of many other rural communities, owed a great deal to federal programs. Throughout the county, the CCCs and Works Progress Administration surfaced roads, dug irrigation ditches, and built retaining walls in Provo Canyon. Orem voters approved a $20,000 waterworks improvements bond that brought an additional federal grant of $16,000, and the great battle in neighboring Provo in the late 1930s to erect a municipal power plant with Public Works Administration funding excited considerable discussion. Both the health care debate and the nature of SCERA indicate that community leaders in Orem were willing to explore a range of options and exploit precedents from successful federal programs in their Church-centered activities. Sympathy for the New Deal, as expressed at the ballot box, endured in Orem into the 1940s, when it was already diminishing in rural communities in other parts of America.

Where Church members unequivocally parted company from the national New Deal was in its class-based appeals and its playing

---

64 Voice of Sharon, 15 April 1938.
65 On the New Deal in Utah County, see Bonner, “Faith of Our Fathers,” chap. 4.
66 Weeks, Sagebrush to Steel, 41.
67 Utah Valley News, 13 May, 24 June, 26 August, and 9 September 1938; 3 February 1939.
68 In 1940, Franklin D. Roosevelt won 61.7 percent of the popular vote in the Orem area and U.S. Senator Abe Murdock received 60.7 percent. Even in rural Lake View, both men won 56.3 percent. The contrast was even more striking in the Democratic primary of that year, in which Murdock was nominated. Overall, he received 65.5 percent of the Democratic vote against two conservative opponents, but in Lake View and Vineyard, the figures were 71.8 percent and 83.3 percent respectively. Rural community studies have tended to stress the steady electoral retreat of the New Deal, even in communities that gained substantively from New Deal investment. See, for example, Donald Worster, Dust Bowl: The Southern Plains in the 1930s (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979), 136; D. Jerome Tweton, The New Deal at the Grass Roots: Programs for the People in Otter Tail County (St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society Press, 1988), 168.
down of the cultural cleavages of the 1920s. The Latter-day Saints considered themselves to be Mormon Americans, not merely Americans who also happened to be Mormons. Their relationship with the national state was shaped by such considerations. The Mormon response to the New Deal was a subtle blending of historical precedent and contemporary need. In the confusion, nominal conservatives took apparently radical stands while nominal liberals cooperated with Church-centered relief. The Mormon New Deal was a religious undertaking that paralleled Catholic social reform more closely than either a liberal Protestantism that generally accommodated itself to the new liberal mores, or a fundamentalist Protestantism that generally rejected New Deal activity as threatening its institutional integrity.

Orem’s Mormons took from the New Deal both the material help and the inspiration they needed to uphold the values of family and community so central to their faith.

---

THE EAGLE AND THE SCATTERED FLOCK: CHURCH BEGINNINGS IN OCCUPIED JAPAN, 1945-48

Shinji Takagi

This article will review some of the events and personalities of major significance in the history of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in Japan from the beginning of Allied (or American) occupation in September 1945 until the Japanese Mission was established in March 1948, the mostly undocumented period of about thirty months when there was no organized Church structure. My purpose is not only to uncover and preserve important events as accurately as possible and restore some forgotten individuals to their rightful place in history, but also to place the early Church beginnings in the broader context of that singular period in Japan’s history when changes in the structure of society were being initiated by an occupying foreign power, of which the Church was a part.

When war broke out in the Pacific in December 1941, the Church had long been gone from Japan. The Japan Mission, established in 1901, was closed in 1924 when Church authorities deter-

SHINJI TAKAGI is professor of economics at the University of Osaka in Japan. He thanks Armand Mauss and four anonymous referees for useful comments on an earlier draft, although he remains solely responsible for any remaining errors of both commission and omission. A second article on the occupation period, covering the Japanese Mission between 1948 and 1952, is forthcoming in a future issue of the Journal of Mormon History.
mined that 174 baptisms by a total of eighty-eight missionaries over twenty-three years did not justify continued efforts at that time.\(^1\) Although the authorities allowed the few practicing members, perhaps never exceeding thirty, to hold meetings on a limited scale from September 1926 to January 1936, there was no effective local leadership to take advantage of that provision to keep the Church really alive. From 1936 on, the members entirely lost contact with the Church authorities, except for a one-month-long visit made in 1939 by Hilton A. Robertson, president of the Honolulu-based Japanese Mission, which was established in February 1937 as successor to the Japan Mission of 1901-24, to proselyte among the Japanese of Hawaii. From early April to early May of 1939, Robertson visited members in Tokyo, Osaka, and Sapporo, baptizing and confirming eight individuals and ordaining one man an elder. These were the last baptisms and priesthood ordination of the prewar era.\(^2\)

Hostilities ended in most of Japan 15 August 1945. The day before, the Japanese government had notified the Allied powers of its decision to surrender by accepting the terms of the Potsdam Declaration of 26 July. By this time, Japan had paid a dear price in human and material loss, even on its mainland. Sixty-six Japanese cities had been devastated and more than 250,000 civilians killed by more than thirty thousand air raids from the long-range B-29 bombers stationed in the Mariana Islands. An almost equal number had been killed by the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki on 6 and 9 August respectively.\(^3\) In Okinawa (the modern Japanese name for a portion of the Ryukyu Islands), where the only ground battles were fought, almost 200,000, about half of them civilians, were lost by the time advancing American troops conquered most

\(^{1}\)Calculated from year-end figures, missionaries in Japan during 1901-24 averaged thirteen and never exceeded twenty. Andrew Jenson, comp., “History of the Japan Mission,” typescript, 1934, Archives, Family and Church History Department, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City (hereafter LDS Church Archives).


of the islands in June. In terms of material loss, the country had lost 42 percent of its national wealth during the war, and manufacturing production had fallen to less than 10 percent of the 1935-37 average.4

Toward the end of August, American troops commanded by General Douglas MacArthur of the U.S. Armed Forces in the Pacific (AFPAC), began to land in various parts of mainland Japan. When MacArthur landed at the Atsugi Airfield near Yokohama on 30 August, he came not only as AFPAC Commander-in-Chief but also as newly appointed Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers (SCAP), empowered to execute the terms of the Potsdam Declaration. After the surrender documents were signed aboard the battleship Missouri on 2 September, he established his General Headquarters (GHQ/AFPAC) in the Daiichi Life Building and dozens of other commandeered office buildings in downtown Tokyo.

To execute his complex undertaking of both military and civil nature, MacArthur added to his general staff sections (designated G-1, personnel; G-2, intelligence; G-3, operations; and G-4 supply/logistics) special staff sections for civil affairs, such as the Economic and Scientific Section (ESS) on 15 September and the Civil Information and Education Section (CIE) on 22 September. The newly organized GHQ/SCAP had dual military and civil functions to perform.5 With the agenda for postsurrender reforms already in place, the GHQ/SCAP immediately launched on a major program of reform, designed to restore and strengthen democracy and human rights in Japan.

Possibly the most lasting accomplishment of the occupation in changing the basis of Japanese society was a new constitution, promulgated 3 November 1946. It denounced war as a means of settling international disputes and guaranteed basic human rights. Even be-


before its drafting, the GHQ/SCAP had already begun to implement a series of democratic reforms through "Potsdam directives," which superseded all existing Japanese statutes. Perhaps most important in our context, on 4 October 1945, the GHQ/SCAP issued a memorandum to the Japanese government, directing that all "restrictions on political, civil and religious liberties and discrimination on grounds of race, nationality, creed or political opinion" should be removed; and that the "operation of all provisions of all laws, decrees, orders, ordinances and regulations which . . . [establish] or maintain restrictions on freedom of thought, of religion, of assembly and of speech" were immediately abrogated.6

Two months later in a memorandum dated 15 December 1945, the SCAP directed the Japanese government to terminate any public support for State Shinto and stated that no one would "be discriminated against because of his failure to profess and believe in or participate in any practice, rite, ceremony, or observance of State Shinto or of any other religion."7 Pursuant to these directives, on 28 December, the Japanese government issued a Religious Corporation Ordinance, stipulating that the restrictive Religious Body Law of 1939 and the associated statutes had lost force; a religious organization could now be incorporated simply by notifying the authorities and registering with a local court.8

Equally important was the SCAP memorandum of 22 October 1945 on educational reform, which directed the Japanese government to discontinue "dissemination of militaristic and ultra-nationalistic ideology" and to encourage inculcation of "concepts and establishment of practices in harmony with representative government, international peace, the dignity of the individual, and such fundamental human rights as the freedom of assembly, speech, and religion."9 With these and other reforms, the religious soil and climate of Japan began to change.

---

7Ibid., 175-78.
9Japanese Government, Foreign Office, Division of Special Records,
CHAPLAIN NELSON AND THE FIRST POSTWAR BAPTISMS

With the defeat of Japan on 15 August, MacArthur reorganized the AFPAC, assigning the Sixth and Eighth Armies to occupation duty. The SCAP’s directives were to be transmitted to the regional and prefectural military government (or civil affairs) teams through the separate headquarters of the Sixth Army in Kyoto and the Eighth Army in Yokohama.10 By the end of 1945, an estimated maximum of 430,000 American soldiers were stationed in occupied Japan.11 Crudely judging from the share of Utah (about 0.4 percent) in the total population of the United States at that time, the number of Mormon soldiers in occupation forces may have numbered slightly less than two thousand, with perhaps several hundreds religiously active. This estimate is consistent with the fact that about five hundred Mormon military personnel from Japan and the Philippines attended the first postwar LDS conference in Tokyo on 7 April 1946.12

Since early in the war, Church authorities had been concerned with meeting the spiritual needs of Mormon servicemen. In late 1942, Hugh B. Brown was assigned as coordinator of a special committee to address this issue. Beginning in July 1943, assistant coordinators were also called, each assigned with a specific geographical area. They gave counsel, ordained men to priesthood offices, directed baptismal services, located meeting places, and set apart group leaders who organized local groups, conducted meetings, administered the sacrament and, under certain circumstances, baptized converts.13 This organization was initially called the MIA (Mutual Improvement Association) group leader program. Men set apart

comp., Documents, 205-7.


11 Takemae, GHQ 22-27, 45.

12 "Mormon Meeting Held in Tokyo," Stars and Stripes, 10 April 1946.

13 Joseph F. Boone, “The Roles of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in Relation to the United States Military, 1900-1975” (Ph.D. diss., Brigham Young University, 1975), 434, estimated that over 100,000 Mormon men were serving in the U.S. armed forces at one time in Europe and the Pacific.

as group leaders received certificates announcing their authorization to organize groups whenever they did not exist and to select two counselors to aid them in their work.¹⁴

Mormon chaplains formed another channel of Church influence. Over the course of World War II, forty-five Mormon chaplains served, about twenty of them in the Pacific. This group included Theodore E. Curtis, John W. Boud, Vadal W. Peterson, Roy M. Darley, and Warren Richard Nelson. At the war's end in August 1945, the number of Mormon chaplains on active duty was at the peak of forty. In November 1945, there were still thirty-nine chaplains on duty; but by 1 July 1946, the number had dwindled to ten, all of them in the army.¹⁵ A Mormon chaplain's first duty was to serve as a Protestant chaplain; only if he had time after completing that assignment could he work with members of his own faith. In that case, he organized men into MIA groups, scheduled LDS conferences, conducted Mormon programs and services, blessed children, performed baptisms and confirmations, and ordained men to the priesthood. The Mormon chaplain also played a vital role in the MIA group leader program as he had the authority to call and set apart group leaders.¹⁶

Although there are no records documenting Mormon service-men's groups in Japan around the end of 1945, there must have been several such groups, presided over by group leaders, possibly with counselors. As the number of occupation troops declined in 1946, soldiers were pulled out of some areas. Even in more permanent military installations, Mormon soldiers came and went, with MIA groups being created and dissolved. Some groups actively proselyted, generally among their fellow soldiers, but sometimes among

---

¹⁴C. W. Nielsen, “Chaplain Corps of the US Navy, and the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints,” May 1952, LDS Church Archives; Thomas E. Bauman, “Personal History,” n.d. Mrs. Bauman photocopied the four relevant pages of this unfinished personal history and gave me permission to quote it, for which I express appreciation.


The local population. Undoubtedly, such missionary zeal reflected the response to the calls of their ecclesiastical leaders voiced from the pulpits at general conference and other religious meetings. For example, at the April 1945 conference, Apostle Ezra Taft Benson noted the important role the Mormon servicemen could play in missionary service, saying that while “our number of full-time missionaries has been reduced, we have . . . almost one hundred thousand of our young men in the service of their country, hundreds and thousands of whom are doing effective missionary work.”

Because the Church authorities at that time were quite tolerant of members serving informally, the majority of Mormon servicemen who engaged in missionary activities in occupied Japan did so without a formal call from the Church. As late as 1954, the First Presidency declined to set servicemen apart as part-time missionaries, meaning that they could proselyte without formal authorization. Group leaders had instructions on how to interview and baptize new members, ordain men to the priesthood, and prepare their membership records, indicating that some converts were indeed being made. Japan was not an exception. Some of the early fruits of the Church in occupied Japan came out of these self-motivated efforts of American servicemen.

Apparently the first person baptized in Japan after World War II was Eugene Johnson of Deposit, New York, who was stationed in Kokura (now part of the city of Kitakyushu) on the island of Kyushu. Befriended by his Mormon barrackmate Clair L. Roberts, he expressed a desire for baptism. At the group leader’s request, Warren Richard Nelson, the LDS chaplain serving with the 25th Division headquartered in Nagoya, interviewed Johnson and approved his baptism. The ordinance occurred Sunday afternoon, 27 January 1946, in an abandoned public bathhouse, which Roberts had located. A printed program shows that Kirk R. Christensen baptized Johnson, and Roberts confirmed him. It was the first known baptism in Japan since that of Naruko Suzuki on 18 May 1939, six and a half years earlier, performed by Hilton Robertson, president of the Honolulu-based Japanese Mission during his one-month tour.

18Ibid., 496.
19Clair L. Roberts, Letter to Shinji Takagi, 12 March 1997, enclosing a photocopy of the minutes and the program, which lists seven in
Occasionally, local Japanese who could speak English attended meetings of Mormon servicemen. Among them were Tatsui and Chiyo Sato, a married couple in their forties, and Mamoru Iga, a thirty-year-old man.20 These three were the first native Japanese baptized into the Church in the postwar period. The Satos were baptized on 7 July and Mamoru Iga on 13 August 1946 in the swimming pool on the campus of Kwansei Gakuin University, a Methodist school located upon a hill in Nishinomiya, midway between Osaka and Kobe. Also baptized with Iga was Ikuko Rose Matsuda, a Japanese American woman working for the U.S. military in Kobe. Matsuda, a Salt Lake native, had been visiting relatives in Japan at the war’s outbreak and was trapped there. Joseph Barrett Richards baptized and John H. Moore confirmed Iga; Matsuda was baptized by Shigeru Mori and confirmed by Clair L. Roberts, who had been transferred from Kokura to Kobe in April.

Mormon soldiers had taught the Satos in Narumi just outside Nagoya, about a hundred miles east of Osaka. In June 1946, some three months after all Mormon soldiers had left the area, Nelson returned to Narumi to interview the couple and invited them to be baptized in Osaka. (See next section.) Iga, born in 1916 on the island of Shikoku, had met the Church through his fiancée, Marye Matsuura, who had been born in Rexburg, Idaho, and raised a Mormon. She came to Japan at age twelve to receive an education, returned to the United States as a teenager, and was back in Japan teaching English and living with her grandparents when the war broke out. Marye began attending Mormon services in Kobe as soon as she heard about them.

It is apparent that the thread that connects these five early postwar baptisms was Chaplain Nelson, who tirelessly travelled across western Japan (presumably the territory covered by the 25th Division) from Narumi in central Honshu to Kokura on the island of Kyushu. He interviewed the candidates for baptism and presided over at least two baptisms. He showed no hesitation in inviting native attendance: Reo S. Archibald, Kirk R. Christensen, Harvey H. Field, Ray J. Green, Eugene Johnson, Clair L. Roberts, and Daniel F. Wood. Judging from the leading role played by Harvey H. Field in the program, he might have been the group leader.

Japanese to be baptized. In sharp contrast Vadal W. Peterson, another Mormon chaplain stationed in Yokohama, apparently either did not see a need or was reluctant to allow native Japanese to be baptized. In the Tokyo area, at least two individuals, Motoko Nara (the wife of prewar convert Fujiya Nara) and Miyoshi Sato (who was introduced to the Church through American servicemen and participated regularly in Mormon meetings) had to wait until the mission was opened in 1948 for baptism. Technically, there was no reason not to baptize native Japanese, if the chaplain or other military leader was willing. Nelson’s positive orientation toward native baptisms was must have been influenced by the experience he had in war-time Utah.

Warren Richard Nelson was born 24 May 1912 at Bear River City, Utah. He attended the University of Idaho-Southern Branch in Pocatello (1933-34) and the Utah State Agricultural College in Logan (1935-37, now Utah State University), graduating with a B.S. degree. He taught vocational agriculture in high school, worked for the U.S. Department of Agriculture as a county farm supervisor, and served a three-year mission in Brazil. After his return in the fall of 1942, the chair of the Department of Education at the Agricultural College asked him to help set up a vocational agriculture program in Topaz, Utah, where a federally operated relocation center had just been constructed for citizens and aliens of Japanese ancestry who were being evacuated from the Pacific Coast.

In the atmosphere of war-time hysteria and racial prejudice that followed the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor on 7 December 1941, President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066 on 19 February 1942, giving the army blanket power to deal with “enemy aliens.” More than 112,000 persons of Japanese ancestry were living on the Pacific Coast, including 40,000 first-generation immigrant (Issei) Japanese who were excluded by law from becoming U.S. citizens. After about a month of voluntary evacuation, on 27 March 1942 compulsory evacuation measures were instituted, allowing each person to take only what he or she could carry.

After being housed in hastily built barracks at fifteen assembly centers, these 110,000 evacuees were moved to ten newly constructed “relocation centers” during the summer and fall of 1942.

21“Mormon Meeting Held in Tokyo,” Stars and Stripes.
The Central Utah Relocation Center in Millard County, known as Topaz after the nearby mountain, was sixteen miles northwest of Delta in a mountain valley. The climate ranged from 106 degrees in summer to 30 degrees below zero in winter. The wind kept up “a seldom interrupted whirl of dust” and the “nonabsorbent soil” turned to “gummy muck” after rain, “ideal as a breeding ground for mosquitoes.” Built between July 1942 and January 1943, the center was made up of “row after row of low, black barracks of frame and tar paper construction.” The unfinished center began to receive evacuees on 11 September 1942; a year later over eight thousand persons were living there. 22

About thirty-six American Latter-day Saints lived at Topaz. Because they had only one car among them, they received permission to hold Church meetings at the camp and organized Topaz Branch. Thirty-year-old Richard Nelson served as its branch president from October 1942 to June 1943. His wife, Maurine, described her experience at Topaz: “I learned a great deal from my association with the Japanese people. They are very industrious, very clean, polite and respectful. They appreciate culture... The people were not bitter about being uprooted from their homes. I wonder how we would have acted under similar circumstances.” 23

Nelson must have developed similar positive feelings toward the Japanese Americans and their alien parents of Topaz. This may in part explain the zeal and willingness with which he responded as a chaplain, inviting native Japanese to be taught and baptized before the opening of the mission. He and Maurine later gave their daughter a Japanese name, Chiyo, not only for Chiyo Sato, one of the first two Japanese converts, but also one of Maurine’s closest coworkers at Topaz.

In November 1943, Nelson enlisted in the U.S. Army, was set apart as a group leader by John Boud, an LDS chaplain in the navy, and was commissioned as a chaplain himself in February 1945. Assigned to the 27th Infantry Regiment of the 25th Division, he served in the Philippines, Japan, and Korea, spending eight and a half

---


23Maurine Larsen Nelson, “My Marriage,” n.d., 3 pp.; photocopy of typescript provided to me by the kindness of her family.
months in combat—four months of them as assistant division chap- 
lain, and four and a half as acting division chaplain. His apparent 
freedom to travel in western Japan can be explained by the position 
he held at the time.24

THE CONVERSION OF TATSUI AND CHIYO SATO

The conversion of Tatsui and Chiyo Sato deserves a section of 
itself because of the important role Tatsui would later play as 
official translator for the Japanese Mission and because already pub-
lished accounts contain errors and contradictions, calling for a more 
definitive account of what happened. What follows is based principally on newly acquired primary materials (mostly contemporary letters), supplemented by other documents.25

Tatsui Sato was born 16 October 1899 in Narumi (now part of 
Nagoya). Influenced by Christianity, he was baptized Methodist at 
age eighteen. After completing his secondary education, he moved to the northern city of Sendai to pursue higher education at the Second Higher School and the Tohoku Imperial University (also in Sendai), from which he graduated with a B.S. in chemistry in March

24Warren Richard Nelson, “Personal and Family Data,” 1955, 
typescript, photocopy provided to me by his courtesy. See also, “Reservist 
Chaplain First to Be Set Apart for Duties,” Church News, 29 November 1950, 
10. He was discharged in October 1946 but returned to active service in 
November 1950 during the Korean War. For the next eighteen months, he 
served in California, Japan, and Korea. See “Five Chaplains Return From 
Ft. Lewis Duty,” Church News, 1 August 1953, 11, and “Funeral Held for 
Chaplain,” Church News, 21 July 1956, 12.

25Apparently most of the factual errors appeared first in Harrison 
T. Price, “A Cup of Tea,” Improvement Era, March 1962, 160-61, and were 
subsequently picked up by such unsuspecting authors as Terry G. Nelson, 
“A History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in Japan from 
1948 to 1980” (M.A. thesis, Brigham Young University, 1986); and Spencer 
George M. McCune’s more recent “A Tribute to Brother Tatsui Sato,” Salt 
Lake City, June 1996, typescript, LDS Church Archives, includes new 
errors, possibly because the author relied too much on Sato’s dimming 
memories. I have used several published accounts as checked against Sato’s 
letter to Harold B. Lee, ca. 1946, LDS Church Archives. Whenever there 
was a discrepancy, I assumed that this letter, written close to the events, 
contained correct information.
1925. Although the course of study is usually three years, for some reason he required four and was the last of the fifteen chemistry students in the entering class of 1921 to graduate.26

Prewar Japan used a double-track system of higher education; those who graduated from the five-year secondary school and wanted higher education could either go to the senmon gakko (“specialty school”) to study in a specified field for three years or enroll in the koto gakko (“higher school”) to study general or liberal arts subjects for two to three years, followed by three years of specialized training at the daigaku (“university”). Greater social status and prestige were attached to the koto gakko-daigaku sequence (intended to produce leaders) than the senmon gakko and comparable institutions (designed to produce technicians). Of the koto gakko, the government-sponsored schools, numbered one to eight, were considered to be the very best; likewise, the seven government-sponsored Imperial Universities were in a class by themselves. In other words, the Second Higher School/Tohoku Imperial University sequence was among the very best courses of education available in Japan. Given the program of generally six years of instruction, those completing the higher school/university sequence received the equivalent of today’s master’s degree, which did not exist in prewar Japan.

When Sato graduated from the Tohoku Imperial University, he was immediately employed there as an assistant researcher. After several years of secondary and normal school teaching and some more university research, in 1937, Sato moved to Kawasaki just outside Tokyo, to work as research supervisor at Nippon Metal Industrial Company, which produced stainless steel exhaust pipe for Japanese aircraft. Tatsui, by now married to Chiyo, lived in Yokohama until 1944, when he resigned from the company on account of illness but also because he thought “from the standpoint of an expert of special alloy steels” that Japan could never win the war.27 Tokyo was suffering devastation and food scarcities, so the Satos returned to Narumi, like millions of other Japanese who moved from large cities to their ancestral homes as the war progressed and came to end. Because no jobs were available, Tatsui began to sell local products on the black market. Once the war ended, his English proficiency

26Tohoku Imperial University, Tohoku Teikoku Daigaku Ichiran (Tohoku Imperial University Bulletin), Sendai, 1924 and 1925.
27Sato, Letter to Lee.
became useful in helping local merchants sell kimono to newly arrived American servicemen. Kimono and silk were popular souvenirs, and the Narumi kimono store became a popular spot for these servicemen, especially since Narumi was conveniently located on a major road connecting Nagoya and Camp Okazaki in Uto (just outside the city of Okazaki).

Many American soldiers had come to Nagoya and its environs, because the 25th Division was initially headquartered there. The first detachment entered the port of Nagoya on 25 September 1945, but bad weather delayed mine-sweeping in the harbor. It was not until 26 October that the next group landed—about six hundred in one day, followed by an additional ten thousand soldiers the next day. Some stayed in Nagoya, others went to Gifu to the north, and still others went to Camp Okazaki, a replacement depot for soldiers returning home. Only two months later, however, a major reorganization relieved the Kyoto-based Sixth Army of occupation duty, moving it to Korea on 31 December 1945. In February 1946, 25th Division headquarters moved to Osaka, as the previously Osaka-based First Corps moved its headquarters to Kyoto. In March 1946, Camp Okazaki closed.

It was during this crucial autumn window, then, that Tatsui Sato met the first group of Mormon soldiers at Camp Okazaki. On Thursday evening, 15 November 1945, he had a conversation with a group that included Raymond E. Hanks, Mel Arnold, and possibly Norton Nixon. It may have been on a religious topic, but no explicit mention was made of the Church. Nevertheless, Hanks was sufficiently impressed to tell another Mormon friend, Reed Davis, about Sato when he returned to the base that evening. A week later on 22 November, Hanks and Arnold decided to visit Sato again, inviting Davis to go along. According to Sato's own account, he saw them outside the shop, apparently waiting for transportation back to the

30Jun Eto, Nihon Hondo Shinchu (Stationing of Troops in Mainland Japan) (Tokyo: Kodansha, 1982), 278-79.
32Reed Davis, Interviewed by telephone by Shinji Takagi, 19 January 1996; also Reed Davis, Letter to Shinji Takagi, 4 January 1996.
base. In reality, unbeknownst to him, they had come with the very purpose of seeing him.\textsuperscript{33}

As an educated person, he had read about the Mormons. He even remembered a vivid description he had read in middle school of the Salt Lake Temple, illuminated against a snowy sky at night. When he heard Hanks say they were Mormons, “the memory of thirty years ago, that ever so beautiful part of the memory vividly came back to my mind. . . . Particularly, when I heard that they did not drink either tea or coffee for a religious reason, I felt a greater desire to listen to their stories.”\textsuperscript{34} The first in a series of religious discussions began on the morning of November 28 in the humble Sato home, initially with Arnold, Hanks, and Davis and continued for a few months with Nixon, Nelson, C. Elliott Richards, and possibly others participating at various times. The soldier-missionaries commuted from Camp Okazaki to Narumi by military vehicle, GI truck, or local train. At least once, they walked back to the base when they missed the last train.\textsuperscript{35}

When the 25th Division headquarters moved from Nagoya to Osaka in February 1946, some Mormon military personnel, including Hanks and Nelson, were also transferred. Postwar troop reductions and discharges also reduced the number of American soldiers beginning in early 1946. Davis left for Osaka on 26 February 1946. Richards, one of the very last to visit the Satos, left for Camp Zama outside Yokohama on 4 March 1946.\textsuperscript{36} By 15 March, no Mormon soldiers remained in the area. Tatsui wrote to Reed Davis that month:

\begin{quote}
After your leaving, all LDS members soon left for their destinations one by one and Mr. Swett was the last one who left Uto . . . on the 14th of March. I am attending every day to the Sensor [sic] Office in Nagoya. . . . Now that all LDS members have gone, no meeting is held on Sunday, but I am reading the Book and pamphlets which were given to me.\textsuperscript{37}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{33}Davis, telephone interview.
\textsuperscript{35}C. Elliott Richards, Letter to Shinji Takagi, 7 November 1995.
\textsuperscript{36}Japanese Mission, “Proselyting Area Histories, 1945-1952,” LDS Church Archives.
Sato's mention of the censor's office referred to his new job in which he used his English skills to censor personal letters and possibly other materials written by Japanese nationals. The Mormon soldiers had arranged his hiring at the civil censorship detachment in Nagoya in January. While the GHQ/SCAP proclaimed the freedoms of the press and expression as the essential components of democracy, it immediately established a strict military censorship, exercised by the Civil Censorship Division of the Civil Intelligence Section (CIS). Much of the actual work was done through the military channels under the supervision of the G-2's Public Safety Division. This office's purpose was to determine whether the Japanese public was complying with the occupation policies. Through local civil censorship detachments, the GHQ/SCAP censored communications, publications, and radio programs, tapped private telephone conversations, and inspected private letters. These civil censorship operations were massive indeed. As of June 1947, over 5.9 million domestic letters, 2,400 telephone calls, and 2.2 million domestic telegraphs had been subjected to censorship, not to mention numerous publications, radio programs, plays and other public media.\(^{38}\)

Some of the departed soldiers, including Elliott Richards, continued to correspond with the Satos. By early May 1946, the Satos expressed a desire to be affiliated with the Mormon Church.\(^{39}\) Nelson took advantage of an assignment in Gifu, a city between Kyoto and Nagoya, to visit the Satos on 27 June 1946. He invited them to be baptized in Osaka following a conference scheduled for early July.\(^{40}\)

Richards, who was unaware of these developments, wrote to Ray Hanks, now back in the United States, from his barracks in Zama on 29 June 1946:

\(^{37}\)Tatsui Sato, Letter to Reed Davis, March 1946, holograph in English; photocopy provided to me by Davis's kindness.


\(^{39}\)Tatsui Sato, Letter to Reed Davis, 12 May 1946, holograph in English; photocopy provided to me by Davis's kindness.

I have been receiving some mighty fine letters from the Sato’s. ... Ray, I wish that before I leave here, I could see the Sato’s baptized in the Church. And it is our prayer that the Lord will open up the way for them to be received in the waters of baptism and receive the laying on of hands for the gift of the Holy Ghost. I know that ... other teachers will come to complete the work that you started. They are humble people, and have a mission to perform here among their own people.

Richards was so impressed by Sato’s “mighty fine letters” that he shared them with a new friend, Boyd K. Packer, whom he had earlier met at a conference of Mormon soldiers. He later explained to Hanks:

Five weeks ago I met Boyd Packer, who has become my closest friend. ... One night while we were studying I had him read two of the Sato’s letters, [which] so impressed him that we went up into the woods behind my quarters and knelt down in prayer, praying that the way would be opened for them to be received into the waters of baptism. ... As we were leaving Boyd felt impressed to say that it would come about and that we would see it! At the time there was absolutely no outward indication of such a possibility.

Shortly after, Boyd was transferred to Osaka, and when he arrived there and contacted Chaplain Nelson he found that W. Richard had just returned from seeing the Sato’s in Narumi ... and he felt so strongly that this was the time for them to be baptized that he had made arrangements for them to go to Osaka that weekend in order to take care of the ordinance. I phoned Boyd the 30th, and you can imagine the thrill I received when he told me the marvelous news. I was being casualized the 3rd, so there was nothing stopping me from going down—not even a request disapproved by the Colonel. He finally saw it my way, and I took off Thursday on TDY. If the baptism had been set for any other time, I don’t see how I could have made it (might have been on the ship that left yesterday).

Conference was being held Sunday, and naturally the Sato’s were the highlight. ... We all fasted morning and noon, so right after the first session we piled into our caravan of jeeps and trucks and rode out to the chosen spot—an open air swimming pool.

Chaplain Nelson conducted the Service. ... As we sang “Oh It Is Wonderful,” I couldn’t keep the tears from coming. ... it wasn’t Boyd and I down there in the water, it was you, Reed, Mel, Hap, Ross, Koch, Swett, Morley, and all the others who helped to bring a knowledge of the Gospel to them. ... I shall never forget the 7th of July as long as I live.

This is how Tatsui and Chiyo Sato became the first native Japanese members of the Church after World War II. Richards and Packer, respectively, baptized them in the Kwansei Gakuin University swimming pool in Nishinomiya on 7 July 1946.42

41C. Elliott Richards, Letters to Ray Hanks, 29 June 1946, 9 and 10 July 1946; photocopy of carbon copies provided to me courtesy of Elliott Richards.

42McCune, “A Tribute to Brother Tatsui Sato,” 9, erroneously states that these were the first baptisms after the 1925 [sic] closing of the Japan Mission and that they took place on the Kansai University campus in Sannomiya, Kobe [sic]. This location is erroneously repeated in other places, including Palmer, The Church Encounters Asia, 68, likely because Price, “A Cup of Tea,” 161, confused Kansai University (located in Osaka, and not Sannomiya) with Kwansei Gakuin University, a Methodist institution located in Nishinomiya. The characters for Kansai and Kwansei are identical in Japanese, and this confusion is not uncommon even among native Japanese. Incidentally, Kansai University had no swimming pool in 1946; its swimming team was practicing in a facility located in Takarazuka in Hyogo prefecture. See Kansai University, Kansai Daigaku Hyakunenshi (Centennial History of Kansai University) (Osaka: Kansai University, 1987),
At the moment of this baptism, no Church meetings were being
held in Nagoya, let alone Narumi, as reflected by the very fact that
the baptisms were performed in Osaka. Things began to change,
however, as the 5th Air Force, including some Mormon airmen,
moved into Japan and set up headquarters in Nagoya. A Sunday
School was organized at the Sato home on Christmas Day, 1946, with
Wadsworth Shigeru Uyetake as president, and Thomas E. Bauman
and E. Carling Whetten attending. Thomas Bauman, an epidemi-
ologist who arrived with the 5th Air Force, in the fall of 1946, com-
mented in his personal history:

It seems that I arrived on the scene in Narumi and met Brother
Sato about the time I was needed. Brothers Richards and Davis had
both been transferred home. The group was dwindling. There were
no group leaders at that time, but the Sunday services continued. . . .
I had access to a jeep when I needed it and would help with the
transportation of Brother Sato and his neighbors on Sunday. Quite
often I visited in their home during the week. . . .

Considering everything, this was really a happy time of my army
life. I looked forward to visits with Brother Sato and his neighbors.
His home was very small. . . . Brother Sato's front room was only about
ten feet square. . . .

It was about this time that I was surprised to receive a promotion
to the rank of Captain. The colonel had arranged for another doctor
to work on epidemiology also. Our work overlapped quite a bit and
I was getting a little bored with my office work. For some time I had
been thinking about asking for a transfer, but I kept hesitating
because of my activities with Brother Sato. I felt that perhaps I was
really needed there to give support to the little branch. One day after

1051. See also Ray Hulet, Mission Recorder of the Central Pacific Mission,
Letter to Russell Horiuchi, 5 December 1947 and to Edward L. Clissold,
president of the Japanese Mission, 19 February 1948, LDS Church Archives;
and Boyd K. Packer, Letter to Shinji Takagi, 8 September 1995. Richards
confirmed Tatsui, but I have not been able to discover who confirmed
Chiyo.

43With the renaming of AFPAC as the Far East Command on 1
January 1947, the 5th Air Force came under MacArthur’s command, and
MacArthur was renamed Commander-in-Chief, Far East, or CINCFC. Eto,
Nihon Hondo Shinchu, 47.

44Japanese Mission, “Proselyting Area Histories, 1945-1952,”
microfilm, “Narumi,” LDS Church Archives.
I had been pondering this problem for some time and was feeling uncertain and agitated about my remaining time in Japan, I decided to make my problem of whether or not to ask for a transfer a matter of prayer. I did not want Brother Sato to feel that I was abandoning him, but I wondered if I were really needed in our branch. Instead of going to lunch that day, I went to my room and knelt at the side of my bed and prayed for guidance in trying to make a decision. After I had finished my prayer, I got into my jeep and was driving back to my office. While turning the corner at one of the busy intersections, I suddenly and unexpectedly felt something that is impossible for me to adequately describe. . . . I knew at that moment that I was to stay.  

In a letter Sato wrote Bauman on 7 March 1949, he called the American “truly a God-sent distinguished Mormon missionary to my family” and termed Bauman’s assignment in Nagoya a “definite plan of the Lord to save my family.”  

Edward L. Clissold and the Tokyo Saints

During this period, Mormon military meetings were held throughout occupied Japan wherever and whenever a group leader and Mormon servicemen could assemble. As late as the summer of 1947 when the U.S. military presence in Japan was declining, the Church News refers to Mormon military groups in Tokyo, Sapporo, Kobe, Kyoto, Kumamoto, Nagoya, Beppu, Sasebo, Sendai, Yokohama, and Fukuoka. Undoubtedly, there had been many more groups in late 1945 and early 1946. Of these, the Tokyo group was by far the most important, not only because its membership numbered in scores, meeting regularly at the SCAP-commandeered Meiji Life Building in downtown Tokyo, but also because it was proximate

---

45Bauman, “Personal History.”
46Tatsui Sato, Letter to Thomas Bauman, 7 March 1949; original in English, photocopy provided to me courtesy of Bauman.
47Tatsui Sato, Letter to Reed Davis, 20 August 1947, photocopy of typed letter made available to me by Davis’s courtesy.
to many of the dozen or so Japanese members from the pre-war period who still identified themselves with the Church. The first bridge between the military Church and the Japanese members was made in late 1945 by Edward L. Clissold, a Naval officer with the Civil Information and Education (CIE) section of the GHQ/SCAP.

Edward Lavaun Clissold was born 11 April 1898 in Salt Lake City, attended East High School and the University of Utah, married Irene Picknell in September 1920, then served a full-time mission in Hawaii (1921-24). After a brief visit home, he and Irene moved to Hawaii in 1925 where he became assistant manager of the Honolulu branch of the American Building and Loan Association (later renamed American Savings and Loan Association), a Utah institution. In 1926, he became the manager of the Honolulu branch of the State Building and Loan Association (later renamed State Savings and Loan Association), also a Utah institution. An overwhelming majority of his banking clients were Japanese; and seeing further business opportunities among the culturally exclusive Japanese, he hired a tutor and attended Japanese classes at the University of Hawaii.

In addition to his successful career, he also served as a counselor in Oahu Stake’s first stake presidency (1935-44), was twice president of the Hawaiian Temple (1936-38, 1942-44), and was president of the Hawaii-based Japanese Mission (1942-44). This mission was renamed the Central Pacific Mission in May 1944, in order to comply with the established Church policy that the mission should “bear the name of its geographical area rather than of a racial group.” As a Church leader, he was closely associated with members of Japanese ancestry, having helped organize a Japanese Sunday School in May 1934 and establish the Japanese Mission in Hawaii in February 1937.

His assignment with the GHQ/SCAP resulted from his position as a reserve Naval officer and his skills, though limited, of Japa-


nese. During World War I (1918-19), he had served aboard the USS *Arkansas* in the North Sea. In 1936, he joined the Navy reserves as a lieutenant junior grade, was promoted to full lieutenant in 1937, was recalled to active duty on 7 December 1941, and served in the communications censorship in Hawaii for two years. Then, in preparation for Japan's surrender, he accepted an assignment as a member of the civil affairs corps. From 9 June to 22 July 1944, he attended the School of Allied Military Government, located on the campus of the University of Virginia at Charlottesville, and was promoted to the rank of lieutenant commander. From 30 July 1944 to 27 January 1945, he attended the Far Eastern Civil Affairs Training School (CATS) at the University of Chicago. Clissold was thus among the approximately 2,500 officers trained for service with military government units to help govern the Japanese nationals in conquered areas behind the advancing line of U.S. troops.\(^51\) Because Japan's surrender came quickly and without land battles on the mainland, most of these officers were never needed.\(^52\) Moreover, the U.S. Army almost immediately adopted a system of indirect rule, rather than setting up a military government, since the Japanese government, unlike the German, remained intact. True, general policies and directives were issued by the United States, but they were implemented by Japanese government agencies. For this reason, only about a thousand of the officers trained in civil affairs ever came to Japan. Most of them were incorporated into the GHQ/SCAP or the 8th (and briefly 6th) Army and soon left Japan.\(^53\)

Clissold was disappointed with his assignment to the CIE, a section charged with the democratization and demilitarization of the spiritual fabrics of Japanese society, including education, religion, and culture in general. He had been hoping for a prefectural assignment as a military governor. In fact, he protested to the Chief of Staff, who bluntly told him that he had “[his] assignment and had better get to it.” He wrote: This interview ended the “vain dream of

\(^{51}\)Williams, *Japan's Political Revolution*, 2; Ward and Shulman, *The Allied Occupation of Japan*, 100. These military government schools were located at seven major universities (including Virginia and Chicago), and the Civil Affairs Holding and Staging Area (CASA) at Monterey, California.\(^\)\(^\)\(^\)\(^\)

\(^{52}\)Takemae, *GHQ*, 17-20.

a prefectural assignment and because of the press of the work I turned to my duties in the CIE section with all the energy I had."54 It would turn out, however, that his CIE affiliation with its connection to religion was helpful when he returned to Japan in 1948 as founding president of the Japanese Mission.

With his vast Church experience, Clissold naturally began to think not only of the need to organize Mormon servicemen’s groups but also of the Japanese saints. He recalled:

While in Japan I gave much thought to the status of the Japanese saints. . . . I also knew that there had been very little contact by the church authorities with the saints. So I took upon myself to call a meeting and had notices placed in the Japanese newspaper and the occupation “Stars and Stripes.” A large group turned out to the meeting, mostly servicemen, but among them a handful of Japanese members. After the meeting I talked with these people and learned that they had been carrying on without leadership to the best of their ability and were waiting patiently for the reestablishment of the mission in Japan. Soon after returning to Salt Lake City [in December 1945] . . . I called on President McKay and told him of my meeting with the saints in Japan. I apologized for presuming to act in the leadership capacity without authority. He told me I had done the right thing and he was delighted that the contact had been made. He said that steps must be taken immediately to restore some organization contacts to these people.55

Clissold’s reference to a “handful of Japanese members” must be an exaggeration, or else he must have compressed into a single reference a series of meetings, both formal and informal. We know that fifty-five-year Genkichi Shiraishi, who had been baptized in Asahikawa in 1909 and who spoke some English, saw a meeting notice on a Tokyo street and attended a servicemen’s meeting at the Meiji Life Building possibly in early October 1945.56 Moreover, the notice

55Ibid., 18-19.
which Clissold placed in the advertisement section of the Mainichi Shinbun, one of Tokyo’s three major dailies, on 30 October 1945, caught the attention of Tazuko Watanabe, another prewar convert. Because of the paper shortage, newspapers immediately after the war were a single sheet, printed on both sides. Given the people’s eagerness to gather critical information, they must have read the papers from top to bottom. The poorly translated notice, occupying a tiny fraction of the bottom column of the back page, said: “Urgent Notice—would immediately desire to get in touch with members of the Church of Recent-day Saints of Jesus Christ (Mormonism). Lieutenant Commander Edward Clissold, Room 548, Daiichi Hotel.” Despite the garbling, the notice did its job.

Tazuko Watanabe was the daughter of Yoshijiro Watanabe who had, in October 1922, become the fifth Japanese man ordained an elder and briefly served as president of the Tokyo unit under Takeo Fujiwara’s tenure as presiding elder from late 1934 to January 1936. Tazuko was the branch secretary, assisted Fujiwara in his travels, and nursed him when he fell ill. On 5 November 1945, Tazuko told Fujiya Nara, another prewar convert with some English ability, about the notice. It is not clear if they had kept in touch with each other during the war, because Nara was in Manchuria much of that time. However, Tazuko knew that Nara worked at the National Railway and must have located him through his work.

On 5 November they called on Clissold at his hotel, preempted as living quarters for occupation officers. The three discussed the condition of Japanese members and their desire that the mission be reopened. Clissold promised to introduce them to Russell N. Horiuchi, a Japanese American serviceman converted in Hawaii. The next day, Clissold took Nara to the GHQ/SCAP to meet Horiuchi. Thus, contact with Japanese members was established two months after the occupation of mainland Japan began. Only a month later, like many other civil affairs officers, Clissold was released from active duty on 7 December 1945.

57 Nara, “1945 nen niokeru Kaigo Hokoku.”
58 Clissold was released early because his two and a half years of service in Hawaii counted as an overseas assignment. Clissold, “Personal Experiences,” 18.
RUSSELL N. HORIUCHI AND THE NARA SUNDAY GROUP

With Clissold’s departure, the torch was passed to twenty-two-year-old Russell Nozomi Horiuchi, then a convert of less than three years. Born 25 January 1923 in Lahaina, Maui, Hawaii, to Mitsutaka Horiuchi and Kikuyo Koyama Horiuchi and fluent in both English and Japanese, he was an effective bridge between the military Church and the Japanese members before the mission was established in Japan. Horiuchi remained in Japan until April 1948, a month after Clissold’s return to found the Japanese Mission. He thus provided continuity in time between Clissold’s departure as a military officer and return as a religious leader.

After graduating from high school on Maui, Horiuchi attended a vocational school in Honolulu, encountered Mormonism, and, on 14 February 1943 at age twenty, was baptized by Kenneth L. Aubrey, a Japanese Mission elder who would later also be stationed in Tokyo. Merlin O. Neilsen confirmed him. In 1944, Horiuchi was drafted and trained in military intelligence in Minnesota. In September 1945, he was assigned to the Banking and Finance Division of the GHQ/SCAP’s Economic and Scientific Section (ESS), one of the principal organs of postsurrender reform. Its duties included overseeing banking, public finance, trade, labor, investment, utilities, anti-trust, foreign exchange, and science and technology.

After Clissold’s departure, Horiuchi informally took charge of liaison with Japanese members. Several meetings of key individuals took place in December 1945 and January 1946. The first meeting was held at the Marunouchi Hotel on 21 December. In attendance were Nara and his wife Motoko (not yet a member), Shiraishi, Kentaro Mochizuki, Tazuko Watanabe, Horiuchi, and Preston D. Evans, another American serviceman. Nara recorded the minutes of additional meetings on 26 December, 11 and 18 January, and 2 February, all of them in Nara’s office. The last and perhaps the most significant meeting was held, also at Nara’s office, on 9 February 1946, in which it was announced that (1) the Mormon military leadership in Tokyo had appointed Nara presiding elder for the Japanese members, with Shiraishi and Mochizuki as his assistants, (2) a suitable building would be rented for meetings, and (3) the Japanese members were

59Horiuchi’s biographical information comes from my interview with him, in Orem, Utah, 20 March 1996.
invited to attend the sacrament meetings of Mormon servicemen. These Japanese officers were sustained during the military sacrament meeting held at the Meiji Life Building on 10 February.\textsuperscript{60}

This was Nara’s second voluntary leadership role among the Japanese members. When the Japan Mission closed in 1924, he took upon himself the task of holding the Japanese members together through visits and a newsletter, \textit{Shuro} (Palm). In recognition of his efforts, the First Presidency assigned Franklin S. Harris, president of Brigham Young University to organize the Mutual Improvement Association (MIA) in Japan in the fall of 1926 when he was attending an academic conference in Japan. Harris organized MIA groups in Osaka (25 September), Sapporo (20 October) and Tokyo (31 October). He appointed Nara president of the Tokyo group, with supervisory responsibility over the other two. On 2 December 1927, a First Presidency letter appointed Nara presiding elder.\textsuperscript{61}

Fujiya Nara was born in Akita prefecture on 10 May 1898. At age twelve, he began attending LDS Sunday School in Sapporo, moved to Tokyo in early 1915, and was baptized on 13 June 1915 in the Tama River. His work with the Japanese National Railway took him to Kofu, a hundred miles west of Tokyo; but, curiously enough, Kofu was then one of only four places in Japan with a Mormon branch. In Kofu, he was ordained a deacon (1916) and a priest (1917). After returning to Tokyo in 1919, he was ordained an elder on 14 January 1923 at age twenty-four, thus becoming the sixth native Japanese holding the Melchizedek Priesthood.\textsuperscript{62} It was because of his awareness that he was the only active elder in Tokyo that he voluntarily assumed leadership when the mission was closed. Because of the discouraging lack of success, he had virtually abandoned his assignment as presiding elder as early as in the fall of 1929. In January 1934, his work took him to Manchuria. In 1958, he sum-

\textsuperscript{61}Takagi and McIntyre, \textit{Nihon Matsujitsu Seito Shi}, 145-47.
\textsuperscript{62}Takagi and McIntyre, \textit{Nihon Matsujitsu Seito Shi}, 144-45. Yukiko Konno, “Fujiya Nara: Twice a Pioneer,” \textit{Ensign}, April 1993, 31-33, should be read as a summary of widely held Japanese Mormon folklore which, in its desire to elevate him, commits several factual errors. Among these errors are that he was the first and only prewar Japanese elder, the only Japanese to be married in a Mormon ceremony, and that he read Clissold’s notice.
marized this period: “Although I was given the honorable mission with the keys of authority as a holder of the Melchizedek priesthood, I could not perform it fully. This was indeed regrettable, and for this I only ask God for forgiveness.”

Perhaps, Nara saw this postwar opportunity as a way to make up for those unfulfilled years.

Whatever his motive might have been, he took the lead in arranging regular Sunday meetings for Japanese members in the Tokyo area. The first meeting was held at 2:00 p.m. on 14 April 1946 in Russell Horiuchi’s living room, with ten people (including three American servicemen) in attendance. They sang hymns, Nara conducted, Shiraishi gave the invocation, then both spoke. They did not administer the sacrament. Kenneth L. Aubrey, who had baptized Horiuchi in Honolulu, gave the benediction. At the second meeting a week later, Nara and Shiraishi administered the sacrament. On 19 May, however, the sacrament was discontinued. Thereafter, these Sunday meetings took the form of hymns, talks, scripture recitations, and sometimes a lesson on a religious theme. It was not exactly a Sunday School class as we know it today, but more like a Protestant service.

Starting on 16 June 1946, the group began meeting at Toyo Eiwa Women’s High School in Roppongi, where Aubrey’s troop was stationed. The next month, Nara wrote a general letter to Japanese members, announcing the Sunday meetings in Japanese held in Roppongi and inviting them to the American servicemen’s sacrament meetings held on the seventh floor of the Meiji Life Building in Marunouchi at 2:00 p.m.

While some Japanese members attended the servicemen’s fast and testimony meetings on the first Sundays of the month, they stopped doing so after some time. It is not clear whether the language barrier discouraged them or whether new military Church leaders dissuaded them.

American Mormons of Japanese ancestry (Nisei Mormons), however, continued their attendance at the Japanese Sunday meetings. Included in Nara’s minutes were such names as Komatsu, Tsukayama, Arima, Takahashi, Ikeda, Shino, Sonoda, Akagi, and Akita. Mike Kiyoshi Tsukayama, born in Hawaii, remained in Japan.


64Fujiya Nara, Letter to Japanese members, July 1946; photocopy of holograph in my possession.
as a civilian employee of the occupation forces after his discharge from military service, so that he could continue to help the Japanese members.

During December 1946, seven to nine children attended Sunday meetings, requiring a special lesson. Beginning on 12 January 1947, Nara and some Nisei members started an afternoon Sunday School class for children at the Nara residence in Shimo-Kitazawa. An average of twenty to thirty children attended.65

In the summer of 1947, the Church News reported in glowing terms:

One of the outstanding groups is the Tokyo Japanese branch. Mike Tsukayama, an intelligent young fellow of 23 years of age, from Hawaii, and three Nisei friends and coworkers, Alan Abesu, Russell Horiuchi, and Sister Alma Sonada, conduct Sunday church services in the morning with an average of 7 members and about 19 investigators present. Brother and Sister Nara and Brother Shiraishi, all [sic] converted members from the old mission days who have stayed true to the Church through all these years of hardship, help conduct the meetings. Mike also has a Sunday School class every Sunday afternoon with an average attendance of 30 children in the age group of from 2 to 12.66

Although the “Japanese branch” technically did not exist, this description suggests that the American soldiers perceived the group of Japanese members and investigators as such.

On 28 July 1947, the morning session began meeting at the large Shirozaki residence in Gotanda, a southern section of Tokyo.67 Ko Sakai, a Toyo Eiwa teacher, apparently made these arrangements.68 These Sunday meetings, namely, the “Sunday meeting” for adults in Gotanda in the morning and the “Sunday School” for children in Shimo-Kitazawa in the afternoon, continued until Edward L. Clissold arrived in March 1948. Attendance was small but steady,

66“Centennial Conference,” Church News. The centennial conference was held 19-20 July 1947 in Tokyo.
68Horiuchi, Interviewed by Shinji Takagi.
with morning attendance ranging between fifteen and thirty, and afternoon attendance attracting about twenty children and three adults. In addition to Fujiya Nara and Genkichi Shiraishi, Tazuko Watanabe frequently participated. Kentaro Mochizuki, Koshi Nakagawa, Namiko (or Nami) Suzuki, and a few others attended sporadically. Motoko Nara, Aiko Mori, and Miyoshi Sato were frequent nonmember participants. Toward the end of the period, some non-Nisei American members were also attending the morning meetings, most notably Spencer Savage, an American air force officer.69

**REESTABLISHING THE CHURCH IN JAPAN**

Meanwhile, developments in Utah were moving toward more formal organizational steps for the Church in Japan. During Clissold's December 1945 meeting with David O. McKay, then a counselor in the First Presidency, McKay had indicated the need to make "organization contact" with Japanese members. At about the same

---

69Ibid.
time, Horiuchi and Preston Evans were discussing the possibility of establishing a branch in Tokyo with key Japanese members. On 15 December 1945, Evans wrote Clissold: “I have been talking to Russell and we feel that we may be able to start a small meeting here in the Japanese tongue... We would like to know if it is possible to have someone designated to take care of the work here and if it could receive the sanction of the mission there in Hawaii.”\(^{70}\)

Interestingly, Evans was not calling for a separate mission in Japan but a unit of the already established Central Pacific Mission (CPM) in Hawaii, undoubtedly reflecting the understanding that its jurisdiction included Japan. Clissold forwarded the letter to the First Presidency, who in turn forwarded it to Melvyn A. Weenig of Ogden, newly called Central Pacific president. In their cover letter dated 23 January 1946, the First Presidency told Weenig that they would “discuss this matter further” when they set him apart.\(^{71}\)

Unfortunately, the projected “organization contact” did not develop. Perhaps the Church authorities were too preoccupied with the more critical situation in Europe, where there was an established Church structure with thousands of religiously active members in desperate economic straits. In fact, in late 1945, Apostle Ezra Taft Benson was called as president of the European Mission to give spiritual guidance and to coordinate welfare to European members, especially those in Germany.\(^{72}\) As a result of his efforts, the first ship carrying food from the United States arrived in Hamburg on 11 October 1946, and the stream of supplies continued until the summer of 1949.\(^{73}\) Compared to Germany, the situation in mainland Japan was less critical and there were, at most, three dozen active Mormons in Japan. Between 1945 and 1947, no organizational steps were taken; Clissold wrote of this period that “the problem was

---

\(^{70}\)Preston D. Evans, Letter to Edward Clissold, 15 December 1945; LDS Church Archives.

\(^{71}\)First Presidency of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Letter to Melvyn A. Weenig, 23 January 1946, LDS Church Archives. Weenig’s appointment took effect on 7 February 1946.


\(^{73}\)Scharffs, “History of the Church... in Germany,” 161, 165; Boone, “The Roles of the Church,” 365-66.
considered by the brethren” and the First Presidency advised him of “the progress being made.”74

Japan was included, however, in the shipment of welfare supplies, beginning 29 October 1945. Reportedly, by 25 March 1946, 356 parcels of clothing, bedding, and food had been mailed to Japan.75 In all likelihood, these supplies were not necessarily meant for the Japanese members per se. It was not until early September 1946 that the GHQ/SCAP allowed the resumption of international mail, subject to the condition that gift “parcels to Japan will be limited to eleven pounds in weight and contents will be restricted to relief items such as non-perishable foods, clothing, soap, and mailable medicines.”76 It seems certain that these parcels were sent to Mormon servicemen, who distributed them to Japanese people, including some Church members. For instance, Russell Horiuchi gave “gifts” to Nara and other Japanese members at the 9 February 1946 meeting.77 Perhaps they were some of the parcels sent from Utah.

Even before international mail resumed in September 1946, the Central Pacific Mission began preparing welfare packages for members in Japan.78 Nara wrote the General Welfare Committee on 25 March 1947, acknowledging that packages had arrived and stating that he would distribute them to other members.79 Tomigoro Takagi, another prewar convert, received his first welfare package from Hawaii on 24 November 1947, containing canned rice, sugar, candies, medicine, underwear, and socks. By January 1948, he had received a total of five packages from Hawaii and Utah. A journalist, Takagi first worked for the Yomiuri Shinbun, then for the Utah Nippo, a Japanese language newspaper published in Salt Lake City (1920-

74Clissold, “Personal Experiences,” 19.
78Melvyn A. Weenig, Letter to the First Presidency, 1 August 1946, LDS Church Archives.
He spent World War II in China as a correspondent for the Toa Nippo and had returned from China in late April 1946.\(^{80}\)

Obviously, the possibility of initiating formal missionary work in Japan was in the minds of those at the Central Pacific Mission. Several incidents establish their jurisdiction over Japan. Hilton Robertson, Honolulu-based president of the Japanese Mission, visited Church members in Japan in 1939 in his official capacity. Furthermore, the membership records of Tatsui and Chiyo Sato, Ikuko Rose Matsuda, and Mamoru Iga were kept in the Central Pacific Mission headquarters until the Japanese Mission opened in 1948.\(^{81}\)

In early 1946, Weenig requested Wadsworth Shigeru Uyetake, a former member of his mission now serving in the occupation forces in Japan, to inform him about prospects for missionary work there.\(^{82}\)

When Shigeru Mori, an American soldier, was killed near Kobe in a plane accident on 10 December 1946, the Central Pacific Mission newsletter reported his memorial service, held in Honolulu on 16 February 1947, and explained, “Brother Mori was acting, at the time of his death, as a Group Leader within the area covered by that [sic] mission.”\(^{83}\)

In 1946, Weenig proclaimed that he had “great aspirations to fulfill the destiny of the Central Pacific Mission here in the islands and prepare ourselves to establish a mission in Japan.”\(^{84}\)

Hence, the initial assignment of reestablishing the Church in Japan naturally fell upon Melvyn Weenig as president of the Central

---

\(^{80}\) Tomigoro Takagi, “Hikari wo Futatabi Uketa Koro (When We Received the Light Again),” *Seito no Michi*, January, February, and March 1961, 23-26, 62-65, and 126-27. (We are not relatives.)

\(^{81}\) For the baptisms of Tatsui, Chiyo, and Yasuo Sato, see Hulet, Letters to Horiuchi and to Clissold, 19 February 1948. For the baptisms of Ikuko Rose Matsuda and Iga Mamoru, see Ray Hulet, Letter to Edward L. Clissold, 20 February 1948, LDS Church Archives.

\(^{82}\) Uyetake’s letter was printed as “Japanese Convert Writes from the Land of His Forefathers,” *Church News*, 10 August 1946.


Pacific Mission. In a letter in April 1947 to Edward Clissold, the First Presidency stated that for “sometime [sic] past the General Authorities have considered the advisability of having members of the Church in Japan visited officially by the President of the Japanese [sic] Mission” and that the First Presidency and Twelve had unanimously decided that “President Weenig should go to Japan to set things in order, and that he should be accompanied by Brother Clissold.”

This is how matters stood in the summer of 1947, when William Paul Merrill, Tokyo area group leader, expressed his hope that Weenig and Clissold would be able to come to Japan to “reestablish this mission.”

Weenig responded to the First Presidency in early July that he had applied to the War Department in Washington, D.C., for entry permits for him and Clissold, now being processed by the State Department. He hoped they could attend the centennial conference in Japan celebrating the 1847 entry of the pioneers into the Salt Lake Valley scheduled for 19-20 July. Apparently, in presenting the case for the Church, the Church’s representatives appealed to Hilton Robertson’s 1939 visit, giving rise to the folklore in some circles that Robertson’s visit somehow facilitated the Church’s official return to Japan. In reality, that was not the case. Clearance did not come for almost nine months, and only a single representative was authorized to enter Japan. Naturally, Weenig and Clissold did not attend the July conference.

On 22 October 1947, the First Presidency passed on to Weenig some information they had received from Washington officials, who explained:

“The only possibility of entrance would appear to be as a
'representative missionary' temporarily to be supported from United States Army sources on a reimbursable basis. Since your church has not carried on mission work in Japan for over twenty years, it would have to be treated as a special case in order to receive favorable consideration, since the requirement of having "carried on missionary activities prior to the war" has been interpreted to mean the years immediately preceding the war. Under this policy, only one person could be admitted from your church as a representative missionary in any case."

The First Presidency then quoted from Section B of the Department of Army Special Staff, United States Army, Civil Affairs, Washington, D.C., Personal Training Branch:

"Organizations which carried on missionary activities in Japan prior to the War but which have no missionaries in Japan to give assurances may send a representative who will be temporarily supported from U.S. Army sources on a reimbursement basis until such time as they can become self-sufficient. Until these representatives have resided for one year in Japan the provisions relating to missionaries regularly admitted do not apply."

Given these circumstances, the First Presidency informed Weenig that they had decided to establish a separate mission in Japan and to appoint Clissold as president, since he had recently been in Japan as a military officer and "had an opportunity to become acquainted with both civic and military rules and regulations governing the present-day situation." On Clissold's part, given many years of absence from his business affairs, Clissold accepted the call with the understanding that he be released as soon as the mission was established and running smoothly. On 22 October 1947, the same day the First Presidency informed Weenig of their decision, George Albert Smith set Clissold apart as president of the new Japanese Mission.

With clearance from the U.S. authorities, Clissold arrived in Yokohama harbor on Saturday, 6 March 1948, aboard the President Cleveland. He would turn fifty in about a month. He spent his first weekend at the Yokohama home of William Paul Merrill. The next

89First Presidency of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Letter to Melvyn A. Weenig, 22 October 1947, LDS Church Archives.
day, he attended the Japanese Sunday meeting at the Shirozaki residence in Gotanda where forty-three welcomed him and the Tokyo military group meeting in the afternoon. On Monday, he reported to the SCAP’s CIE section, then headed by Lieutenant Colonel Donald R. Nugent; the chief of the Religious Division was Lieutenant Commander William Bunce. Clissold was assigned a room in the Daichi Hotel, which “oddly enough was across the hall from the room I occupied as an officer two and a half years before,” and received written instructions that, as a Church representative, “I could live in the hotel for six weeks [sic] but after that would be required to find my own housing accommodations or leave Japan. It further stated that I was to report to the CIE Section for whatever direction or help I needed in my work.” His reception by his former CIE colleagues convinced him that “my original assignment . . . was not by chance. As I went to this office and entered the door a number of officers with whom I had served before rose to greet me and I was assured that I would receive every possible assistance from them.” With Clissold’s arrival in March 1948, a mission of the Church was finally (re)established in Japan, after well over two years of American occupation, and twenty-four years of official absence.

CONCLUSION

This article has reviewed some of the events and personalities of major significance in the history of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in Japan during the first thirty months of the post-World War II era (September 1945-March 1948). No LDS Church organization existed in Japan, except for the servicemen’s units, so self-motivated and often unauthorized American Mormon servicemen propelled the work of the Church forward. Their initiative was crucial, since the Church, as an organization, did very little to reestablish contact with its few prewar Japanese members. The Church owes much to the work of Warren Richard Nelson, Edward L. Clissold, Russell N. Horiuchi, and other men and women in uniform for spanning the gap between the abandoned prewar members and the

---

91 Ward and Shulman, The Allied Occupation of Japan, 841. In February 1948, the CIE staff consisted of 14 officers and about 560 people, including more than 300 Japanese employees. Takemae, GHQ, 128.  
92 Clissold, “Personal Experiences,” 20. The CIE’s assigned probationary period was sixty days, not six weeks.
reopening of the mission in March 1948. To be sure, administrative control from Utah was necessarily limited by postwar strictures, but the environment of apparent institutional laxity may also have reflected the less “correlated” administrative style of George Albert Smith (1945-51), which placed greater value on local initiative and stewardship than it may be the case today.93

With the establishment of the Japanese Mission in March 1948, the Church entered a period of institution building and expanding missionary activity. Within three years, the cumulative number of missionaries in the postwar Japanese Mission exceeded the cumulative number in the prewar Japan Mission. When all the eighty or so missionaries of the mission gathered together at a special conference held in the mountain resort of Nikko 9-13 August 1951, the sight was something to behold, for Hilton Robertson, the last president of the prewar Japan Mission and the first president of the Honolulu-based Japanese Mission, who came in his capacity as president of the Chinese Mission in San Francisco. The sight was even more moving to another guest—Chaplain Warren Richard Nelson of the U.S. Army, who had returned to Japan to serve in the Korean War. A hero of the past had come back to admonish the eighty or so successors to what was once his one-man show.

93I owe this insight to Armand Mauss.
THE CULTURAL DYNAMICS OF HISTORICAL SELF-FASHIONING: MORMON PIONEER NOSTALGIA, AMERICAN CULTURE, AND THE INTERNATIONAL CHURCH

Eric A. Eliason

THE YEAR 1997 WAS A UNIQUE TIME of reflection for members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints as two disparate aspects of our self-conception converged. Our sesquicentennial reverence for the 1847-69 era saw a resurgence of Pioneer Day festive activity as we turned to a defining moment of our past. This historical awareness came together with our growing sense of being a future worldwide religion—as illustrated by our enthusiastic reaction to David van Biema’s Time Magazine cover piece on Mormonism.¹
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These forward- and backward-looking aspects of our self-perception are still engaged in a process of ongoing reconciliation and mutual reinterpretation. How Mormons come to conceptualize the relationship between a pioneer heritage and a new world religion potentiality tells us much about who we are now and has profound implications for the shape of Mormon culture to come.

This study examines the impulses present at the beginnings of Pioneer Day in 1849, the ensuing development of an annual celebratory tradition, and the manner in which Mormon historical consciousness about the pioneer trek maintains and manifests itself in the contemporary world-wide Church. Ultimately, this study explores the possible implications of ways in which the relationship between past and future is working itself out in the creative practice of contemporary Mormons in Utah and around the world.

**Methodology and Goals**

This study's methodology was necessarily eclectic, remote, and at times even speculative. The benefits of such approaches are a wide view and, hopefully, multi-faceted nuance. Contemporary ethnography in complex transcommunity settings requires an attention not only to traditional historical documents, but also interviews, participant observation, and the processing of information from a variety of media. The decades of participant observation fieldwork required to personally and systematically record once-a-year Pioneer Day festivities and glean interpretations from participants around the world were simply not possible. However, for many years, I have made it a point to quiz returned missionaries and natives of the international Church about their experiences with pioneer nostalgia. Often, I had the opportunity to perform extensive interviews, but at other times I relied on notes from a brief conversation or the published sentiments of Mormons as they contemplated their relationship to their history. Some of the material here comes from a series of telephone interviews I conducted with Pioneer Day organizers in the American West during the summer of 1995. Pioneer, explorer, and travelers' thanks his research assistant David Allred for helping to gather examples of contemporary uses of the term pioneer in Church publications and reports of Pioneer Day experiences outside of Utah.

journals as well as Church magazines such as the *Improvement Era* and *Ensign* have been especially helpful as cultural documents, as has the multi-volume series of Utah county histories published by the Utah State Historical Society. Kate Carter’s multi-volume collection *Heart Throbs of the West* has been criticized for inaccuracies as well as a romantic and intrusive editorial hand, but her works are often the best available source for tracing the early history of Mormon expressive culture.

Such a mixed methodology will necessarily reflect my own experiences and opportunities. The coloring effect of filtering data through the ethnographer’s mind—in this case, a believing American Latter-day Saint’s—is probably even more pronounced in this study than is usually the case. Such concerns emerge in even the most intimate and prolonged ethnographic settings. Even so, I hope this study presents a reasonably accurate overview of the main themes and issues in Pioneer Day celebrations worldwide. I gladly defer definitive evaluative authority to Latter-day Saints around the world who celebrate, or don’t celebrate, Pioneer Day according to their own specific needs and desires.²

This study is in some ways a cultural history. However, its ultimate aim is not to trace change through time, but rather to explore how a sense of the past is maintained and understood in the present.³


Nevertheless, to understand the ways in which Pioneer Day came to shape Mormon identity and historical consciousness, a review of the emergence and early history of Pioneer Day is in order. Unlike other holiday traditions whose antecedents and influences are often multiple and ancient, the origin of Pioneer Day celebrations can be pinpointed to one place and time. This is not to say that forms of Pioneer Day celebratory practice were not influenced by preceding and surrounding cultural patterns, but these forms were given their current meaning and set on their current course of development on 24 July 1849 when the first Mormon Pioneer Day was celebrated. To a remarkable degree, the first Pioneer Day etched grooves along which celebratory activity has flowed to this day all over the world, despite adapting forms and changing sensibilities.

**THE FIRST PIONEER DAYS**

In 1848, there was no Pioneer Day commemoration of Brigham Young's vanguard company's entrance into the Salt Lake Valley on 24 July 1847. Conditions were too harsh. However, the
first “Pioneer Day” was celebrated the next year, displaying the concerns of Mormondom in the late 1840s—especially the complex relationship between Mormons and the United States government. In March of 1849, the Mormons petitioned Congress for a territorial government. The request that Dr. John M. Bernhisel carried to Washington, D.C., proposed Brigham Young as territorial governor and included an endorsement by Senator Stephen A. Douglas of Illinois as well as the supporting signatures of numerous Latter-day Saints.\(^5\) After this petition left for Washington, the provisional government of Deseret held its first session in Salt Lake City on 2 July 1849. Full of enthusiasm about their new society and eager to enjoy greater autonomy than that provided by territorial administration, the provisional Deseret legislature decided to supersede the territorial petition with a proposal for Deseret’s admittance to the Union as a state. In fact, this action was taken so hastily that apparently no provisional legislature convened at all except on paper.\(^6\) Acting legislators quickly drafted a state constitution and elected Almon W. Babbitt as a delegate to Congress and sent him to Washington, D.C., to plead their case.\(^7\)

No resolution on either measure was announced until 9 September 1850, when President Millard Fillmore signed the bill authorizing the creation of Utah Territory. News of this decision did not reach Utah until January 1851. Since the summer of 1849, however, Mormondom bristled with optimism, entertained grand visions of its potential, and reveled in the power of self-determination and government-making. Full of confidence, the provisional government of Deseret went ahead, made laws, and passed measures—most of which were later adopted by the Territorial Legislature.\(^8\)


This is the political climate in which the first Pioneer Day took place only three weeks after the national Fourth of July. A certain relationship in form and sentiment between the Fourth of July and Twenty-fourth of July celebrations has always existed in Utah. In fact, the similarity in timing and style of celebration has led to some confusion. In 1872 Walter Clement Powell—a member of his more famous cousin John Wesley Powell's Green and Colorado River exploring expedition for the U.S. government—recorded the following exchange with John D. Lee: "July 24th. After breakfast received a note from Lee inviting me to spend the 24th, 'The anniversary of Mormon Independence (?)'. We accepted. Had a good dinner. The Old Gent regaled us with sermons, jokes, cards, &c., &c., &c." This exchange suggests that Pioneer Day and Independence Day were seen by Lee, at least, in much the same spirit.  

Richard Burton, English traveler to Utah in 1860, observed that the Mormons treated the Fourth of July "with silent contempt, its honors are transferred to the 24th of July, the local Independence Day of their annus mirabilis 1847." Burton's observations about the Twenty-fourth of July being honored like the Fourth of July are correct but his observation that this meant a neglect of the Fourth of July may have more to do with the fact that he spent most of his time in Salt Lake City which, according to the pattern that eventually developed of "Fourth of July towns" and "Twenty-fourth of July towns," chose to emphasize the celebration of the Twenty-fourth of July. While some Gentiles in nineteenth-century Utah saw Pioneer Day as evidence of Mormons' lack of patriotism, it seems that Mor-

9Charles Kelly, the journal's editor notes, "'Pioneer Day, commemorating the arrival of the pioneers in the Salt Lake Valley, not 'Mormon Independence Day.' At that time the terms were practically synonymous." Charles Kelley, ed., "Journal of W. C. Powell," Utah Historical Quarterly 16, Nos. 1-4 (January, April, July, October, 1948), 17, Nos. 1-4 (January, April, July, October, 1949), 434.
mons regarded themselves as celebrating double the number of patriotic holidays in July as other Americans. Often nearby towns of similar size developed a tradition of dividing up the July patriotic holidays with one taking Pioneer Day and the other taking Independence Day. For example, Provo has come to be known for its Freedom Festival on the Fourth of July while Salt Lake City celebrates an elaborate “Days of ’47.” If Mormonism were linked to lack of interest in Independence Day celebrations, then logically Provo, with almost 90 percent Mormon residents, should have ended up with Pioneer Day, while Salt Lake City, which has always had a higher percentage of Gentile residents and now has a population that is less than 50 percent Mormon, would have celebrated Independence Day, rather than the other way around.

Edward H. Anderson identifies three issues that were uppermost in the minds of the organizers and participants of the first Pioneer Day celebration: (1) American patriotism surrounding Independence Day, reinforced by the fact that Utah now lay within the boundaries of the United States of America since the end of the Mexican War in which the Mormon Battalion participated; (2) the second anniversary of the Latter-day Saints’ entrance into the Great Salt Lake Valley; and 3) the hope of entering the Union with the autonomous rights and privileges of a full-fledged state. Despite the grave hardships Mormons suffered at the hands of the federal government in the latter half of the nineteenth century, celebrating their identity as Americans and what they saw as the ideals of Americanism have been inextricably linked to and have shaped Pioneer Day celebrations since their inception.


13Some historians have noted that Gentiles at the time regarded Pioneer Day as antipatriotic. However, that American identity and sentiment were prevalent and widespread among Latter-day Saints in nineteenth-century Utah is evidenced by numerous documentations of local Independence Day celebrations and patriotic expressions on Pioneer Day throughout the late nineteenth century. For example, Glen M. Leonard, *A History of Davis County* (Salt Lake City: Utah State Historical Society/Davis County Commission, 1999), 68, recounts Farmington’s 1855 Fourth of July as honoring the founders of the country and the territory and being celebrated with “feasting, dancing . . . speeches and toasts.” Linda King Newall and Vivian Linford Talbot, *A History of Garfield County* (Salt
At 7:00 A.M. on 24 July 1849, cannon fire and martial music awakened Salt Lake City’s inhabitants for the first “Twenty-fourth of July Celebration.”\(^1\) (It was not known as Pioneer Day until after 9 September 1850, when the last of Nauvoo’s inhabitants reached Utah.) In the brush and timber provisional tabernacle called “the Bowery” on Temple Square, the Saints gathered to enjoy “music, firing of musketry and artillery, shouts and hurrahs, the unfolding and hoisting on a large liberty pole of an immense national flag made by the ‘Mormon women.’”\(^2\) A procession followed consisting of a brass band, twenty-four bishops carrying the banners of their respective wards, and twenty-four young women each carrying a Bible and Book of Mormon while one bore a banner proclaiming “Hail to Our Chief.” One young man in the procession, Richard Ballantyne, carried a copy of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States which he solemnly presented to Brigham Young with a prepared speech reaffirming the sacredness of these founding

Lake City: Utah State Historical Society/Garfield County Commission, 1998), 133, records that among those inspired to celebrate Pioneer Day with patriotic displays was Mary Ann Schow who sewed a home-made American flag from an Indian blanket because the flag that had been ordered for the event had not shown up in time. Richard C. Roberts and Richard Sadler, A History of Weber County (Salt Lake City: Utah State Historical Society/Weber County Commission, 1997), 155, recount that the Fourth and the Twenty-fourth were “particularly celebrated” in the 1870s in Weber County. Miriam Murphy, A History of Wayne County (Salt Lake City: Utah State Historical Society, 1999), 289, notes that Elias Blackburn gave a Fourth of July oration in 1888. David Hampshire, Martha Sonntag Bradley, and Allen Robert, A History of Summit County (Salt Lake City: Utah State Historical Society/Summit County Commission, 1998), 227, tells how in the 1880s at the height of the polygamy raids, Latter-day Saints in Park City flew their American flags on Pioneer Day but Gentiles refused to fly theirs to demonstrate their support for the Edmunds-Tucker legislation. At least in this case, it seems that it was not so much that Mormons did not display their patriotism on Pioneer Day but that their Gentile neighbors refused to display patriotism with them.

\(^1\)Grand Scribe of the July 24th, 1849, celebration as quoted in Tullidge’s History of Utah, as quoted in Kate B. Carter, Heart Throbs of the West, 12 vols (Salt Lake City: Daughters of Utah Pioneers, 1939-51), 7:90.

American documents, Latter-day Saint loyalty to their ideals, and Latter-day Saint fealty to Brigham Young as "our future governor and defender of our rights." This presentation was followed by three cheers of "Long live the Governor of the State of Deseret."  

Apostle Erastus Snow then read the Declaration of Independence to the assembled crowd and led them in the "Hosanna Shout"—a Mormon recapitulation of the ancient Israelite practice reserved for the holiest and happiest of occasions such as temple dedications. Feasting, games, and contests followed the procession and presentations. Sixty Indians as well as hundreds of Gentile immigrants on their way to California celebrated with the Saints.  

Mormon/Gentile interactions at this first Pioneer Day celebration seem to have been generally positive. A Pittsburgher passing through Salt Lake City in July 1849 recorded:

I shall never forget the first sight of this valley. It shall ever remain on my mind as the most beautiful spectacle I ever beheld...  

There are about 10,000 Mormons here. [Actually there were about half that number.] They say that they will welcome to their society any good citizen, no matter what his religion may be. Their motto is "do right."...  

[At Sunday services a clerk] announced that on Tuesday they would have an anniversary feast, as it was the day of the month [July 24] on which they arrived at their present snug quarters. He stated that the city would be roused early in the morning by the firing of cannon and the music of the brass band. A procession would then be formed, which would march out of town, and at 2 o'clock dinner would be served. The emigrants were all invited to attend.  

---

16Quoted in ibid., 695. All of the patriotic flourish of the first Pioneer Day celebration did not mean that the Mormons did not take the opportunity to air their grievances with certain government policies and officials such as Martin Van Buren, who had refused federal aid to the Mormons in Missouri. But in America's freewheeling free-speech democracy, even such a complaint can be seen as patriotic. See Brigham Madsen, Gold Rush Sojourners in Great Salt Lake City, 1849 and 1850 (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1983), 100-103.


18An unnamed emigrant's journal, quoted in Dale L. Morgan, "The
The Mormons’ sense of Americanness and their association of the first Pioneer Day with Independence Day can be seen in Richard Ballantyne’s calling the festivities a “celebration of our Independence.”

Brigham Young underscored this parallel and displayed his practical-minded sense of humor by remarking, “The reason we are celebrating the twenty-fourth instead of the Fourth of July is that twenty more days were needed for some of our vegetables to mature. We waited so that we could have beets and cucumbers for our feast today.”

On the first Pioneer Day, martial bands, veterans groups, and militaristic themes were established as appropriate features. The especially patriotic tone surrounding the special circumstances of 1849 have not been as pronounced in subsequent celebrations, except perhaps during war years. Still, a flag-raising ceremony is common any year for any Pioneer Day celebration in the United States.

For the second Pioneer Day in 1850, in a calm of good will before the storm of federal intervention, LDS leaders exchanged toasts at a formal banquet with Howard Stansbury and John Gunnison. These two leaders of the U.S. Army’s recently completed survey of the Great Salt Lake and Jordan River were honored guests at the occasion. Showing sensitivity to his audience, Stansbury diplomatically offered a toast to “freedom of thought; freedom of speech, freedom of the press; and the more inestimable freedom to worship our God just as we please.” Brigham Madsen notes, “Not to be outdone, Mormon Patriarch John Smith reciprocated with words of praise for the army engineers, ‘Capt. Stansbury, and the officers under his command, are worthy of praise for their prudence, perseverance, industry, benevolence and urbanity: they have done their work honorably for their country; may honor, fame and power be their portion forever.’”

---

21 Ibid., 38.
22 Quoted in Brigham D. Madsen, “Stansbury’s Expedition to the Great Salt Lake,” Utah Historical Quarterly 56, no. 2 (Spring 1988), 156.
PIONEER DAYS IN THE LATER NINETEENTH CENTURY

Later in the nineteenth century, Mormons and antagonistic Gentiles began to hold very different views about the significance of Pioneer Day. To Mormons, the Twenty-fourth of July was an extension and reaffirmation of their exceptional patriotism as loyal citizens, especially protected in their unpopular beliefs and practices by uniquely American Constitutional liberties. To their Gentile detractors, Pioneer Day seemed clear evidence of Mormons’ allegiance to Deseret theocracy rather than U.S. democracy. The “Hail to Our Chief” banner featured in the 1849 procession could have referred to either President Brigham Young or President Millard Fillmore. To Mormons, such expressions made patriotic sense; to the Gentiles, such expressions were highly worrisome and eventually contributed to the U.S. government’s punitive intervention in Utah.

On 24 July 1857 while the Mormons were celebrating Pioneer Day in Big Cottonwood Canyon, a rider brought word to Brigham Young that the U.S. Army was on its way to Utah to “put down rebellion” and remove Young from office as territorial governor. It struck Brigham Young and the Latter-day Saints as particularly ironic that the Mormons would learn of the U.S. Army’s imminent invasion of Utah on a day its citizens devoted to celebrating their patriotism. According to Orson F. Whitney, a historian and apostle in the early twentieth century, on this day “the stars and stripes were unfurled from the summits of two of the loftiest peaks surrounding the encampment; also from the tops of two of the tallest trees.”

To Colonel Albert Sidney Johnston, who led the occupational force, it may have seemed appropriate that his army’s arrival should spoil the Mormons’ celebration of founding what Johnston consid-

23 This later animosity may be part of the reason why opposing legends emerged about the timing and type of flag raised on Ensign Peak soon after the Mormons’ arrival in Salt Lake Valley and at subsequent Twenty-fourth of July celebrations. Was the American flag run up right away or only later? Was it an American flag or was it the Mormons’ own pale blue and white variant of the Stars and Stripes? Was the Mormon flag raising an act made by those on the patriotic vanguard of American progress, or was it a rebellious statement of independence from the rest of America? See Ronald W. Walker, “A Gauge of the Times: Ensign Peak in the Twentieth Century,” Utah Historical Quarterly 62, no. 1 (Winter 1994): 4-25. 24 Quoted in Carter, Heart Throbs of the West, 7:95.
erred a political domain incompatible with American civilization. While his expedition turned out to be an embarrassing fiasco for President James Buchanan and while its more ambitious long-term goals were sidetracked by the Civil War, the Utah War did remove Brigham Young as governor and signaled the beginning of the federal government's ultimately successful campaign against Mormon political autonomy.25

In the later nineteenth century, invitations to and participation in Twenty-fourth of July celebrations remained litmus indicators of the tensions of the day. After the failure of Reconstruction in the South, the federal government took up the more manageable task of "reconstructing" Utah. It made no iron-fisted use of federal troops this time but relied instead on legislation, federal marshals to arrest polygamists, and forced receivership of the territory under a five-man Utah Commission selected by Congress to run the territory and disfranchise the Church.

In the 1880 Jubilee year of the Church's organization, while Mormons prepared for an especially extravagant Pioneer Day, Salt Lake City Gentiles under the direction of Utah's Governor Eli H. Murray planned a counter-celebration on the Fourth of July. It consisted of a small parade with a large group of spectators. Conspicuously snubbing Brigham Young, Murray invited no Mormons to participate, thus sending a clear message about federal feelings on Mormon worthiness as true Americans.

For their celebration on the 24th, the Mormons sent invitations not only to Murray but also to other federal officials. The tone of the governor's acceptance letter was especially gracious. He said he would be delighted to honor "the Pioneers, [for their role] in opening up the great west and this beautiful valley." However, apparently after some consultation, he and the other federal officials decided to stay away from the Latter-day Saint celebration lest their presence aid Mormons in their efforts in presenting a respectable public image before the country.26

By 1880, Pioneer Day parades included the 1847-69 pioneers as honored participants in the parade.27 Also, the practice of floats

26Carter, Heart Throbs of the West, 7:97.
creating scenes of American history, beginning with Plymouth Rock and leading up to representations of Mormon pioneers “attired in old fashioned style and surrounded with rude furniture and implements,” had been established.\(^{28}\) Throughout Mormon country, the Pioneer Day repertoire of parades, dancing, sport, and oratory had established itself.\(^{29}\)

**EARLY MULTI-CULTURALISM AND RECONCILIATION**

Despite tensions, Pioneer Day became a showcase for what we today might call cultural diversity—such as it existed in the Church and in Utah. During the 1880 Salt Lake City Pioneer Day celebration, Apostle Orson Pratt organized an event designed to show the varied backgrounds of the Latter-day Saints gathered in Zion.\(^{30}\) While Pratt spoke, Church members in national costume arranged themselves on a platform before the assembled Pioneer Day celebrants. They

\(^{28}\)Ibid., 262.

\(^{29}\)See for example, Martha Sonntag Bradley, *A History of Kane County* (Salt Lake City: Utah State Historical Society/Kane County Commission, 1999), 88, which records rifle fire at midnight, parades, a procession of girls representing Utah, pioneer wagons, and Indian impersonators. Roberts’s and Sadler’s *A History of Weber County*, 186, records dances and plays as early as 1856. Martha Sonntag Bradley, *A History of Beaver County* (Salt Lake City: Utah State Historical Society/Beaver County Commission, 1999), 95, 168, records parades, speeches, toasts, band music, picnics, games, races, and dances in Beaver in the 1850s. In the 1870s, she notes floats and a Brigham Young impersonator. Ronald G. Watt, *A History of Carbon County* (Salt Lake City: Utah State Historical Society/Carbon County Commission, 1997), 326, describes a parade, dancing for children, lunch, and games in Price in 1902, even though the Fourth of July was a bigger occasion. John D. Barton, *A History of Duchesne County* (Salt Lake City: Utah State Historical Society/Duchesne County Commission, 1998), 131, lists baseball games, dances, parades, speeches, and roping contests in many communities in 1914.

\(^{30}\)P.A.M. Taylor, “Early Mormon Loyalty and the Leadership of Brigham Young,” *Utah Historical Quarterly* 30, no. 2 (April 1962): 124, notes that, even in its first four decades, Pioneer Day celebrations and reports about them tried to emphasize the international character of the Church, both by highlighting the international membership of the Church in Utah and by publishing news of Pioneer Day in the Church paper, *Millennial Star*, in England.
represented their lands of origin and all twenty-five “countries in which the mission work of the church had been introduced.”

In 1883 members of Bountiful’s Chinese community carried a dragon in the parade. According to observer Annie C. Carr, “The din of pans . . . could be heard for blocks.” Mormons took pride in Deseret as a mini-melting pot and the Church as an umbrella under which people from all cultures could find refuge. In the 1920s, Salt Lake City’s Italian American community began participating in the Pioneer Day parade. The Christopher Columbus fraternal organization usually entered a float depicting Columbus’ arrival in America. Philip F. Notarianni interviewed lodge member Joe Merebelle who remembered that “the lodge members wanted to show their goodwill” and also show that they were “proud of living in this community.” Notarianni concludes: “This inclination toward an outward display of respect, not only for the pioneers (both Mormon and Italian) but also for the custom itself, demonstrated the willingness of the Italians to seek a common denominator with their fellow Utahns.”

In most Utah communities, Mormons were especially eager to encourage Indian participation by inviting nearby Native American communities to feast, march in the parade “in Indian regalia,” and participate in historical recreations. Many late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century accounts from rural Mormon communities tell of Indians, and/or whites dressed as such, abducting parade participants, willing and unwilling. Captives were later released, sometimes after parlaying with a Brigham Young impersonator. In 1910, a group of “highly decorated” Bannock Indians from Idaho came as special guests to Salt Lake City’s Pioneer Day celebration. Upon someone’s suggestion, they took off after a Mr. Davis—who was dressed as a Chinaman for the festival—with the mock intention of scalping him. Mr. Davis, however, escaped.

Over half of the accounts of various towns’ late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Pioneer Days collected by Kate Carter for Heart Throbs of the West relate this apparently very popular practice

---

31 Carter, *Heart Throbs of the West*, 7:97.
32 Quoted in ibid., 7:107.
34 H. B. Folsom as quoted in Carter, *Heart Throbs of the West*, 7:100.
of faux attacks and abductions perpetrated in front of (sometimes) surprised audiences by Indian impersonators and sometimes real Native Americans. These raids seem to have been similar to Santa Claus stories in that children were led to believe that they were real while adults realized they were a sham in good fun. However, even as late as the turn of the twentieth century, the very real violence of the Black Hawk war and other Native American engagements still rested in the living memory of many people. Historical documents do not provide much data on what Native Americans made of this carnivalesque appropriation of their native culture. However, it is clear from the record that at least some of them attended these events; and in the 1930s, an Apache in Snowflake, Arizona, laughed so hard that he fell out of the tree in which he had perched to watch the festivities.\footnote{Albert J. Levine, “Reminiscences of a Dude at the Snowflake Pioneer Celebration in the 1930s,” Snowflake Historical Society Wagon Trails 17 (December 1976): 3.} In Garfield County’s week-long Pioneer Day festivities, Native Americans organized games and dances of their own attended by their white Mormon neighbors.\footnote{Newell and Talbot, A History of Garfield County, 191.}

The 1890 Manifesto announcing that the Church would cease sanctioning new plural marriages marked the beginning of a new era in Church policy and heralded the beginning of reconciliation between the Church’s hierarchy and the U.S. government, as well as between Mormons and Gentiles in Utah. At the semi-centennial Pioneer Day celebration in 1897, one enthusiastic observer proclaimed:

The Mardi Gras festival and fiestas of other cities . . . are not to be compared with the splendors of the past five days in this city. Gorgeous floats, which were never equaled in number or in effect, [by] thousands of marching children, a band of pioneers who, 50 years ago, first turned their eyes upon this valley in all the beauty of its barrenness; the richest products of the field, the mine and the factory, and above all, an American manhood and womanhood which are the crowning glories of the state.\footnote{Quoted in Carter, Heart Throbs of the West, 7:98.}
development of Utah's mineral wealth while influential Gentile developers took just the opposite stance.

As tensions eased, Pioneer Day lost its potential as a shibboleth dividing Mormons and Gentiles and began to be reconfigured as a community celebration in the various municipalities where it was held. The Salt Lake City parade of 1910 highlighted the degree of rapprochement that had occurred in the twenty years since 1890. In 1857, Mormon raiders were burning U.S. Army supply trains, and in 1880 federal appointees in Salt Lake City thought it best to steer clear of Pioneer Day. But in 1910 Mormons responded enthusiastically to the War Department's authorization for a full brigade from Fort Douglas to march in the Pioneer Day parade. Long forgotten or forgiven were the tense days of Fort Douglas's founding when Colonel Patrick O'Connor installed his garrison on the bench east of Salt Lake City to give his artillery immediate command of Brigham Young's house and Temple Square.

THE DAYS OF '47 TODAY:
THE SOCIAL FUNCTION OF PIONEER DAY CELEBRATIONS

In her study *Parades and Power*, Susan Davis points out the inadequacy of the "common sense" view of parades as "straight forward reflections" of consensual notions held by all performers and observers. What she says about Philadelphia's 1832 parade in honor of George Washington's birthday could also be said about the Salt Lake City's "Days of '47" parade. "Upon closer examination . . . the procession's meanings for performers and audience seem less unified. This performance was a selective version of local social relationships that hardly represented all communities [and] all points of view."40 In Salt Lake City as well, all do not share the same interpretation of the pioneer story. Some feel that despite a long (but perhaps underappreciated) tradition of diverse inclusiveness even in non-LDS communities, Pioneer Day has been lacking as a commu-

---

38H. B. Folsom, quoted in Carter, *Heart Throbs of the West*, 7:100.
nity event because it has traditionally highlighted the dominant group's collective historical memory.  

In Salt Lake City's Days of '47 Parade, notions not only about social relationships but also about the sacredness of certain historical events and the divine destiny of Utah's majority religion have been literally paraded in public. But as parade organizers' sensitivity to Salt Lake City's Gentile population has adapted over the years, the tone of the parade has changed. Mormon themes still dominate the Pioneer Day Parade, but parade entries in recent years have employed symbols that bridge the Mormon/Gentile divide or are specifically non-Mormon in character.

One theme that has emerged as a bridge is the completion of the transcontinental railroad. As the railroad closed off the time window of the 1847-69 pioneer era, it opened the possibility of a new progressive romanticism celebrating the modern world's arrival in Utah. Today the railroad can be seen on Pioneer Day as heralding the possibilities of Mormon/Gentile cooperation in Utah—a memory open for appreciation by a larger percentage of Utahans. From today's vantage point, the inclusion of floats that celebrate the transcontinental railroad might be seen as antithetical to older understandings of what Pioneer Day was designed to celebrate and as a sign that the parade is being secularized and broadened to allow for the inclusion of more non-Mormon participants. Other signs of the evaporation of Mormon religious exclusiveness have been the inclusion of floats honoring the establishment of Salt Lake City's Catholic cathedral and Jewish synagogue. However, parades in the past also celebrated diversity in their own way and looked forward to just the sort of progress the transcontinental railroad represented.

When speaking to the gathered crowds at the 1992 "Days of '47" celebration, Elder Loren C. Dunn, a Seventy, acknowledged the contributions of "pioneers of other faiths" who also came to Utah.

---

41I once had a discussion with a non-Mormon former professor at a Utah university who claimed to have hidden in his room during the whole week of Pioneer Day because public displays of Mormon cultural identity disgusted him so much. Unfortunately, this man's reluctance to appreciate Utah's unique cultural life was part of what made his stay in Utah short and unpleasant.


43"Pioneer Day Activities Celebrate the Heritage of Early Saints,"
The official theme of 1994’s “Days of ’47” celebration was “All Are Welcome Here.” Even though contemporary assumptions about nineteenth-century Pioneer Days may have underestimated their inclusiveness, certainly this theme was chosen, in part at least, as a corrective to what some see as the parade’s past exclusivity and Mormon-centeredness. Religious themes—while still important—have lost their former predominance in Salt Lake City’s “Days of ’47” celebration. Floats that promote business establishments and bear corporate logos have become more prominent as well. Some feel that reasons other than the remembrance of sacred history, including fun in and of itself, threaten to become the undergirding of the Days of ’47 celebration rather than being only ancillaries to it.

These developments have coincided with shifts in responsibility for organizing the parade. In pioneer Utah, relationships between public events and Church authority were intimate. LDS leaders initiated and delegated the planning and performance of Pioneer Day celebrations. Gradually, responsibility for the parade passed into the hands of the Sons of Utah Pioneers (SUP) and Daughters of Utah Pioneers (DUP), even though the Church continued to provide financial support. In 1936, “Days of ’47 Inc.” grew out of the SUP as a nonprofit, unaffiliated organization responsible for organizing Salt Lake City’s Pioneer Day festivities. Today Church leaders no longer

Ensign, October 1992, 70.

44Mirroring the changes made in Pioneer Day celebrations, Pioneer Trail State Park’s “Old Deseret” model pioneer village and Lagoon’s “Sons of the Utah Pioneers Village” have sometimes downplayed the “Mormonness” of the history they seek to recreate, instead enacting generic frontier community scenes. The perceived “secularization” of Pioneer Day celebrations is not uncontroversial to some. A community leader in Spring City, Sanpete County, Utah, interviewed 20 July 1995, complained to me that he regarded the demolition derby and ATC pull that had become the premier Pioneer Day activities in his community as inappropriate modes of Pioneer Day celebration. His sentiment is understandable, but it ignores the long history (and still current practice) of holding rodeos and baseball tournaments on Pioneer Day. Demolition derbies are a modern version of the kind of recreational activities that Mormons have always regarded as wholesome and appropriate even, and perhaps especially, when done in conjunction with pioneer remembrance.
organize Pioneer Day affairs, even indirectly, but participate as honored guests in their important symbolic function as the living heirs and continuing administrators of Brigham Young’s kingdom. Thus, even though the Pioneer Day queen must still be a descendant of the 1847-69 pioneers and Brigham Young impersonators and representatives of the current Church leadership still occupy important positions in the parade, community organizations have been allowed to take control of a tradition of public historical celebration once centrally controlled by the Church. Mormon leaders, realizing Pioneer Day’s expanded significance, have willingly released control and have encouraged inclusiveness. Today, the Twenty-fourth of July is a state work-release holiday and Salt Lake City’s Pioneer Day parade is one of the biggest parades of any sort in the nation.

In this context, the Mormons’ sacred exodus-recapitulation has been refashioned to also be a secular “origin myth” for a diverse cultural region. The hopeful statement of Utah’s Mormon governor Mike Leavitt, when he welcomed the Sesquicentennial trek reenactors’ arrival in Emigration Canyon, reflects this changing role for the Mormon pioneers in Utah: “Whether you celebrate this as a remembrance of the coming into the valley of your own ancestors, or if you’re a newcomer to this state, I invite you to embrace this as part of your heritage.”

Despite these developments, it will probably always be impossible to completely separate church from state in public functions in Utah. Popular public expressions of significant events in Utah’s history will always face the fact of Mormon prevalence in that history, and Mormons will likely always see sacred significance in Utah’s pioneer heritage. Also, even with a continued influx of Gentiles, demographic trends indicate that Utah will likely retain its Mormon majority indefinitely. There is, and will continue to be, a high correlation between prominence in Utah society and a family heritage of leadership in the Church. For these reasons, attempts to provide public displays of history that meet the spiritual needs of Mormons as well as the community-building needs of Utah’s increasingly Gentile urban areas will continue to be challenging.

PIONEER DAY SPREADS FROM SALT LAKE CITY

Salt Lake City had a large Gentile population, was the Church’s headquarters, and was also capital of the Territory of Utah. Consequently, its Pioneer Day celebration reflected the tightening and releasing of grand tensions between Mormondom and the larger American culture. In the isolated villages of Deseret, Pioneer Day was relatively less affected by such issues and reflected the more local concerns of each specific community.

Pioneer Day’s spread across the West closely followed the general pattern of Mormon colonization. With few resources and more pressing concerns, a new village’s first or second Pioneer Day was often little more than a religious service. For example, Jennie Walker Johnson records that the Pioneer Day celebration in Pleasant Grove during its founding year of 1850 was “in the nature of a religious meeting. The program consisted of songs and speeches and experiences of the founders of the community.” Soon after its founding, however, each new community generally began celebrating Pioneer Day following established patterns adapted to local exigencies. Mormon villagers saw being able to put on a decent Pioneer Day celebration as a sign of successful colonization. Jennie Walker Johnson continued: “A little later parades were instituted as part of the enjoyment” and the celebration took on more of the tone of revelry.

While many features of nineteenth-century Pioneer Day celebrations would be familiar to twentieth-century Latter-day Saints, others have been transformed into modern settings or have atrophied. The principle of community inclusion, especially of Native Americans, continued and grew in importance over the years. The nature of this inclusion and, in many communities, the nature of the celebration itself, responded to the broad systematic rethinking of American race relations that occurred during the 1960s. Feasting, sports, contests, and games continue to dominate Pioneer Day celebrations while the religious procession has evolved into a more secular parade as the central focused event in most communities. In many smaller communities, cannon firing, anvil blasting, fire engine sirens, or some other raucous enterprise still wakes the community for the day’s festivities. Today, the holiday is much more retrospec-

46 Quoted in Carter, Heart Throbs of the West, 7:120.
47 Ibid.
tive than forward looking. Long forgotten are hosanna shouts and the focus on an immanent endowment of political autonomy.

As Church expansion has shifted primarily from natural increase and colonization to "mission field" convert stake building, the evolving Pioneer Day tradition has begun to spread with missionaries to the rest of the world. Traditions of sport, games, feasting, wearing costumes, and parading have adapted to local conditions in many ways. In areas outside the Mormon culture region, Pioneer Day celebrations do not claim the public space of Main Street as they do in many towns in the Mountain West but occur within the private religious space of LDS buildings or rented facilities.

**INTERNATIONAL ISSUES**

As Pioneer Day has spread, developing traditions from around the world display many possible dynamics that can emerge as celebrating Mormons rub shoulders with Gentile neighbors who do not share their history and beliefs, and as celebrators try to affirm their Mormon identity while at the same time retaining an allegiance to cultures very different from that of Deseret Mormons.

One response to these cultural currents has been the abandonment of, or resistance to, Pioneer Day. On 24 January 2000, my research assistant David Allred administered an informal survey to twenty BYU students in his English composition class about their Pioneer Day experiences in places outside Utah. Michael Stewart from San Jose, California, said that his ward's Pioneer Day in 1998 and 1999 "occurred without structure, that is without... even talking about the pioneers," and involved only the youth "playing miniature golf." Gary Sheppard of Orange County, California, remembers visiting relatives regularly as a child on this holiday; but when he was serving a mission, beginning in Rhode Island because of visa delays, "my companion was upset with me for even mentioning July 24th since he wasn't from Utah." The next year in Rio Rancho, Brazil, Sheppard commented, "The members realized that it was a special day, but no formal celebration occurred. We missionaries celebrated following our weekly zone meeting though." Paul Smith, who had spent Twenty-fourths in California and Texas, didn't "recall any celebration of any kind." Most remembered Pioneer Day as a children's

---

48 Response papers by the individuals quoted, 24 January 2000, are my possession.
holiday. Eight-year-old Prisilla Allen “thought it was silly” to play “pioneer games” and wear pioneer costumes. “I didn’t really know what we were doing this for because none of my neighbors celebrated it.”

Walter van Beek, a Dutch anthropology professor and stake president, discounted the Utah pioneer’s relevance to the international church in general and the Netherlands’ seven and a half thousand Mormons in particular.\(^4^9\) In a letter to the editor of *Sunstone*, he cast the Mormon pioneer epic as an unusable past for the international church since it unduly privileges “American history.” He suggested that, during the 1997 sesquicentennial, Mormons in Holland ought not to have acquiesced to what he seemed to view as American cultural imperialism and instead should have celebrated local Dutch national heroes that displayed heroic Christian virtues. Dietrich Kempski, a Church leader from neighboring Germany, responded in the next issue to van Beek’s letter by explaining the many ways in which Latter-day Saints in his country were going to enthusiastically celebrate the sesquicentennial.\(^5^0\) (Part of the disparity between these two men’s attitudes toward the pioneers can perhaps be accounted for in the fact that the American West has historically enjoyed a much more central place in German popular culture. The German-language westerns of Karl May and the paintings of Charles Schrevoogel do not have equally popular counterparts in the Netherlands.\(^5^1\)

Concern over such privileging of a seemingly American story in an international church is understandable. However, Kempski’s response suggests that there are ways of understanding the Mormon pioneer story that van Beek does not consider. These interpretations may allow Pioneer Day to survive internationally, if perhaps in truncated or modified form, well into the future. The history of Pioneer Day is Latter-day Saint history, not American West history. The Great Salt Lake Valley was in Mexico when the Mormons first arrived, a fact that pleased some Mormons who were happy to be out of a country that had rejected them. Most of the hardship Mormons


\(^{50}\)Dietrich Kempski, “Pioneers? Yes!” *Sunstone* 20, 2 (July 1997): 2.

endured once in Utah was at the hands of the U.S. government. Most of those who made the trek were not native-born Americans but European immigrants who were coming specifically to gather with the Saints in Zion and only incidentally to America. These Europeans included a number from the Netherlands. The pioneer epic is the story of a church already international in the nineteenth century—an international church in the process of consolidating its resources and establishing a homeland from which to become solidly international again later.

Rather than being primarily a part of American history for which the international church has no use, the historical moment of 1847 may turn out to be a touchstone that emphasizes LDS exceptionalism rather than Americanism. As time passes and Mormons come to more fully understand the foundational history of their new religious tradition, might arguments such as the following be made?: Jews and Christians regard the Hebrew scriptures as much more than merely Egyptian, Iraqi, Israeli, and Palestinian history. Christians regard the New Testament as much more than merely Greek, Italian, and Turkish history. Do Mormons and other Christians begrudge the "privileging" that these geographic regions (and the nation-states that currently administer them) receive in sacred history? Are the stories contained in the Acts of the Apostles any less meaningful or universal to Christian believers because of their location of occurrence? Mormon leaders and the Mormon multitude will shape the answers to questions similar to these about the 1847-69 pioneer trek.

At this point in the ongoing formation of the LDS scriptural canon, only Brigham Young's revelation (D&C 136) of organization, encouragement, and instruction given to the Nauvoo Saints as they prepared to move west is officially considered scripture. No further canonization on the westward migration story seems immediately forthcoming. As a result, the place of the nineteenth-century westward migration in Mormon sacred history is open to reevaluation and local adaptation in ways most Church doctrines and programs are not.

This openness will be especially well exercised in a religion where more and more adherents participate in it with multiple cultural allegiances. The days of most Mormons' overlapping multiple cultural identity as American, western, Anglo-Scandinavian Mormons are over. The internationalization of Mormonism with the
discontinuation of a literal gathering occasions a differentiation of identities that Mormondom has not before had to see as separable. Teasing out a usable Mormon historical past that does not seem to privilege white Americans’ experience will be difficult. Dietrich Kempski and Walter van Beek are only two voices in the diverse chorus of multiple cultural allegiances that will debate this issue.

As the LDS Church has grown, leaders and members have had to decide what aspects of Mormon regional culture need to be exported and what can be left behind in bringing the gospel to the world. This situation recapitulates the development of early Christianity. To an extent, early Christianity became inseparable from some aspects of the Roman Empire, and Europe became “Latinized” to a certain degree as it was Christianized; this process continued even after the political and military might of the Roman Empire had disappeared. Latin was abandoned as a required liturgical language only with Vatican II in the 1960s. To this day, the number of non-Italian popes for many hundreds of years can be numbered on one hand. Likewise, expanding Mormondom extends and transplants elements of American culture as it transforms peoples and places, not only with LDS religion but also with American hymnody, sports, church architecture, organizational principles, styles of dress, and a religious historical consciousness grounded in events that happened along the American frontier. Perhaps this regional imprint of “first cultures” on subsequent converts elsewhere is an inevitable aspect of the emergence of new religions. It seems inevitable that Mormonism will always have an American flavor, but there are ways to interpret this fact other than as a sinister exercise of American cultural hegemony.

It may be that LDS people who live in cultures and regions that have their own sense of a pioneer heritage are often more enthusiastic about the story of LDS pioneers than LDS people in areas with no such tradition. For example, LDS Afrikaners already understand the pageantry of covered wagons and can relate both to the Great Trek and the Mormon Trek. In 1997, Argentine Mormons cele-

52Jacques Duplessis, interviewed by Eric Eliason, November 1997. Brother Duplessis’s enthusiasm for his Afrikaner identity is surpassed only by his enthusiasm for his LDS identity. He pointed out the Mormon/Afrikaner historical resonance to me. Another South African, Tessa Meyer Santiago, despite some initial bewilderment, manages to weave
brated Pioneer Day by studying local pioneers but dressing in Utah-
style pioneer clothing. Many remember the story of Russian Latter-
day Saints who built a handcart and pushed it most of the way across the former Soviet Union, then shipped it over the ocean to be in the 1997 "Days of '47" parade. The idea of "pioneer spirit" is not new to Russians whose country has an eastward pioneer tra-
dition analogous to our westward one and whose organized youth groups under communism were called "pioneers."

In other places, Pioneer Day celebrations are showing a great deal of flexibility in responding to particular local situations. Several small islands in the South Pacific, where Mormons have been pros-
ytizing since the 1850s, are inhabited exclusively by Mormons. The island nations of Western Samoa and Tonga are 25 percent and 40 percent Mormon respectively and still growing. Parts of these is-
lands' geography can be described as contiguous, primarily Mormon villages. Certain areas of the South Pacific thus seem to be experi-
encing the first instances of total cultural conversion to Mormonism.

Yet little research into the geography of emergent international Mormon cultural areas has been done. Future maps of the Mormon culture region will have to include places in the Pacific and Latin America. Laie, Hawaii, is the first of these new Mormon cultural areas outside the North American Mountainwest. Located on the northern shore of Oahu, Laie is unique in being a former official gathering site for Pacific Mormons until the early 1900s.


56Some Hawaiian and other Polynesian Mormons immigrated to Utah before the building of the Hawaii Temple and founded Iosepa in Utah’s west desert on 28 August 1889. Until the colony was disbanded twenty-eight years later, the residents celebrated 28 August as "Hawaiian
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Laie is home to the first LDS temple outside of Utah and to Brigham Young University’s only remote campus for many years. About 90 percent of its six thousand residents are LDS. They display not only the extraordinary ethnic diversity of Hawaii, but also the ethnic diversity of Mormon Polynesia. Saints from all over the Pacific still gather in Laie to settle, go to BYU-Hawaii, and/or work at the Church’s tourist-oriented Polynesian Cultural Center.

On the Twenty-fourth of July, Laie celebrates one of Mormon-dom’s most unique civic-sponsored Pioneer Day celebrations. Called “Laie Day,” it has little to do with covered wagons and sunbonnets but much to do with local Hawaiian and pan-Polynesian cultural identity and the faith that binds Laie residents together. While not a celebration of Utah pioneers, Laie Day is a celebration of Mormon identity. LDS wards organize religiously themed floats for the parade, and individuals dress up as famous figures from Mormon history in the Pacific. As in the Mountainwest, feasting forms a central aspect of Laie’s Pioneer Day activity. Instead of potlucks and barbecues, Laie residents of Tongan and Samoan descent head into the forest to hunt for wild pigs to bake underground in traditional imu parties. Or the village might turn out for a hukilau—a Hawaiian tradition in which a boat lays out a net into the ocean extending as a half-circle from the beach. Everybody then takes hold of a section of the net and walks toward the beach, scooping up fish that are then grilled and eaten.57

Pioneer Day.” According to Tracy E. Panek, “Life at Iosepa, Utah’s Polynesian Colony,” Utah Historical Quarterly 60, no. 1 (Winter 1992): 73: “Outside visitors came to celebrate with the colonists on August 28, the anniversary of Iosepa’s founding. Indians, the LDS First Presidency, and former missionaries to Hawaii gathered for ‘Hawaiian Pioneer Day’ festivities. A feast of poi and steamed pork followed baseball games that matched the colonists against their visitors. The evening showcased Polynesian music and traditional Island dances.”

57Eric Eliason interviews of Joni Spurrier, December 1997; Mike Smith, July 1997; Randall Allred, December 1997. At the time of these interviews, Spurrier was an ethnic Hawaiian from Laie studying at Brigham Young University—Provo. Mike Smith was a “haole” born in Laie, studying graduate linguistics at the University of Texas at Austin. Randall Allred was a BYU–Hawaii English professor on exchange at BYU–Provo during 1997-98.
In another example from the Pacific, a student of mine from Samoa remembered donning sunbonnets and lavalavas and pulling model wagons across the beach on Pioneer Day. This activity may seem silly, and some may call it a mindless surrender to American cultural pressures; but is it any sillier or any more of a cultural acquiescence than the Mesa Arizona Temple pageant where mostly white youth costume themselves as first-century Semitics from Palestine to enact the Easter story? Who would call this drama a capitulation to ancient Hebrew cultural imperialism?

**PIONEER DAY MULTICULTURALISM IN NORTH AMERICA**

In the United States, syncretic local adaptations have appeared as well. Kanosh, Utah, holds its largest annual civic celebration on the Twenty-fourth of July, under the name of “Community Day.” The Anglo-Mormon town of Kanosh is the nearest white settlement to the mostly non-LDS Native American reservation, many of whose residents do not have the same warm feelings about the arrival of the Mormon pioneers as their white Mormon neighbors. Rather than being the triumphant claiming of their ancestors’ religious freedom and the founding of a Mormon homeland, Pioneer Day, according to Kanosh’s Anglo-Mormon mayor, “is the day the interlopers came, as far as the Indians are concerned.” But “Community Day” draws participants from Kanosh, the reservation, and the Hispanic community. The elements of the celebration are much the same as for any other community—a parade, market fair, music, family reunions, barbecues—but public references to LDS pioneer heritage are avoided. Magrath, Alberta, was originally founded by Mormons but has shifted over the years to include an increasing percentage of other religions and irreligious people. Like Kanosh, it has kept its Twenty-fourth of July summer celebration but it has become less and less markedly Mormon.

Like Wyoming’s Big Horn Basin and Arizona’s Little Colorado River settlements, the villages of Sanford, Eastdale, and Manassa in

---

58Paia Palmer, a native of Samoa and BYU student, interviewed May 1999.

59Kanosh, Utah, mayor and informant, telephone interviewed by Eric Eliason, June 1995.

60Magrath, Alberta, community organizer and informant, telephone interviewed by Eric Eliason, June 1995.
Colorado's San Luis Valley constitute an "ethnic island" of Mormon culture well within the Hispanic culture region that extends from New Mexico into southern Colorado.\(^6\) Primarily Mormon when settled after the late 1870s, today the population of San Luis Valley is about half Anglo (mostly LDS) and about half Hispanic (mostly Catholic). Its full-blown Pioneer Day celebration draws about 10,000 people and enjoys such "big league" celebratory flourishes as F-16 fly-bys from a nearby Air Force base.\(^6\) Like all Pioneer Day parades, Manassa's includes floats made by non-Mormons on non-LDS themes, and local Catholics take full advantage of this openness, making Pioneer Day a combination Mormon parade/Catholic procession. Both religions display their symbols publicly in the same joint event. The organizers with whom I spoke were pleased that their celebration had come to reflect the diversity of the area. "We're glad the Mormon origins of Pioneer Day don't keep people of other faiths away. In fact . . . we're glad that the whole community sees it as a community day where we can express our unity and diversity."\(^6\)

A fuller understanding of the multiple views of both Mormons and Catholics in the San Luis Valley would require much more fieldwork, and it would be premature to draw firm conclusions from the few interviews I conducted. It is telling, however, that Mormon informants with civic responsibilities consciously portray their Pioneer Day celebrations as inclusive and multi-cultural.\(^6\)


\(^6\)Manassa, Colorado, Pioneer Day celebration organizational committee member and informant, telephone interviewed by Eric Eliason, June 1995.

\(^6\)Ibid.

\(^6\)According to Nostrand, *The Hispano Homeland*, unlike the geographically disassociated farmsteads and loose communities of other Anglos in the region, rural Mormons have traditionally been a communitarian "village people" like the Hispanics. Both Hispanics and Mormons established a homeland and made their own distinctive cultural imprint on the American West. Except for Native American nations, they
Unlike Mormon theology, whose content passes through strict hierarchical channels that maintain doctrinal uniformity even as Mormonism has spread across the globe, Pioneer Day celebrations, as an aspect of Mormon folk culture, are free to adapt and respond to local conditions. Popular stereotypes about rural whites might suggest that Pioneer Day celebrations would turn into Mormon “wagon circling.” Instead, Pioneer Day organizers in Kanosh and Manassa have followed a kind of from-the-ground-up multiculturalism to make a historically Mormon celebration open and responsive to all cultural groups within specific geographic locales. In contrast is the defiant attitude of the Protestant Orangemen in Northern Ireland who, during summer marching season, provocatively parade through what are now predominantly Catholic areas of town to celebrate Protestant victories over Catholics in years gone by. In Kanosh, celebration organizers have downplayed the Mormon roots of the celebration while Manassa’s Pioneer Day is a pastiche of religious and ethnic themes. In both communities, organizers seemed pleased with their efforts at inclusiveness rather than disappointed at the lack of “pure Mormonness” in their celebrations.

There are two possible reasons for this bottom-up multiculturalism in Pioneer Day celebrations. One is, of course, that going out of one’s way to offend and alienate people is counterproductive to the missionary goals of the Church as well as violating values of the restored gospel of Christ that Mormons seek to celebrate on Pioneer Day. Another possible reason is that Pioneer Day, despite its religious impetus, has long been expressed primarily in terms of celebration and festivity—activities that are, by their nature, expansive and adaptable. The parades, sporting events, feasting, and socializing that have characterized Pioneer Day since 1849 have long eclipsed in magnitude and enthusiastic participation the solemn speeches about remembering pioneer heritage that take place in the DUP hall or ward meeting houses. Reflecting this emphasis, my collection of flyers advertising Pioneer Day celebrations have traditionally highlighted the festive rather than the pious aspects of the holiday.

are probably the two most distinctive regional cultures in the West. The San Luis Valley is both cultural zones at once—an outpost of the Mormon culture region in the expanded Hispano culture region.
PIONEER REVERENCE IN COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE

The continuance of Pioneer Day celebrations begs the questions of what cultural desires they satisfy and what social functions they fulfill. One of the central contributions of folklore scholarship is the idea that examining the ways regular people understand and celebrate their own history as well as examining celebratory practices that are seemingly trivial from a great-moments-in-history perspective provide opportunities for significant cultural analysis. We can tell a great deal about Mormon identity by examining how we conceive of, and how and why we honor, our pioneer past. Pioneer Day celebrations in particular are a lens through which to focus on the issues facing Mormonism. Our pioneer past as a historical touchstone continues to appeal to us for what I call the “genesis reason” and the “exodus reason.”

Like many other groups, our peoplehood is emergent—formed in the forge of particular historical events which we continue to commemorate—hence, our “genesis.” Conversely our continuing commemoration is what maintains the particularities of this sense of group identity. The Great Trek from the Cape to the Transvaal by Afrikaners fleeing British encroachment in 1836 (trek, by the way, is an Afrikaans word that has made its way into English), the Long March of the Peoples’ Army for Communist Chinese, the middle passage for African Americans, and Mohammed’s flight from Mecca to Medina for Muslims are all examples of historical focal points whose ongoing special remembrance sustains a particular sense of group identity. It is through the interpretive stance that people take toward such touchstone events that new senses of shared peoplehood are formed. There can be no doubt that the Mormon religion emerged in Joseph Smith’s era, but Mormon ethnicity, if there is such a thing, emerged in Brigham Young’s time with the Mormon trek and its resultant sense of isolation.

The “exodus” reason has to do with the fact that Christians and Jews have always interpreted their own history in terms of the scriptural history that preceded them. This interpretive style, which Nephi employed in reading Isaiah to “liken all scriptures unto us . . . for our profit and learning” (1 Ne. 19:23) is called typology. In other words, people see the events happening in their own lives in terms of events they have read about in scripture. To greater and lesser degrees, they see themselves reliving sacred history. Despite higher criticism’s efforts to expose typology’s weaknesses as a critical
reading strategy, as Philip Barlow points out in his study of Mormons’ use of the Bible, typology remains one of the main ways in which believing peoples approach scripture to make sense of their own lives.65

We Mormons didn’t invent this process of Exodus identification as peoplehood formation; it is common among many groups. The Afrikaners did it, seeing their battles with indigenous Africans at Blood River and elsewhere in terms of ridding the promised land of pagan Canaanites.66 The Chinese communists, of course, didn’t exploit this possible parallel; but the Puritans did in their 1630s migration to New England. So did African Americans in their struggle for civil rights in the 1960s. Even the most cursory examination of the rhetoric of civil rights leaders will turn up Pharaoh, bondage, deliverance, and “chosen people” as central allegorical motifs. While many groups have practiced a typological hermeneutic, we Mormons have taken this art to an especially well-developed level. The Mississippi River freezing to let the Saints escape Nauvoo, the miracle of the quail, and Utah’s Jordan River connecting a fresh-water lake and salt-water lake all show that the pioneers did not overlook the parallels between their lives and the Israelite exodus. All this interpretive effort underscores our claim to be literal restored Israel. That Mormons view the pioneer past in these terms was underscored by the title and content of Elder Russell M. Nelson’s 1999 article “The Exodus Repeated.”67

**SEMANTIC EXPANSION OF THE TERM “PIONEER”**

It is important to realize that pioneer has not had a static semantic history. Eugene Campbell observed that the time window in which one might be classified as a pioneer expanded in the following manner:

In the Great Basin they [the Mormons] were no longer outcasts but “pioneers.” Although the term initially referred to members of

---


the 1847 advance company, Mormons who made the journey later the same year also came to be known as the “Pioneers of ’47.” And by the 1870s, virtually everyone who had “gathered to Zion” before the completion of the transcontinental railroad could lay claim to the title “pioneer.”

Between 1869 and about 1900, tens of thousands of Mormon immigrants continued to make great sacrifices to “gather” to Utah and join with their fellow Saints—but they took the train. According to many family traditions, these immigrants would often get out at stops, walk beside the train, then enter a more forward car just so they would be able to say that they too had “walked across the plains to Zion.” So even at this early date, the mystique of the pioneers had achieved a high level of resonance within LDS culture.

In the late twentieth century, pioneer underwent an even greater semantic expansion. This broadening can be witnessed by opening virtually any recent copy of the *Ensign* to discover “Pioneering in South Korea,” “Pioneers in the Bahamas,” or “Hong Kong Pioneers.” This semantic expansion of pioneer has been officially promoted by the Church and was a focus of the Church’s 1997 sesquicentennial celebration. Expanding the term beyond its traditional designation can be seen as attempts within Mormon culture

---

68Eugene E. Campbell, *Establishing Zion: The Mormon Church in the American West, 1847-1869* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1988), 1. The Utah Genealogical Society extends the pioneer designation by offering “Utah Pioneer Certificates” to two classes of people who can prove their pioneer ancestry: “Founding Pioneers” (July 1847-9 September 1850—the date of the arrival in Utah of the last organized party of Nauvoo Mormons) and “Territorial Pioneers” whose ancestors lived in Utah before statehood on 4 January 1896.


71Church administrator in the Office of the Presiding Bishopric, interviewed by Eric Eliason, January 1994.
to seal potential points of fissure within a community that has always valued equality and unity in faith.

Another issue facing reverence about pioneers in Mormon popular consciousness could be seen in the light of what Armand Mauss calls the “angel and beehive” dichotomy. On the one hand, Pioneer Day celebrations need to function as an essentially secular official holiday for the state of Utah, as civic festivals for Mormons and Gentiles alike. (Of course, the extent to which non-LDS Utahns have felt a connection with this holiday has always been somewhat problematic.) On the other hand, Pioneer Day has to function as a not necessarily theological but definitely religious celebration for the millions of Mormons around the world, by far the majority of whom do not have plains-crossing pioneer ancestry. Considering the multiple functional strains placed upon it, it is perhaps amazing that the holiday has survived at all.

CONCLUSION

Since they have been so resonant in the past, Pioneer Day in particular and pioneer adoration in general are especially telling places to look for the strains that international/multi-cultural experiences have exerted on LDS culture. Pioneer Day celebrations are the best-developed Mormon practice that is not theologically mandated. Unlike baptism, the standard works, or temple ceremonies, Pioneer Day is open to bottom-up reinterpretation and change.

The sesquicentennial trek year of 1997 breathed temporary life into pioneer-honoring traditions that have been in decline as a relative proportion of Mormon cultural activity. However, the worldwide growth of the Church has been so dramatic that the tradition seems to be growing in absolute if not proportional terms. This growth shows numerous and varied local adaptations that involve syncretic mixes of Utah Mormon with local history and culture. The emergence of local historical consciousness seems to be a major


factor in shaping local international pioneer day celebrations—sometimes, but not always, at the expense of remembering the North American history of the Church. For the most part, handcarts, gingham dresses, and Brigham Young impersonators are not rejected as symbols of cultural imperialism; they merely take a reduced place alongside symbols of local Mormon history according to local tastes and proclivities rather than politicized rejection of Americanism.

Except for 1997, the official Church has not especially emphasized Pioneer Day in recent years, but it has continued as a folk tradition on its own. Outside the Mormon culture region, there seem to be greatly varied levels of enthusiasm for Pioneer Day between wards and stakes, even in the same city. One ward may have an elaborate parade while another may have a picnic with a few ostensibly pioneer games. Yet another may have no celebration at all. The interests of individual leaders and organizers seem to play a large role in determining the shape of Pioneer Day on any given year.

Mormon Pioneer Day festivities are perhaps a manifestation of the LDS embrace of the goodness of God’s material creations and the anti-ascetic aesthetic with which Mormons have customarily approached the world. In its time of the year and in its method of celebration, Pioneer Day can rightly be seen as a Mormon version of the Fourth of July, but it is also in a very important way the Mormon Thanksgiving. Feasting and celebration in thanksgiving is the logical parallel to the equally religious act of fasting; as shown

74 My experience living numerous places outside Utah and the United States as the child of a U.S. Air Force pilot confirm this as did David Allred’s informal survey.

75Mormons thought of Pioneer Day not only in terms of the Exodus but of its antecedent Passover. In an 1884 oration, Judge Warren Dusenberry of Provo, Utah, said: “We commemorate the day with feast and festivity, as a sacred Passover and escape of the oppressed from their oppressors. We annually hail its return with joy and thanksgiving, because it is the anniversary of a triumph for religious liberty, and the laying of the foundation of a great commonwealth.” Journal History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (chronology of typed entries and newspaper clippings, 1830-present), 24 July 1884, 4; Archives, Family and Church History Department, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City.
by Pioneer Day celebrations, feasting is deemed by Mormons as wholly appropriate on religious grounds for certain occasions.

Pioneer Day celebrations and the festive attitude that Mormons hold them in are justified in the LDS scripture most applicable to the Mormon trek: Doctrine and Covenants 136:28: "If thou art merry, praise the Lord with singing, with music, with dancing, and with a prayer of praise and thanksgiving." Just exactly how we sing, and how we dance, and how we feast has undergone—and will continue to undergo—rethinking and adaptation as Mormons in their various communities around the world seek to be Latter-day Saints in multi-cultural contexts.

Reviewed by Gregory A. Prince

In updating and renaming his biography of J. Reuben Clark Jr., who served for three decades in the First Presidency, D. Michael Quinn has returned to the subject that first brought him to the attention of many—perhaps most—readers who since have followed his writings. Both editions of the biography have been unique among Latter-day Saint histories and biographies in that they reflect the unprecedented access to primary source material that Quinn was given. This access was due primarily to the fact that the biography was championed by Marion G. Romney, a Clark protegé who was then a counselor in the First Presidency. Although Quinn’s access was incomplete—for example, it did not include minutes of First Presidency meetings, and Quinn’s access to the massive David O. McKay office diary was limited to the years prior to Clark’s death—it allowed him to peruse data unavailable to any other writer before or since. He took full advantage of the situation. Working with the prodigious energy and enthusiasm for which he is well known, Quinn produced a heavily documented book whose 428 pages of text are followed by 169 pages of endnotes.

Elder Statesman differs from the earlier *J. Reuben Clark: The Church Years* in several significant ways. Consisting of the same number and types of chapters (the first five largely chronological, the last seven largely topical), it is 50 percent longer, though containing fewer photographs whose reproduction is of poorer quality. This difference is due mostly to the inclusion of material that he either chose to withhold or was asked to withhold from *Church Years*, and partly to the addition of material from secondary sources published since 1983. It expands upon significant topics whose treatment was muted in *Church Years*, most notably Clark’s strident and persistent anti-Semitism, which contrasted sharply with McKay’s approval of special proselytizing missions to the Jews. Clark becomes a more three-dimensional and believable, albeit less sympathetic figure, whose later years as a counselor to David O. McKay were often a stark and sad contrast to his earlier years with Heber J. Grant and George Albert Smith.

Quinn explains that he made “numerous deletions and revisions” in the published form of *Church Years* “so that it could be an officially approved biography” (vii), and takes exception to Francis M. Gibbons, a former secretary to the First Presidency, who recently charged that “the manuscript
as originally submitted probably would have had the approval of the modern warts-and-all school of biography” (viii). While Gibbons’s gratuitous dismissal of the original manuscript is distasteful, I was left with a less-than-sweet taste after reading *Elder Statesman*, a stark contrast to the positive reaction I had two decades earlier upon reading *Church Years*. My unexpectedly negative reaction was due partly to Quinn’s overuse of details in text and endnotes that seemed more to showcase his biases and his vast database than to assist in telling a balanced story. But the main reason was major analytical errors in several important areas relating to Clark’s interactions with David O. McKay, of whom Quinn is consistently and unjustifiably critical. These areas are McKay’s ecumenism, Clark’s so-called demotion in favor of Stephen L Richards, the subsequent “exclusion” of Clark from many First Presidency decisions, and McKay’s stand on the policy banning priesthood for blacks.

One of Clark’s least endearing traits was his lack of ecumenical feeling. Quinn describes (121-22) a battle over the airwaves between Clark and Monsignor Duane G. Hunt, the Roman Catholic bishop of Utah, that needlessly did great damage to relations between the two churches. Having been given airtime on KSL, the Church-owned radio station, in 1948, “[Hunt] infuriated President Clark by speaking on the primacy of the pope and defending the Holy See at Rome as the temporal repository of apostolic succession from the apostle Peter.” Rather than accept Hunt’s remarks as an understandable attempt to put his own church’s best foot forward (without attacking Mormonism), Clark wrongly “was convinced that Hunt had fired the first shot of a sectarian battle.” Clark thereupon shifted course and made his own talks over the same station direct attacks on Roman Catholicism. A year later, fanning the flames further, he added 220 pages of anti-Catholic polemics to his book, *On the Way to Immortality and Eternal Life* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1949). Quinn defends Clark and calls the church’s continued provision of airtime to the Catholic Church “a measure of the tolerance that existed between contending religions in Mormon-dominated Utah” (122).

A more accurate analysis, however, is that Clark did much to cause senseless intolerance between the two churches, creating a situation that required damage control by McKay, even while McKay was subordinate to Clark in the First Presidency. Monsignor Jerome Stoffel, who occasionally substituted for Hunt on the radio broadcasts, related that, although the LDS Church through Clark, who oversaw KSL, granted them airtime, KSL assigned them only a cramped studio rather than the spacious one used by Clark. One week, however, Stoffel was unexpectedly moved to Clark’s studio during a period of remodeling. After his broadcast he encountered Clark, who glowered at him as if to say, “What in the hell are you doing in my studio?” Stoffel contrasted the combative Clark, who escalated the animos-

1 Monsignor Jerome Stoffel, interviewed by Gregory A. Prince, 6 October
ity, to the pastoral McKay, who even before becoming president in 1951 worked to heal the wounds that Clark had needlessly inflicted and to engender increasing friendship and cooperation between the two churches.

Several months after Clark’s radio polemics began, McKay and Monsignor Hunt spoke by telephone about a controversial newspaper editorial. McKay recorded, “Bishop Hunt then said he thought when anything like this comes up that it is better to get in touch directly; that he did not want any misunderstanding.” 2 Four years later, to avoid any misunderstanding relating to a proposed Catholic high school in Ogden, Hunt paid McKay a courtesy call, after which McKay reported to a group of Ogden stake presidents, “I shall always respect Bishop Hunt and what he did the other day.” 3 When Stephen L. Richards died in 1959, Hunt attended the funeral, prompting this note from McKay: “When, from the rostrum I saw you and my esteemed friend [and Roman Catholic], John F. Fitzpatrick, sitting in the audience, paying tribute of respect to my departed friend and associate, Stephen L. Richards, I wanted to shake your hands in personal appreciation. Thank you for your attendance at Stephen L.’s funeral rites.” 4

When Hunt died a year later, McKay and Henry D. Moyle, his second counselor, went to the funeral mass, the first McKay had ever attended. Clark did not go, although perhaps ill health rather than ill feeling prevented him. At the conclusion of the service the new Catholic bishop, Joseph Federal, greeted McKay and Moyle and thanked them for attending the services. McKay recorded, “I was very favorably impressed with him.” McKay continued to build bridges to Roman Catholicism and other faiths throughout his tenure as president, and his death in 1970 was much mourned by Salt Lake City’s Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish clergy.

In a second area where I disagree with Quinn’s interpretation, Quinn makes much of the fact that David O. McKay, when newly ordained as president, called Stephen L. Richards to be his first counselor and Clark his second counselor, although Clark had served as first counselor to other presidents for eighteen years: “In the world of government where Reuben had received his administrative training, a shift of a man’s position from first to second assistant was a stark demotion. In all the history of the church LDS hierarchy, he thought, never before had a counselor in any quorum

1995, typed transcript of handwritten notes of the interview.

2David O. McKay, Office Diary, 2 March 1949, Special Collections, Marriott Library, University of Utah, Salt Lake City; extracts in my possession.

3Ibid., 28 February 1953.

4David O. McKay, Scrapbook No. 44, not paginated, Archives, Family and Church History Department, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City (hereafter LDS Church Archives).

5McKay, Office Diary, 5 April 1960.
been changed from first to second. Nor could he think of a single instance in a ward or stake where such a thing had happened” (146).

There is no question that Clark and many of his friends were deeply disturbed that he was not retained as first counselor, and Quinn quotes several of Clark’s protégés among the Quorum of the Twelve who expressed their displeasure:

Apostle Benson wrote in his diary, “There was expressed a feeling ‘It will kill Brother Clark’ and also ‘The people will not be reconciled.’” That evening several members of the Twelve paid unannounced visits to the Clark home to commiserate directly with Reuben. He “assured us that he would never do anything to cause a break between the Twelve and Pres. McKay and would try his best to be a good counselor, despite the humiliation that was inescapable.” Clark’s reassurance about not causing a split was significant. It reflected the loyalty he saw in his protégés and the severity of dissent they had expressed against the new president’s decision. (147)

Yet both Quinn and Clark ignored a tenet of institutional Mormonism far more durable and important than retention of rank—the fact that at the release or death of any presiding officer, the presiding council is automatically dissolved and the counselors are thus released. (This is in contrast to the Quorum of the Twelve, where tenure is life-long.) If they are again called to serve as counselors, such a decision is at the pleasure of the new presiding officer. Clark, having served as an ambassador, understood that certain government positions, including that of ambassador, are granted strictly at the pleasure of the U.S. President and are not a function of accumulated rank or tenure within the government. Thus he, perhaps more than anyone else in the Church, should have understood that McKay was well within his rights as the new president to call him as either first or second counselor or even to release him altogether from the First Presidency. (Indeed, at McKay’s death, Harold B. Lee, a Clark protégé who effectively headed the Church during the tenure of the ailing Joseph Fielding Smith, released Hugh B. Brown outright from the First Presidency, something that had not occurred in nearly a century. Quinn fails to mention either this incident, or the grace and dignity with which Brown and the Church in general accepted it.) Neither Clark nor his friends had justification within Church law to dispute the decision, yet Quinn perpetuates the mistake of portraying McKay as perpetrator and Clark as victim. McKay’s choice of Stephen L. Richards as his first counselor flowed naturally from their decades-long close friendship, and from Richards’s twenty-one-year seniority to Clark as an apostle. Indeed, throughout McKay’s presidency his first counselor (he had four) always had greater apostolic seniority than his second counselor.

The third area in which I disagree with Quinn’s interpretation is his criticism of McKay for making First Presidency decisions with Richards, in Clark’s absence:

Aside from occasionally excluding Reuben altogether from administrative
decisions, President McKay more often neutralized his dissonant counselor by forging an administrative juggernaut with first counselor Richards. For example, if Clark objected to the philosophy or content of a proposed statement, presidents McKay and Richards dropped the subject for the balance of the meeting. After Reuben left the room, they then asked a secretary to type the statement in final form, which they presented to him with their two signatures already in place. Further comment was unthinkable at that point and Reuben silently accepted the inevitable: "I therefore attached my signature." (158)

Although using emotion-charged words such as "neutralized" and "administrative juggernaut" to describe the situation as it applied to McKay, Quinn describes but twice passes over matter-of-factly the same situation when it occurred during the George Albert Smith administration, and McKay was the one left out:

For months President Smith had tried to ease his administrative burdens. For example, he had begun consulting alone with Reuben prior to the meetings of the entire First Presidency. This allowed the formal meetings to conclude in half an hour. But this also amounted to an exclusion of second counselor McKay. (127)

In addition, when Smith's health declined, Reuben shortened the presidency's formal meetings to thirty minutes by deciding all agenda items with the LDS president in advance. This left McKay to attend pro forma meetings in which his views didn't matter since the other two had already made up their minds about every item on the agenda. (144)

Furthermore, Quinn gives the erroneous impression that Clark’s isolation within the First Presidency occurred from the outset. The quote above, "I therefore attached my signature," occurred in 1959, after eight years of well-documented pessimism and even insubordination (314) on Clark's part. Furthermore, Quinn quotes Ernest L. Wilkinson in such a way as to make it appear that McKay was second-guessing his choice of Clark as a counselor at the time it occurred (1951), when in fact McKay's comment to Wilkinson came nearly a decade later:

McKay shrank from the prospect of having the administratively somber Clark continue to have ascendance over a counselor who shared the church president's views. Finally he prayerfully made a decision that he explained to a church educator [Wilkinson] who was critical of Reuben's negativism: "How do you think I have gotten along with him? If I ever had any inspiration it was when I selected Stephen L Richards as my first counselor, against all precedent." (145; Wilkinson's diary entry is 28 April 1960.)

These anachronisms are highly misleading; if intentional, they betray a bias unbefitting a scholar of Quinn's experience.

Quinn spends twenty pages discussing the ban on priesthood ordination of blacks of African origin and the related topic of civil rights in the United States. At times from 1947 onward, Clark advocated for these men either quasi-priesthood functions or segregated “Afrikan Branches” (354). McKay
did not approve of such changes, causing Quinn to write simplistically that “the inescapable conclusion is that President McKay opposed allowing any independence to black Mormons” (355). This is an inaccurate and unfair assessment of a man who, in fact, agonized for years over the subject and took the matter to the source—the Lord—on several occasions.

McKay’s trip to South Africa in 1954 came in response to repeated requests from the South African mission president that began several years previously and was specifically for the purpose of assessing the situation there vis-à-vis the problem of the ban on ordination. While Quinn correctly writes that, during a missionary conference, McKay changed an important policy by rescinding the requirement of proving all-white ancestry by pedigree (356), he makes it sound as if this change was an on-the-spot administrative decision. Such was not the case, as indicated in McKay’s letter to his counselors: “After careful observation and sincere prayer, I felt impressed to modify the present policy of compelling every man to prove by tracing his genealogy that he has no trace in his blood of negro ancestry.”

That impression lingered with him, and appears to have caused an important change in his view of the ban on ordination. A few weeks after returning from South Africa, he met privately with Sterling McMurrin and said:

“As far as I am concerned, it is not now nor has it ever been a doctrine of this church that the Negroes are under a divine curse. We believe that we have scriptural precedent”—by which he meant a passage in the Pearl of Great Price—“for withholding the priesthood from Negroes, but they will eventually receive it. This is not a matter of doctrine. It is simply a practice and it is going to change.”

Viewing the ban as a policy susceptible to change—albeit one requiring a revelation—in contrast to the doctrine that Brigham Young had announced it to be was a major shift in McKay’s thinking, setting him apart from his predecessors. On other occasions, he affirmed privately that the priesthood ban was a policy and not a doctrine and was thus subject to change. However, there is no record that he ever discussed the subject with either Richards or Clark. It is certain that he did not discuss it with later counselors in the First Presidency, as events in 1968 and 1969 disclosed, yet on multiple occasions—and as late as 1968—he took the matter to the Lord, each time

---

receiving either no response or a negative response. While one may speculate about why there was no revelation during McKay’s lifetime, there is no doubt about his earnestness in seeking one. Quinn’s offhanded dismissal of McKay’s concern about this matter is an inaccurate and unjust treatment of the man who did more to prepare for the 1978 revelation to Spencer W. Kimball than any other Church President.

In spite of these errors in analysis, Elder Statesman is an important book and will likely stand as the definitive Clark biography, particularly if the source material available to Quinn remains inaccessible to others. But it should have been better.


Reviewed by Lowell “Ben” Bennion

This atlas carries no “third edition” designation, perhaps because Oxford University Press rather than Harper & Row published it. But to appreciate fully the newness of the New Historical Atlas of Religion in America, one must compare it with the 1962 and 1976 editions produced by pioneering historian Edwin S. Gaustad. The new atlas has a somewhat larger format and roughly two and a half times the length (and weight!) of the earlier editions. More importantly, almost all of the newly designed 310 charts and maps appear in color rather than black-and-white, thanks to the skill of Kelly Graphics in Maryland and the cartographic technology available at Indiana University–Purdue University at Indianapolis.

Less evident than the revised and expanded set of graphics but equally significant is the completely rewritten and greatly enlarged text—a task undertaken by historian and MHA member Philip L. Barlow in collaboration with Gaustad. The first edition cost only $8.95, but the superb quality of

both the writing and the new and revised maps justify the high cost of this third edition and make it much more readable than most reference books.

The authors assert in the first sentence of their preface that “anyone hoping to comprehend religion in its historical context ignores geography at severe peril” (xxi). Geographers like me can only admire and envy the skill with which these two historians have applied the space-place perspectives of my profession to reconstruct the changing distribution of almost every denomination that has graced the American religious landscape during the two centuries before and after 1800 (Parts 1 and 2). Here and there they reflect the American tendency to equate geography with the physical environment, but generally they stress the importance of understanding that “chosen people, promised lands, sanctified cities, sacred rivers, taboo forests, holy mountains, hallowed directions—all suggest an intricate mesh of religion and ‘interpreted space’” (xxi). The first paragraph of the first section on “Mormons” illustrates this point nicely and serves as a fair sample of the authors’ writing style:

The notion of place is built into the very origins and theology of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Beyond even the Bible—and precisely because it is so biblically interwoven—the Book of Mormon is saturated with land consciousness from its opening narratives. Similarly, both sacred time and sacred space attach to Mormon temples and, historically, to such key Mormon concepts as “Zion” and “gathering.” (232)

Mormon History Association members should appreciate, as an added bonus, the fact that one of three in-depth case studies—another new section of the atlas (Part 3)—features the Mormons, “the country’s most distinctive and prominent ‘home-grown’ religion” (283). The other two are the Lutherans and Catholics. A few of the LDS/RLDS maps in this and the preceding section appear in the Historical Atlas of Mormonism (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1994), but Gaustad and Barlow have improved their cartographic design. They also have juxtaposed for the first time anywhere and at the same scale, the “Promised Lands” of Palestine and an inverted Utah, making it much easier to visualize and compare the two pairs of salty and fresh water seas, each connected by a Jordan River (Figure 3.16).

For some reason the authors omitted D. W. Meinig’s classic 1965 map of “The Mormon Culture Region.” But Figure 3.22 compensates in part for this omission and updates Meinig’s map by demonstrating “that Mormonism is the largest, next-largest, or third-largest denomination in three-fourths of all U.S. counties west of Denver.” Although they don’t suggest the idea, the Gaustad/Barlow version of the Mormon culture region invites comparison with the “Proposed State of Deseret” (Figure 3.15), which it now approximates in area. Dominant as the Mormon culture region remains in governing and supporting the church’s membership, Figure 3.23 charts the crucial “countervailing trend” of its rapid global expansion since 1960. “To point this out is not merely to engage in demographic acrobatics: these trends are changing Mormonism’s very character” (305).
Gaustad and Barlow repeatedly recognize the crucial role of migration in shaping America’s religious mosaic, but in one instance they perpetuate the common notion that poor, persecuted Protestants dominated the flow of German immigrants to British North America. They indicate that only deprived and oppressed German Reformed and Lutherans left the Rhineland for New York in 1708-10 (29, 47). In fact, an equal number of Roman Catholics landed in London at the same time, only to be informed by British authorities that they must convert to the Church of England or return to their homeland. Most of them returned. Frequent English recruitment of settlers from German states, even by a relatively tolerant William Penn, ruled out invitations to non-Protestants.

Part 4 of the atlas, also entirely new, briefly treats “Broader Perspectives”—subjects designed to suggest the broad range of topics that can be analyzed profitably by means of maps. Here Gaustad and Barlow reach beyond U.S. borders to consider how patterns of church membership in Canada resemble and differ from those within this country. “In both nations church membership is higher in the East than in the ‘younger’ West” (327). But Canada, with only one-tenth as many people as the United States, has proportionately fewer denominations. In addition to considering camp meetings and place names, this section touches upon the complex relations of politics and religion, religion and higher education, and even belief and unbelief.

Unlike the earlier editions, the reincarnated atlas considers the significance of “Denominational Predominance in U.S. History.” Perhaps the most striking pattern to emerge from the set of maps featured in the conclusion is the degree to which the Baptist, Lutheran, Methodist, and Roman Catholic faiths have eclipsed the Colonial “Big Three”—Congregationalist, Episcopal, Presbyterian (compare Figure C.1 with Figures C.10, C.11, and C.14). These geographical changes have resulted from each denomination’s unique history, but they’re also related to what the atlas terms “ten distinguishing traits of American religion.”

These characteristics are “individualism, overriding a countervailing communalism; experimentalism, producing new revelations, new denominations, and a host of new interpretations; a consequent radical diversity, created also by ... immigration on a scope unprecedented in human history; primitivism, an effort to return ... to the faith of the Old Testament and the New, and even to primeval Native American spirituality and African tribal religion; nativism, not merely in the form of episodic xenophobia and hostility to immigrants, but ... involving a pride in and a sense of superiority about things ‘American’; probabilism, meaning that Americans ... have repeatedly chosen the path of greater liberty; denominationalism, in the sense that many American ecclesiastical organizations ... have made no claim to be the ‘church universal,’ but only a portion thereof; volatility, or exceptionally rapid change, and a comparative vitality; fideism, for all the celebration and lamentation ... about religion’s decline in recent decades ... , Americans are
Distinguishing the fifteen different shades of color on these maps is not too difficult, but differentiating all of the twenty-five colors on the foldout map in the back pocket, even with its larger size, taxes my aging eyes. A brief but critical introductory section underscores the cautions readers should exercise in “Interpreting the Maps and Graphs” (xvii-xix). Most will find the pre-1800 dot maps showing numbers of churches easier to read than the post-1800 maps depicting numbers of churches per county, partly because the atlas does not include any distribution maps for the population as a whole. And on the color-loaded “regional denominational predominance” maps, the smaller or more localized faiths such as the Jewish are difficult to locate and visualize. The maps of Conservative, Orthodox, and Reformed Judaism—roughly equal in size and similar in distribution as of 1990 (see Figures 2.134-36)—reveal the general patterns. But they do not convey the striking concentration of Jews at the top end of the U.S. urban hierarchy as clearly as, say, the smaller dot map depicting the Jewish population’s distribution in the National Geographic’s 1993 edition of the Historical Atlas of the United States (59).

These kinds of cartographic complaints pale in comparison to the overall impact and importance of this new atlas. The Association of American Publishers has already named it the Best Single-Volume Reference Book in the Humanities for 2001. Moreover, the conservative national weekly, Christianity Today, rates it as “one of the top 5 reference books ever published.”

With less than 5 percent of the atlas devoted to Mormonism, why should LDS/Community of Christ readers in general or Journal of Mormon History subscribers in particular purchase and peruse this expensive new atlas? To paraphrase the German poet Goethe, I would argue that only by studying and understanding other religions (or languages) can we comprehend our own. I know of no better source for the comparative study of American religions than the Gaustad/Barlow atlas. If and when the LDS Church decides to add such a course to its curriculum (perhaps at the Institute level) to support its newly proclaimed “Doctrine of Inclusion” (Ensign, November 2001, 35-38), this volume could serve as a splendid text.

Gaustad and Barlow conclude their new atlas with a provocative geographical thought for Mormons as well as Americans to ponder. “A people well into its third century of national life and now entering a new millennium may frame the central question of religious geography thus: By what latitude and longitude does one locate the spiritual center of American life?” (394)

To promote the historical and geographical study of religion in America, maybe Brigham Young University’s Joseph Fielding Smith Institute for far more likely to believe in God . . . than are citizens of . . . virtually any other industrialized nation; American religion has in many ways been subject to the destiny of American geography” (392-93; ellipses between items and italics omitted).
Latter-day Saint History Institute or some other group can commission Philip Barlow to produce a new Historical Atlas of Mormonism, with photos added to enhance a dazzling array of maps and graphs. Perhaps the influential Journal of Mormon History and its Mormon History Association parent can contribute to such a project by encouraging the notion that pictures—meaning graphics of every kind—can matter as much as words in the telling of Mormon history, especially when visuals and text are artfully integrated.

BEN BENNION {ldbscb@mstar2.net} is professor emeritus of geography at Humboldt State University, Arcata, California, retired to Salt Lake City. His most recent Mormon Studies publication is “Mormondom's Deseret Homeland,” in Homelands: A Geography of Culture and Place across America, edited by Richard L. Nostrand and Lawrence E. Estaville (Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001), chap. 12.


Reviewed by Polly Aird

Like Noah's ark, this volume gathers on its decks a group of individuals whose stories, told together, are too important to be lost in the floodwaters of Mormon history. And like the ark, a surprising variety is aboard. The men and women whose short biographies compose this book have not fit the Mormon norm, but just for that reason, their stories can enrich the reader's life. Most of their names will be familiar to students of Mormonism, but the collection here brings out freshly and movingly the diversity of thought and experience of individuals who, whether converts or born in the Mormon faith, have struggled to find a place in it for themselves.

Lavina Fielding Anderson. All except two of these essays have been published before, six in *Dialogue*, and three in the *Journal of Mormon History*. The two new contributions are Brigham Madsen on Sterling McMurrin and Lavina Fielding Anderson on D. Michael Quinn. Collecting these essays in one volume brings out in strong relief the broad range of reasons for dissent. And, as the editors write in the introduction, “While it can be fairly stated that these individuals constitute a small part of the larger story of Mormonism, to leave them out of the story would be unfortunate because they are the salt in the stew. The right amount flavors the whole” (ix).

These Mormon mavericks—men and women who have taken an independent stand in thought or action—found it hard to conform to the expectations of the Church leaders. Approximately half left the Church permanently, and half stayed, usually remaining loyal to the parts of Mormonism they loved and ignoring what made no sense to them. As the editors write, “While each case is obviously different, all of them seem to have been motivated by the desire to promote truth in the face of falsehood. Whether or not they were correct or succeeded in their endeavor is up to each of us to decide in light of our own beliefs and values” (x). The exception to the seeking for truth might be James Strang, who appears to have been driven by dreams of grandeur and declared himself king after the death of Joseph Smith.

In spite of the editors’ statement that the biographies are arranged chronologically (ix), it is not true in the first half of the book. For instance, the Stenhouses, who did not emigrate from Great Britain until 1855 and reached the peak of their disillusionment in the 1870s, are placed before James Strang, who converted to Mormonism in 1844, just a few months before Joseph Smith was killed, and who then claimed to be Smith’s legitimate successor. It is surprising that Strang, William Smith (younger brother of Joseph), and John E. Page (an early apostle) are not grouped together, as the latter two joined Strang for a period after the death of Joseph Smith. Amasa Lyman would also seem more logically placed near the Stenhouses, as both joined the Godbeite Movement.

That somewhat confusing arrangement and the sorry lack of an index aside, the heart of the volume lies in the stories of the people and what caused their troubles within the Church. With some it was theological: Amasa Lyman believed that the individual was saved by moral progression rather than Christ’s atonement or an organized church; and John E. Page came to see the Book of Mormon as central and that spiritual life should be inner directed rather than outer directed by a prophet. For others, it was their inability to accept the Church’s changed direction: William Smith, as brother of the Prophet, expected to have full rights as Church Patriarch; and Moses Thatcher refused to give up the Doctrine and Covenants statement that one had free agency in political matters, even though subsequent presidencies had modified that. Brigham Young’s economic policy was at least part of T. B. H. Stenhouse’s disillusionment. Fawn Brodie’s search to understand her own doubts led her to repudiate Joseph Smith as a prophet.
Polygamy figured in at least three instances: Fanny Stenhouse, Samuel Taylor, and Sarah Pratt. Samuel Taylor, described as Mormondom's Mark Twain (307), delighted in seeking out stories the Church would rather bury, especially about polygamy. Sarah Pratt felt embittered by Joseph Smith's marriage proposal, by subsequent slanderous accusations that she was an unfaithful wife, and then by her husband Orson Pratt's taking nine new plural wives.

Four essays were particularly touching to me. First was Juanita Brooks's unflinching position of loyal dissent in tackling the forbidden subject of the Mountain Meadows Massacre. Second was Thomas Stuart Ferguson's unwavering efforts for a quarter of a century to prove definitively the truth of the Book of Mormon through archeology, only to conclude that his life's work had been in vain. Still he found value in his religion, especially in the "fraternity" of Mormonism (269). Third was the account of Sterling McMurrin who stood firmly for the individual's right to freedom of thought and intellectual integrity, and sought continually to improve Mormonism and make it more available to others. Author Levi Peterson, in his description of Juanita Brooks, captures what makes these three and others in the volume so salient to the Church and the reader: "She embodied more clearly than any other Mormon a crucial principle: that a person who took exception to established authority was not necessarily disloyal to Mormonism: that indeed, such a person might induce a vital and salutary improvement within that religion" (237).

Most important to me is the poignant journey of the talented D. Michael Quinn. His story is the Greek tragedy of this collection. Doomed by his talent as a historian who believes in the importance of looking into "the silences and spaces of the past" (350) and his admission of homosexuality, he will never be acceptable to the Church he loves. The Church's refusal to be more inclusive leaves me wondering how it will fare in the long run when so many new converts come from cultures with widely different mores and values. Will such converts find a lasting home in this Church that demands conformity to the Utah hierarchy's ideal?

Mormon Mavericks follows the basic pattern set by Differing Visions: Dissenters in Mormon History, edited by Roger D. Launius and Linda Thatcher (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1994), which consists of seventeen biographical essays, all previously unpublished. Two of the individuals included are also treated in Mormon Mavericks: William Smith and Fawn McKay Brodie. Both books can profitably share space on one's shelf. It is my hope that more volumes may follow. I would welcome consideration of such people as George D. Watt, John Hyde, and such lesser-known, common folk as George A. Hicks, Stephen Forsdick, and Charles Derry. Each has a voice that should not be lost; each can add to one's understanding not only of the development of the church but also of one's own spiritual journey.
POLLY AIRD (pollyaird@earthlink.net) is an independent historian who is working on a biography of Mormon maverick Peter McAuslan.


Reviewed by Thomas G. Alexander

As a young missionary in Freiburg, Germany, I will never forget the impression left on my soul by the biblical phrase carved on one of the university buildings. It says, “Die Wahrheit Wird Euch Frei Machen.” In English, the full passage from which the stone masons excerpted that passage reads: “Then said Jesus to those Jews which believed on him. If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed: And ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free” (John 8:31-32). I have tried to use that scripture as a measure of my success in research and writing. Truth is the only standard good enough for the Church and profession to which I belong.

I am pleased to report that Kathryn Daynes applied the same standard in More Wives Than One. Like any good scholar, she mastered those secondary works that have furnished historians with their understanding of plural marriage to the present time. Then she has researched the primary literature as well. On the basis of such readings, she has first provided us with an overview of the history of Mormon marriage practices. Not content with generalizations from literary sources, however, she has tested her conclusions through an exhaustive statistical analysis of the entire population of Manti, a representative central Utah town. Unlike most previous studies which have focused on a single year for such towns, however, she has used census data together with church, family, and personal records to reconstruct the marital histories of virtually the entire Manti population over the period from 1850 through 1900.

In large part because of its scope and depth, readers will quickly recognize More Wives than One as the standard by which they will measure all studies of Mormonism’s nineteenth-century marriage system. Although Daynes has drawn on such publications as Kimball Young’s Isn’t One Wife Enough (New York: Henry Holt, 1954); Stanley Ivins’s “Notes on Mormon Polygamy,” Western Humanities Review 10 (Summer 1956): 229-39; Lawrence Foster’s Religion and Sexuality: The American Communal Experiments of the Nineteenth Century (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981); Jessie L. Embry’s Mormon Polygamous Families: Life in the Principle (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1987); and Richard Van Wagoner’s Mormon Polygamy: A History, 2d ed. (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1989), the range of her book both revises and extends conclusions in these and other studies.
She agrees that polygamy originated with Joseph Smith and that it declined after 1890. Like Todd Compton (In Sacred Loneliness: The Plural Wives of Joseph Smith [Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1997]) and others, she found that some of the marriages were polyandrous, though she argues persuasively that these were few in number. She agrees with observers like B. Carmon Hardy (Solemn Covenant: The Mormon Polygamous Passage [Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1992]) and D. Michael Quinn ("LDS Church Authority and New Plural Marriages, 1890-1904," Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought 18 [Spring 1985]: 9-105) that polygamy persisted after 1890. She shows, however, that it was in decline by that date. Most significantly, her statistics show that the decline began in the 1870s.

In spite of the deferential tone with which she approaches Stanley Ivins's work, she shows rather conclusively that Ivins's analysis is seriously flawed. In part because of the sources he used, Ivins argued that the incidence of Mormon polygamy increased during times of stress. Daynes shows that he was right about the increase during the Mormon Reformation of 1856-57, but that, instead of increasing, plural marriage declined dramatically during the 1870s and 1880s as the federal government applied additional pressure on the Latter-day Saints.

She argues, however, in one of her most significant contributions, that the decline came only in part because of such pressure. The change in social and religious conditions in the Mormon community itself drove down the incidence of plural marriage much more surely than did federal pressure. During the 1850s, impoverished immigrant women and widows tended to enter polygamy in large numbers, in part because of religious teachings, but also in search of security. As Utah prospered, especially after the arrival of the transcontinental railroad in 1869, the percentage of such women in the Mormon community declined and with it the percentage who entered plural marriage.

In spite of her disagreement with Ivins on some matters, Daynes also agrees with the correctives he and others supplied to erroneous perceptions about plural marriage. Mormons instituted polygamy for religious reasons, not because of a surplus of women. In fact, during the Reformation of the 1850s, as religious pressure led to an increased number of plural marriages, the marriages of girls in their early teens increased apace as men sought to find partners in a society of short supply. In addition, although the percentage of polygamous families varied over time, in the period between 1850 and 1900 it was never as low as the 2 to 3 percent figure that missionaries are often taught to recite to the curious. By using a complete data set of all families in Manti, Daynes not only demolishes the reported 2 to 3 percent participation rate but also shows that the nineteenth-century perception held by anti-Mormons of a pervasive polygamous community is false. Her statistics show that the percentage of men, women, and children living in polygamous families increased during the 1850s, but declined startlingly thereafter. The percentage of people in polygamous families in Manti increased from 24.9 percent in 1850 to 43.1 percent 1860. Thereafter
it declined to 36 percent in 1870, 25.1 percent in 1880, and 7.1 percent in 1900 (101). Unfortunately the fire which burned the 1890 census returns made it impossible for Daynes to do the analysis for that year; but from other sources, she concludes that it probably declined during the 1880s as well.

Daynes also offers a thorough analysis of patterns of divorce. She agrees with Eugene and Bruce Campbell and Phillip Kunz that the incidence of divorce in polygamous marriages was higher than among monogamists. The data are problematic, however, because lax marriage and divorce laws in nineteenth-century Utah make analysis difficult. Utah apparently became a haven for divorce seekers during the late nineteenth century much as Nevada did during the 1930s and '40s. She shows, however, that the divorce rate was higher for plural wives than for first wives.

Moreover, in addition to demolishing Ivins's neatly constructed crisis theory, Daynes raises serious questions about the Campbells' theory that "Mormon polygamy developed within a context of normlessness or anomie [with a conspicuous] lack of regulations in the social structure including the marriage and family system" (189). On the contrary, she has persuaded me that "rules on marriage and divorce were lenient . . . not because these rules 'developed within a context of normlessness,' . . . but because the church’s policy, like policy elsewhere in mid-nineteenth century America, was to encourage marriage and to minimize barriers to it" (193). Significantly, most who divorced remarried, many in polygamous relationships.

Her concluding paragraph masterfully ties together the themes of this important volume:

The church had never advocated the practice of plural marriage outside of Mormon strongholds. As the nineteenth century waned, the monogamous family proved more suitable for Utah Saints seeking economic opportunities outside Mormon communities as well as for converts remaining in their homelands. In the Victorian middle-class nuclear family, the church found a family form conducive to social acceptance, increased geographic mobility of its members, and the inculcation of Mormon doctrines and practices. As communities became more diverse and secular, the Mormon home increasingly became a refuge from the outside world, and women were exalted as angel-mothers who taught their children religious precepts and disciplined wayward conduct. The Saints successfully adapted the American nineteenth-century family ideal to their own uses, although the church increasingly faces the challenge of how to incorporate within that ideal growing numbers of single, divorced, and widowed men and women as well as less-than-wealthy women who do not fit the stay-at-home model. In general, however, the ideal of eternal family relationships combined with the adapted Victorian family form has proved remarkably successful in retaining members and making new converts. While consistently emphasizing the eternal nature of marriage sealings since the 1840s, the church has adapted both plural marriage and Victorian middle-class monogamy to changing needs. (214)

The scope of Kathryn Daynes's book is truly breathtaking and richly
merits being honored by the Utah State Historical Society and the Mormon History Association’s “Best Book Award” for 2001. Clearly, this book is absolutely essential for anyone who wants to understand Mormonism’s nineteenth-century marriage relationships.

THOMAS G. ALEXANDER is the Lemuel Hardison Redd Jr. Professor of Western American History at Brigham Young University.


Reviewed by Susan Sessions Rugh

This handy guide will fit perfectly into your glove box or backpack on your next trip to Kirtland or Nauvoo. Authored by BYU Church history professors, *Sacred Places* will be a valuable resource to pilgrims seeking facts about Church history sites in Ohio and Illinois. This volume is part of a larger series edited by LaMar C. Berrett that aims to serve as a guide to “the many places made sacred by the faith and testimonies of past generations of Saints” (vii). It provides a broader scope and a more scholarly treatment of historic sites than other guidebooks for the LDS audience, so it will be of interest to amateur historians as well as tourists. Notably, the book discusses sites of special importance to members of the Community of Christ, not just Mormons.

The book is divided into two sections, with the first hundred pages introducing the Mormon experience in Kirtland, Ohio, and its surrounding region. The bulk of the book focuses on historic sites in Illinois, including twelve self-guided tours of Nauvoo, complete with precise directions and photos. Each section contains a brief guide to places in Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois visited by Zion’s Camp. Particularly interesting are lengthy entries, such as essays on the Kirtland and Nauvoo temples. Cannon’s discussion of the Hancock County settlements surrounding Nauvoo will enable the reader to appreciate the extent of Mormon migration to and from Illinois. The text is highly detailed, listing prominent events and persons for each site. It is unfortunate that more of the “bigger picture” could not be included, such as the important fact that the town of Ramus once numbered over 400 persons, and was the second largest Mormon settlement next to Nauvoo.

The guidebook’s format—numbered sites, symbols, and bold-faced type for significant people and events—facilitates its easy use. Detailed maps of Kirtland and Nauvoo supplement the text, but the presbyopic may need a magnifying glass to read the fine print. The book is chock full of smaller
maps of counties and significant sites to further assist the reader. It can be exciting for an ordinary pilgrim to find an ancestor’s name in the guide, and the index makes it easy to look up a person or event and locate it in the text.

Modern travel guides are descendants of the WPA state guides of the 1930s, and this one is no exception with its overviews and self-guided tours. Any guide or map creates an imaginary universe simply by including geographic points of interest. If a site is not on the map, most travelers will not know it exists. By providing information not found in the auto club or Rand McNally guide, guides for the Mormon tourist thus create an alternate universe. The tight focus on Mormon history may lead us to a deceptively simple interpretation of places, seeing them only as significant to our own past and not appreciating them in the broader geographical and historical context into which Mormon history was woven. That said, the authors do supply information on Abraham Lincoln sites in Springfield, Illinois, and on the city of Chicago, although trying to reduce that city’s guide to two pages borders on the ludicrous. Because a short guide like this cannot do justice to the broader setting, tourists should take along that Rand McNally tour guide, after all.

Any guide is only as good as its sources, and the authors of this guide are to be praised for sharing with us their years of lecture notes and research files on church history. The list of sources is impressive but at times the sources are outdated. For example, the entry on Patty Sessions cites Frank Esshom’s *Pioneers and Prominent Men of Utah* (1913), not Donna T. Smart’s authoritative edition of Sessions’s diaries (1997). And the reference to the Amish in Ohio relies on Milton V. Backman Jr.’s *American Religions and the Rise of Mormonism* (1965), not recent excellent work on that group.

The tourist will not be much interested in the documentation, but it may frustrate the scholar. Instead of the conventional use of author and date, the guide supplies a long list of abbreviations that can be humorous but not memorable. Who would guess that IBMW refers not to a computer manual or a sports car but to Richard L. Anderson’s *Investigating the Book of Mormon Witnesses*? My other quibble is the sometimes distracting use of bold-faced type, such as: “Many spiritual experiences took place in the Nauvoo Temple” (180) or “Oliver [Cowdery] was also active in politics” (73).

Now that the Nauvoo Temple is a major tourist destination, I predict that this guide will become indispensable to the steady stream of Saints reverse-crossing the prairies in their minivans. Perhaps the best measure of its usefulness will be the book’s dishevelment as pages are dog-eared and the cover is smeared with dribbles of ice cream. When the children tire of being enlightened about their ancestors, you can always use it to swat those hungry Midwestern mosquitoes.

SUSAN SESSIONS RUGH {susan_rugh@byu.edu} is associate professor of history at Brigham Young University and author of *Our Common Country: Family Farming, Culture, and Community in the Nineteenth-Century Midwest* (Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, 2001), about those who resisted the Mormons in Illinois.

Reviewed by Thomas W. Murphy

Terryl L. Givens, professor of English at the University of Richmond, Virginia, enters the stormy field of Book of Mormon studies with an examination of why generations of believers and skeptics have taken the Book of Mormon seriously. *By the Hand of Mormon* is a courageous and valuable contribution to our varied understandings of the Book of Mormon. His refreshing intent is not to argue for or against the truth of the Book of Mormon or Joseph Smith’s account of it. Rather, he offers the wider public an overview of the “tempestuous career” of an American scripture as a sign of a young man’s prophetic calling.

Givens finds the Book of Mormon to be “the most religiously influential, hotly contested, and, in the secular press at least, intellectually underinvestigated book in America” (6). His study surveys the Book of Mormon’s origins, packaging by detractors and proponents, variable relationships to LDS belief and practice, shifting status among scholars and theologians, and potential impact on Christian canonical concepts. He examines the casting of the text as “sign of the end of times, litmus test of prophetic authority, Rosetta stone of Mesoamerican civilizations, barometer of public gullibility, [and] prima facie evidence of blasphemy” (4).

In a significant contribution to Book of Mormon studies, Givens wrestles with the grounding of the Book of Mormon in mundane as well as spiritual reality. He finds the roots of continued debate about the book in the combination of historical and religious claims in the story of the angel Moroni and the gold plates. “Grounding the text in a history that is proximate and verifiable proves a keenly double-edged sword, subjecting the record as it does to the exacting gaze of scholarly verification. Its claim to reveal this continent’s history gives it an appealing relevance at the same time it raises expectations of confirmatory evidence” (12). Givens builds a compelling argument that the validity of Smith’s prophetic status rests upon historical claims of the Book of Mormon. He rejects as nearly impossible “a comfortable middle ground—that the record is a human product perhaps meriting some divine approbation” (83). With its dependence upon historical and prophetic foundations, Givens thus claims a unique status for the Book of Mormon and discourages attempts to find a middle ground by comparison with the Bible. First, he notes, “the story of the gold plates could not be fanciful mythology and the Book of Mormon still be scripture” (178). Then, he proposes “any attempt to find middle ground by analogizing the Book of Mormon and the Bible that does not take cognizance of this fundamental and irreducible difference between those two sacred texts may be an exercise in futility” (178).
In his effort to draw such a sharp contrast between Book of Mormon and biblical studies Givens overlooks debates over alleged forgeries and frauds in the Bible, most especially the book of law found in the temple during King Josiah’s reign. Givens also devotes inadequate attention to sociopolitical boundary maintenance (i.e., excommunication, dismissals from BYU, temple worthiness, correlation, etc.) in the LDS Church that likewise impedes allegorical readings of the Book of Mormon.

Givens outlines the history of non-Mormon objections to the Book of Mormon while observing that today “the Book of Mormon wars that rage most furiously are taking place within the Mormon scholarly community” (175; emphasis his). Givens provides a very valuable and generally balanced portrait of the recent debate within Mormon communities. He varies from balance at times when he treats the work of Hugh Nibley, John Sorenson, and Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies (FARMS) more favorably and less critically than that of Dan Vogel, Brent Metcalfe, D. Michael Quinn, and the New Mormon History. Yet Givens goes beyond that debate in an original discussion of “dialogic revelation,” or the role of prayer in the Book of Mormon (209-39). He locates the Book of Mormon’s emphasis on personal mystical communication within a movement toward a more democratic and experiential religion during the nineteenth century.

The book’s subtitle, “The American Scripture That Launched a New World Religion,” is misleading. Givens’s claim that the Book of Mormon serves as “the principle catalyst behind the rise of a worldwide church” (11) is not substantiated by any evidence from outside the United States. An examination of the scripture’s role in the international growth of Mormonism would need to examine the book’s role in missionary work in Latin America, its status in schismatic movements in Mexico and New Zealand, and the protests it has spawned in Africa. Givens appears to have drawn the


concept of Mormonism as a new world religion from Rodney Stark's predictions about the future of Mormonism but generally fails to examine the Book of Mormon within a historical or contemporary global context.

An overview of the "tempestuous career" of the Book of Mormon needs a broader discussion of the variety of responses from Native American communities. While he mentions missions to the Lamanites, he devotes no attention to American Indian thoughts on this missionary work. He ignores significant twentieth-century opposition to the Book of Mormon from activists in the American Indian Movement and contemporary scholars like Jace Weaver (Cherokee). Givens overlooks the use of the Book of Mormon by George P. Lee (Navajo) and Margarito Bautista (Nahua) in their critiques of the LDS Church. He mentions but does not discuss the role of the Book of Mormon in the Indian Student Placement Program (244). While non-Indian disputes about Lamanite identity form a central component of the book, Givens continues the long-standing Mormon tradition of denying American Indians a voice in the debate.

Givens's reliance upon secondary and often polemic accounts by LDS scholars for his depictions of American archaeology and Mesoamerican studies results in some significant factual errors. He incorrectly claims that nineteenth-century postulations of an Indian-Israel connection were emblematic of the "problem ... that the monuments left behind by the ancients had little apparent connection with the current Native American peoples" (101). On the contrary, the previously overlooked but explicit connections between ancient and living American Indians were the foundation upon which Samuel Haven challenged and Cyrus Thomas disproved the myth of


an ancient race of Moundbuilders. Likewise, phonetic similarities between inscriptions on ancient monuments and modern languages were key to the decipherment of Mayan hieroglyphics by Yuri Knosorov, David Kelley, and Linda Schele in the twentieth century. Givens also incorrectly assumes that the inclusion of prestigious non-LDS scholars like Alfred V. Kidder, Gordon F. Eckholm, and Gordon F. Willey on an advisory panel for the New World Archaeological Foundation (NWAF) “lent powerful support to the credibility of the Book of Mormon” turning it into “a viable player on the field of Mesoamerican studies” (114). On the contrary, the advice of these scholars helped keep the work of NWAF on a scientific ground independent of the claims of the Book of Mormon.

Givens’s most blatant error is his claim that “Mesoamerican studies in general are not much further along today” than Book of Mormon archaeology and geography (130). Givens based this claim upon a 1966 statement by W. Krickeberg taken out of context and quoted second-hand from Hugh Nibley in a 1993 publication. Contrary to Nibley’s polemic misrepresentation of Mesoamerican studies, the decipherment of Mayan hieroglyphics, the discovery of thousands and excavation of hundreds of new archaeological sites, the translation of hundreds of monument inscriptions, identifica-


7A more accurate view of outside influence on NWAF is available in a source cited elsewhere by Givens (269 note 14): Stan Larson, Quest for the Gold Plates: Thomas Stuart Ferguson’s Archaeological Search for the Book of Mormon (Salt Lake City: Freethinker Press, 1996), 41-84. Givens subsequently cites (273-74 note 87) a non-LDS perspective noting the lack of viability of the Book of Mormon in Mesoamerican studies: Michael D. Coe, “Mormons & Archaeology: An Outside View,” Dialogue 8 (Summer 1973): 40-48. Obviously, Givens is self-contradictory on this issue because the Book of Mormon cannot be both a “viable player” in Mesoamerican studies (114) yet be, as he later claims, rejected “a priori” by the anthropological community (148-49). Neither of the contradictory portraits is accurate.
tions of Olmec and Toltec influences on the Maya, and the recent extraction of DNA from ancient skeletons constitute significant advances unmatched by anything comparable in Book of Mormon studies. 8

In a similar vein Givens repeats, without critical examination, the polemic charge that the “larger academic community of anthropologists . . . will reject a priori any text that proffers a theory of transoceanic contact with the Americas long before Columbus (whether Semitic injections or other kinds)” (148-49). Givens could not have picked a worse example for this argument than the one he selected: Kennewick Man (misspelled as Kenniwick). In this case, the Army Corps of Engineers (with the backing of the Clinton administration) joined a coalition of American Indian tribes in an effort to prevent anthropologists from conducting further examination of these bones. A group of very prominent anthropologists (including Robson Bonnichsen, Dennis Stanford, George Gill, C. Loring Brace, Vance Hayes, etc.) have filed a lawsuit advocating further scientific investigation of the skeleton. Not only is it the anthropologists who are seeking investigation of these remains, but the real issue at stake is the application of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act to ancient skeletons whose tribal identity cannot be clearly established. 9 The reason for the perceived resistance of anthropologists to ideas of transoceanic contact beyond the well-established Viking expeditions (also overlooked by Givens) is the general lack of compelling evidence. Yet even with limited evidence, prominent anthropologists like Michael Coe and David Kelley entertain the possibility of contacts between Mesoamerica and East and Southeast Asia, while Dennis Stanford and Bruce Bradley seriously consider early contacts with the Solutrean culture of Spain. 10 The issue is not an anti-Mormon

---


scientific agenda, as implied by Givens, but one of a simple lack of convincing evidence for Semitic contacts with the New World.\textsuperscript{11}

Despite some gross errors produced by his occasional failure to investigate claims made by LDS scholars, Givens's book is not a simple repetition of the general failings of Book of Mormon studies. Givens forthrightly confronts difficult and thorny issues. "The conundrum of the Book of Mormon is that, on the one hand, as Mormons readily admit, not one single archaeological artifact has been found that conclusively establishes a direct connection between the record and any actual culture or civilization of the Western Hemisphere" (155). Givens complements such admissions with a lengthy analysis of prayer as dialogic (or conversational) revelation in the Book of Mormon:

Far beyond a forceful spiritual intimation, one finds in the Book of Mormon that prayer frequently and dramatically evokes an answer that is impossible to mistake as anything other than an individualized, dialogic response to a highly particularized question. . . . For millions of believers, the Book of Mormon has been the vehicle through which they could find their own sacred grove and reenact on a personal scale the epiphany that ushered in a new dispensation. (217, 239)

Givens's willingness to discuss the nineteenth-century context as well as peculiarity of prayer in the Book of Mormon helps keep the delicate balance he seeks and mostly maintains.

Givens, an English professor, is at his best when dealing with linguistic and rhetorical analysis in the Book of Mormon even though his forays into anthropology lack a similar rigor. He identifies the historical root of Mormon struggles with our central scripture in the mundane rhetoric of a prophet with a divine message. Givens's valuable summary of, as he terms them, the Book of Mormon wars in the United States and his original analysis of the role of prayer in this American scripture is necessary reading for any serious student of the Book of Mormon.

THOMAS W. MURPHY {tmurphy@edcc.edu} is chair of the Department of Anthropology at Edmonds Community College. He is a Ph.D. candidate in anthropology at the University of Washington and is writing a dissertation on folk biology

\textsuperscript{11}There is also an abundance of evidence virtually ruling out the likelihood of Semitic contact. A summary of such evidence from molecular anthropology appeared after Givens's publication: Thomas W. Murphy, "Lamanite Genesis, Genealogy, and Genetics," in Vogel and Metcalfe, \textit{American Apocrypha}, 47-77.

"influential" status in the field are discussed in an article Givens cites (286 note 145): Stengel, "The Diffusionists." These are not isolated cases as the Wattis Symposium's most recent anthology indicates through the inclusion of an article on Solutrean connections by Stanford and Bradley, "Ocean Trails and Prairie Paths? Thoughts about Clovis Origins," in \textit{The First Americans}, edited by Nina G. Jablonski (San Francisco: California Academy of Sciences, 2002), 255-71.
in the Book of Mormon and the Popol Vuh, a sixteenth century Quiché Mayan sacred narrative.


Reviewed by Allan Kent Powell

This is a book that delivers what it promises. Because it does, we have a better understanding of the Mormon frontier, a clearer picture of nineteenth-century family life, a stark sense of the daily economic pressures and limitations that heads of households had to face, and a deeper appreciation for the strengths, difficulties, and realities of Mormon community life. Author Ronald Barney effectively justifies yet another biography of a nineteenth-century Mormon, noting that “the Barney chronicle provides a window into the hopes and aspirations of many on society’s fringe who struck out for satisfaction in the country’s empty corners,” and “this story is important in that it comes from the voice of the underrepresented, quiet majority of Mormonism. There is a propensity within LDS culture to accentuate examples of the ‘first wagon’ stratum of Mormonism . . . [but] the larger view of Mormon life may very well be found among the lesser known but significantly more numerous rank and file” (xviii).

Lewis Barney was a committed rank-and-file member of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints from the time of his baptism in 1840 until his death in 1894. He was also a pioneer and frontiersman in every sense of the word, helping to establish settlements in ten valleys in Utah, New Mexico, Arizona, and Colorado. He hunted buffalo and other wild game, cleared fields, cut down forests, sawed lumber, built houses, fought Indians, and helped construct railroads. He was one of the first of the 1847 pioneers to see the Salt Lake Valley. He enthusiastically participated in the settling of the far corners of the Mormon frontier and lived to see the beginning of the end of polygamy—an institution in which he participated with his marriage first to Elizabeth (“Betsey”) Turner in 1833 and second to Elizabeth Beard in 1851.

Writers of biographies and serious readers of biographies will appreciate the sources available to the author and understand their limitations. Ronald Barney has conducted extensive research into a variety of sources in an effort to add a few more details, give a sharper focus to contemporary events, and to place Lewis Barney and his family in the context of the Mormon religious experience and the story of frontier America. In 1878, sixteen years before his death, Lewis Barney compiled his life story,
correspondence, and other documents that provided an overview of his life to that time. He wrote a 300-page life history in 1886 of which only 40 pages survive. Between 1886 and 1890, he gathered his personal papers, writings, and journals. These, along with an autobiography of his son Arthur, provided the framework for the biography. Unfortunately the perspectives of his two wives are unavailable because they left no written records.

Three major themes run the length of this biography—Barney as a frontiersman, Barney as a loyal Mormon, and Barney's relationship with his family. Except for the winter of 1841-42 which Barney spent in Nauvoo, at no time was he a city dweller. His statement about the decision to leave Nauvoo after a few months tells much about Barney, his father, brothers, and their priorities: “Not being accustomed to a city life, we bought, each of us, a quarter of a section of prairie land about 12 miles from Nauvoo” (61). Salt Lake City held no attraction for him, and he was drawn to St. George and Manti for brief stays only because of the opportunity to perform temple ordinances. Indeed, the title of the book, “One Side by Himself,” conveys a dual outlook of community participation and individual independence.

Barney took pride in his reputation as a hunter but was bitterly disappointed when he was not chosen as one of the twenty-five hunters selected to provide fresh meat for the 1847 pioneer company. Later, during the trek, he took the opportunity to prove his skill and consequently was promoted from teamster to hunter. Proving his hunting skills, Barney was one of twelve men selected to go in advance to kill and dry meat for the group returning from the Salt Lake Valley to Winter Quarters in 1847.

While his skills as a hunter were important, his enduring occupations on the frontier were those of farmer and sawmill operator, both of which required tremendous physical energy and effort. Describing his work at a newly established sawmill in Payson Canyon during the winter of 1852-53, Barney recorded, “I worked in the snow and storm all winter getting out timber for the mill. The snow being about 3 feet deep, I suffered very much with cold and for the common comforts of life” (142). And yet he was not without education as demonstrated by his writings, his selection as speaker on special occasions, and his service in several villages as a school teacher.

In all these endeavors, Barney looked for and expected economic success. However prosperity and financial security eluded him. Social status and church office were of little consequence to Barney, but his chosen religion was important. Although his travels took him along the outer corridors of Mormonism, and day-to-day life with less than perfect Saints brought frustrations and disappointments, Barney remained firmly rooted in the teachings of Mormon faith throughout his life. In 1888, six years before his death, he wrote to B. F. Cummings, “I acknowledge that I am poor in this world’s goods, but rich in the faith of the gospel and health of body which I consider the greatest wealth any person can enjoy in this life” (273).

Genealogy was the ideal bond between religion and family for Barney. Though his financial resources were meager, he hired a man to search out all family members. Lewis Barney then made sure that the essential temple
ordinances were carried out, performing many of them himself, first in the St. George and then later in the Manti Temple.

Family relationships appear to be a paradox. On one hand he was physically apart from his wives for long periods of time. During separate time periods in the 1880s, five years passed without seeing either Betsey or Elizabeth. Similar lapses occurred between visits to some of his seven adult children. Yet one of Barney's most important goals was the establishment of a family kingdom that was united in physical proximity, economic endeavor, and shared spiritual beliefs. For Lewis Barney, the church and the frontier were the parallel roads leading to this family kingdom. Writing to his son Arthur in 1882, Lewis Barney outlined his view that the old system had not worked and that a new vision, grounded in the family and the frontier, held the best promise for success. "I have been satisfied for a long time that we would have no luck in the way we have been doing. It is our duty as a family to keep together and if we wish to prosper we must cultivate a feeling of affection for each other and stay together... If we have to make new homes let us all go to some good place and settle together as the Lord requires of us to do" (249).

One of the greatest disappointments for Barney must have been the failure to see this dream become a reality. Some family members described Barney as a "wanderer," implying that this trait brought hardship to the family and may have been the reason for the lack of success in establishing the illusive temporal family kingdom. But as the author explains, "Post-nineteenth-century moderns misperceive the frontier's opportunity of freedom. Where was it written, where was the statute demanding that as humans mature they immobilize? Barney was never limited by such conventions. With his personal visions of family kingdom, he tested the limits of his family's patience and understanding of their own life's objectives" (253).

Ronald Barney, who is a descendant of Lewis Barney, is quite capable of not only telling an interesting life story, but also of using the skills of a good historian and keen observer to give insights and perspectives into the life of an extraordinary but little known Mormon frontiersman.

ALLAN KENT POWELL {kpowell@utah.gov} is a historian at the Utah State Historical Society in Salt Lake City.


Reviewed by Gary James Bergera

Reviewing the biography of a living LDS Church General Authority written
by another living LDS Church General Authority poses some unusual challenges. On the one hand, the reviewer would like to bring to his or her analysis the same critical judgement he or she would to any new title. On the other hand, if the reviewer does, he or she—and possibly the periodical in which the review appears—may be accused of either politically motivated flattery or secular bias. Even the standard scholarly convention of using last names to refer to subject and writer may be problematic. (That readers are responsible for bearing in mind they are reading one person’s response to a biography and not that individual’s judgment of either the subject or the author of that biography should also be mentioned.) With this admission, I hope the following observations strike a fair—if not always satisfying—balance among the various demands at play here.

Bruce C. Hafen, a member of the First Quorum of Seventy of the LDS Church since 1996, has written an informative, engaging biography of Neal A. Maxwell, a member of the Church’s governing Quorum of the Twelve Apostles since 1981. It shares much in common with previous “official” biographies of twentieth-century LDS leaders, including those by James P. Bell (James E. Faust), Sheri Dew (Ezra Taft Benson, Gordon B. Hinckley), G. Homer Durham et al. (N. Eldon Tanner), L. Brent Goates (Harold B. Lee), Francis M. Gibbons (David O. McKay, Joseph Fielding Smith, etc.), F. Burton Howard (Marion G. Romney), Edward L. Kimball and Andrew F. Kimball Jr. (Spencer W. Kimball), Eleanor Knowles (Howard W. Hunter), and Lucile C. Tate (LeGrand Richards, Boyd K. Packer): personal acquaintance with the subject and emphasis on his accomplishments, privileged access to unpublished materials, acceptance of the miraculous, and disregard for the controversial and troublesome.

Hafen is both candid and unapologetic in his approach to Maxwell’s life: his affectionate biography, written at Maxwell’s request, with his cooperation and approval, is “a kind of manual on trying to become a follower of Christ” (xiii). The theme of discipleship engages pervades Hafen’s text as he sees it repeatedly reflected in Maxwell’s life: “This book is the story of one person’s discoveries about applying the story of Jesus to his own life” (xiv). It structures and strategizes the author’s organization, chronology, use of sources, and analysis: “For Neal would grow up with an unspoken sense in some unchartered region of his heart that as much as he would come to love basketball and as much as he would come to hate war, he wanted more to become a disciple, ‘a follower of righteousness, desiring also to be . . . a greater follower of righteousness, and . . . desiring to receive instructions, and to keep the commandments of God’” (58). While Hafen writes that this controlling theme appeared only after he had begun work on the biography “rather than being imposed on it” (xiii), I suspect that it surfaced very early on and played a determining role in the writer’s strategy and tactics (two of Maxwell’s favorite management-related nouns). “When we tell our own stories to others,” Hafen explains, “we realize that the cosmic quest to overcome evil and find God is our very personal quest” (xiii). I am certain such an agenda brings to the biography insights that might not otherwise
be readily apparent; I worry it may obscure other interpretations that may be equally illuminating and probable. That said, Hafen has succeeded in producing a very humane and humanizing work as well as an intriguing guidebook for the authors of future official LDS biographies. “Real people who believe and prevail,” Maxwell himself has written, “are ultimately more faith-promoting and impressive than saccharine saints with tinsel traits” (xv).

In Hafen’s hands, Maxwell emerges as an insecure adolescent, inclined toward the intellectual (he disliked farming) and wanting to please a father whom he obviously loved. Maxwell still painfully recalls his first church talk at age thirteen as a “complete failure” (79). He did not “connect” to most Church activities as a youth (79-80), yet fretted about his ark-steadying tendencies (82, 129). His family’s lower economic circumstances “made him feel not quite good enough for the ‘in crowd.’” He “still winces” when he thinks back on a basketball career that did not blossom—“the wound he would long feel” (89)—as he had hoped because he temporarily stopped growing in high school. Even his success in breeding pigs became “a source of social stigma” (85) and “infamy” (89). Because of scabious facial acne, Maxwell “felt some emotional rejection during this time, and his pockmarked scars are still visible, permanent reminders of a condition that evoked a variety of reactions in a high school crowd, most of them unspoken and almost all of them negative” (90).

This insecurity may be responsible in some measure for his tendencies toward aggressive overcompensation. Hafen describes the “competitive spirit that has regularly found a way to ‘let go’ on the tennis court in a playful intensity that might surprise the average general conference goer” (7). As a soldier, Maxwell refused to drink coffee, even though it afforded one of the few safe ways of quenching one’s thirst (the other was catching rain water) (108-9). Yet Maxwell was not blindly subservient. When J. Reuben Clark, a counselor in the First Presidency, refused Maxwell’s invitation to address a group of visiting Saints lest he be seen as encouraging such extravagant trips, Maxwell did not back down but instead issued the invitation to Apostle John A. Widtsoe, who readily accepted (147). Maxwell also brazenly complained to Apostle Harold B. Lee about the poor quality of Church lesson manuals and remembers Lee’s being “very nice to listen to this young punk who was telling him what ought to be done” (170).

Maxwell could be impatient and critical, chafing under institutional intractability and learning slowly to hold a sometimes sarcastic tongue. He understood and appreciated the political aspects of secular life, which presumably also applied to his later Church career and service; the value of networking; the role of mentors; bridge- and consensus-building; and being at the center of activity. Driven and ambitious, he clearly was impressed by and desired authority and position, including Church status (144), yet was a skilled, effective administrator, articulate, thoughtful, and self-reflective, who eventually came to worry that he was not sufficiently meek, humble, and self-sacrificing. Hafen writes that Maxwell’s “honest effort to tame that
urge [for recognition] became part of his commitment to discipleship” (211).

While an administrator at the University of Utah, according to Hafen, Maxwell was forever changed by the turbulence of the 1960s (268). He came to embrace fully the idea of in loco parentis (275) and to fear increasingly the threats to traditional morality he believed secularism posed (395-96). About 1969, he experienced what sounds like a mid-life crisis: “Neal was feeling closer to discouragement than he had ever felt before—or since…. He felt unsettled, as if it were time to ‘break camp and move down the trail,’ and he wasn’t sure what to do” (334). At that point, he was called/hired as Church Commissioner of Education.

The move from secular to Church employment signalled something of a sea-change for Maxwell. Family and friends noticed “he was more fulfilled and happy,” and “seemed liberated” (345). (Among other adjustments, he had to manage better his “Type A” personality and curtail his occasional use of mild “cuss words” [344].) Aided by the retirement of several veteran Church educators and the commanding influence of new Church president Harold B. Lee (Hafen characterizes him as “intimidating” and “demanding” [326]), Maxwell steered the Church’s seminaries, institutes, and universities toward a greater and more finely honed sense of mission and market. Viewed as a role model for the successful integration of faith and intellect, an observation he encouraged, Maxwell cultivated a “Camelot-like” environment (348) and became “as significant as any individual in the Church in raising the confidence level of senior Church leaders in their religious educators” (349). Although an advocate for academic freedom, he has always believed that faith trumps intellect. Under his guidance, the Church tied religious education to areas of Church population growth, stopped acquiring new higher education facilities, and phased out elementary and high school programs except where state-sponsored education was inadequate (363). The Church also determined to focus its resources “on academic areas where Church doctrine made the most difference, [to] organize experiences that produce leaders of families, and [to] produce ideas that serve the Church while blessing the world” (374). This meant, among other challenges, “lift[ing] both the religious faithfulness and the professional quality of [BYU’s] faculty” (377), while emphasizing that “BYU would remain an undergraduate university where the main purpose of research was to strengthen teaching quality. BYU would remain a culturally conservative place by national standards” (378).

Given his “unqualified acceptance” of the authority and scriptural literalism of Church doctrine, Maxwell became a leading proponent of BYU’s role in combatting what he and others viewed as the threat of modern secularism (396). Especially as an apostle, he championed mobilizing “the resources of BYU’s faculty and others to aid the Church as it is attacked” (504). According to Hafen: “As had long been the case, he felt an urgency for the Church not only to answer its critics but also to be informed and lead with its own strategic priorities” (507). He encouraged—openly and “behind
the scenes"—the activities of the Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies (FARMS), the compilation and publication of the Encyclopedia of Mormonism, the publication of the diaries of LDS apostle-turned-dissident William E. McLellin, B. H. Roberts's previously suppressed The Truth, The Way, The Life, and the voluminous diaries of First Presidency counselor George Q. Cannon. He is also a driving force behind the current PAPERS OF JOSEPH SMITH project. Clearly, Maxwell believes that openness and honesty are the Church's best defense.

In 1974 Maxwell was called as an Assistant to the Twelve, in 1976 as a member of the Presidency of the First Quorum of the Seventy, and in 1981 as an apostle. He was fifty-five. His assignments with the Special Affairs Committee and Correlation Department let him influence the Church's increasing participation in the national political arena as well as in consolidating and streamlining Church programs and religious instruction worldwide. He also learned to adapt to the sometimes frustrating seniority protocols (411). With the Twelve functioning "more as a body of generalists and less as a collection of specialists" (449), he knew the quorum could seem "notoriously slow" (454) as it moved toward consensus. He came not only to "tolerate such a process but [to] increasingly see its wisdom": "their need for unanimity... was not just a 'procedural nicety.' To have real agreement by the next presidents of the Church sitting there in the Twelve' ensures 'continuity of policy.' So unanimity means not mere assent but a willingness to support. And if it takes time for that willingness to develop, someone may have to 'wait a little longer'" (454-55). Maxwell readily admits that occasionally he has "‘tried] too hard to fix things,’ putting his ‘shoulder to the wheel,’ only to discover that he was pushing not a wheel but ‘a stationary hitching post’" (455).

With age Maxwell has become more compassionate (176) and has learned to appreciate better the value of imperfection (236) but continues to grapple with a predisposition to criticism (192) and difficulty expressing physical affection (194). But more than any other single event, his diagnosis of leukemia in 1996 seems to have been the most life-altering, the most disciple-shaping. The news was devastating. Praying that he not shirk the challenge of facing death with dignity and meaning, Maxwell experienced all of the stages of grief, eventually coming to accept what seemed to be the inevitable. That he has been living during the years since his diagnosis in a state of fragile remission—thanks to a debilitating regime of chemo- and other experimental therapies—has allowed him to focus, perhaps finally, on those aspects of Christian discipleship that he apparently believes matter the most: not competition, power, and status, but compassion, forgiveness, and gratitude.

Hafen has a deft rhetorical touch and, like Maxwell, clearly loves words. He is very good at placing the events of Maxwell's life in historical context and especially in chronicling Church administrative history (notably the rise of Correlation) during the second half of the twentieth century. He depicts touching, memorable images; I was especially moved by his description of
Maxwell’s father sleeping in the bed of his recently deceased wife (77). Not surprisingly, however, Hafen’s greatest strength—his affection for Maxwell and insider position as a General Authority—may also be his greatest challenge as a biographer. I would like to have known more about Maxwell as the faithful “ark-steadier,” since the Church currently seems to place such heavy emphasis on obedience. I would like to have known more about Maxwell as a father, since he seems to have approached family vacations with agenda as detailed as his committee meetings (295). I would like to have known, based on quantifiable data, if America really is becoming more secular and precisely how secularism threatens “traditional” morality. Hafen’s treatment of Maxwell as a writer (529-34) is particularly balanced and insightful; the observations of Maxwell’s colleagues on his memorable but sometimes difficult-to-grasp rhetoric are both refreshing and disarming. Given Maxwell’s interest in politics and his involvement in drafting the Church’s statement on blacks and the priesthood in 1970 (327-28), I wanted to know more about Maxwell’s views on race and racism and about his contributions to the Church’s recent declarations on unofficial symposia, on “The Family: A Proclamation to the World,” and on “The Living Christ” (452). I would like to have read more examples of Maxwell’s interactions with the Twelve and more details of the nature of his involvement in his quorum’s decision-making process. I don’t doubt that Maxwell’s references to “operational revelations” (414) accurately reflect his belief regarding God’s place in Church governance. I’m equally certain that he fully appreciates the role of strong-willed and fiercely opinionated men striving to differentiate God’s will from their own.

Hafen’s bibliography seems thorough, though he does not cite such apparently relevant books as Mary Bradford’s biography of Lowell Bennion, Homer Durham’s biography of N. Eldon Tanner, Burton Howard’s biography of Marion G. Romney, or any of Francis Gibbons’s biographies. Perhaps they contained nothing of interest. A significant portion of Hafen’s sources is the interviews he, and especially Gordon Irving of the Church’s Family and Church History Department, conducted. From the excerpts Hafen includes, these sources are of major importance, although I am less confident than Hafen that, without confirming written documentation, they are always factually and chronologically reliable. These transcripts will remain closed at LDS Church Archives for at least ten years and probably longer; most such oral histories are restricted during the interviewee’s lifetime. I wish Hafen had acknowledged these restrictions. I also wish that Maxwell himself had kept better records, including a diary. In fact, one particularly revealing story is of his reading a memo and immediately ripping it up while its writer, BYU President Dallin H. Oaks, was still explaining it. Maxwell agreed with Oaks’s point and, perhaps following his CIA training, saw no point in keeping the memo itself (376). “He learned instinctively to tear up or shred unneeded documents,” Hafen explains, “a practice he frequently employed in later work assignments” (206).

Despite my wishes for more, I believe that A Disciple’s Life could become
GARY JAMES BERGERA is managing director of the Smith-Pettit Foundation, Salt Lake City.


Reviewed by Dale C. LeCheminant

T. Edgar Lyon: A Teacher in Zion is a fact-filled, candid story of a man's life as a loving family man, professional scholar-teacher-writer, faithful, believing Latter-day Saint, colleague and friend, and a skilled and tireless "do-it" man. No lifeless morality play, son Ted's narrative summons up the Ed I knew and loved—a red-blooded man who energetically pursued life. From a vast array of primary and secondary sources found in Ed's personal records, Ted, himself an accomplished historian, has fashioned a book worthy of his father, Published by the press of Brigham Young University, where Ted is a professor, it is the inaugural volume of the Joseph Fielding Smith Institute for Latter-day Saint History and the BYU Studies series, BIOGRAPHIES IN LATTER-DAY SAINT HISTORY. Hopefully, it will thus be seen as a belated vindication of T. Edgar Lyon's clear-headed, independent faithfulness and the advanced learning he took seriously. Ed's independent and scholarly turn-of-mind is a prominent theme of this biography, examples of which are found throughout the volume.

Thirteen chapters cover Ed's life story from "Living Pioneer Legacy," which treats his family's genetic roots, to "Deep Well-Spring of Vitality, 1963-1978," depicting his final years. He was born in 1903 in a well-to-do neighborhood of the Avenues in Salt Lake City and died in 1978 of cancer at the LDS Hospital in the same Avenues neighborhood where he was born and reared. The five appendices include "T. Edgar Lyon's Poetry and Romantic Writings," a celebration of his love for Hermana, his wife. Another important appendix is an exhaustive bibliography of his publications on Western and Mormon history and thought. These are to be found in scholarly journals and books produced by regional publishing houses devoted to those topics and in the official books, periodicals, instructional manuals, and courses of study of the LDS Church. Ninety-seven illustrations and photographs of people and places significant in Ed's life bring a visual
dimension to the narrative. The ten-page index, unfortunately, is so spotty and inconsistent in its coverage that it is not very useful.

As in Ed’s own teaching and writing, Ted uses an abundance of factual details, which come from the seventy-two boxes of the T. Edgar Lyon Collection in the LDS Church Archives. In this collection are Ed's personal files, including diaries, daybooks, correspondence, mission and mission president's files, and Church Institute materials. A detailed index to this collection is available both at the LDS Church Archives and in the L. Tom Perry Special Collections, Harold B. Lee Library, Brigham Young University. Central in the source material is the 292-page T. Edgar Lyon Oral History, nine interviews with Ed, covering fifteen hours, conducted over a three-month period in 1974-75 by Davis Bitton, friend and former Assistant Church Historian. Although the oral history is an extensive record, it is “very incomplete” (xi). Likewise, of this series Ed himself acknowledged, “Interviews and oral histories conducted many years after the fact are not always accurate accounts of the past” (xi). Such a stickler was Ed for exactness.

As a scholar-teacher himself, Ted faced the daunting task of balancing his selection from Ed’s records with his personal admiration for the father. However, Ted could not have done otherwise than to tell honestly the story, avoiding a temptation “to exaggerate, distort, eulogize, or ignore conflicts.” He wrote that his father “would have appreciated that [challenge]” (xii). In amazement yet admiration for B. H. Robert’s candid handling of early Church leaders in his Comprehensive History of the Church, Ed wrote a personal manifesto of his approach to writing history: “I think that it is far better to make a bold admission of facts and truth, and do it now, than wait until it is forced down our throats at a later date when it will be embarrassing to us” (134). This comment, which Ed made in 1932 to his father, echoes down through seventy years, applying to many dark issues of past Church history which Ed faced squarely. One such was the Mountain Meadows Massacre, again become controversial this year.

It was not Mormon history per se but Ed’s use of the tools of higher criticism, which he learned from the foremost scholars of the time, that for years got him into trouble with those Church officials who looked with disfavor on what they believed was Ed's over-reliance on history, particularly in his manual on the Doctrine and Covenants. Of this work, J. Reuben Clark of the First Presidency, directed, “Don’t use it!” (206). He considered Ed to be using the “philosophies of men” in a misguided attempt to teach spiritual truths. Later, when Ed was called to preside over the Netherlands Mission—the youngest mission president in the Church at the time—he was advised to “forget” what he had learned about higher criticism at the University of Chicago.

But Ed could not deny his education, which he believed could help him better serve the Church’s youth. In his work as historian for Nauvoo Restoration, Inc., Ed had honest differences with the Nauvoo Restoration officials over their corner-cutting haste to turn the city of Nauvoo into a
"glitzy" proselytizing showplace rather than restore it to exhibit the true quality of Mormon life of that earlier time. Ironically, during all these trying times, students appreciated Ed's factual illumination of history as a mind-opening and testimony-building experience. Still, for years he remained under a cloud because of administrators' distrust of his methods and unyielding call for the truth of facts.

Relentless opposition to Ed's scholarship and independent spirit increased until 1962 when his colleague Lowell L. Bennion, also under fire, was removed as the director of the University of Utah Institute of Religion. Ed took a year's leave of absence to write a Church manual, his first leave in all his years of service. It is the bitterest of ironies that, in the week Ed was awarded his Ph.D. from the University of Utah in history and philosophy, the culmination of long years of preparation to better serve the Church, he was invited to leave Church employ.

Ted wrote candidly of a number of private family matters: Hermana wept once while telling a son of their tenuous finances during the years Ed was trying to support his family, complete his own long-delayed graduate studies, and serve the Church. Ted was frank about his mother's strong feelings against polygamy, about her reservation concerning the ill-conceived and oft-expressed attempts of funeral orators to comfort the bereaved by saying that a loved one had been "called home to perform a greater work," and about her chafing under the perceived ill-treatment of her husband. Though a feisty, outspoken woman, she at the same time served faithfully for years on the boards of Church auxiliary organizations. All such honestly expressed feelings of the family and the frank recounting of Ed's courageous stand give the story an appealing credibility that a glossing-over would have cheapened.

Careful as authors, editors, and production people try to be, errors slip by. The index omits the name of William Mulder, referred to several times in the book. Additional other omissions and flaws, hopefully, will be corrected in subsequent printings, which this volume merits. Furthermore, a careful selection of fewer episodes to represent Ed's life might better serve the book's economy and flow. Some of the ninety-seven photographs, which seem marginal to the writer's purpose, might have been excluded for the sake of brevity. Two appendices will probably interest only a few readers: "Letter to Missionaries from Rudger G. Clawson, 1923," and "Full-time and Part-time Missionaries who Served under T. Edgar and Hermana Lyon (1933-37)."

Ted Lyon's purpose is stated clearly in the Preface: "My intent in writing this book has been to make the life of T. Edgar Lyon available to some of his students from the Salt Lake Institute ... to his 128 living posterity ... to those interested in Church history," and to others interested in Nauvoo (xii). Ted certainly succeeded for me. This book took me back fifty-seven years to my own days as a student in Ed's classroom and later, as a colleague, to the faculty meetings and retreats where he taught us all. His rugged face, smiling outbright-eyed from the portrait on the cover, speaks to us afresh.
DALE C. LECHEMINANT, educated at the University of Utah and the University of Southern California, retired in 1992 after thirty years teaching at the Salt Lake Institute of Religion. He and his wife, Wanda Nielsen LeCheminant, are the parents of five children.

In their acknowledgments, Brian and Petrea Kelly explain that their book "began as scripts for a set of cassette tapes. . . . We provided some narration to tie it all together and made note of some contemporary events in the United States and the world. Many listeners requested a printed copy with references so they could study in greater depth." This tape-to-book commences as a religious saga with the words: "True Mormon history begins long before the history of the earth. It started in the Grand Council in heaven . . ." (1). With this introduction Latter-day History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints opens to express visual Church history.

Latter-day History is divided into a section for each church president. Except for Joseph Smith and Brigham Young, each contains very short biographies, averaging about eighteen pages, on the lives of presidents from John Taylor to Gordon B. Hinckley. However, 46 percent (273 pages) of the book covers the life of Joseph Smith, with Brigham Young accounting for another 10 percent (63 pages).

What may be distinctive about this volume is that it contains over 400 illustrations including photographs, drawings, engravings, maps, paintings, daguerreotypes, portraits, and documents of the people, places, and events that form Mormon history. There are two photographs of Orrin Porter Rockwell (253, 313) and a rare image of Martin Harris (327).

Unfortunately, a photograph of one piece of the Joseph Smith papyri was printed reversed (169). Also reversed is the 1846 Lucian Foster daguerreotype of the Nauvoo Temple on the hill with an outhouse in the foreground (287), photographed by Charles William Carter (572). The daguerreotype should have been reversed with the front of the Nauvoo Temple facing left (west).

Although many of the images are very well known, a genuine rare gem is a photograph of the Assembly Hall on Temple Square, showing an angel placed on the top central pinnacle as a weather vane (348). This angel has since been removed. The authors unfortunately do not tell the readers that, until the 1960s, the ceiling of this historic building was divided into different-sized panels containing drawings representing church historic scenes completed by William C. Morris. It is unfortunate that none of these scenes, which were photographed for the Church News, could have been included. Other interesting photographs are marred with inaccuracies in the captions. For example, under “world events” is a photograph of Richard M. Nixon. According to the caption, the photograph includes Harold B. Lee, George Albert Smith, and N. Eldon Tanner (483). It is not George Albert Smith but Joseph Fielding Smith who is in the photograph.

The narrative, while following the traditional account of Church history, contains many errors of fact that will be annoying to well-informed readers and misleading to those who attempt to use this book as a reference. Emma Hale is identified as the “only daughter” of Isaac Hale (25); but he actually had four. The book twice states that Brigham Young was baptized on 14 April 1832 and quotes from the Manuscript History of Brigham Young that he was baptized on that date by Eleazer Miller (104, 107). The correct date, however, is 9 April as recorded in Young’s personal journal. On the revelation or prophecy concerning wars in LDS Doctrine and Covenants 87, Latter-day History says, “Wilford Woodruff is believed to have been the scribe” (109), even though he was not a member of the Church in December 1832 when the revelation was given. Woodruff evidently only made a copy of this revelation.

The section on Brigham Young’s administration omits completely any mention of the tragic 1857 Mountain Meadows Massacre. Latter-day History also states, “After Brigham’s death, there were no questions about who would lead the Church” (340). In fact, the historical record is less than crystal clear, and the succession issue was still being worked out during the second apostolic interregnum. While the book quotes from an 1880 revelation of Apostle Wilford Woodruff (347-48), John Taylor’s revelations are not quoted or even mentioned. He gave at least eight written revelations as Church president.

When the reader comes to the issuing of the Manifesto (added to LDS Doctrine and Covenants in 1908 but not in all printings until 1921; now Official Declaration 1), the authors state, “Now that plural marriage no
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longer was being practiced..." (371). While the Manifesto issued on 24 September 1890 gives the impression that this may be the case, the historical facts show priesthood-authorized plural marriages continued for an additional twenty years (1890-1910).

There are too many typographical errors for a history book and the publisher must bear some responsibility for carelessness in proofreading. The Illinois newspaper *Quincy Whig* is identified as the *Quincy Quake* (251) and Willard Richards's baptismal year is given as 1835 (it was actually 1836) (306).

Latter-day History works into its thesis the recurring emphasis of Saints being persecuted. This is one of the most timeless myths of Mormonism, an element that has become crucially important in establishing the identity of the suffering but stalwart Saints. It is certainly true that they suffered and that much of it stemmed from unjustified persecution. However, this portrayal is too simple. We should not overlook evidence indicating that some members were, in fact, bad neighbors. We do not need to justify unrighteous actions or speeches, and we must not repeat hate crimes whether verbal or physical. Sometimes important insights into church history may take many years before becoming a recognizable fact. History has a strange way of telling its own story. Once we know that historical facts are sometimes carefully worked through for different audiences it opens up a new view of our heritage.

Latter-day Saint readers should desire to have a faith based on correct readings rather than traditions that may be founded on inaccurate rendering of historical records. I must reluctantly state that, while *Latter-day History* is rich in illustrations, their presentation and identification are not always reliable. More seriously, the text fails to give a good understanding of the Latter-day Saints as a church or as a people, even for a young or general audience.

H. MICHAEL MARQUARDT (research@xmission.com), an independent researcher and research consultant, is the author of *The Joseph Smith Revelations: Text and Commentary* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1999), and coauthor of *Inventing Mormonism: Tradition and the Historical Record* (San Francisco: Smith Research Associates, 1994.)
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Reviewed by William W. Slaughter
In his aptly written foreword, former Salt Lake Mayor Ted Wilson eases the reader into the tone of this volume:

Images shape our view of history; Salt Lake’s past is no exception. It is fortunate that the photographic art was sufficiently developed during the late 1800s to provide the superb pictures of artists like William Henry Jackson, the great Hayden Survey (Yellowstone) photographer. His early photographs of Salt Lake City, the nearby mountains, and the natural setting give us a sweeping sense of the burgeoning settlement. To savor such images is to gain a deep appreciation for, and sense of, early Salt Lake City life. To see an open field where there is now a strip mall, to see the original police headquarters where the Federal Building now stands, to see the old Social Hall where there is now a pedestrian underpass to a towering office building and like photographs can be an electrifying experience. (v-vi)

Salt Lake City is truly fortunate to have been home to more than its share of notable pioneer photographers who documented the growth of Salt Lake from a small log and adobe frontier village to a bustling, modern high-rise state-capital city. Daguerreotypist (the first form of photography) Marsena Cannon was early on the scene, and a few of his early 1850s portraits still exist, as do even fewer of his late 1850s Salt Lake cityscapes. He was soon followed by pioneer photographers Edward Martin (the same Martin of handcart fame), Charles W. Carter, Fox and Symons, Sainsbury and Johnson, and, perhaps the most famous, Charles R. Savage. All left a legacy of images evidencing the Mormon, Salt Lake, and western experience. In addition to these locals, Salt Lake was photographed by “national” photographers David Burr, Andrew Russell, and William Henry Jackson.

These photographers left us a visual history rich with information. They allow us and future generations to literally look back into the past—a past filled with real places, events, and people. The often unappreciated studio portrait—a frozen moment of a life—gives us the wonderful opportunity to look into the eyes of an ancestor, an ancestor whose life was filled with emotions, loves, hate, successes, failures, and joys. Cityscape photographs are alive with details, giving a wealth of information about a community and providing a view of “the way life really was.”

James W. Shipler, a non-Mormon, arrived in Salt Lake on 1 August 1891, just after the anti-polygamy persecutions and before statehood. No longer a frontier town, Salt Lake was growing into a modern western regional city. Shipler established a downtown Salt Lake photography studio; and from 1891 to 1988, four generations of Shiplers (James, Harry, Bill, and Bill Jr.) worked, at times on their own and sometimes together, in the ever-changing local photography business. Their services were “commissioned by . . . a business, an organization, a government entity, or an individual” to photograph portraits, accident scenes, damaged property, farms, business buildings, churches, street repairs, homes, and schools (xii). In taking these images they just happened to document a growing dynamic city.

A sampling—180 altogether—of their exquisite photographs has been
brought together in this well-designed volume. Alan Barnett, formerly Information Services Manager at Utah State Historical Society, crisply introduces us to the Shiplers and the scope of their work. To his credit, Barnett lets the images “do the talking,” taking us on an incredible visual tour of early twentieth-century Salt Lake City. Barnett’s expressed purpose is to “highlight the relatively unknown work of the Shiplers using selected examples to illustrate the breadth, depth, and quality of their work. In addition, these images offer a visual record of Salt Lake City’s history” (xiv).

This volume focuses on images of Salt Lake City taken between 1903 and 1940, a period when the Shiplers created their greatest number and variety of images of the area (xiii). After the late 1930s, as the demands of their business changed, the Shiplers produced fewer and fewer views of Salt Lake City.

Given the size of the Shipler collection—more than 100,000 images—it is easy for the reader to sympathize with Barnett’s confession that “selecting a representative sampling... for this book was a difficult task” (xiii). Probably an equally fine collection could have been constructed from the images Barnett did not select, but readers are indeed the beneficiaries in this volume of Barnett’s daunting and time-consuming effort. Treats from this visual smorgasbord include 1903 South Temple Street, an April 1908 view of Salt Lake City from atop the Boston Building, flooding on North Temple in 1908, Main Street with an automobile and buggy side by side, children swimming at Pioneer Park, the 1920 Spring Frolic and Mardi Gras, the Airplane Service Station at First South and State, and the Utah State Capitol under construction. The topics range from the whimsical to the official, inviting us to look long and hard because there is so much to see.

Frankly, all of the “stuff” to see in a photograph is a major source of their fun. The Shiplers were particularly good at filling their images with detail. For example, the 1909 image of the Kenyon Hotel on the southeast corner of 200 South and Main (59) is not merely a photograph of some old building. It is filled with life and information. Well-dressed women and men walk in front of stores advertising clothing, ten-cent cigars, cash registers, and guided trips to Yellowstone National Park. A sign above the main entrance announced that the Kenyon is “Nat’l Headquarters Ladies of the G.A.R.” (Grand Army of the Republic) during its Salt Lake City national convention—which explains all the patriotic bunting on the hotel. Barnett’s concise captions give geographical context and historical perspective to the photographs.

It should be noted that the quality of photographic reproduction in this book is excellent and, therefore, all the more delightful to look at and study. To assure the highest quality, the original negatives were scanned, and Barnett spent hours fine-tuning the images. In fact, the intelligent and beautiful design of the book was a team effort with credit going to Tom Marben, Connie Disney, and Ron Stucki as well as to Alan Barnett.

There are a few factual mistakes in the captions. For example, Barnett mistakenly identifies Amelia Folsom as Brigham Young’s youngest wife.
The small building on Temple Square was the Meridian House government observatory, not, as it is commonly misidentified, Orson Pratt's observatory (47). However, these are minor flaws in an otherwise excellent book—a book that will delight all who take time to read the images.

This volume adds to the history of our community as well as our sense of community by letting us see a Salt Lake City that once was and will never be again.

WILLIAM W. SLAUGHTER {ridgwlkr@aros.net}, a photo archivist, is the author of Camping Out in the Yellowstone, 1882 (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1994), Life in Zion (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1995), Church History Timeline (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1996), and, with Michael Landon, is coauthor of Trail of Hope (Salt Lake City: Shadow Mountain, 1997).


Reviewed by Harvard Heath

It is fortuitous that the publication of this excellent work coincides with the release of the Utah 2000 census figures indicating a growing diversity among Utah's populace. "Diversity" takes on two meanings in Utah: first, those not of the dominant culture; and second, those considered not to be WASPish in cultural, racial, or ethnic make-up.

For many Utah residents, the essence of immigration and an ethnic presence has always meant the exodus of Mormon converts from northern Europe and the British Isles. Mormon culture, ever immersed in genealogy, proudly identifies and lauds progenitors as sacrificing Saints fleeing foreign countries for a better and more homogeneous world in Zion. The melding cultural magnet of Mormonism soon assimilated these immigrants into the host culture with minor difficulties. There were, of course, the exceptions—the Scandinavian enclaves that persisted in Sanpete County and the ethnic wards in Salt Lake City—but for the most part, immigrants adapted to and were facilely adopted into mainstream Mormon culture, thus largely sloughing off any residual ethnic make-up. (Patricia Limerick, historian and sometime Mormon observer, has posited that Mormons constitute an ethnic category in and of themselves in the American West.)

Such was not the case among the immigrants and their descendants described in Missing Stories. They were invisible to many Mormons; and when they were recognized as they began to appear in mining camps in
Carbon and Summit counties and obtained employment in the smelters and mines of Salt Lake and Tooele counties, they were summarily ostracized and assigned a second-class status.

In the book’s introduction, Helen Papanikolas in her own inimitable way provides a concise, historical overview of minorities in Utah. She perceptively contextualizes who they were, from whence they came, and why and how they were received upon their arrival. Unfortunately, for far too many Utahns, Papanikolas’s historical treatment of minorities would be terra incognita. There is only vague recognition of other cultures, other histories, and other voices that make up a rich, cultural past and present in the state of Utah. In many respects, Utah has not been much different in its response to immigrants than the United States as a whole. John Higham’s enduring classic Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism, 1860-1925 (New Brunswick, N.J.; Rutgers University Press, 1955) could have just as well been describing what Papanikolas has chronicled for Utah’s ethnic history. Kelen agrees that the immigrant issue had three problems: “First, they were children of aliens . . . coming to this country to take over. Second, the children’s fathers had been Americanized to the extent that they were [recruited] into workers movements . . . [hence] despicable and un-American. Third [they] responded instantly to Europe’s entrance into World War I. . . . Americans were unpleasantly surprised at [the immigrants’] great concern for the countries of their birth” (5). Xenophobic tendencies are not exclusively a Utah problem. Still, given the state’s genesis and peculiar cultural contours, Utah’s Missing Stories has something significant to say. The editors are to be complimented for compiling a compelling story of ethnic struggles unknown to many who reside in Utah.

In the preface the editors lay out their purpose: “Missing Stories is meant to be read on several different levels at once. The first and most apparent is the historical: As a dramatization of non-Mormon ethnic and minority life in Utah . . . [a story] until now, has only been alluded to by Utah historians. The second level of significance reflects the personal, the psychological. Here, we refer to the quest for identity—the journey toward spiritual development—which is recounted by a few informants in each community” (x). These communities are the Ute, the African American, the Jewish, the Chinese, the Italian, the Japanese, the Greek, and the Chicano-Hispano.

In the afterword, the editors catalogue ethnic groups that are not represented among the missing voices (Irish, Finnish, Basque, Yugoslav, Hungarians, Korean, Tongan, or Vietnamese) and define the boundaries of inclusion that they used in this work. They used a three step process: First, to obtain narratives recounting earliest settlement, we identified communities that were indigenous to the area or that arrived prior to Utah’s statehood or during the 1880-1920 immigration era. Second, to investigate and portray their [the immigrants’] long-term social accommodation, we narrowed our pool to groups that had sizable populations and had developed and maintained viable cultural institutions. Then, third, to convey the state’s racial
and cultural heterogeneity, we selected those groups that were emblematic, we believed, of the experiences of native peoples, racial minorities, and ethnic minorities. (507)

In addition the editors argue that the excluded groups did not "maintain cultural institutions" long enough, "were too few in number for our study," or did not reach Utah in sizable communities arrived until "after World War II and thus form a new wave of non-Mormon immigrants" (507). This explanation may have been helpful for the reader to know from the beginning of the book, rather than appearing in the afterword. An excluded group that may seem to have the strongest case for inclusion is the Navajos. Kelen and Stone explain: "Although the Navajos in San Juan County constitute a sizable group, they were not included because their history and development are less central to, and revelatory of, Utah life than is the history of the Utes" (507).

The oral histories that constitute the bulk of this hefty tome (over 500 pages) are substantially assisted by scholarly introductions preceding each ethnic chapter. These individuals, all eminently qualified to speak about the history of their assigned ethnic group, adumbrate for the reader the issues that will emanate from the oral history interviewees. The selection process was thoughtfully done. A representative cross section from each group succeeds in capturing the pulse and tenor of each ethnic experience. The wealthy and the indigent, the successful and the not so successful, the laborer and the CEO, the honored and dishonored (one interview was conducted in prison), the politician and the dispossessed—all are represented.

Space limitations preclude any extensive discussion of the multifaceted stories and vignettes that elucidate stories tinged with tragedy yet detailing the trials and triumphs of people whose voices have for far too long been muted. Over and above the obvious attempt to give voice to neglected groups and cultures, these interviews also provide superb history of Utah. In many cases, interesting historical facts would still be buried if not for this attempt to elicit stories that our traditional histories missed or omitted.

Two examples will have to suffice. One involves J. Bracken Lee, the former governor of Utah and mayor of Salt Lake City. Vito Bonacci, mine worker and union organizer, relates a story of a group of miners discussing prevailing conditions and the possibility of stronger union activity. This discussion occurred at a private residence. The mining superintendent told the group to "move out," whereupon the elderly lady whose property it was pushed Bonacci down the hill. Within an hour the group observed a group of men on horseback in the distance making for their area. It turned out to be out to be an armed mob from Price with J. Bracken Lee in the lead. He was on a "white horse," armed with a rifle. According to Bonacci, "One by one, they got around us with rifles and told us to keep walking. J. Bracken Lee got behind me. We had to walk from up on top of that hill clear down to the road that goes to Price. Every time I slowed down a little, he'd hit me.
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with the gun muzzle. So I kept walking. What could I do? I didn’t figure he’d shoot me. I didn’t think he had the guts to do that. But it’s hard to tell what somebody will do in that situation” (273-74).

Another remarkable insight is the history of Lamb’s Grill Café in Salt Lake City, owned by Ted Speros. In his interview, he shares the rich tradition of the restaurant as the quintessential place for the “power lunch” before the term was invented. Bankers, politicians, and businessmen—all congregated here daily. The location of their respective areas were almost sacrosanct. They had a permanent reservation. Democrats met in one dining room and the Republicans in another. The Freemasons had their table, the Salt Lake Tribune writers had theirs. Deals were struck, loans were made, political quid pro quos exchanged, and business mergers consummated. Patrons wanted to enjoy the same ambience—which meant no change in the décor, tables, chairs, menu, and service. Once when music was added during the lunch hour, so many complained they were here “to conduct business, not to be entertained,” that Speros discontinued it. It is an affectionate and insightful vignette of an important community institution (416-17).

This remarkable collection of interviews chronicles for us all the history of a significant segment of Utah’s population that has heretofore not only received short shrift but has also been unnecessarily stigmatized. Their stories are poignant reminders of how Utah’s mainstream population has frequently marginalized and maligned groups that had, and still have, much to contribute to Utah’s changing cultural contours. Their tradition and values are not inferior—just different—and they should be afforded their proper place without the lingering resentment and obstacles these oral histories unfortunately document.

HARVARD HEATH, a former archivist at Brigham Young University, is president of Heath Historical Associates and is currently editing Mormon journals for publication.


Reviewed by Ken Driggs

“Mormons learned many lessons about the changeable nature of constitutional law and theory, as well as the fear of religious difference across the country,” observes University of Pennsylvania law professor Sarah Barringer Gordon in her impressive new book The Mormon Question (222). This work is
easily the most comprehensive examination available of the national legal debate, both in popular discourse and the courts, over Latter-day Saints and the First Amendment. The book is primarily about the debate itself, not the actual conflict.

Gordon’s book is exhaustively researched and relies primarily on sources that are underutilized by Mormon historians. It explains the stark realities facing LDS Church leadership by late 1890 which brought about the Manifesto and the effort to reconcile with mainstream America, efforts which continue today. Gordon covers much of the same ground that Edwin Brown Firmage and Richard Collin Mangrum did in their 1988 book *Zion in the Courts: A Legal History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1830-1900* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1988) but from the vantage point of those who opposed Mormon life. Much of it may be difficult for Mormons to read because they were so demonized during the period, not because Gordon embraces those views but because she paints such a vivid picture of the rhetoric of the times. Her book provides valuable insights into why and how the rest of the nation came to be so hostile to Mormon kingdom-building in the late nineteenth century.

The first time the U.S. Supreme Court considered the religion clauses in the First Amendment was in a series of Mormon cases, beginning with the landmark *Reynolds v. United States* in 1879 and running into the 1890s. These cases dealt with the application of increasingly harsh Congressional actions, beginning with the 1862 Morrill Anti-Bigamy Act. The prosecutions came at a time when Mormons were a pariah people in the nation’s eyes. Politicians also sometimes used the Mormon issue to divert attention from the collapse of Reconstruction and the nation’s failure to meet promises made to freed African Americans after the Civil War.

The Supreme Court consistently ruled against Mormons and set precedents which continue to echo loudly through U.S. freedom of religion and federalism law today. Gordon, who has a Yale law degree and a Princeton Ph.D. in history, teaches at the University of Pennsylvania. She explores the details of the legal, philosophical, and rhetorical aspects of this conflict, primarily from the vantage point of those hostile to Mormons. The book is organized into more or less chronological sections beginning with Mormon arguments that religiously motivated plural marriage was constitutionally protected, how Congress decided to wage war against the Mormons, the evolution of the legal tools used against Mormons, the Mormon response, and the ultimate outcome. It is a discussion of republican democratic attitudes and how the tightly bound LDS theocratic community seemed to challenge this national value. The recently organized Republican Party and its campaign against the “twin relics of barbarism,” slavery and polygamy, became a primary anti-Mormon force in the nation.

Particularly interesting is Chapter 5, “The Erosion of Sympathy.” LDS women were first seen as the victims of male polygamous patriarchy but lost national sympathy as they defended polygamy; their image became that of co-conspirators who should be stripped of newly won political rights and
punished along with male polygamists (161-81). "Many antipolygamist activists outside Utah also shifted in the 1880s from calling for the liberation of Mormon women to unhappily admitting that Mormon women were just possibly part of the problem" (164). Gordon's research includes detail on the types and timing of prosecutions of Mormon plural wives that I have not seen presented in historical literature before (181). But she also writes as if these Mormon women never enjoyed any sympathetic support from the national women's movement. This view conflicts with conclusions I have read by other historians, among them Lola Van Wagenen and Joan Smyth Iversen whom she lists as sources.

One particular strength is Chapter 6, "The Marital Economy," a lengthy discussion of the 1890 decision in The Late Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints v. United States, which approved the federal seizure of church holdings in excess of $50,000. The decision came literally weeks before President Wilford Woodruff's Manifesto suspending public support for new plural marriages. It has long been my opinion that, more than any other single event, the *Late Corporation* decision forced President Woodruff's hand. The economic cooperation of the Mormon community was portrayed in ways that offended the rest of the nation, who interpreted it as proof they would not assimilate. One of the strongest criticisms of the LDS community was that Mormons had become a law unto themselves—that Church government had become a quasi-state in the midst of the nation which made its own rules, levied and enforced its own taxes, had its own courts (94-95), opposed a system of free public education (198-99), and refused to respond to Congressional authority to regulate the territories.

I was disappointed that Gordon discusses only in passing (224-28) an especially outrageous 1890 Supreme Court decision, *Davis v. Beason*, upholding the prison sentence of an Idaho Mormon who had the audacity to vote, contrary to an Idaho law which effectively denied Mormons the franchise. She correctly observes that the opinion "reveals the intolerance and exasperation at the heart of antipolygamists' turn to coercion in the 1880s" (225) but leaves unexplored the broader implications of this decision.

The book is additionally interesting in its description of how the Mormon cases altered the legal role of the federal government and its power to dictate local affairs. Ultimately these Supreme Court decisions eroded the philosophical and legal underpinnings of states' rights.

While I would not have come to the same conclusions as Gordon on some points, the flaws I perceive in the book are more a matter of perception than research. Her work is particularly useful because she is from outside the usual group of historians who are sympathetic to or part of the Mormon community. Gordon has written a very thought-provoking work that serious scholars of nineteenth-century Mormon history should read. Although The Mormon Conflict is a demanding book that requires readers to have some familiarity with the legal conflicts of the time to fully appreciate, it is well worth the effort.
KEN DRIGGS holds journalism, law, and legal history degrees and has written extensively on the legal aspects of Mormon history. He is a public defender, specializing in the death penalty, and a member of the Atlanta Ward in Atlanta, Georgia. Driggs is the author of *Evil Among Us: The Texas Mormon Missionary Murders* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 2000)


Reviewed by Lynne Watkins Jorgensen

CHILDREN OF THE PROMISE traces the fortunes of the Thomas family, Mormons living in the Sugarhouse neighborhood of Salt Lake City in 1939. The parents, D. Alexander ("Al") and Bea, struggle to raise their six children righteously, honor their religion, and maintain a respectable standard of living. As the series begins, the five Thomas children still at home ignore the threat of World War II as Hitler's tanks plunge across Poland. Instead, their greatest worry is whether East High's football team will win on Saturday night.

The oldest son, Alex, who is serving a mission in Germany, has a different perspective. He has learned to love the German people, in particular a young Mormon convert named Anna Stoltz and her family. As Alex and his fellow missionaries are forced to flee from the Nazis, the horrors of World War II in Europe and Japan form a counterpoint narrative to the at-home life of the rest of the Thomases in middle-class America.

By the end of the first volume (1941), Alex returns home safely, bringing a happy resolution to this tense narrative; however, he must face the possibility that, when the United States enters the war as it almost certainly will, he will find himself fighting the very Germans he learned to love. Wally, the second son, who is sixteen when the story opens, eagerly enlists at age eighteen in the Army Air Corp after the bombing of Pearl Harbor. He is captured in the Philippines and forced on the brutal Bataan death march, an ordeal that continues a saga of privation and suffering throughout all five volumes. Daughter Bobbi at the University of Utah, in a patriotic gesture, changes her major from English to nursing and falls in love with every man she meets, a motif also repeated throughout all five volumes and, consequently, a source of repeated suffering as they are killed or wounded. The three remaining children are Gene, age thirteen, as the story opens;
nine-year-old Beverly, sweet, charming, and the family pet; and eleven-year-old LaRue, who, in the course of the series, becomes a sassy teenager, who challenges her father over every decision and brags (over-optimistically) that she knows exactly how to handle him.

In the second volume, *Since You Went Away*, the Thomas family is scattered. Because of Alex’s fluency in German, he parachutes behind the lines in Normandy where his leg is shattered. Because of his valor, he earns a medal and recovers from major surgery in England. Wally is taking part in the Japanese capture of the Philippines. Gene, now a marine, is in Hawaii where he spends some time with Bobbi, a nurse in a burn unit at a naval hospital in Hawaii. Just before Gene is shipped out for an assault on the Marianas, Bobbi sympathetically asks how he feels about the danger he will face. Gene answers:

“I got to know this guy at boot camp. He wasn’t religious at all. But one day he said to me, ‘I wish I believed in Heaven. Then I wouldn’t be so scared.’ He was just kidding around, but it hit me—he was right. All my life I’ve been going to Sunday School and everything, but I think that was the first time I ever just said to myself, ‘Okay. I do believe in heaven. So everything will be all right—no matter what happens.”’ (292)

All of the Thomas children seriously question their faith, then learn to rely on it, even though Gene’s death in the second-wave assault on Saipan (430) turns one of the four blue stars in the Thomas family’s window to gold.

Meanwhile on the home front, Al Thomas struggles as stake president to care for his large flock and struggles with his own patriarchal tendencies to assert control over his growing sons and daughters. Because Thomas owns the Hudson/Nash dealership, he does not have to give up their car (as my family did) for lack of gasoline and tires. Bea Thomas, a proper Mormon homemaker-wife, finds that World War II actually expands her horizons as she takes charge of a family sub-business—a plant making parts for defense companies—and builds it into a major weapons industry after the men go off to war. These Salt Lake City scenes are affirming in the solidity and sweetness of their staunch family life and devotion to the gospel, but Hughes also makes it apparent that major problems for the Church during the last sixty years had strong roots even during this period: racism, intermarriage, women’s issues, authoritarianism, and stereotyping enemies.

When LaRue tries to make a case for spending Sunday afternoon at the USO instead of returning to an nonairconditioned chapel for sacrament meeting after two hours of Sunday School in the morning, Al Thomas lectures her harshly:

“The truth is, right now, what you are is immature and self-centered. I keep hoping to see some improvement, but it just doesn’t come.”

The words were a stab and LaRue reacted. “Thanks, Dad, I’m looking forward
to being mature like you. Then I'll always know exactly what's right and wrong—not only for myself but for everyone." (75-76)

Alex's converts, the Stoltz family of Frankfurt, realize their precarious position as Mormons when an SS man stalks Anna. They run for their lives and, after harrowing adventures in Switzerland and France, reach England. Anna, learning of Alex's whereabouts from his parents, surprises him in the London rehabilitation hospital. Quickly they are married, then separated. Both end up working for Allied intelligence in London and Germany. Anna's father, who sneaks back into Germany to search for his missing son, also becomes a volunteer for Allied intelligence.

In the third volume, aptly titled *Far from Home*, Wally and his fellow prisoners are starved, beaten, and left to die by the Japanese. The hatred these Americans feel is palpable. Wally's faith is tested every moment, and he almost gives up completely after he is removed from the Philippines and is sent as slave labor to a Japanese mine.

Back on the European front, Alex fights in repeated battles, losing friends and colleagues to enemy bullets, and then is sent behind the lines posing as an SS officer, intensifying the tension and danger.

In *When We Meet Again*, the fourth volume, the war winds down on both fronts. Wally and his friend Chuck have just been released from brutal solitary confinement where they have nearly frozen. Wally wearily admits, "I guess it was the worse thing the Japs have done to me. I thought I wasn't going to make it." His prison mate threatens:

"Someday these guards are going to pay for all this."

Later Wally sees a new Japanese supervisor in the coal mine. He didn't know his name, didn't know anything about him. What he noticed was that he had come to the mine without shoes. That was strange, and Wally had to wonder what was happening. He picked up his lamp and walked to the man. "Are you all right?" he asked. The supervisor looked up. Tears were on his cheeks.

"Nothing you can do."

Wally nodded. He didn't know what to say.

"Bombs come. Kill children."

"Your children?"

"Yes."

"I'm sorry."

Wally thought back to the night before when he had been happy to hear the bombs drop. He hadn't meant to take joy in something like that—not in the death of children. Certainly not in the loss of this man's children. (107-8)

In London, at Allied headquarters, Anna who is translating agents' messages sent from behind German lines, suddenly heard something familiar in this strained, muffled voice. She listened for a time without writing. By the time the message had ended, Anna was certain she knew the voice... She left her booth and ran down the hall. "Mr. Coleman, I need your help... Could you listen to a recording for me?"
The messenger's first statement was, "This is Driftwood."

Suddenly Mr. Coleman's head came up. . . . He said, "I can't answer any questions, so don't ask."

"I know who it is."

"Of course you do."

"He's in great danger, isn't he?"

"All our men are in danger, Anna. You know that." (161-62)

Anna anticipates Alex's quick return after the war, but Apostle Ezra Taft Benson asks him to stay: "We need you—the Saints need you" to help locate members, reestablish the Church, and, as he comes to realize, forgive his enemies (212).

In Hawaii, Bobbi learns to love and depend on the Hawaiian and the Japanese people, many of them in her ward. Her best friend falls in love with a handsome Hawaiian, much to the horror of her Mormon parents living in Arizona. Agnes and Sam are married in the Hawaiian Temple with Bobbi as a proud bridesmaid. Agnes accepts Hawaii as her home, for it will be a long time before Sam will be welcomed on the mainland.

One by one, all of the Thomas children learn important lessons except teenage LaRue, whose battles with her father escalate. She notifies her father that she won't be going to a family picnic, responding to his anger with an angry accusation of her own: "You don't want to spend the day with me, and I don't want to spend it with you. . . . You don't like me and you know it. You haven't liked me for a long time" (336). This intrafamily conflict is resolved as both mellow a bit but primarily because the plot provides a breathing space. LaRue earns a scholarship to Radcliff; and despite her parents' misgivings about her departure for Massachusetts, they give permission for her to go—perhaps with relief.

The fifth volume, As Long As I Have You, deals with the aftermath of the war. American troops rescue Wally, and he slowly regains his health. He decides not to tell the family when he is coming home and thus returns to Salt Lake City in complete privacy. Hughes reconstructs this personal homecoming lovingly:

He wanted to feel that it was a normal day, and he wanted everything to look the same, smell the same, be the same as he remembered. Wally got off the bus at Eleventh East, by the old World War I Memorial, right in the center of Sugar House. As he walked north toward his house, through his old neighborhood, he recognized all the details of the place, the August sun. Each front porch jumped back to his mind—all surprisingly clear, part of him, and at the same time dreamlike. . . . He looked all about trying to recall everything. What he felt was that it was all sacred, blessed, part of a beauty he had carried with him in his darkest days. Up on the mountain the fall colors were already fading, the red and bronze of the scrub oak turning gray. The air was cool and burnished, the sun lowering in the west. . . . The houses, the hedges, the telephone poles, everything was just as it was supposed to be. (64-65)

Hughes's story-telling ability made this series very enjoyable, although I
found that some of the post-war episodes dragged, with the surviving Thomases involved in the same efforts to make money that they had rejected in their father. The series is also available on audiocassette, in an abridged version.

This series makes for wonderful reading, especially for people like me, who grew up in Salt Lake City, and my husband, who spent fourteen grueling months on Guam. Hughes's descriptions of the Salt Lake City I knew as a teenager are eerily accurate, and I get the same feeling of authenticity about the details of the war on all fronts. One of his few errors is attributing a radio speech in 1947 to President Joseph F. Smith (5:451). Smith died in November 1918 and was succeeded by Heber J. Grant. George Albert Smith had been president since May 1945.

Hughes continues the adventures of the Thomas family in a related series, HEARTS OF THE CHILDREN of which the first volume, The Writing on the Wall, appeared in 2001 (489 pp., $22.95, ISBN 1-57008-725-3). This series picks up four Thomas grandchildren, one for each of the married surviving children, in the 1960s. Perhaps because I was an adult then, newly aware of the power of television to make us instant participants in historic events, I found the petulant high school students who are Hughes's narrators less appealing than their parents. Their limited awareness of the actual significance of such world-shattering events as freedom marches, John F. Kennedy's death, and Vietnam seemed to trivialize these powerful markers in my own life.

Nevertheless, HEARTS OF THE CHILDREN will give my children and grandchildren the same opportunity to place themselves within the events of world and Church history that I discovered in CHILDREN OF THE PROMISE I eagerly await the appearance of Volume 2, and meanwhile, both series are required reading for the Jorgensen family.

LYNNE WATKINS JORGENSEN is an Accredited Genealogist, has a master's degree in history from Brigham Young University, and recently retired as a consultant in the U.S./Canada Reference Department of the LDS Family History Library. A member of the Journal's executive committee, she has also served on the board of the Mormon History Association.


Reviewed by Scott H. Faulring

Of all the contemporary biographies or histories dealing with early Mormon
history, few are as significant, informative, or personal as that of Lucy Mack Smith, mother of the Prophet Joseph Smith. In 1844-45, with the assistance of a personal secretary, Joseph’s aged mother dictated a detailed reminiscence about her family, including her famous prophet-son. Who better than Mother Smith, as she was affectionately known, to give readers a first-hand account of the persons and events associated with the founding of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints? As an eyewitness, Lucy’s history provides most of what is known of the immediate Smith family and formative years of her son Joseph Smith and the events leading up to the restoration of the Church. Her lively family memoir remained unpublished until 1853, when Elder Orson Pratt, a member of the Twelve on his way overseas, obtained a manuscript copy which he published in England as Biographical Sketches of Joseph Smith the Prophet and His Progenitors for Many Generations. Having published the book without President Brigham Young’s knowledge, review, or approval, Orson Pratt and the 1853 edition were eventually publicly condemned by the Mormon leader. Under Young’s direction, copies of Biographical Sketches were gathered up to be destroyed. Fortunately copies of the first edition survived to the present day; and there have been several facsimile reprints of the 1853 edition, along with edited or revised editions, over the last thirty years so that anyone interested in reading Mother Smith’s history can do so. And yet, until the publication of this professionally edited documentary volume, appropriately titled Lucy’s Book, readers have not had complete access to the earliest draft manuscripts or the fair copies prepared from the original draft.

Lucy Mack was born in Gilsum, New Hampshire, on 8 July 1775, the youngest child of Solomon Mack and Lydia Gates. As a young woman, she traveled with her brother Stephen Mack to Tunbridge, Vermont, where she met her future husband, Joseph Smith Sr. They fell in love and were married on 24 January 1796. The couple lived in Vermont and New Hampshire over the next twenty years, where they alternately prospered and suffered setbacks, while raising a large family. In 1816, first Joseph and then Lucy, along with their eight children, moved to western New York, settling in the village of Palmyra. Eventually they contracted with a land agent to buy 100 acres of undeveloped land in Manchester Township, a few miles south of the village of Palmyra. Here they worked hard, clearing and cultivating some sixty acres of land in just a few years’ time. During those years on the farm, young Joseph experienced several visions, including a visit from the Father and the Son and also the Angel Moroni. Joseph shared many details of these supernatural experiences with his parents and siblings. Mother Smith would later recall her feelings about some of the miracles and divine experiences which her son had while living in New York, Ohio, Missouri, and Illinois. She outlived all of her sons except William and, in late 1844 and early 1845, began to dictate, with the assistance of the wife-and-husband team of Martha Jane and Howard Coray, her lively narration of her family and the wondrous things which God had done for and through them. Mother Smith, who died in Nauvoo in May 1856, lived long enough to see her family reminiscences published in 1853.
Lucy’s Book: A Critical Edition of Lucy Mack Smith’s Family Memoir, prepared by Lavina Fielding Anderson, a professional writer and editor with a Ph.D. in English from the University of Washington, is a skillful, painstaking redaction of Lucy Mack Smith’s family story. In this positive context the word critical means: “exercising or involving careful judgment or judicious evaluation” of the various manuscripts and publications involved in Lucy’s classic family reminiscence. Continuing its twenty-year tradition of publishing scholarly editions of early Mormon sources, Signature Books presents Lucy’s Book in first-class fashion. The dust-jacket design is strikingly distinguished, the page layout is compact yet readable and the content’s scope is comprehensive. Lucy’s Book is, without question, the most thorough and detailed presentation of Lucy Mack Smith’s family memoir ever to appear in print. In contrast to the various less complete, unprofessionally edited volumes published since the original 1853 edition, Lucy’s Book gives its readers virtually all the pieces in this biographical puzzle.

The book’s contents, totaling over 960 pages, are as follows: brief acknowledgments, a foreword by Irene M. Bates, the editor’s introduction, an extensive textual history of Lucy’s dictated story, a detailed chronology, a side-by-side presentation of the manuscript and published versions of Lucy Mack Smith’s history, several appendices, biographical summaries of individuals named in Lucy’s memoir, a bibliography, and an index.

In the acknowledgments, Anderson confesses that she is a lover of history and a self-trained historian. The former admission appears to be her sustaining motivation for taking on such a difficult research and editing task, while the latter is an understatement of her real qualifications as an excellent writer and historical editor. Anderson admits, and it shows, that she has been influenced by some of Mormonism’s most noted researchers, historians, and editors. It is significant that she offers specific thanks to David J. Whittaker, noted Latter-day Saint historian and Brigham Young University manuscript curator, for lending her his personal photocopy of Lucy’s rough draft manuscript which he purchased from Deseret Book’s used and rare book department in the mid-1980s. From this acknowledgment, and from other comments throughout Lucy’s Book, Lavina evidently had difficulty getting access to some original documents related to Mother Smith’s history from the archives of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saint in Salt Lake City. And yet, in spite of this restriction, Lucy’s Book is a valuable contribution to Latter-day Saint historical and biographical studies. The John Whitmer Historical Association honored it as best book of the year and the Mormon History Association gave it the Steven F. Christensen Best Documentary Award.

Irene M. Bates, a Latter-day Saint with Ph.D. in history from UCLA, writes an insightful foreword to this book, aptly titled “Lucy Mack Smith—First Mormon Mother.” Bates identifies three reasons to be grateful for Lucy Mack’s story: “First, because we are given a picture of Lucy’s early life as well as a description of her own crucial role in the Mormon restoration. ... Second, we are able to see through Lucy’s own words how beautifully she
matches the ideal of the ‘republican mother’ described by several historians of post-revolutionary America. Third, she gives us a first-hand account of the whole family’s involvement in the restoration of the LDS church and in the coming forth of the Book of Mormon” (2). In spite of various title changes over the years implying that this was a history of Joseph Smith, Bates points out that the narrative dictated in 1844-45 by Mother Smith is in fact Lucy Mack Smith’s own story.

In her fifty-five-page editor’s introduction entitled, “The Domestic Spirituality of Lucy Mack Smith,” Anderson analyzes Mother Smith’s place in her cultural milieu. She describes Lucy’s dictated work as “Mormonism’s first family history and Mormonism’s first female autobiography” and points out that this work by Lucy Mack Smith is best understood as a family memoir—not as an extensive sourcebook of early Mormonism (11). Examined in detail is Lucy’s family narrative and how she (Mother Smith) “represents the ideal Mormon woman in five ways: (1) She is a ‘good’ citizen, devoted to patriotic ideals of republican virtue and civic responsibility. (2) She has remarkable executive and managerial skills but defers consistently to male authority. (3) She is focused on her husband and household, expressing ill-concealed contempt for women who are not. (4) She has impressive spiritual gifts and is a woman of intense piety, but these qualities are manifest only in relation to her family. (5) And crowningly, her self-identification is overwhelming that of a Christian mother” (17-18). Throughout the introduction Anderson takes each of these five areas and offers a thought-provoking discussion of Lucy Mack Smith’s role as a mother and a participant in and observer of the earliest days of the latter-day gospel restoration.

Anderson also considers what modern scholarship has attempted to offer in its historical, psycho-historical, and psycho-biographical analyses of the Smith family. I was impressed that Anderson expressed her reservations with the more controversial findings of such scholars as psychiatrists Roger D. Anderson and C. Jess Groesbeck that Joseph Smith Sr. was an alcoholic and that both Father and Mother Smith suffered from chronic depression. In answer to the question: “Was Joseph Smith Sr. an alcoholic?” Anderson wisely concludes, “There are considerable dangers in diagnosing the dead (to borrow Steven Harper’s phrase) and considerable frustrations attempting to prove the negative (that Joseph Smith Sr. was not an alcoholic)” (25; parenthesis and italics in original).

Occasionally I came across an omission or typographical mistake that distracted me. On page 24, there is a short-titled parenthetical reference to Dan Vogel’s article “Joseph Smith’s Family Dynamics,” but surprisingly the full citation is not listed in the book’s bibliography. A typographical error on page 28, second line of first full paragraph, reads, “In April 1829.” Since it is discussing a vision of Joseph and Hyrum Smith escaping from their Missouri imprisonment, the correction should read “April 1839.” And finally, footnote 18, on page 52, Dean C. Jessee’s surname is spelled “Jesse.” And yet, in spite of these minor problems, the editor’s introduction is well-written and informative.
The next section of the book, over 100 pages in length, is entitled "The Textual History of Lucy’s Book." This is the most sweeping essay ever written about the writing and publication of Lucy Mack Smith’s biographical history. Anderson begins the second paragraph of this section with this matter-of-fact statement, "Lucy’s book has a very complicated documentary history." She then goes on to explain the crux: "In any given passage, depending on the in-print edition, it is not always immediately clear if we are listening to Lucy’s voice or to that of Martha Jane Coray, Howard Coray, Orson Pratt, George A. Smith, Elias Smith, Preston Nibley, or even an anonymous British typesetter" (66). Anderson describes the thesis of her textual history: “This essay will explain the complex and complicated history of composition that produced two almost-identical manuscripts and the publication journeys that each took from that point” (67). She then describes the writing project that involved Lucy Mack Smith assisted by Martha Jane Knowlton Coray and Howard Coray which began some time in the winter of 1844-45 and resulted, a year later, in the creation of two finished manuscripts, along with the rough draft, and a possible intermediate manuscript. Mother Smith retained one of these finished manuscripts. It was her copy that actually made its way into Orson Pratt’s hands and was taken to England and published in 1853. The other complete copy, designated as the “1845 fair copy,” was taken to Utah and remains unpublished to this day. Anderson states that she would have preferred to present all three versions (e.g., preliminary draft, 1845 Coray fair or finished copy, and the 1853 Pratt edition) in parallel columns, but was twice denied permission by the LDS Church Copyrights and Permissions Office to publish the 1845 Coray fair copy manuscript. Given this restriction, Anderson presents the Lucy’s 1844-45 preliminary manuscript paralleled with the 1853 published edition. Only the significant or clarifying variations found in the Coray fair copy manuscript are footnoted. Anderson does give, as an example of what could have been the three-column parallel arrangement, the short chapter in which Lucy describes the emotionally charged, risky surgery on Joseph’s typhoid-fever-infected leg (69-77).

The remainder of the textual history chapter describes in detail the involvement of Martha Jane and Howard Coray in the creation of the dictated and fair copies, Orson Pratt’s publication of Biographical Sketches in 1853, the official reaction by President Brigham Young to the publication of Biographical Sketches, the work of the revision committee in 1865-66, the question of accuracy, other reasons for Brigham Young’s suppression of the 1853 edition, the Coray fair copy in Utah, the structure and analysis of Lucy’s book, a descriptive summary of the documents, the editorial procedures and her conclusions. Each of these subsections includes a wealth of interesting details and discussion.

As with the editor’s introduction, there were a few mistakes that detracted from the narrative. On page 81, about two-thirds of the way down the page, Anderson mentions a visit Mother Smith paid the Knowlton family on Bear Creek the winter after “Joseph Jr. died,” which visit was
shortly before Howard and Martha Coray were married in February 1841. Father Smith died in January 1841 and the phrase should read “after Joseph Sr. died.” And on page 102, the reference to the Millennial Star in footnote 22 should read 1855 not 1854.

In the last thirty years, several editors and scholars have worked with the various unpublished and published components comprising Lucy’s family biography, but none has documented as well as Anderson the intricate textual evolution from dictation in the mid-1840s to the present day. In my opinion this essay, although complex in discussion and argument, is the best published elucidation on the textual development of Lucy’s history. Immediately following the textual history is a detailed chronology (167-216) that begins with the birth of Lucy’s father, Solomon Mack, in 1732 and continues to 2001 with the publication of Lucy’s Book. The chronology briefly lists information about events and people related in one way or another to Mormon history or Lucy’s narrative. Although the chronology is a helpful supplement to the book, I spotted a few problems. For example, the entry for 19 March 1830 reads in part, “The completed Book of Mormon is advertised for sale in this and the next three issues of the Wayne Sentinel: 2, 9, and 26 March.” This statement is both confusing and inaccurate. In the 19 March 1830 issue of the Wayne Sentinel there was a prepublication announcement that reads, “We are requested to announce that the ‘Book of Mormon’ will be ready for sale in the course of the next week.” It was not until the next issue, on 26 March 1830, that the book of Mormon was advertised for sale: “The above work, containing about 600 pages, large Duodecimo, is now for sale, whole-sale and retail, at the Palmyra Bookstore, by HOWARD & GRANDIN.” This advertisement also appeared in the Wayne Sentinel’s 2, 9 and 26 April 1830 issues.

As another problem, the entry for Winter/Spring 1831 misidentifies John Johnson’s wife Elsa (also called Alice) as “Mary Musselman Johnson,” evidently confusing her with Mary Musselman Whitmer. And I was surprised to find several entries that were out of chronological order (e.g., 20 September 1827, 17 June 1829, 27 February 1833).

A line diagram describing the relationship of Lucy Mack Smith’s documents, from Coray’s notebooks, to the 1844-45 rough draft, to the alleged intermediate manuscript, to the two fair copies of 1845, to the published versions (from Orson Pratt’s 1853 edition down to and including Lucy’s Book in 2001), appears as a facing page illustration to a modern typographic facsimile of the 1853 title page (218-19). While the chart is definitely a helpful illustration, it would have been more effective if placed in the textual history section where readers could have more easily referred to it.

The core of the book, some 559 pages, is listed in the table of contents as The History of Joseph Smith by Lucy Mack Smith. Lucy’s family history is broken out into six major subdivisions. Part One, “The Mack Family,” includes the original chapters 1-9; Part Two, “The Pre-Mormon Years,” includes chapters 10-17; Part Three, “The New York Years,” includes chapters 18-38; Part Four, “The Kirtland Years,” includes chapters 39-47; Part Five, “The
Missouri Experience,” includes chapters 48-50; and Part Six, “The Nauvoo Years,” includes chapters 51-54 and the original appendices. Since the 1845 fair copy and 1853 edition of Biographical Sketches are similar in chapter breaks, Anderson surmises that the chapter titles from the 1853 edition “represent more or less what Lucy Smith intended” (v) and so they are used in Lucy’s Book. In this main section, Anderson presents the complete text of Lucy Mack Smith’s 1844-45 rough or preliminary draft in the left-hand column (which she identifies as “Lucy: 1844-45”) and parallels that text with the Orson Pratt 1853 first edition in the right-hand column (identified as “Coray/Pratt: 1853”). This side-by-side juxtaposition allows the reader to easily compare the two texts. I found this alignment to be very helpful in determining where and when an addition, deletion, or modification occurred. In those instances when the text from one source has no counterpart, then the text is printed in a single full-width column. The textual variants from the 1845 Coray fair copy, corrections by George A. Smith, Elias Smith, or Robert L. Campbell, and variant readings from the RLDS, Improvement Era, and Nibley published versions are conveniently annotated in the footnotes. Overall the transcription of the 1844-45 preliminary draft manuscript is accurate. On a rare occasion a misreading or inaccurate transcription is introduced. Two examples will suffice:

Lucy’s Book

... I anticipated <as> much happiness with my second daughter in law & as I had received great pleasure from the society of the first ... (364)

Preliminary Draft Manuscript

... I anticipated <as> much happiness with my second daughter in law <&> as I had received great pleasure from the society of the first ... all set off for Misouri to assist the brethren against their oppressive neighbors in protecting their rights. <for the purpose of providing of [sic] forming> a treaty with the mob and also to take clothing and money to relieve them ... (570)

After the sixth and final section of the history closes, the first part of the book’s back matter is a nice biographical epilogue on Lucy Mack Smith’s final years. Anderson discusses Lucy’s situation after the martyrdom of Joseph and Hyrum and gives details of the Twelve’s contact with Lucy before and after the Church’s exodus from Nauvoo in early 1846. Although Lucy publicly stated her desire to journey west with the main body of the Church, for unknown reasons she remained in Nauvoo with her daughter Lucy Millikin and daughter-in-law Emma and their families. Anderson discusses the impact of William Smith, Lucy’s sole surviving son, and the acrimonious division between William and the leading members of the
presiding Twelve. I was particularly interested in William Smith's interactions with James J. Strang, especially Strang's invitation to bring Mother Smith to Voree to be affiliated with the Strangite movement. Fortunately for Lucy, she did not move to Wisconsin but stayed with her namesake daughter's family as they moved to various places in Illinois. Eventually Mother Smith returned to Nauvoo, where she lived with Emma for her remaining years.

The next section of the book's back matter is called “Biographical Summaries of Named Individuals.” Here we find short biographies of persons mentioned in Lucy's family history. There are biographies on over 250 people. Anderson deserves credit for attempting to identify all the individuals mentioned in Lucy's narrative. All of the information in this biographical register is gleaned from other researchers' work. This is not an uncommon practice by historians in assembling summaries like this, but it has a certain amount of danger when it comes to repeating biographical mistakes. For example, in the entry for Sarah/Sally Chase it reads that "Sally was a "Serving Mach[ine] Op[erator]' when the 1860 census was enumerated" (810). In reading through her citations for this biographical entry we discover that this occupational information came from Dan Vogel, Early Mormon Documents 1:342 note 154, which reads, "According to the same census [i.e., 1860], she worked as a "Sewing Mach[ine] Op[erator]."" Vogel misread the census entry which lists Sally's occupation as "Sewing Mach[ine] Op[erator]."

While much interesting information is summarized in these biographies, some of it is wrong or misleading. Again, a few examples. Under Oliver Cowdery I was surprised to discover that he was "ordained an elder by Sidney Rigdon (August 1831)” (812) and yet Cowdery had been signing priesthood certificates as "Second Elder" since the 9 June 1830 conference. Notwithstanding the historical-intellectual debate of the early Latter-day Saint meaning of “high priesthood,” Oliver Cowdery was an elder since at least the summer of 1829. In the entry for Joseph Smith Jr., we find that Joseph married Emma Hale on 18 January 1827, which is correct, but Anderson immediately writes that Emma first "met Joseph Smith in 1827 when he boarded at her parent’s tavern" (870). The correct year, of course, is 1826. For Peter Whitmer Jr., it notes that he “served on the Far West high council and died near Liberty, Clay County, . . . on 22 September 1836” (884). Unfortunately Far West was a wilderness for most of 1836 and did not have a standing high council until after Peter’s death. Anderson’s misunderstanding probably arose because Peter was appointed to the "High Council of Zion," a Missouri-wide church council, in January 1836.

Let me conclude this review by stating, as a historian and researcher, that I believe *Lucy's Book* is a welcome addition to Mormon historical and literary studies. Readers will be enlightened as they discover an expanded portrait of Mother Smith and her legendary family through this carefully edited scholarly presentation. I am confident that this landmark publication will
expand the personal voice and influence of Lucy Mack Smith to those interested in exploring the rich textures of the early Mormon experience.

SCOTT H. FAULRING {scott_faulring@byu.edu} is a research historian with the Joseph Fielding Smith Institute for Latter-day Saint History at Brigham Young University and the editor of An American Prophet's Record: The Diaries and Journals of Joseph Smith (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1989).


Reviewed by Kenneth W. Baldridge

In the spirit of disclosure, I need to state that Lance Chase was my teammate, my colleague, my bishop, the master of ceremonies at my retirement party, and my friend. Furthermore, our wives are third cousins. He and I cofounded the Mormon Pacific Historical Society (MPHS) in 1980. When I retired from BYU-Hawaii and left the islands in 1993, Lance took over the shepherding of that society. The biographical information on Lance on the back cover, taken largely from his obituary, calls him “a founding member” of MPHS. That is somewhat like saying John Wayne used to ride horses in the movies. Lance held more offices in the organization, worked harder, and presented more papers at the annual conferences than any one in the group.

Temple, Town, Tradition is a collection of thirteen papers presented at various conferences over an eighteen-year period while teaching at Brigham Young University-Hawaii. He delivered the last in 1998, the year before he died of cancer after a valiant struggle of nine agonizing years. After his diagnosis in November 1991, he and Londa undertook a six-month program of chemotherapy at Castle Hospital in Kailua. Beginning in January 1992, after his last class on Fridays, he and Londa would make the hour-long drive, take the treatment, and then Londa drove them home. Lance spent Saturdays in bed trying to recuperate. He rose from his sickbed on Sundays to spend most of the day serving as bishop of Laie Second Ward, then again returned to bed. Monday, without fail, he was in his classroom. He taught up to three weeks of his death in June 1999. As Londa said, “Teaching kept him going.” I told him as early as 1993 that many people could teach us how to live but that he was a rare one; he was teaching us how to die.

About 1996, Paul Spickard, Lance’s friend and chair of the Behavioral and Social Sciences Division at BYU-Hawaii, persuaded a reluctant Lance to gather some of his papers for publication by the school’s Institute for Polynesian Studies. He died, however, before the volume was published and
it was left to others to put the finishing touches on the book. Dale Robertson, editor-in-chief for IPS, wrote the preface; Paul Spickard wrote the introduction, "Lance Davis Chase, Faithful Intellectual."

Of the thirteen papers, eight (Chapters 1-2, 5-9, and 11) were presented at MPHS conferences and the originals appear in the conference Proceedings. Chapters 3, 4, and 12 were papers at the Mormon History Association conferences, which he attended faithfully. The BYU-Hawaii faculty selected him for the honor of presenting the David O. McKay Lecture in 1988, published here as Chapter 10. Lance delivered the concluding essay at Calvin College in Grand Rapids, Michigan, at a conference on Faith and History. It is the only essay in the book that was not prepared for a predominantly Mormon audience and one of only three not dealing directly with Hawaii. I feel fortunate in having heard over half of his presentations. It brought back delightful memories to read them again.

My favorite was "The Purported Hawaii Temple Attack on 7 December 1941," a topic we had researched, compared notes on, and debated for over a decade, with both of us finally concluding that the "attack" never occurred. He and I both presented papers on the topic at the 1988 MPHS conference held—quite appropriately—at the Hawaii Temple Visitors Center. His depth of research was most impressive.

Lance was not at all reluctant to tackle sensitive topics, to explore them with thorough research, and to present them with complete documentation. His insistence upon balance led him to be sometimes mildly critical of Church leaders, as he was in "The Hawaiian Mission Crisis of 1874" (1980), "Samuel Edwin Woolley: An Appreciation" (1991), and "The Meek Did Not Inherit the Earth: The 1927-28 Laie Beachfront Sale and Suit" (1985).

He was also very fair—sometimes too fair, I felt—to those who took positions in opposition to BYU-Hawaii or Zions Securities, both major landholders and policy setters in Laie. Acknowledging his own hurt at being considered an outsider, he still struggled to represent objectively the concerns of political activists in "Hawaiian Sovereignty and the Balkanization of Paradise: 'When We Have Turned to Loving Will They Have Turned to Hating?'" and "On Being Held Hostage: Cultural Activists and Environmental Entrepreneurs in Laie, Hawaii" (1994, 1996).

He always wrestled with the dilemma of writing accurate history, simultaneously maintaining absolute loyalty to the LDS Church, which he joined as a university student in 1960. He served as a missionary, twice as bishop, and as head of BYU-Hawaii's Division of Religious Instruction (1980-84). By all but the most intransigent "iron-rodders," he would be considered the epitome of Mormon orthodoxy. His dedication to the truth, however, often caused him anguish as he considered the potential impact of historically accurate information upon the developing testimonies of his students, a struggle beautifully expressed in his final soul-baring chapter, "When I Have Fears: The Perils of a Fin de Siècle Mormon Historian." As Chase points out, "The faithful modern Mormon historian [must] sometimes risk his own soul
in pursuing an account of 'what happened,' conscious all the while of the
dangers to himself and his audience. . . . More importantly, he or she should
become convinced of the necessity to describe and thoughtfully examine
such struggles, in part because we can thus be instructed in how to wrestle
with our own moral dilemmas, that struggle which is the very purpose for
our being" (172).

There are some flaws in the book which, I'm sure, Lance would wish to
have addressed. I personally feel that the format could have been improved.
The chapters are arranged according to the chronology of the topic; that is,
the first essay describes missionary work on Kauai in 1850-54. Next comes
"The Hawaiian Mission Crisis of 1874," and so forth. I would have preferred
arranging them in order of their presentation, thus allowing the reader to
identify any changes in Lance's choice of topics, scholarship, or other
factors. Despite this preference, I must confess that I have noticed no such
changes over the years. "When I Have Fears" was a most appropriate
concluding piece, but it deals with finding a balance between faith and
scholarship, a topic that Lance thought persistently about during his entire
professional life.

Had Lance enjoyed good health at the time of the publication, he no
doubt would have corrected several minor errors. "It Was All in the
Ohana (Family)," was originally presented at the MPHAS conference on Kauai as
"If at First You Don't Succeed" in 1995, not 1996 as the book states (1). In it,
he mentions the ordination of a man named Kauwahi. A parenthetical
sentence in the book, which does not appear in the Proceedings, says that this
individual's first name was not known. It was, most likely, J. W. H. Kauwahi,
to whom Chase had made earlier reference on the same page (5). A
typographical/agreement error, "This ordinations. . . " (5) also did not
appear in the Proceedings.

Are residents of Jackson County "Jackson Countians"? (29, 31) I don't
know; I'm just asking. The Chicago Manual of Style points out that although
the Southwest should be capitalized, southwestern Utah should not (36).

Chase's essay on Samuel Edwin Woolley received considerable editing,
most of it good. For example, the woman mysteriously referred to in the
1991 Proceedings as "IK or I.A., as she later came to be called" is identified by
name as Ivy Kekuku or Ivy Apuakehau (65). On the other hand, poor use of
pronouns in a later paragraph left me in some confusion about who was
being discussed (60, 64).

A clarification of considerable personal interest is required for his "The
Meek Did Not Inherit the Earth: The 1927-28 Laie Beachfront Sale and
Suit." In illustrating that it is indeed possible for faithful Latter-day Saints to
sue the Church, he cited my experience in receiving a letter in 1978 signed
by both the outgoing and incoming presidents of the Pacific Islands Area.
They assured me—and others with whom the letter was to be shared—that
legal proceedings then in progress over the sale of land in Laie to permit
home ownership "should not be interpreted as evidence of any conflict
within the Church." Chase added: "The issue was settled out of court in
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Baldridge’s favor” (97). What was not said, unfortunately, was that for seven years I chaired the Land Conversion Committee of the Laie Community Association and that the settlement resulted in about ninety-seven families in Laie and Hauula being able to purchase their house lots in fee simple from the Church-owned Zions Securities in 1979. Most MPHS members in 1993 knew what the settlement “in Baldridge’s favor” actually meant, but many readers of the book doubtless will not.

In “The Voice of the Waves of the Sea,” the island of Hawaii is referred to inconsistently as both “the big island” and (correctly) “the Big Island” (114). A more serious error is the statement, “At Punaluu, a few hundred yards hauula side (east). . . . “ (116), which may mislead a reader unfamiliar with Hawaiian customs into thinking that hauula means east, an error compounded by its inclusion as such in the index (191). Except on freeway signs, the directions north, south, east, and west are seldom used in Hawaii. Instead, directions are given toward the next town. Lance’s original (“A few hundred yards Hauula side of Pats of Punaluu”) is much clearer, meaning “in the direction of the town of Hauula from the town of Punaluu.” The Hawaiian word for east is hikina, or “the arriving,” having reference to the sun rising in the east. Incidentally, anything hauula-side of Punaluu would actually be toward the northwest, not east.

“Hawaiian Sovereignty and the Balkanization of Paradise” gives Hawaii’s 1990 population as 1,108,299. Other typographical errors not found in the Proceedings are “severity would produced” (19), kuleana misspelled kuleiana (20), Kekuku spelled Kekuka (62), and “Hammond” indexed as “Hammon” (191). Kalihi (193) and Punahou (200) are seemingly indexed as towns; actually, they are neighborhoods in Honolulu. Ricks College has no apostrophe (176, 200).

I commend all connected with the publication—Dale Robertson and Paul Spickard for initiating the project, Lance’s son, Zach, for research efforts, and The Institute for Polynesian Studies for bringing it to fruition. This book is not only a delightful, informative, and diverse collection of essays but also a fine tribute to an outstanding individual.

KEN BALDRIDGE retired from BYU-Hawaii in 1993 as professor emeritus of history after a twenty-five-year career there. He and Delma, his wife of fifty-four years, now live in Pleasant Grove, Utah, where he is now wrapping up a history of the Church College of Hawaii.

Danny L. Jorgensen and Joni Wilson, eds. Religion and the Challenge of Modernity: The Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints in the United States Today. Binghamton, N.Y.: Global Publications, Binghamton Univer-
At the 1997 John Whitmer Historical Association meeting at Kirtland, Ohio, George N. Walton, Roger D. Launius, Danny L. Jorgensen, and Paul M. Edwards presented papers, all of which in one way or another gave a pessimistic view of the contemporary Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints (since 6 April 2002 renamed Community of Christ). Launius's paper was later published in *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* (Spring 1998), while those by Walton, Jorgensen, and Edwards appeared in the *John Whitmer Historical Association Journal* (1998).

The writings of Roger Launius, clearly the preeminent historian of the RLDS Church, are consistently good. His essay should be read in connection with Walton's. Launius reflects deep pessimism about the future of the Church. Borrowing from historians Clare Vlahos and Alma Blair, Launius sees the RLDS Church as traditionally having steered a course between Nauvoo Mormonism and Protestant sectarianism but as having now moved far away from the legacy of Joseph Smith (91-92). Since the 1960s, this trajectory away from its roots has accelerated "at a rate no one could have predicted" (104). He believes the Church must reshape its intellectual underpinnings. "Failure to forge a new dynamic identity will spell the doom of the Reorganization" (105). He does not suggest how the Church might do such reshaping.

George N. Walton, a mechanical engineer at the National Institute of Standards and Technology, presents a statistical analysis of important indicators of religious vitality such as number of baptisms, ordinations, and tithe payers in the RLDS Church for 1940-97. He observes that the church "did quite well in comparison to the other churches until 1980" but since then has declined more quickly on these measures than other churches (79). He finds that while the Church is growing in the Third World, there has been a 50 percent decline in active membership in the United States since 1980 (84-85).

Paul M. Edwards's paper, "Christ-Centered Boredom: History and Historians," suggests that the RLDS Church suffers from "a rather widespread loss of spirituality" and a "growing apathy, absenteeism, and decreasing financial participation" (203). Edwards's creativity sometimes gets the best of him, leading to generalizations which simply can't withstand scrutiny. For example, he asserts, "Most RLDS history has been written from the assumption that the past exists in a manner that can somehow be reconstructed exactly as it was" (206). He understandably doesn't cite any RLDS historian as an example because it would be difficult to find a single historian—much less most of them—who works from any such assumption. He also claims: "For the past 150 years, church leaders have assumed the church was significant because it managed to continue in existence" (217). On the
相反，通过过去的150年，RLDS领袖们一直认为教会的存在是因为神的恩惠，“耶稣基督在地球上的唯一真教会”。也似乎非常可疑，这个概括论断在最近的领袖们放弃了“唯一真教会”的信念后，是否还能被严肃地支持。从Wallace B. Smith的任期（1978-96）开始，这种宗派主义的信念已经被抛弃。另一个需要解释的陈述是：“因为有那么多[RLDS历史学家]在领域内工作，传统上是 Hegelian的，在教育和宗教考虑中，他们没有从假设历史是线性地按照 metaphysical laws在中立的人类活动的舞台上展开这一观点中走出来。一个观点，可以引用英国历史学家Hugh Trevor-Roper的话，‘不但错误，而且可憎’（211）。很难理解这个观点的解释者为什么认为这是‘可憎的’。

Edwards引用了他论文的第一部分的许多哲学史著作；但在第二部分，也就是对各种RLDS历史学家的评论中，读者可能会奇怪他是否读过他们的著作。对具体作品的引注是几乎不存在的。一个例子是他对我的工作的引用。他的论文中说，我试图解释RLDS的分派运动，是‘解释阴谋论’（24）。1998年论文印刷后，我向Edwards解释，我从未认为RLDS转向自由派、泛神论的神学是阴谋。然而，在三年后第二版的论文中，Edwards不仅重复了这个错误的断言，还增加了‘不受控制’，将句子改为：“Russell反映了一种不受限制的阴谋论”（206）。在这两个版本的论文中，Edwards断言我找到了‘每个 Fundamentalist的不满背后都有一家机构自由派’（211）。我的RLDS激进主义者的作品中没有支持这些断言。

作为另一个不准确的例子，在两个版本的论文中，Edwards都引用了James和Richard Lancaster的作品，‘他们在这个早期阶段生产了重要的著作，但在他们的早期成功后，几乎没有产出’（225注22）。Richard Lancaster从未出版过有关RLDS历史的内容。与此同时，Edwards忽略了那些在领域中做出重要贡献的人，例如Norma Hiles，Barbara Bernauer，Pat Spillman，Larry Conrad。


Norma Hiles: Gentle Monarch: The Presidency of Israel A. Smith (Independence:...
In Jorgensen’s 1977 presidential address to the John Whitmer Historical Association, he made three arguments: (1) Mormonism was a conservative reaction to modernity, but it also incorporated certain modern themes; (2) The RLDS Church, from the very beginning, resolved the tensions between these premodern (conservative) and modern (liberal) themes in favor of modernity, and (3) “the challenge facing the RLDS Church today is to move beyond modernity” (149). As to Jorgensen’s contention that the RLDS Church through much of its history tended to resolve the tensions in favor of the modern worldview, I have to disagree. While many other denominations were coming to terms with biblical criticism in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the RLDS Church did not begin to deal with it seriously, let alone accept it, until the last half of the twentieth century. Resistance to the concept of evolution did not disappear until the fundamentalist defection of the 1980s.

A century ago, the RLDS were also very slow to accept insights from the new disciplines of the psychology of religion and the sociology of religion. Nor did they embrace until very recently the belief of late nineteenth century modernists that the other great religions of the world have something to offer that Christians should appreciate. Jorgensen also claims that decentralization “is currently underway in the RLDS Church” (152). Based on my own long history of church-watching and anecdotal reports from other observers, the RLDS Church has become even more centralized in recent years.

After the presentation of these four papers at a single conference, some attendees felt that the speakers had been too harsh in their evaluation of the Church’s future; and by invitation of the John Whitmer Historical Association, W. Grant McMurray (a member of the First Presidency since 1992 and


president of the Church since 1996; also a former JWHA president) responded at the 1999 meeting at Excelsior Springs, Missouri. His paper appeared in the 2000 issue of the *John Whitmer Journal*. McMurray reviewed his own historical writings, commenting on his tendency during his period as a historian (ca. 1972-92) before becoming Church president. He discovered, to his surprise, that “my own historical writing seemed intent on advancing a particular agenda” (245). From his current perspective, he found that the critics (Launius, Jorgensen, and Edwards) were “carrying chips on their shoulders” (245). He affirms the importance of the historical task but asserts that the “real danger comes if we embrace the revisionism and scholarship, but find ourselves unable to reconstruct a story that speaks to our hearts and bonds us together” (246). He overlooks what was probably his first significant scholarly article, “Closed Communion in the Restoration,” published in *Courage: A Journal of History, Thought and Action* (September 1971), a short-lived liberal RLDS journal. This issue has been a major area of contention between its fundamentalist dissenters and the liberal establishment; and when the Church abandoned closed communion by official action in 1994, further defections occurred. Possibly McMurray’s transition from historian to Church president can be best seen in his 1999 discussion of his 1982 JWHA presidential address, “The Reorganization in Nineteenth-Century America: Identity Crisis or Historiographical Problem?” published in the 1982 *John Whitmer Historical Association Journal*. In this piece, he called for a history that would recognize the contributions of women and laborers rather than focusing primarily on the “movements of the brethren.” He wrote: “By discovering anew what we should already know—that church and culture are intertwined in complex ways—we may be able to build bridges of understanding that so far have eluded us.” Reflecting on this essay seventeen years later as president of the Church, he refers to the RLDS identity crisis as the “so-called” identity crisis (235). McMurray asserts: “A religious organization functions in an entirely different manner than a market-driven corporation” (241). While I agree with the ideal expressed in this sentence, McMurray should have eliminated “entirely.” Many people in the Community of Christ (as well as in the LDS Church and others) are critical of the way its leaders seem to manage them as if they were corporations. (As an academic, I have the same problem with the leadership of most universities, including my own.) It seems likely that churches and universities can learn some things from corporations without compromising their mission, while at the same time they should sedulously avoid other aspects of the corporate mentality. The goal of a university is the

---


5 Ibid., 9.
pursuit of truth, not profit. Governance in the university is shared, more democratic, involving the creation and maintenance of a community of scholars who are free to speak and publish as they see fit, without pressure from the administration.

All five essays have had at least some slight revision since their previous publication, but there are few, if any, substantive revisions to be found in them. Jorgensen’s introductory essay (chapter 1), newly written for this book, introduces the reader to the issue of the challenge that modernity poses to religion in the United States and to the RLDS Church in particular. Jorgensen explains that the Latter Day Saint movement was founded when the forces of modernity were only beginning to be felt in America. Modernity “refers to massive social and cultural changes that fundamentally have altered the conditions of human existence, at least in the Western world, over about the last 200 or 300 years” (2). Jorgensen identifies the processes of modernity as industrialization, urbanization, rationalization, and individualization, with each affecting religion. Industrialization and urbanization did not significantly alter everyday life in America until after the Civil War and thus would not have noticeably affected Joseph Smith. The influences of rationality and individualization, however, had already made themselves known by his time. Jorgensen indicates that secularization “usually refers to the diminished significance of religion as the central institution in modern society” (5).

He also asserts that “the lack of a formal doctrinal orthodoxy [in the early Reorganization] permitted considerable individual differences in belief and practice” (16). I disagree. By the 1880s, the RLDS Church under its founding president, Joseph Smith III, had reached a theological consensus which remained fairly stable until the 1960s. The “Epitome of Faith,” based on the Wentworth Letter and very similar to the LDS Articles of Faith, served as an unofficial creed reflecting this RLDS consensus.

The book also contains new essays by James C. Cavendish, an assistant professor of sociology at the University of South Florida; by Maurice L. Draper, an apostle (1947-58) and also a counselor in the First Presidency (1958-78); Edward A. Warner, a humanities professor at Indiana State University; and a second essay by Jorgensen. Cavendish’s essay, “Religion and Modernity in America: A Perspective on the Secularization Debate,” which follows Jorgensen’s introduction, expands the theme of modernity and religion. Cavendish says, “There is, indeed, a debate among social scientists about whether secularization is occurring in modern, Western societies” (26). Some RLDS leaders have suggested that secularization has caused a decline in RLDS membership in recent years (25, 113, 114). Cavendish counters by citing Stark’s and Bainbridge’s assertion that secularization actually enhances religion’s capacity to thrive (27) and disagrees that society’s secularization has caused the membership decline in the

---

Community of Christ or in mainline Protestant churches. He offers as evidence the remarkable growth of other churches, including the LDS Church (28). Cavendish suggests that the RLDS Church must set itself apart from other groups because, if it "promotes a level of ecumenism that suggests to its members that they are really not all that different from the mainline denominations, then RLDS membership may continue to decline in a pluralistic, modern society" (51). He hastens to add that this doesn't mean that the RLDS Church must reject modernity, but he does not give any suggestions for how the Church can "set itself apart" and simultaneously "not reject modernity."

Maurice L. Draper wrote a new essay for this collection, "Sect-Denomination Transition in the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints." He provides a useful application to the RLDS Church of Liston Pope's analysis of the characteristics of sects and denominations explained in his classic *Millhands and Preachers: A Study of Gastonia* (New Haven, Ct.: Yale University Press, 1942). Draper's analysis draws upon his graduate education in sociology and his long career in the Church. He concludes: "The RLDS Church from its beginning has contained elements that fall in the sociological categories of both sect and denomination, and this continues to be true, with a general trend in the direction of denominationalism" (194; emphasis his). Draper asserts that there is no formal discipline for members of the Church who choose not to pay their tithing or file their annual tithing statement (189). While that may be technically true, for many years it has been customary for priesthood calls to be denied unless the potential ordinand had filed her or his tithing statement with the bishop.

In the last essay, "The Reorganization, Secularization, and Resacralization: A Scholarly Assessment and Some Suggestions," also new for this collection, Edward A. Warner discusses factors that made American religious history different from the European religious tradition: church-state separation, revivalism, the frontier, and the emergence of a democratic, pluralistic, and egalitarian culture (253-54). He makes an important point: The RLDS Church "did not have the history of the repeated and visible quarrels with the U.S. government that the LDS did" (257). That difference has strongly influenced the differences we find today between the two churches. The RLDS, located in the Midwest, rejected the more sectarian elements of Mormonism, even trying to expunge them from their historical memory (256). Warner cites the ordination of women (1985-present), the end of the hereditary Smith dynasty (1996), and the new church name (2000) as three major RLDS changes that helped produce the recent fundamentalist schism (260). However, he has omitted two additional influential changes: (1) Section 156 (1984), granting ordination to women, also called for the soon-to-be-built temple to be dedicated to the pursuit of peace, which has reoriented much of the Church's program and mission to improving society rather than focusing on our own uniqueness, and (2) the 1994 World Conference approved open communion. Warner cites two "powerful, liberally educated leaders"—RLDS President Frederick Madison
Smith (1915-46) and Graceland professor of religion Roy A. Cheville, later the Presiding Patriarch (1958-74) as having had a great influence on "liberalizing, democratizing, and denominationalizing the RLDS institution" (258). This is a very good point, although I disagree about the "democratizing" part. F. M. Smith centralized power in the office of the President of the Church in the 1920s to such a degree that he drove away many Church members, including some of the top leadership; and Cheville did not seem interested in collaboration with colleagues either on the faculty at Graceland (1923-60) or in his years as Presiding Patriarch (1958-74). The vast number of students he educated may, however, have had a democratizing influence on the church.

Readers interested in the recent history of the RLDS Church will welcome these nine essays, as most of them are well worth reading. Those by Cavendish, Walton, Launius, and Draper, and Jorgensen's introduction are particularly useful. However, the price of $50 for a paperback with only four new essays might deter it from receiving a significant audience.

Also troubling is the fact that the editors do not make proper acknowledgement of the previous publication of five essays. The oversight seems strange since Jorgensen and five of the other authors are past presidents of the John Whitmer Historical Association (Launius, Edwards, Draper, McMurray, and Warner), and Wilson is currently editor of its journal. While Jorgensen acknowledges in various places that five of these papers were presented at JWHA meetings, he nowhere acknowledges that any of them were published. The reader can piece together most but not all of the information about previous publication, but only in footnotes to papers by other authors.

I was also surprised to find incorrect dates for the publication of the Book of Mormon (10), the Pearl of Great Price (10), and Section 156 of the RLDS Doctrine and Covenants which provided for the ordination of women (23), all three in Jorgensen's introductory essay. Unless the introduction was written while the book was already on its way to the press, it seems odd that neither Jorgensen's coeditor nor the five LDS/RLDS scholars listed as members of the "Editorial Committee" (Martha Sonntag Bradley, Richard L. Bushman, Jessie L. Embry, Roger D. Launius, Carol Cornwall Madsen, and David L. Paulsen) identified these errors. Did they read these essays themselves? Surely the five who are LDS would have noticed that Paul Edwards refers to that nemesis of the New Mormon Historians, Boyd K. Packer, as "Elder Parker" (210), an error that is repeated from its publication in the John Whitmer Historical Association Journal (27).

Rather mystifyingly, although Edwards's paper on the contents page has the same title as his 1997 JWHA paper ("Christ-Centered Boredom..."), in the text the title appears as "A Conflict of Memory: RLDS History in Crisis." Yet there is very little change in content from the earlier edition.

It is good that some of these essays will get a wider reading. Let's hope that others will undertake to examine the recent history of the RLDS
Church and the interesting comparisons that can be made to the larger group of saints headquartered in Utah.

WILLIAM D. RUSSELL {RUSSELL@graceland.edu} is professor of American history and government at Graceland University, Lamoni, Iowa, and a past president of both the Mormon History Association (1982-83) and the John Whitmer Historical Association (1976-77).


Reviewed by Paul H. Peterson

In the comparatively brief history of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, thirty-nine men have served as counselors in the First Presidency. It is author-compiler Michael K. Winder’s contention that the counselors, excepting those who ultimately became Church presidents, have not received their just due from biographers, and that the faithful members of the Church are the poorer for it. In an effort to address this deficiency, Winder assembled a disparate team of established historians, apprentice historians, descendants, in-laws, friends, and/or admirers to write biographical sketches of each of the brethren. Winder’s intent throughout was to produce a faith-promoting book.

The emphasis was on illustrating the special spiritual qualities of these unique men, not on understanding how each of these men understood their roles as counselors or how successful they were in fulfilling these roles. “Viewing the history of the Church of Jesus Christ through the eyes of the counselors will enlighten and inspire,” Winder wrote (15). “Readers will discover that there are many inspiring passages among the life stories of the counselors that will draw them closer to Divinity” (x). While as a historian, I would have preferred a greater emphasis on historical context and on the evolving role of a counselor in the First Presidency, as a believing Latter-day Saint, I certainly have no problem with anyone writing or compiling a volume extolling the exemplary lives and wise counsel of good people. In truth, I share Winder’s assessment that, by and large, these were and are remarkable men and that we can benefit ourselves by learning more about them.

Having said that, the book would have been better and more helpful for readers of all persuasions and backgrounds had Winder, his editors, and his:

7Edwards’s titles are frequently so delightful that you want to see the paper published if only for the title. My favorite is his “‘Moonbeams from a Larger Lunacy’: Poetry in the Reorganization,” a paper presented at the Association of Mormon Letters in 1983 and published in Dialogue (Winter 1983): 22-32.
publisher maintained a higher level of scholarly control. Many readers will
be disconcerted (or confused) by publisher Bret Eborn’s prefatory com-
ment that the editorial team chose to let each author adopt whatever format
he or she found useful in order “to preserve the spirit and character not only
of 39 unique counselors to a living prophet but also that of their biogra-
phers” (viii). But what does creativity have to do with sloppiness? Rather
than allowing contributors to adopt their own manual of style (or no style
guide whatsoever), the editors should have required all of them to follow a
standard consistent format. In addition, they should also have provided
assistance of whatever kind and to the extent it was necessary to authors who
were obviously in need of editing assistance. A few of the essays were
unnecessarily uncritical and laudatory and were more akin to hagiography
rather than biography. And some of the articles were simply subpar, both in
terms of conception and execution.

Happily there were also a goodly number of quality pieces. Winder’s
policy of allowing the various authors free rein also had advantages where
the authors were knowledgeable historians, experienced biographers, and
talented writers. These essays were characterized by subjects framed within
a meaningful historical context, with the authors extolling their subjects’
strengths and accomplishments as well as commenting on their challenges
and occasional errors of judgment. Stan Kimball’s essay on Heber C.
Kimball is about as fine a brief biographical piece as anyone is likely to write.
A discerning reader need go no further than Kimball’s opening paragraphs
to realize he or she is in the hands of a skilled and confident historical
practitioner:

Heber C. Kimball was early Mormondom’s most colorful leader, third in
stature after Joseph Smith and Brigham Young, most dedicated though reluctant
polyganist, and least inhibited preacher. No plaster saint, two-dimensional
cardboard cutout, or religious ascetic, he was a masculine man, at home on the
frontier, where he spent most of his adult life. (129)

Davis Bitton’s piece on Brigham Young Jr. is of a stripe similar to Kimball’s
essay. Readers will also learn a good deal from reading the informed
submissions of John Christian Thomas on Frederick G. Williams, Kent
Dunford on George A. Smith, and Kenneth Godfrey on Charles W.
Penrose.

I also would point out that Winder’s decision to include relatives and
descendants as authors sometimes worked out well. I thought Stephen
Davis wrote a solid piece on his grand-grandfather, J. Reuben Clark, and I
enjoyed the personal touches and poignant moments that Charles M.
Brown provided about his father, Hugh B. Brown. Among other things,
Charles Brown noted his father’s recounting of President McKay’s selection
of President N. Eldon Tanner to replace recently departed first counselor
Henry D. Moyle. Apparently, President McKay, somewhat wearied from the
well-intentioned recommendations of others, told Elder Brown (then a
second counselor and soon-to-be first counselor) that he was “going across
the street to the Temple to learn who the Lord wants." President McKay returned and told Hugh, "The Lord wants N. Eldon Tanner—can you work with him?" Elder Brown replied, "President McKay, he is my nephew—I have known and loved him since the day he was born—of course I can work with him" (193).


In sum, I am glad I read this book because I learned a good deal and because I gained some helpful insights. Winder is to be commended for putting together an interesting, if uneven, volume of essays on men who have played important roles in the unfolding drama that is Latter-day Saint history.

PAUL H. PETERSON {Paul_Peterson@BYU.edu} is a professor of Church history and doctrine, Brigham Young University.


Reviewed by Ronald O. Barney

A "most deluded people," an "ungodly people," a "den of infamy . . . utterly depraved and wicked," wallowing in the "mysteries of [their] abomination"
(26-28) is the report Oregonians read about the Latter-day Saints from the pen of Jotham Goodell after he spent the winter of 1850-51 in Utah. Eight more letters similarly characterizing Brigham Young and his followers, all published between April and June 1852 in Portland, Oregon’s *The Oregonian*, fulfilled Goodell’s vow that if he were ever to escape the Mormons’ grip he would “expose the corruption of that people” (28). David L. Bigler’s recent edition of Goodell’s letters makes available this previously obscure commentary on Utah and the Mormons soon after their establishment in the Great Basin.

A beautifully crafted volume, the fifteenth in the UTAH, THE MORMONS, AND THE WEST series published by the University of Utah Marriott Library’s Tanner Trust Fund, the book is Bigler’s fourth work on Utah and the Latter-day Saints. Enhanced by period and modern maps, photographs, and significant supplementary historical commentary, Jotham Goodell’s objective in exposing the Saints’ corruption is more than adequately accomplished in this book. Bigler, a retired steel industry executive, presents a point of view to be considered seriously while excavating the landscape, seeking clues to understand the past.

Jotham Goodell, born in 1809, was a Massachusetts native whose ancestors arrived in America in 1634. Very well-educated for the time at Dartmouth College and Andover Theological School, Goodell embraced the Christian ministry, becoming a Presbyterian clergyman coincident to his marriage. His national heritage and religious zeal combined to energize his mission of Christianizing America in Calvinistic orthodoxy. He ministered initially in Upper Canada before settling in Ohio. A published critic of Alexander Campbell’s assault upon mainstream Protestantism, Goodell’s training and belief fostered his impatience at what he considered heterodox religious aberrations. In 1850 at age forty-one, he, his wife, and seven of their ten children departed from Ohio with Oregon as their destination. Bigler hypothesizes that popular notions of Oregon’s economic opportunity probably inspired the move. Their journey westward consumed over a quarter of the year. Rather than risk his family’s safety in mountain snowstorms, Goodell decided to winter in Salt Lake City along with several thousand other travelers, many on their way to the California gold fields. Their chosen winter quarters was Lorin Farr’s young settlement, some forty miles north of Salt Lake City, now part of Ogden.

A number of those who stayed among the Mormons en route to Oregon and California, beginning with the Gold Rush in 1849, left written records describing their visits among the Mormons. Generally their accounts were favorable toward the Saints, their way of life, and their hospitality, despite religious and social differences. Bigler argues, however, that most accounts lauding the Mormons were written by those whose time among the Saints was brief while those compelled to endure a lengthier tenure in Utah had a more negative experience. Not deluded by the Mormons’ superficial hospitality, Bigler continues, “The longer some remained . . . the more their attitudes turned against their Mormon hosts” (13).
To describe the Goodells’ experience that winter in Farr’s little hamlet at the mouth of Ogden Canyon as negative is an understatement. Initially, Goodell claims, “we were treated with much civility” (35). But the “sky of Mormon civility soon became overcast with lowering clouds” (38). Goodell’s complaints focused primarily upon the Mormons’ theocratic corruption and manipulation, polluting the American ideal: “The Jesuits of the 16th century were not more deceitful and cunning than are the leaders of the Mormons,” he charged (38). Among other egregious behaviors, Bigler states, the Mormon leaders’ flagrant abuse through “arbitrary court actions, disloyalty to the United States, denial of free speech, lack of political freedom, control of markets, and discriminatory taxation” stirred Goodell’s hostility toward the Saints (15). Before the winter ended, Goodell, with about one hundred other disgruntled overlanders, moved north to the scantily populated site of present-day Willard, Utah, “to place as much distance between themselves and their Mormon neighbors as they could” (15).

Goodell’s conflict with Utah’s settlers began soon after his arrival in September 1850 at Farr’s settlement during the immediate aftermath of the accidental slaying of Terikee, a Shoshone chief, by local resident Urban Stewart. In retaliation, the Indians had killed another local settler named Campbell. The scandalized Goodell claimed that the Mormons neglected Campbell’s remains, appropriated his worldly goods, and callously left his survivors to mourn without comfort. It was “at this point,” he wrote, “that my eyes began to be torn open to the abominations of that people” (42). Thereafter, apparently, Goodell’s five-month tenure among the Saints was one outrage after another: harassment, threats, and confiscation of his wealth. Nothing was too low for the Mormon “cut-throats” (107). Especially aggravating was the “tax” extorted from him just as his company prepared their getaway from the Saints’ clutch. Fearing the clandestine attentions of the “blood-thirsty Danites” (27), Goodell shuddered but complied to effect his escape from Brigham Young’s treachery. Fleeced by the Saints, his party “wept for joy” (126) in April 1851 when they reached the Snake River Valley en route to Oregon, having “scaled the mountain walls of our prison” (125).

Central to determining the value of this collection of letters is the question of Goodell’s credibility in appraising Mormonism. Is his recital of Mormon abuse just another anti-Mormon diatribe? Or does corroborating evidence support Bigler’s argument that Goodell’s report is actually representative of the majority of those who spent more than a week or two among the Mormons? Bigler, clearly an advocate of Goodell’s contentions, supplements the letters with three corroborative appendices which comprise almost a third of the text. Two of the them are the brief printed testimonies of Major William Singer in the *St. Louis Intelligencer*, 7 August 1851, and Asa Cyrus Call in the *Sacramento Daily Union*, 28 June 1851. The third and lengthiest is a fifty-four-page reproduction of U.S. President Millard Fillmore’s weighty Executive Document No. 25, *Message from the President of the United States* (1852). The prevailing sentiment of this document reflects the
reports of three federally appointed territorial officers, Justices Lemuel G. Brandebury and Perry E. Brocchus, and Broughton D. Harris, territorial secretary, who, after witnessing first-hand the Mormon resistance to anything federal fled Utah together in September 1851. While it is unlikely that Fillmore’s report reached Goodell’s hands before he penned his letters to *The Oregonian*, the primary charge of the erstwhile officials—the un-Americanism of the Mormons—parallels Goodell’s charges. (The President’s message to Congress also includes letters to President Fillmore from Brigham Young and John M. Bernhisel, territorial delegate to Congress, and a memorial from the Legislative Assembly of Utah Territory to the President of the United States, all of whom tried to impress upon the American president Mormon allegiance to the United States.)

Goodell’s eyewitness voice denouncing Mormonism as being antithetical to his countrymen’s republican ideals must be given credence. Goodell, trained in nineteenth-century American mores, qualifies as an honest man, candidly reporting his experience. Questioning, for example, the reasoning of a Mormon resident of Weber County who approved a petition from the legislature setting boundaries for Ogden City, the man replied, “Brigham has sent the form of the petition, counseling us to sign it, and that is all that concerns us” (56), shocking Goodell’s democratic sympathies. His letters typify the chronic polarity between Mormon singularity and American pluralism. But eyewitness depreciation formed only part of Goodell’s report.

Portions of his letters, describing circumstances of which he was not an eyewitness, perpetuate the tale-bearing and vitriolic baggage characteristic of other nineteenth-century anti-Mormon writers who wrote outside their experience, reliant upon the ubiquitous rumors of Mormondom’s horrors. To substantiate his claim of emigrants being “murdered in cold blood,” he emphatically declared that an overlander, recognized by Mormons as being a former Missouri mobocrat, was dispatched by the Saints when Brigham Young said, “[M]ark that man!” “[I]t was enough,” Goodell claimed, “he never passed the Weber!” (79; emphasis Goodell’s).

While Bigler’s edition of Jotham Goodell’s testimony aids our understanding of Mormon relations with non-Latter-day Saints, Bigler fails to acknowledge that many other “outsiders” living in Utah in the 1850s avoided Goodell’s troubles, largely by adopting a different attitude.¹

spite Goodell's claim of neutrality toward the Mormons upon entering Utah, his religious fervor obviously shaped his encounter with the Saints. Bigler could have cited, for instance, the account of William Bell, an agent for Salt Lake City merchants Livingston, Kinkead & Co., who left Utah in 1857 having lived among the Mormons since 1849. Interviewed by a New York Herald reporter, Bell indeed describes troubled Mormon/Gentile relations in Utah but attributes them primarily to the suspicion and judgmentalness of hypercritical visitors like Goodell:

The troubles between the Gentiles and the Mormons have sprung from meddling, unnecessarily and unwisely, on the part of the former. Many had come to Utah with the idea that the new faith and “peculiar institution” [polygamy] were matters which everybody had a right to criticize, talk about, joke about, ridicule and oppose, and such have invariably got themselves into trouble; but others who have gone there, and who have regarded Mormonism and polygamy as matters pertaining to the Mormons, and attended to their own affairs, have lived in peace and been respected by the community. That a prejudice exists against Gentiles in general is very certain, but it has no practical results, if they mind their own business. (New York Herald, 23 February 1858, reprinted in the Deseret News, 12 May 1858)

In short, Bigler’s portrayal of Jotham Goodell’s experience in Utah in 1850-51 contributes to our understanding of the time, the place, and the people (especially Goodell himself), but it does not qualify for the bellwether status that he claims for it.

RONALD O. BARNEY (frontporch_barney@hotmail.com) is Senior Archivist in the Church Archives, Family and Church History Department, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City.
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Ronald W. Walker, David J. Whittaker, and James B. Allen, with a contribu-
181, 188-89, 192-96, 230-31, 265. Other visitors found the Latter-day Saint climate more to their liking than what they left behind or future prospects. One overlander, bound for California riches in 1849, was Albert K. Thurber, who, while resting among the Mormons for several months, converted to the faith when he “was satisfied in regard to the Kingdom of God and the duty of honest men toward the Kingdom.” A. K. Thurber, “Journal and Diary of Albert King Thurber, in Treasures of Pioneer History, compiled by Kate B. Carter, 6 vols. (Salt Lake City: Daughters of Utah Pioneers, 1954), 3:272. For a broader overview of this time, see Craig S. Smith, “The Curious Meet the Mormons: Images from Travel Narratives, 1850s and 1860s,” Journal of Mormon History 24, no. 2 (Fall 1998): 155-81; Edwina Jo Snow, “British Travelers View the Saints, 1847-1877,” BYU Studies 31, no. 2 (Spring 1991): 63-81.

Reviewed by Curt Bench

Walker, Whittaker, Allen, and Mauss are well known to students of Mormon history and sociology. They produced the important and massive bibliography *Studies in Mormon History* (published in 2000, also by University of Illinois Press); it not only lists the authors and titles to more than 16,000 works of Mormon history, but indexes the material by topic. *Mormon History* is a companion volume to that book. The authors explain in the preface that they felt that their readers would want them to describe and interpret their work. As with the first volume, they hoped that this work would be “useful” (ix). They wanted “this volume to aid readers in several ways: by describing what has gone on in the past, including the various methods, themes, and interpretations that historians have used; by sketching the background and work of leading LDS writers; and by suggesting the pitfalls and strengths of previous writing with an eye toward improving our professional craft.” They identify their intended audience as “those starting a study in Mormon history,” but wisely “suspect even the most seasoned historical veteran will find value in the [book]” (ix). That addition is an understatement. The book will be of value to any who have more than a passing interest in LDS history and who dare venture within the pages of a book published by an academic press.

Walker, Whittaker, and Allen survey and examine the historical writings of the LDS Church from the beginning to present day. They chronicle and evaluate the often polemical written attacks against and defenses of the Church that were typical of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Next they look at the often more balanced and professional approach used by Mormon historians and other writers from the 1950s on. Included is a discussion of the New Mormon History. Complementing the thorough discussion of Mormon historiography is an examination of Mormon biography and other “life writings.” Armand L. Mauss’s chapter, “Flowers, Weeds, and Thistles: The State of Social Science Literature on the Mormons,” dovetails nicely with the historiographical chapters. The book ends with two interesting and valuable appendices, the first a history and evaluation of Mormon imprints and the second a guide to reference works and bibliographies.

One might wonder before reading the book just how objective the authors might be in their approach as three of them are on the faculty of BYU and/or the Joseph Fielding Smith Institute for Latter-day Saint History. I believe the reader will find, perhaps surprisingly, a good deal of balance and objectivity. In describing a book, the author, or the subject of that book, they frequently discuss both the positive points and shortcomings. A few examples will illustrate. The authors lavish praise on B. H. Roberts’s *Comprehensive History of the Church*, calling it a “monumental achievement,” but also point out some of the criticisms it received when
REVIEWS

published, including “unabashedly Mormon,” “hierarchical, male and political,” and often “argumentative” and “dramatic” (36). They describe Joseph Fielding Smith’s Essentials in Church History as being “one of the most influential LDS historical works of the century” but add that it had “serious shortcomings” (35). The first edition of Mormon Doctrine by Bruce R. McConkie, “intended as a handbook of LDS doctrine, was criticized as being ‘full of errors and misstatements’” (218). Non-mainstream and sometimes controversial periodicals such as Dialogue and Sunstone, and books by presses like Signature Books are discussed right along with traditional and official works and publications. Even anti-Mormon books are examined.

I appreciated the evaluations of many Mormon imprints. For instance, the authors write that Parley P. Pratt’s “Voice of Warning and Instruction to All People may have been the most important book published in early Mormonism outside of the LDS scriptures,” and then explain why (202). Having surveyed a truly vast amount of literature, our historian authors save us readers countless hours of research by winnowing the wheat from the chaff. This is done throughout the book, but particularly in the appendices which I enjoyed as much, if not more, than the rest of the material. Appendix A, “Mormon Imprints as Sources for Research: A History and Evaluation,” is a historical and topical discussion of numerous categories of Mormon imprints. The second appendix is a very helpful guide to reference works and bibliographies.

In one section of “Appendix A” the authors relate how George Q. Cannon, newly appointed over the European Mission, wrote to Brigham Young on the wastefulness of Church printing in Britain: It would “take half the Millennium to sell what are now on hand in this office. Were . . . [the books and pamphlets] mine, with my present feelings, I would think it better to sell them to the Saints those disposed to buy our works at the price of waste paper, or even give them away, than to have them lie year after year rotting on shelves or in boxes doing no good to anybody. . . . There is, therefore, but little demand for them” (215).

His account of some of the inventory and sales for the past three years is revealing: John Lyon’s Harp of Zion: 21 sold, 3,404 copies remaining; Eliza R. Snow’s Poems: 19 sold, 2,590 copies; Lucy [Mack] Smith’s Joseph Smith the Prophet [actual title: Biographical Sketches of Joseph Smith the Prophet...]: 732 sold, 454 bound volumes and 5,611 unbound; Journal of Discourses: 481 sold, 2,884 unbound volumes, “and 108,716 odd numbers out of which a good number of perfect volumes can be made” (215).

Perhaps this kind of detail might be tedious to some readers, but to me as a book dealer—and I think to many bibliophiles and history buffs—it is enormously interesting and informative. What we would give now to be able to get some of those publications they were giving or throwing away!

I found few obvious shortcomings in the book. I would have liked to see a detailed treatment of censorship and suppression of Mormon imprints (official and other). Although the authors mention some suppressed works, there is no thorough discussion. This is a small but important area of
Mormon historiography, but it is often neglected. I also found the index to be inadequate at times; I was not able to find a number of names or topics that are germane to the book. This seems an ironic deficiency for a bibliographic work.

Mormon History stands well on its own, but taken together with its companion volume, Studies in Mormon History, 1830-1997, they represent a very important addition to the ever-growing body of Mormon historiographical writing. This book is excellent reading and research material for everyone from novice to experienced scholar.

CURT BENCH (cbench@netzero.net) is the owner of Benchmark Books in Salt Lake City and the author of "Fifty Important Mormon Books," Sunstone 14, no. 5 (October 1990): 54-58.


Reviewed by William Shepard

I am impressed by the objective historical treatment the Cutlerites have received in Danny Jorgensen's articles published in the Journal of Mormon History, the John Whitmer Historical Association Journal, and Kansas History. These articles, coupled with published accounts by Richard E. Bennett, Biloine Whiting Young, D. Michael Quinn and others, when meshed together, give excellent insight into this unique and important Mormon leader and his church.¹

I was disappointed to find that *Obscure Believers* by Biloine Whiting Young, however, was not the definitive biography on Cutler I desired. Young does not satisfactorily examine Cutler's role within the Mormon hierarchy and the process by which he became convinced that he had to reject the leadership of Brigham Young. Also lacking are detailed explanations about the Cutlerite doctrine of the Gentile rejection (the view that the Gentiles had had their chance to accept the gospel and, because they had rejected it, would be rejected by God), their enlightened views on the role of women within the organization, the adversarial relation between Cutler and Orson Hyde, Cutlerite beliefs in and practice of folk magic, and other items I wanted to better understand.

Having said this, however, I hasten to add that disappointment turned to delight when I realized that Young was presenting a work on the Cutlerites every bit as valuable as my desired history. Using hundreds of primary documents, she captured the essence of their character, courage, and deep religious conviction. In this portrait, the Cutlerites are not members of a failed Mormon movement, but noble, God-fearing individuals with a supreme sense of dedication. This portrait is enhanced by Young's sensitive analysis and enjoyable literary style.

*Obscure Believers* contains a wonderful introduction by Robert Bruce Flanders, identification of principal Cutlerite families, and sufficient history about Cutler's important position within the Mormon hierarchy that even non-Mormons will understand who the Cutlerites were, the chronology of Cutler's break with Brigham Young, and a description of unique Cutlerite beliefs and practices. Cutler's membership and experiences within the Nauvoo Council of Fifty, the Nauvoo High Council, and the Anointed Quorum are also clearly explained. It becomes understandable why Cutler believed he had an heavenly mandate to convert Native Americans and why he believed he held the highest authority in the Mormon church.

Cutler's excommunication in 1851, the failure of his mission to convert Native Americans near Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, and the first Cutlerite settlement of Manti, a community of five hundred souls in Freemont County, Iowa, brings readers to the meat of the book: the story of the Cutlerite settlement by Clitherall Lake in Otter Tail County, Minnesota.

Many of the principal Cutlerites were converted to the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, headed by Joseph Smith III, beginning in 1859. Following Cutler's death in 1864, some sixty Cutlerites left their Iowa homes to find a place of safety "in the north" that Cutler had seen in vision. Traveling by wagon for roughly eight hundred miles on primitive roads during winter, these believers become the first permanent

---

settlers in Otter Tail County. Clitherall was founded within three years of the great 1862 Sioux uprising.

Young's account of the Cutlerites' strenuous task of carving farms out of virgin lands, community building, and inculcating social values should be of interest to any person who has Mormon progenitors who were pioneers. The Cutlerite millennial belief that they were approaching the "end times" was an important theme in their community. This value translated into their self-imposed isolation from a degenerate society, remaining ready to instantly return to Zion (Independence, Missouri), and the belief that they had to convert the Indians to the true faith. This continuing (but unsuccessful) effort is of special interest for its parallels with similar failed attempts in other Mormon groups.

I found Young's essay on the plight of the Indians who inhabited the Clitherall area extremely interesting. Their changing world is described with pathos, and their interaction with the Cutlerites makes delightful reading. One example is the story of George Hammer, who poisoned a dozen wolves, skinned them, and left the carcasses hanging in a tree. A day or so later, he discovered that a sizeable group of Ojibwes had cooked the wolves and were eating the meat. Believing the Indians, like the wolves, would die from the effects of his poison, he dashed into their midst and attempted to take the cooked meat out of their hands. When the Indians resisted, he pointed at the meat, clutched his stomach, made grimacing gestures, and pretended to die. The Indians found his acting terribly funny and laughed uproariously throughout the performance while they finished their meal. Only then, did one of the Ojibwe men tell Hammer in English: "Poisoned wolf no kill Indian." After Hammer demanded, "You redskin! Why didn't you tell me that?" the Ojibwe responded: "It was heap fun to see white man have big scare" (155).

A second example is Young's description of an evening charivari of Cutlerite newlyweds in which friends "banged tinware, rang cowbells, shot off their guns and shouted." The neighboring Ojibwes leaped to the conclusion that their enemies, the Sioux, were attacking:

Chauncey Whiting, Jr., who for some reason was not participating in the charivari, also heard the racket and came to the same conclusion as the Ojibwe—that an Indian war had broken out. He rushed out of his house, gun in hand, to encounter an Indian crawling over the lake bank. Whiting took aim at the man but the Indian shouted "Don't shoot!" and convinced him that he was a friend. As they stood trying to figure out what was going on, another Indian ran by them into Whiting's house gasping out, "What for so damn much shoot?" It was morning before many of the Indians came back to their camp and the Cutlerites claimed it was several days before all of the Indian women had returned. (152)

Young details the demise of Clitherall, due to three factors: a "second Josephite invasion" beginning in 1875, schisms within the organization, and the waning of the earlier religious fervor. Today, only a graveyard and the remains of three buildings are reminders of this once-flourishing Cutlerite
settlement. The sale of Chauncey Whiting’s homestead in 1927 was the end “of the dream of a utopian community, a Kingdom of God by the Minnesota lake that would foreshadow the Zion they hoped to build in Independence. The hallowed spot where men had knelt in prayer for guidance, the land between two lakes seen in Cutler’s vision, was about to become a fishing camp for Gentiles” (184).

Fewer than twenty-five Cutlerites remain at this time, residing in and near Independence. Biloine Young herself is descended from two principal Cutlerite families who were converted to the Reorganization. Raised RLDS in Council Bluffs, Iowa, and Independence, Missouri, Young vacationed with her family at the Cutlerite settlement at Clitherall, Minnesota, as a child and learned first hand much of the history, folklore, and traditions of the Cutlerites. This early exposure triggered years of research into Cutlerite oral history, letters, diaries, and memoirs. The result is Obscure Believers, an exciting, informative book. Having said that, I am still looking forward to Danny Jorgensen’s biography of Alpheus Cutler.

WILLIAM SHEPARD {shep@speeddial.net}, of Strangite heritage, has extensively studied the history of James J. Strang’s Voree settlement near his home at Burlington, Wisconsin. He also is in the process of compiling information about the Mormon criminal element at Nauvoo and a biography of William Smith.

**BOOK NOTICES**

The Journal of Mormon History invites contributions to this department, particularly of privately published family histories, local histories, biographies, other publications of limited circulation, or those in which Mormonism is dealt with as a part or minor theme.


Eric A. Eliason, who is an assistant professor of English at Brigham Young University, shaped this collection of eleven essays “with the general interest reader in mind but also . . . [as] an anthology suitable for use as a supplementary textbook in courses on American religious history, religious studies, and the emerging interdisciplinary field of Mormon studies” (2). His introduction reviews Mormonism’s claim as “an emergent world religion”: “Since Islam started in the seventh century, perhaps only two movements besides Mormonism—Sikhism and Baha’i—can lay reasonable claim to the status of a new world religion based on their longevity, population, world-
wide distribution, and doctrinal uniqueness" (2, 15). He reviews Joseph Smith's experiences, documents the serious attention that Mormon studies are now garnering, explains the goals and dimensions of the New Mormon History, summarizes the objection of its critics, but comments that "even [these critics'] most constructive remarks continue to ring hollow for many scholars since critics have often seemed to rely on ad hominem arguments but by and large did not try (and were usually not trained) to produce the kind of scholarship for which they themselves yearned" (4).

In a lengthy footnote on Joseph Smith and folk magic, he also reviews the Mark Hofmann forgeries and provocatively notes:

Except for two book reviews of [D. Michael Quinn's Early Mormonism and the Magic World View], the issue of Mormonism and folk magic has not been addressed by scholars in the field most obviously suited to examine it—folklore. Without folklore-informed commentary on this issue, misconceptions remain uncorrected and serious questions are left unaddressed. Folklorists have helped demystify distinctions people commonly make between magic and religion by showing them to be functionally and structurally similar concepts whose differences have more to do with culturally constructed notions emerging from relationships of class and power than from intrinsic qualities of either phenomenon. For Mormons who understand this, the idea that the restoration of all truth might draw on folk magic is no more shocking than that Protestant hymns would find their way into LDS hymnbooks. (16-17)

Since Eliason is himself a folklorist, perhaps he will undertake this interesting project.


Anyone involved with Mormon historical or scriptural studies is familiar with LDS scholar Richard Lloyd Anderson. As Andrew Hedges points out in his introduction, Anderson was “trained as both a historian and lawyer” and “the cautious, probing, analytical approach he brought to the field more than forty years ago revolutionized the way scholars have researched and written about Joseph Smith and the church he restored.” Much of that contribution has come from Anderson himself, as manifest by the impressive double bibliography by David J. Whittaker. Offered both topically (559-57) and chronologically (559-76), the bibliography demonstrates that Anderson has not only been prolific—he has been publishing for over fifty years—but versatile, with interests in religious history ranging from early Mormonism to the New Testament. In fact, the essays delivered at a BYU gathering to celebrate his retirement fill two volumes, this one and another dealing with ancient Christianity: Ricks, Parry, and Hedges, *The Disciple as Scholar: Essays on Scripture and the Ancient World in Honor of Richard Lloyd Anderson*.

The Journal of Mormon History

"Illusions" by John W. Welch, and "Mormon Missionology: An Introduction and Guide to the Sources" by David J. Whittaker.

Many of the eighteen essays in this volume deal with Anderson's own decades-long pursuit of the Three Witnesses. Important to note is Scott H. Faulring's, "The Return of Oliver Cowdery," (117-73) based on extensive use of primary sources, which was awarded the T. Edgar Lyon Award for 2000. In Kenneth W. Godfrey's "David Whitmer and the Shaping of Latter-day Saint History" (223-56), particularly useful is his compilation of David Whitmer's seventy-three interviews arranged in a table showing interviewer, date, and publication source and date. Despite this mass of data, Godfrey warns:

Historians of Mormon beginnings are grateful that he spoke so often and in such detail about the seminal events in early Latter-day Saint history. However, care and corroborating documentation must be applied before we can accept his recollections as reality.

At least two problems are glaringly present in the things he said he remembered. First, most conversations with him took place fifty years or more after the events happened. . . . Second, what he said, or did not say, comes to us through the pen of reporters, most of whom did not believe in Mormonism, or through believers, who, like the reporters, may have had an agenda of their own as they talked with him. . . .

To rely solely and unquestioningly on David Whitmer for our knowledge and interpretation of early Latter-day Saint history does neither the cause of Mormon history nor David Whitmer himself the justice they deserve. (243-44)

Many of the contributors to this volume are associated with FARMS, the Joseph Fielding Smith Institute for Latter-day Saint History, and the religion department at BYU, and represent scholarship from a faithful and thoughtful perspective.

Of particular interest to many readers will be Richard O. Cowan's essay, "Richard Lloyd Anderson and Worldwide Church Growth," which chronicles Anderson's accomplishments as a missionary in the Northwestern States Mission just after World War II. Because the Church had no systematic plan for teaching the gospel, mission presidents developed their own, based in part on suggestions from their missionaries. Building on the popularity of older missionary tracts, as well as concepts published by Elder LeGrand Richards (later expanded as A Marvelous Work and a Wonder), Anderson as a missionary developed a teaching and commitment plan that resulted in a dramatic increase of convert baptisms. The plan, adopted by many missions, inspired the first of the official LDS teaching plans published in 1952.


A handsomely produced book with color cover photographs on the dust
this volume also has an unpaginated black-and-white photo section of thirty-two pages between the two halves. The first half is a deliberately short biography to reflect Faust's modest wish to be "a workhorse, not a showhorse" (x). Bell explains that, although he had "absolute freedom to write the book as I deemed appropriate" within the page limitation, he did not treat "vast portions of [Faust's] life and ministry" after his call to the Quorum of the Twelve, especially since "his absolute adherence to the confidentialities surrounding most of the work in which he is involved precluded my delving into much of what he has done as a General Authority" (xi).

The son of George A. Faust and Amy Finlinson Faust, James Esdras Faust grew up as a farmer/sheep rancher in the rigorous environment of Delta, Utah, served a mission in Brazil from 1939 to 1942 when not even the Book of Mormon was available in Portuguese, participated in World War II in Air Force intelligence, married Ruth on a private's pay but in the temple by hitchhiking to Salt Lake City between assignments, and then graduated from the University of Utah Law School by dint of great sacrifice and discipline. The first of their five children was born after frustrating infertility was ended by a blessing. Ruth attended his ordination as an apostle in a meeting of the Twelve in the temple, "the first time that [a] wife... had been present for her husband's ordination" (132).

As an attorney, Faust was active in Utah politics as a Democrat, serving in the legislature, as president of the Utah Bar Association, as manager of Democratic Senator Frank Moss's campaign, and on President John F. Kennedy's Civil Rights Commission. In addition to service as a stake president, he was also one of the first group of Regional Representatives called, actively worked with Gordon B. Hinckley "in coordinating the Church's opposition to an initiative to liberalize the state liquor laws" which "started out with widespread support but ended up being soundly defeated" (86), was called as an Assistant to the Twelve (1972), as a member of the First Quorum of the Seventy's presidency (1976), as an apostle (1978), and as second counselor to Church President Gordon B. Hinckley (1995).

Faust explains his political opinions:

I am a conservative on fiscal and property matters and I am a liberal in terms of human values and human rights. I believe what is said in the Book of Mormon, that the Lord values all of his children equally—black and white, bond and free, male and female, Jew and gentile—and that the Lord likewise has compassion for the heathen. As a result, I like to see all people enjoy every advantage, every blessing, every opportunity that comes to them by reason of citizenship. I also support what has been said by the Brethren—that it is in the interest of the Church to have a two-party system and not to have one party that is exclusively LDS and the other party exclusively non-LDS. Both locally and nationally, the interests of the Church and its members are served when we have two good men or women running on each ticket, and then no matter who is elected, we win. (86)

With humor and modesty, he also describes his panicky reaction when, for the first time after his call to the First Presidency, the president and other
counselor were out of town simultaneously. They were “both on long flights, and I knew I couldn’t get in touch with either of them,” he recalled. “The concerns and burdens were so great that I felt physically ill, and I thought to myself, ‘What am I going to do with this great responsibility and authority?’ But the Lord came through and whispered in my ear, ‘Nothing, if you’re smart’” (221).

The second half of the book, “Teachings,” consists of excerpts of general conference addresses and articles from Church publications, arranged alphabetically by 120 topics. Among them are abortion, Book of Mormon, children, conscience, disabilities, diversity, education, faith, families, homosexuality, industriousness, integrity, marriage, missionary work, priesthood, repentance, Sabbath observance, single adults, testimony, welfare, women and the priesthood, and youth.


This study of Nauvoo consists of sixty-two full-color photographs of building exteriors, landscapes, and building interiors. No tourists, historic personages, or costumed missionaries are included. The brief captions name the building, explain the event, or quote a historic document related to the scene. An introduction describes Telford’s first visit in 1995 to do a week’s shooting on site, followed by four follow-up visits at different seasons of the year, all of them funded by Telford’s College of Fine Arts and Communications at Brigham Young University.

The subjects include the homes (and/or shops) of Sylvester Stoddard, Heber C. Kimball, Brigham Young, Joseph Smith, Lucy Mack Smith, and John Taylor—both interiors and exteriors. Public buildings are the Seventies Hall, the Red Brick Store, the Cheap Riser Boot Shop, the Scovil Bakery, the Lyon Drug and Variety Store, printing office, and Masonic/Cultural Hall. The remaining photographs are landscapes, including the frozen Mississippi and Carthage Jail.

Telford returns most frequently to the temple for a total of eighteen photographs, all exteriors of the completed temple, architectural details, or temple-related sites. Particularly dramatic is a double-spread photograph taken from across the Mississippi showing the temple rising from a bramble of leafless trees on its hillside and laying a streak of white across the smooth river, almost to the foreground where a pair of ducks paddles serenely. The closing scenes are also of the temple: a pair of photos taken at dusk with the temple walls a darker blue against the deepening slate-blue sky, windows blazing, and a final shot of the temple flushed pink at dawn, light glinting as pinpoints in two windows.

Because the photographs show only finished buildings and unpeopled landscapes, the effect is of timeless perfection. Only two captions hint at the restoration/construction process that created this cityscape: “The painting of 49,000 window-frame edges, which included 36,000 feet of putty, was done three times with no masking tape, razor blades, or cut lines” (45); the elliptical window on the east side, which provides light for the celestial
room, “is 21 feet wide and 8 high and contained 234 diamond-shaped panes of handblown glass” (52). The windows were done by a local company, the Allyn Historic Sash Company of Nauvoo.


This novel for young adult readers describes the life of the LDS O’Shea family in the British Isles in 1963. A useful map is included as a frontispiece. The author grew up in Wales, joined the LDS Church in the United States, and lives in England with her husband and four children.

While the O’Shea parents and younger children move to Ireland, taking the mother’s terracotta herb pots along, one teenage son, Patrick, defiantly strikes out on his own and ends up arrested for a bungled robbery but is paroled to his parents’ custody.

Of more interest to Mormon history readers are the activities of Ken, the other brother, who is serving a labor mission in Scotland, building an LDS chapel. The author’s disclaimer notes: “None of the characters represent people I know, but some of the labor missionary predicaments are taken from real events” (iv). These predicaments include assaults by local youth, name-calling in the streets, a description of pouring reinforced concrete beams, housing arrangements with local members, “Diversion Day” activities, quotations from the *Millennial Star*, and opportunities for missionary work.

A subplot involves Ruth, a youthful aunt who disappeared from the family in the wake of what was apparently sexual abuse by her brother. She meets an ardent Mormon while crossing the Atlantic Ocean to a new life in the United States who had visited her ward:

“They met in an old Victorian building somewhere at the back of town—Temperance Hall I think it was. I know we helped sweep up cigarettes ends before meetings began.”

Ruth stared into the dark night. . . . It was as though she could see herself sitting on the floor in the Temperance Hall next to her niece, seven-year-old Debbie. She could still remember the smell, a musty oldness of mildew and brooding disinfectant.” (13)

An announcement for the next volume, *Chamomile Winter*, promises to “[bring] the O’Shea family together.”


Among the plethora of the recent works generated by the construction of new Nauvoo Temple, *Window Maker* may come closest to creating the feeling of sacrifice and commitment of the workmen on the original temple.
Charles W. Allen, a specialist in historic windows and doors, became friends with President Spencer W. Kimball in northwest Missouri during the 1970s. The book includes a number of tender experiences between them. On a visit to Salt Lake City, President Kimball showed Allen his own journals, inspiring Allen to begin keeping his own. Journaling became one of Allen’s main therapies in dealing with the prolonged (almost thirty years) ordeal of having two of his six children die of cystic fibrosis. After working on a number of projects for Nauvoo Restoration, Inc., (1975-89), Allen moved to Nauvoo where he has served on the stake high council for many years.

With quotations from his journal and interspersed clarifying comments, Charles Allen describes, with great simplicity, gravity, and faith, the process of building the temple’s “116 big sash windows and 99 smaller sash windows” (238) from 16,000 separate pieces of wood. That process included a certain lack of clear communication from the Church Building Department, a period of negative reaction by non-Mormon Nauvoo townspeople to the temple’s construction, repeated (and uniformly unsuccessful) attempts by the various contractors to press Allyn House to speed up the process and cut corners, the workpeople who were led to Allyn House to provide needed assistance, and the faith and sacrifice of their consecrated labor, guided and undergirded by united, daily prayer. Particularly interesting are the many small miracles by which Allen was able to obtain frequently rare materials, some of them never used in the United States before, try new processes, and develop innovative techniques to produce windows of a stunningly high quality.

Building the windows took thirty-four months of intensive hand labor. One journal entry in December 2000 reads: “I have hand-glazed 4,179 pieces of glass and have 12 more to go.... When I finish glazing, I will have applied a 3/8” thick bead of putty that is 2.35 miles long. All of it is installed with a putty knife held in my hand and pressed with my index finger. It will have taken almost 700 pounds of putty” (227).

One of the workmen tells a story Allen does not:

After cutting blocks of wood and shaping for 6 months, 16,000 pieces were in stacks, on racks, and smaller pieces in boxes. All the pieces fit together to make the sash. . . . On a particular day in January 2001 . . . [Charles] paced, wrung his hands, wandered about, and about 4:30 he was urging us to go home. We noticed he was preparing to do something. We loitered, and about 4:50 he gathered pieces from the various stacks of pieces and assembled a round window sash. All the pieces fit together perfectly and in fifteen minutes the sash was assembled. (244)


In 1885, the year before Arthur Conan Doyle wrote *A Study in Scarlet* featuring the first appearance of Sherlock Holmes, he used both the title and the
novella’s embedded Mormon plot in a three-act play that he never finished. The manuscript of that play, here printed for the first time, distinctly shows the title crossed out and “Angels of Darkness” written in as the new title. It also features the first appearance of Dr. John Watson—but not Sherlock Holmes.

In this drama, Mormon pioneers had rescued John Ferrier and his little daughter Lucy twelve years earlier. Although Ferrier has refused to join the Church, he has contributed heavily and lived peaceably among them until now when he receives an ultimatum that seventeen-year-old Lucy must choose between two sons of the sinister and all-powerful Council of Four and enter plural marriage. Lucy, however, pledges her maidenly love to Jefferson Hope, a “Washoe miner,” as he leaves for Nevada. A frantic message brings him back on the last night of their thirty-day grace period and they escape with the aid of a Yankee peddler. Ferrier is killed in the attempt. Hope is apparently killed but survives with an aortic aneurism. He finds the peddler and Lucy in San Francisco, kills the “Avenging Angels” sent to kidnap Lucy, and confides her to the care of Dr. Watson, who has fallen in love with her, before (presumably) expiring. The play has two endings, both of them unfinished.

Included in the cast are the comic characters peddler Elias Forecourse Smee (“To depend means to hang. Look it up in Webster’s pocket unabridged bought out by the Baltimore press at the ridiculous som o’ fifty cents”), Ferrier’s Negro servant Splayfoot Dick (“I got a black skin, Massa Ferrier, but I hope dat my heart is not black”), their Irish maid Biddy McGee (“Sure we had all the Constabulary o’ Tipperary at the door from the Tuesday till the Froiday, an’ they moight ha’ been there yet if the praties hadn’t run short. All I axe is plenty o’ hot porridge, a ladle, and a winder”), their treasonous laundryman Ling-Tchu (“the yellow varmint is not worth powder and shot”), the “New Woman” owner of boarding-house (“Child, your great fault is that you are too feminine. . . . You must rise above your unfortunate sex”), and the British Sir Montague Brown (“I’m bawed, deah boy. I’m bawed. I’m the most bawed thing in cweation, don’t you know, unless it’s an Artesian well”) who falls in love with the New Woman’s daughter.

In addition to the facsimile reproduction of some holograph pages of the text, four critical essays round out the presentation: a history of the manuscript’s provenance, writing, and development, the character of Watson compared to his later role in the Sherlock Holmes’s tale, sources and influences, and theatrical context by Clifford S. Goldfarb, Christopher Roden, and Don B. Wilmerth.

Of particular interest to readers of the Journal, however, is the fourth essay, “The Mormon Subplot in A Study in Scarlet and Angels of Darkness,” (166-83) by Michael W. Homer, a Salt Lake attorney who has published scholarly articles on Mormonism in Italy and Mormonism and Masonry. This essay describes the resemblances and differences between the two Mormon plots and provides an extensive listing and discussion of the travel accounts, anti-Mormon, Masonic, Spiritualist, and literary sources that probably influenced Doyle. Interestingly, Homer postulates that Jules
Remy's harassing experience by a group of Lehi boys may have given Doyle his idea for the Baker Street Irregulars (173). He also traces Doyle's later use of Mormon materials, including his much less stereotyped views after visiting and lecturing in Utah. Doyle and his wife discharged the children's Christian Science governess when they found she had been threatening the children that they would be kidnapped if they stepped out of their hotel in the Mormon city (180).


In 1974, two young elders in Austin, Texas, Gary Darley and Mark Fischer, went off to keep a dinner appointment with a contact, Bob Kleasen, a man alone in a trailer house in a rural area. They never came back. The bishop, warned by Church headquarters in Salt Lake City that Kleasen might be a con artist and alarmed at Kleasen's collection of guns and verbal fight with another member, counseled the missionaries to drop him. This was to be their last appointment. They were not missed for more than twenty-four hours, but the police were not informed until later. Kleasen was charged with the murders when a search of his property turned up a name tag with a bullet hole through it, an unexpired temple recommend (both accidentally disposed of), and grisly evidence on a band saw that Kleasen had cut the bodies apart. They were never found, and Kleasen was convicted and sent to death row. Two years later when he was freed on a technicality, prosecutors failed to exercise their option to refile the murder charge.

Ken Driggs, an attorney specializing in death row appeals, has carefully investigated and documented this true crime, establishing Kleasen's long history of violence both before and after he became a Mormon, including breaking his elderly mother's leg and repeated episodes of marital violence with his several wives. After Kleasen completed his parole, he went to England where he married a woman he had written to from prison, who also left him, and was arrested in 2001 for stockpiling weapons (illegal in the United Kingdom). A British judge has ruled that Kleasen can be extradited to answer new charges based on DNA analysis of blood found on clothing outside Kleasen's trailer in 1974. Because Britain does not have the death penalty, Kleasen, if convicted, would not face the death penalty again.

Driggs, who describes himself as "opposed to all executions," acknowledges that "justice was frustrated in this case. However, it also illustrates how cases can work out in the real world of criminal law. And while I believe Kleasen was a murderer and, like everyone else, would prefer that he be locked up, I found considerable evidence of the forces that shaped him. I believe that understanding these forces—however much we may want to ignore them or tell ourselves they could never affect us—may help to prevent future Kleasens" (v-vi).

Rev. France Davis. *Light in the Midst of Zion: A History of Black Baptists in Utah,*
Trinity African Methodist Episcopal Church (AME) was the first black religious institution on record in Salt Lake City. Organized in 1890, it is still in existence. Calvary Missionary Baptist Church followed two years later, first as a “prayer band” of women who began meeting in 1892, followed by its first baptisms in 1896. Other congregations also formed in Ogden, Price, and Sunnyside, largely around railroad workers. The first meetinghouse was secured two years later.

As this history makes plain, the continued existence of Calvary Missionary Baptist required commitment and sacrifice from local members. Between 1898 and 1974, when this history’s author, Rev. France A. Davis, still its pastor, arrived to become its leader and community voice, twenty-three pastors moved through its top position. Only three stayed longer than two years (107). Between 1914 and 1916, Sunday School collections never exceeded more than eighty-four cents a week (25). As late as the middle 1950s, a funeral director refused to take a coffin into the church for a funeral “because the floor was so rotten” (57). In 2001 the congregation moved into a large new facility near downtown Salt Lake City, with ample room for its thriving programs.

Of particular interest for journal readers is the fact that, except for the introduction noting that African American constitute less than 1 percent of Utah’s population, there are only two mentions of the Mormon Church in this history. The first is that David H. Oliver, a black attorney and member of Calvary Missionary Baptist, authored A Negro on Mormonism, contents not described (117). The second occurred (time not specified) when Oliver bought a house on 400 East and 700 South owned by the LDS Church. “When they found out that they had sold it to a black man, . . . they broke the contract and gave him his money back. The house was too good for a Negro to own that house” (quoting Edward Miller, 123).

While the book contains a lengthy record of exclusion and marginalization, it is presented as the result of blacks living in a white society, not of blacks or Baptists living in a Mormon society. The NAACP was organized in February 1919 “when a group of soldiers committed an act of brutality against a group of young ladies from Calvary” (33).

Edward Miller, vice president of the Salt Lake branch of the NAACP during the 1960s, recalled a pivotal moment in civil rights. Black members of the union at Kennecott Copper were not allowed to attend a Lagoon concert by Nat King Cole, who refused to meet with them:

For the next two years, the union president refused to let his members participate in any Lagoon Day saying, “We are all union men and if these boys (we were called boys then, not men) can’t go in, there won’t be no Lagoon Day.

Then in 1964, Fats Domino came to sing for the Lagoon Day. When he saw no Negroes on the dance floor the first night of his performance, he asked the restroom employees what the problem was. They included . . . two members of
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the Calvary Missionary Baptist Church. They explained that the swimming pool and the dance floor were off limits to us. He instructed them to get in touch with as many blacks as they could find and have them there for the next night. He said, "If they don't get admitted at 7:00 P.M, there won't be any music. My music is for all people." We showed up by the carload and Fats Domino told the management to let us in. Lagoon management was concerned about trouble starting. He explained to them, "The NAACP president is here and my people don't cause no trouble. There won't be no trouble, at least, not from our side." So they let us in and that started the break up of segregation at Lagoon and with Kennecott. (122)

Still, it was 1970 before the first black served on a jury in Salt Lake County District Court. The county illegally taxed Calvary Baptist properties, refusing all petitions and efforts to negotiate until, after six months of futile negotiations, the ministers of the local black congregations invited the press and their members to a public meeting with the commissioners in 1974. "The commissioners responded promptly to refund the taxes paid and discontinue further taxation of church facilities" (66). When an effort to educate the public about a bill to declare a holiday for Martin Luther King Jr. stalled,

a major breakthrough resulted from a Take 2 television debate between Reverend Davis and Utah Representative Robert Sykes. The debate turned out to be a major educational session showing that Dr. King had spoken at the University of Utah, that his civil rights work was inclusive, and that the holiday would have a zero state budget fiscal note. At the conclusion of the half hour Sunday night program, Representative Sykes asked, "What can I do to make sure this legislation passes?" and signed on to become sponsor of the bill in the Utah House of Representatives. (73)

There are five appendices: "List of Black Baptist Churches in Utah" (there are sixteen); "Roster of Utah Black Baptist Pastors," "Utah Para-Church Organizations," "Future Vision Church Survey Form," and "Personal Testimonials" (fourteen biographical sketches of long-time members).


These two autobiographies focus on the experiences of Elder John H. Groberg of the First Quorum of Seventy in Tonga. His experiences as a young missionary (1954-57) chronicled in In the Eye of the Storm became the basis for a motion picture under the title, The Other Side of Heaven, released in 2001. Groberg and family returned to Tonga where he served as mission president (1966-69), then as regional representative for the South Pacific (1969-75), an assignment that included Tonga, Fiji, Niue, Samoa, Tahiti, the
Cook Islands, the Gilbert Islands, New Caledonia, and the New Hebrides. In 1976, he was called as a member of the First Quorum of the Seventy and became area supervisor for the newly created Hawaii-Pacific Islands Area until 1978. *The Fire of Faith* covers his 1966-78 experiences.

Both volumes use a similar format: Groberg relates a personal experience, then draws from it the spiritual meaning that it acquired for him. With dry humor, he explains in the introduction to his first volume:

> At times I look back with great longing to those carefree days [as a young missionary], when the only things I worried about were dangerous seas or broken ropes or ripped sails or being drowned or crushed against sharp coral or beaten by angry people or being seasick or learning a language or finding a place to sleep or getting enough to eat, and so forth.

> But these were mostly physical concerns and really not much of a problem when your attention is focused on spiritual things. (xiv)

His mission sent this Idaho farmboy, alone with his trumpet, on a circuitous path to his missionfield. Church officials did not know where he was much of the time. He was immediately assigned to a remote island with Feki, a native companion, where he struggled to learn the language, adapt to the customs, survive a severe tropical storm, and endure the resultant period of near-starvation before rescue came. His and Feki's lives may have been saved because an elderly man who had opposed their proselytizing gave them a jar of jam. Close to the end of that period of starvation, he says:

> At times I wasn't sure which side of the veil I would end up on, but it didn't matter. . . . I remember jotting down a little phrase . . . which came at that time with the power of firsthand knowledge: "The only thing that is important is your standing in the sight of your Father in Heaven. If that is as it should be, nothing else matters. If that is not as it should be, nothing else counts." (114)

Among the many lessons he learned from the Tongans was the sincerity of their service and the genuine honor accorded, not to the wealthy, but to the talented. "I remember once calling a man to be a branch president," writes Groberg. "He asked if the job of choir director was already filled. When I told him it was, he sighed and accepted the 'lesser' calling as branch president. The Saints loved to sing in choirs, and it was not uncommon to have more people in attendance at choir practice after church than at sacrament meeting" (270).

In *The Fire of Faith*, Groberg recounts the challenges of taking a family (eight daughters, three sons) into the mission field. Particularly revealing of the place he held in the hearts of the Tongan people was that, when a baby son became ill, even Queen Salote fasted with the members of the Church for the baby's recovery (236). The royal family also offered to let Groberg say "good-bye" to everyone on the island by broadcasting his farewell address over the national radio (237).

As an example of Groberg's combination of experience plus spiritual meaning as a writing technique is the unusual challenge of transferring
between the small launch and the larger ocean-going boat. It required wait-
ing until a large swell lifted the launch as high as possible, then jumping
toward the ship at the peak, grabbing the railing, and clambering over onto
the deck with the assistance of people who pulled him in. He explains:

You had to time your jump just right. If you jumped too soon or too late the
barge would be too low, you wouldn't reach the rail, and you could get crushed
between the barge and the boat as you fell.

. . . They yelled, “Now! Jump! Hang on!” I jumped and caught the side rail
while two strong pairs of hands from above grabbed my arms and started pulling
me up.

Suddenly one of my arms slipped from the grip above, and for a second I was
left dangling by one arm. Fortunately the man holding the other arm never
wavered nor weakened, and almost immediately someone else grabbed my loose
arm. Together they flipped me over the side and onto the deck. . . . I thanked
those who had helped me, but they didn’t feel they had done anything unusual.

Later, . . . I thought of the scripture: “In the mouth of two or three witnesses
shall every word be established” (2 Corinthian 13:1). . . .

I didn’t have time to panic, for the brief moment I was dangling by one arm.
. . . This unusual thought came to my mind: “I wonder what the Brethren would
think if they could see me now.” (70).

and the American West: The Life of the Place Itself*. Logan: Utah State University
$19.95, ISBN 087421-407-6

This collection of essays began as a festschrift honoring Barre Toelken but
progressed beyond the usual format to a stand-alone anthology in which the
editors “have aimed for a range of voices, methods, and visions but have
integrated them through the focus of one theme, worldview, in one region,
the American West” (1). They define worldview as “social as well as material,
spiritual as well as physical. It refers to the socially agreed upon way in which
a group with continuity in time and space shapes and expresses its reality.
Thus worldview inevitably permeates all of every group’s culture, yet, as
members of a specific culture ourselves, it is hard for us to understand that
worldview is only our take on reality (and our only take on reality) since it is
the very conceptual tool with which we see and communicate” (1).

The essays are “The Language of Animals” by Barry Lopez, “Faith of Our
Fathers” by George Venn, “Blue Shadows on Human Drama: The Western
Songscape” by Hal Cannon, “A Diversity of Dead Helpers: Folk Saints of
the U.S.-Mexico Borderlands” by James S. Griffith, “Icons of Immortality:
Forest Lawn and the American Way of Death” by Elliott Oring, “Ride ’Em,
Barbie Girl: Commodifying Folklore, Place, and the Exotic” by Jeannie B.
Thomas, “Tall Tales and Sales” by Steve Siporin, “Jesse James: An American
Outlaw” by C. W. Sullivan III, “John Campbell’s Adventure, and the Ecology
of Story” by Jarold Ramsey, “Raven and the Tide: A Tlingit Narrative” by
Nora Marks Dauenhauer and Richard Dauenhauer, editors, “Two Moon-
light Rides and a Picnic Lunch: Memories of Childhood in a Logging Community" by Twilo Scofield, "The Coquelle Indians and the Cultural 'Black Hole' of the Southern Oregon Coast" by George B. Wasson, "Visible Landscapes/Invisible People: Negotiating the Power of Representation in a Mining Community" by Robert McCarl, and "Local Character" by Kim Stafford.

The two essays with a Mormon component are "In Her Own Words: Women's Frontier Friendships in Letters, Diaries, and Reminiscences" by Margaret K. Brady and "The Concept of the West and Other Hindrances to the Study of Mormon Folklore" by William A. Wilson. The Brady essay draws on the personal writings of Mormon women and women on isolated ranches in Texas to illustrate her thesis:

A woman's life in nineteenth-century America was ... a life lived in the presence of other women; womanly friendship was not only casually accepted, but it was the very cornerstone of social relationships within and outside of the family itself. These female friendship networks played significant roles in providing mutual emotional and physical support, in holding communities and kin systems together, and in providing an arena of status and power for women, who were so often denied a place of value in male-dominated society. (163)

She notes that because Mormons moved west "as a community, its female members more easily maintained the kinds of relationships so important to them in the days before their westward trek." These relationships were facilitated by "by the geographical proximity and community expectations." While polygamy may have been a factor in promoting such relationships, Brady notes that the frequent absence of missionary husbands was a more significant cause (164-66). Her Mormon examples come from the writings of Mary Haskin (misspelled as Harkin) Parker Richards, Lucy Flake, and Eliza, Caroline, and Lydia Partridge (sisters and wives of Amasa Lyman) and Jane Snyder Richards. Brady draws more examples from Texas ranching wives. Her essay also discusses questions of audience and the presentation of self in the three genres of letters, diaries, and reminiscences.

William A. Wilson's analysis of "hindrances" to the study of Mormon folklore provides a solid scholarly review of folklore and historical critical theories that have impacted Mormon folklore. Early differentiations between "folk" and "urban" religion, while useful in studying small independent Protestant denominations are also limited. "We must not look at all religious traditions," points out Wilson, "in formal vs. informal or institutional vs. noninstitutional terms. We must understand that the formal, hierarchical religious institution may itself be the source of much folklore" (182).

Early studies of Mormon folklore have identified it as regional, "evolutionarily backward," as a feature of the frontier, and as geographically bound—all approaches that have likewise produced limited views of Mormon folklore. "The Mormon westward migration and settling of the Great Basin, far from being an exercise in rugged individualism, was one of the most successful communal and communitarian movements since Moses" (186). Furthermore, Wilson continues:
Of today's ten million Mormons only 10 percent live in Utah, and over half of all Mormons live outside the United States and Canada. Therefore, any attempt to describe the contemporary Mormon ethos as a result of western landscape will be doomed to failure.

If we are ever to understand Mormons by examining their folklore, we must turn our eyes from the past to the present, from the rural landscape to urban centers, and from the West in general to the faith and commitment that give unity and direction to Mormon life. And we must finally discover behind Mormon folklore typical human beings coming to terms through their lore with enduring life and death questions that know neither temporal nor cultural boundaries. (189)


Ronald G. Watt, a native son of Carbon County, leads off his history with a high-relief profile of the ways it differs from other counties. Settlement came late—not until 1879—and then:

The Mormon pioneers who settled the Price River Valley came not through a call from their leaders; rather, they came on their own volition out of a desire to farm the land and raise their families. These predominantly young pioneers also were not favorably inclined toward the cooperatives that Mormons previously had tried elsewhere. The early settlement . . . also differed . . . because of the arrival of the railroad within four years. . . . Adaptation to other people began almost immediately. (1-2)

The Denver and Rio Grande Western Railroad with its subsidiary, the Utah Fuel Company, controlled the early coal mines and the politics of the county. The county was distinctive in Utah for its early large-scale industrial development. (3)

Almost from the beginning, then, the conventional Mormon farming community coexisted with a larger community of non-Mormon freighters, shepherders, coal-miners, railroaders, and especially a level of ethnic diversity that was probably unprecedented in the state. “By 1920,” observes Watt, “the county was home to thirty-three different nationalities, with Italians and Greeks predominating. In 1920 there was a greater foreign-born population in Carbon County than in any other Utah county” (4). Another difference was politics. The county became Democrats during the 1930s but, “unlike most other Utah voters . . . have remained loyal Democrats” (6). Furthermore Mormons did not dominate the county. It was one of four churches in the early twentieth century (the other three were Catholic, Methodist, and Greek Orthodox), and today the county is still religiously shared among “at least fourteen religious denominations” (7).

Watt then develops these themes in seventeen additional chapters dealing with the geography and Native Americans, the settlement period and agriculture. Four solid chapters on aspects of coal mining form the book’s...
core and provide a distinctive treatment of union activities, lethal disasters, and exploitive and unresponsive management contrasted to community outreach and support. Price also has the dubious distinction of a brief Ku Klux Klan flourishing in the 1920s (215-17) and the shameful 1926 lynching of African American Robert Marshall, a story made particularly hideous by the fact that the sheriff rescued him before he had expired only to have the lynch mob snatch Marshall away, and hang him again (217). There are also separate treatments on cultural diversity, religion, education, health practices, recreation and entertainment, clubs and fraternal organizations, government and politics, and the county’s probable future.

A triumphant and comic story is how the county residents fought off the penny-pinching efforts of Price-born Governor J. Bracken Lee to close the College of Eastern Utah in 1953. To override the legislative action, they needed signatures of 33,000 Utah residents from fifteen counties. Within the required sixty days, over 56,000 people throughout the state had signed (296).

Eldon Dorman, an ophthalmologist, who ended up as head of the newly born College of Eastern Utah Prehistoric Museum in the 1960s, tells the amusing story of inviting the head of the University of Utah’s anthropology department to examine the collection. Jesse Jennings came with a couple of archaeologist friends and, over lunch “‘didn’t pay much attention to me, they talked about archaeology in China and all this stuff. The salad was brought in and Dr. Jennings said to me, “Well, now, you’ve got a Museum here in Price. How many people have you had see your so-called museum?” I said, “Fourteen thousand.” He damned near choked to death on the big hunk of lettuce in his salad. So I took him up to the Museum and he was absolutely amazed.’ Thereafter, Jennings supported the museum all he could” (97). Annual visitation to this museum, which has extraordinarily rich dinosaur holdings, tops 60,000.

Another native son is John D. Fitzgerald who set his novels in southern Utah. However, argues Watt, “many of the facts lead to Price” (102). Watt also pays a well-deserved tribute to Helen Zeese Papanikolas, ethnic historian and memoirist, who was born in the coal camp in Cameron (103). Mitchell’s Mummies, a woman’s softball team sponsored by the mortuary in Price, were consistent contenders during the 1950s, and an outstanding sports memory from the late 1940s was a baseball match between the Jewish team of House of David and the Kansas City Monarchs, “a powerhouse in the segregated Negro League” (336-37).

For readers of the Journal of Mormon History, the Mormon thread is consistent but subdued, suggesting how Mormons might have lived in the Midwest if they had not insisted on “gathering.” The Church owned and operated a coal mine with volunteers as a welfare project after World War II, leading to interesting controversies with the miners’ union (234). The Mormons sponsored the 24th of July parade in Price, but “all community businesses and other churches participated” (328). During World War II, it was the Sorosis women’s club, not the Relief Society, that became the local Red Cross affiliate and organizer, another difference from most of Utah (367). One might wish that it was the Mormon residents who rallied against the
Klan, but it was the Catholic Knights of Columbus who defiantly "burned fiery circles" when the Klan burned crosses (216). "It was claimed," writes Watt cautiously, "that a few of them [Klansmen] were active Mormons, although this was somewhat clouded because some members were inactive Mormons and others considered to be Mormons were not members themselves but were married to active Mormon women" (216). One of the stories Watt tells to illustrate cultural diversity is of a Mormon man who was warned not to marry a Catholic. "We were told by many that it wouldn't work, but after 56 years, something must have been wrong. We are still together and will be that way until the Lord sees fit to separate us" (223). Even more dramatically, when Verda Petersen was hospitalized in 1976 after a fall, she received visits from the Catholic and Greek Orthodox priests, Methodist minister, and Mormon former stake president; and all four of them delivered to her home a new TV, the gift of a former student, upon her release (255).


With the epigraph from President Harold B. Lee of "I say to you the day of miracles has not passed," son-in-law Brent Goates introduces this compilation, drawn from a file Lee kept labeled "Modern Miracles." It contained "over sixty separate miracle stories, most of them describing the healing of sick bodies, all of them telling of lives changed for the better. . . . When people wrote to him of miraculous results from his labors amongst the Saints, he often wrote back to them to document the event and circumstances. These letters he would place in his 'Miracle File'" (1). In preparing this compilation, Goates "made attempts to locate the individuals in the stories, a task not easy after thirty, forty, and even fifty years have passed. . . . The updated commentaries from these people have sometimes uncovered even greater miracles and explanations, but they have never failed to add interest to this study of the striving of the soul for spiritual victory" (2).

In addition to the preface, there is also an unsigned introduction about miracles, presumably by Goates, a tribute to Lee from Francis M. Gibbons, and an epilogue, "Hosanna Moments," excerpted from a 1993 BYU devotional address by Richard H. Cracroft (his middle initial is incorrectly given as "M" in both the contents and on his title page), and a procedural description of "Succession in the Presidency" (187-90), which is not listed in the contents.

The core of the book consists of forty-two narratives, thirty-four of them involving President Lee in some way, usually in pronouncing a blessing or articulating a principle of the gospel with unusual power and clarity. The remaining eight are experiences presumably also found in his file or invited by Goates but not directly connected with Lee.

The first account is by Ernest N. Eklof, Swedish translator for the Church, who, at October 1973 general conference, had a "great desire" to
translate so that some Swedish priesthood leaders who were attending their first and possibly last general conference, could “receive everything the prophet had to deliver.” Lee was speaking without a prepared text that could be pretranslated. Eklof then describes an unusual manifestation of the gift of tongues:

I was startled by the fact that I knew beforehand what he was going to say. The words came in groups before he spoke them. Nevertheless, I dared not translate them and deliver the translation, fearing that some might be my own thoughts. In the past I have usually closed my eyes to better listen, then translated the words in my mind and delivered the interpretation. This time, however, the Spirit told me to not close my eyes, but to keep them on the speaker. . . .

At President Lee’s left temple appeared his thoughts—which were the exact words that had only a moment earlier entered my mind—written in golden letters in an absolutely perfect handwriting. The letters were about two inches in height and the thickness of writing was about 1/16 of an inch. The words came towards me and passed before my eyes at a distance of somewhat more than twelve inches. They did not appear to be written on anything, but hung as if written in the air. Both the words entering my mind and the writing were in English, exactly as he spoke them moments later. This gave me time to translate his message into Swedish and deliver the interpretation therefor at the very same moment he spoke the words in English from the pulpit. (19-20)


The 109 men who have served as apostles and prophets since the organization of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints are the subjects of brief biographical essays. The author describes it as “a convenient reference book” with the “major objective” of capturing “the inspirational highlights in the lives of these great men” (xi). Apparently an updating and revision of Flake’s *Mighty Men of Zion: General Authorities of the Last Dispensation* (Salt Lake City: Karl D. Butler, 1974), it is taken from secondary sources.

It is organized in two parts. The first part (pp. 3-316) is on “The First Presidency,” with subdivisions: “The First Presidency: An Introduction,” a chart of Church presidents and their counselors, the presidents, assistant presidents, first counselors, second counselors, additional counselors, and assistant counselors. The second part, “The Quorum of the Twelve Apostles,” again includes an introduction and chart, presidents of the quorum, and members of the quorum.

The charts will be particularly useful for researchers who have struggled to go man by man through the *Church Almanac*. Brigham Young had seventeen counselors, including “additional” and “assistant” counselors. His son, John W. Young, appears three times: as an additional, assistant, and first counselor (7). The chart of apostles is organized chronologically, according to Church president and the apostles he called. Two apostles were called during what Flake terms “apostolic presidencies”: Ezra T. Benson during
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the first (1844-47), and Moses Thatcher during the second (1877-80). This chart (321-22) further identifies the four reasons for leaving the quorum: (1) becoming Church president, (2) becoming a counselor in the First Presidency, (3) being excommunicated, disfellowshipped, released, or resigning; and (4) dying. An accompanying fold-out chart graphs by individual name and by year from 1835 to 2000 the length of service of each man in the quorum. The line continues in a darker color for those who also served as president or acting president.

Because the book is organized by administrative period and thereunder chronologically, readers looking for a particular individual should consult the alphabetical “Contents by Name” (vii-x), for the index is exclusively a topical one, for example: “Persecutions,” “Pioneers,” Plural Marriage,” “Prayer,” and “Presidents of United States.”

Each essay is accompanied by a portrait, with only a few exceptions where none is known (e.g., Jesse Gause). Additional seldom used and often charming photographs illustrate the essays on the Church presidents. Heber J. Grant shows Helen Keller a Braille Book of Mormon (71), a laughing David O. McKay in a three-piece suit pitches horseshoes (89), and a shyly smiling Spencer W. Kimball, as a missionary about 1914, washes his feet in a pan of water while sitting on a porch step (114). Although a paragraph in the introduction lists offices and individuals who supplied photographs, specific sources are given for only five.

Each essay includes a headnote containing birth and death information and terms of apostolic service. Although brief information is given about the family of origin, information on the individual’s own wife/wives and children is incomplete so that the brief essay can focus on spiritual experiences. For example, in depicting George F. Richards’s reputation for honesty, Flake quotes a story told by son LeGrand of being sent on an errand to a mill:

A new miller from out of town refused to extend credit to him. Legrand asked him to check with the owner of the mill. The new miller did so and a few days later reported to the boy that his boss had said, “The next time one of those sons of George F. Richards comes to this mill, if he wants the mill, get out and give it to him.” George F. Richards was so honest that he was known to go back around the block to stop for a red light he had accidentally run. (341)

Among minor errors, the first source note for John W. Taylor (409) was duplicated for Marriner W. Merrill (413), and Mark E. Petersen’s surname is misspelled as “Peterson” twice in the notes for that essay (479).


Guenavere Allen Sandberg, an English teacher and writer in southern Utah, constructed this fictionalized biography of her great-great-grandmother, Margaret Ruth McConnell Allen Hornback, from the scanty documents
available, the broader context of the times, the “whispers” of the family about her, and Sandberg’s own intuitions about what Margaret would have “whispered for herself” (10). Margaret left no autobiography or personal papers, although there are a few letters from her father and brothers. Her first husband, Rufus Chester Allen, mentions none of his wives in his biographical sketch.

Margaret was born in 1841 in Indiana and left motherless at age five. Her father, Jehiel McConnell (“convert, emigrant, explorer”), remarried four months later, was baptized Mormon in Iowa in April 1848, and left in May 1848 for Utah leaving behind his second wife, who was bitterly opposed to Mormonism, with their two children, one of them a month-old baby. Jehiel, eight-year-old Margaret, and her three brothers reached to Utah in 1849. They lived in Lehi for a time, then settled in Cedar City. Jehiel married seven times after reaching Utah and adopted seven Native American children, despite the family’s acute poverty. Margaret married thirty-year-old Rufus Chester Allen as the second of his three wives at age fifteen and divorced him in May 1863. (Her signature on the divorce record is “the only sample of her handwriting”). When she left southern Utah at age twenty-four, her father gave her only son (Sandberg’s grandfather, Chester William Allen) to Allen who hid the child from her. Apparently she saw her son only twice more, once when she returned to southern Utah in 1874 and again in 1877 when he came briefly to Salt Lake City at age eighteen. Margaret’s activities in or near Salt Lake City are unknown, although Sandberg, hypothesizing on rumors and the basis of a photograph of Margaret in her forties that she was “knockout good looking” (128), hints that she may have been some wealthy man’s mistress.

In 1878 at thirty-seven, Margaret went to Idaho with Anthony Hornback, an illiterate Gentile about fourteen years her senior. He had gone to California in the 1849 gold rush and then became an “Idaho frontiersman, mule packer, and Indian fighter” (10). They married two years later, homesteaded on the Lemhi River, and later managed a saloon in Salmon. Their only child, Jessie Ruth, was born in Idaho when Margaret was forty-one. Margaret died at age fifty-five.

Sandberg explains her approach: “Is my story true? It is true I have researched faithfully and used every scrap of information I have found. For every fact . . . I also found more questions. It is true that some of Margaret’s stories are real but details have been invented or guessed at. Where truth is not verifiable I have substituted informed speculation. . . . Where informed speculation will not provide an answer, I have chosen to bridge the gap with whispers” (10).

Sandberg writes chapters of history based on known documents and background research (printed in roman type) alternating with chapters in Margaret’s “whispers” (printed in italics). For example, in Margaret’s voice Sandberg personalizes the experience of Mary Jane McCune Farrer, a young pregnant wife in Cedar City, who was attacked by a rabid coyote (a historical event) by making her a friend of Margaret’s (a “whisper”):

Almost a month went by, then one day she began to develop unmistakable signs of
hydrophobia. She steadily became so vicious and violent that several strong men could not hold her, and it became necessary to bind her and peg her to the floor to keep her from attacking others. She would beg piteously for people to come near her so she could kiss them, but when anyone approached, she would snap at them like a mad dog. As the disease progressed to its horrible end, the stricken girl's suffering became so unbearable that her family finally smothered her to death between two feather beds to shorten her agony . . . .

The frothing coyote came after me at night for a long time. I cried and couldn't sleep, or I wakened screaming. I guess if I had a childhood, watching Mary Jane die marked the end of it. (46)

In her own voice, Sandberg describes Idaho's history a decade after Margaret and Anthony settled there:

Idaho achieved statehood July 3, 1890, and George Laird Shoup, Anthony Hornback's former employer and fellow Mason, became the first governor. In Salmon that year, the wheat crop was big; it was a fine year for fish; there was talk of a Corbett-Sullivan fight; people went bathing in Andrews Hot Spring and Salmon Hot Spring; . . . Main Street blossomed: the George Shoup Mercantile Building (solid brick and stately) had opened in 1886. The elegant Shenon House Hotel opened in 1895, and the old days slipped away.

George Shoup went on to the United States Senate, and Anthony Hornback went on to heavier drinking. (173)
George Q. Cannon was the most able defender of Mormonism in the nineteenth century. By the time he was thirty, Cannon had been a printer’s devil, a religious refugee, an 1847 Utah pioneer, a member of the great trek of 1849 across the southern Great Basin to California, a gold miner, a Latter-day Saint missionary to the Hawaiian Islands, and finally, editor and publisher of the San Francisco Western Standard. In an unequal contest, the eloquent young believer was the sole Mormon combatant in a fiery newspaper war in a day when media meant print.

This study is often an honest defense of this Defender of the Faith, a fearless but hopelessly outnumbered soldier in one of the frontier’s most bitter newspaper wars. As a contribution to the documentary record of frontier Mormonism, Defending Zion presents the most cogent arguments of the religion’s best nineteenth-century champion. To understand the passions that surrounded this new religious movement, such a perspective is more than desirable; it is essential.

A volume of over 450 pages, containing historical introduction, notes, appendix, bibliography, index and illustrations. Printed on acid-free paper and bound in linen cloth with two-color foil stamping. $42.50

Kingdom in the West: The Mormons and the American Frontier, a series of approximately 15 volumes, explores the story of the Mormon people and their part in the greater history of the Western Frontier. A 20% discount is given to series subscribers. For more information, call, write, email, or visit our web site at www.ahclark.com.
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One Side by Himself
The Life and Times of Lewis Barney,
1808–1894
RONALD O. BARNEY

“...Barney's journey into the wilderness with the Saints contains many archetypal elements of the whole Mormon saga—life on the ever-moving frontier, the trials of persecution, the exodus, struggles in the arid Great Basin, and grudging accommodation to the late-nineteenth-century evolution of the religion toward the mainstream... The contribution to Utah/Mormon history is remarkable and replete.”
—Gene A. Sessions, author of Mormon Thunder: A Documentary History of Jedediah Morgan Grant

Disaster at the Colorado
Beale's Wagon Road and the First Emigrant Party
CHARLES W. BALEY

Across north-central New Mexico and Arizona, along the line of Route 66, now Interstate 40, there first ran a little-known wagon trail called the Beale's Wagon Road, after Edward F. Beale, who surveyed it for the War Department in 1857. This survey became famous for employing camels. Not so well known is the fate of the first emigrants who the next year attempted to follow its tracks. Charles Baley tells this dramatic story and discusses its aftermath.
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MORMON Heritage

The Texas Republic and the Mormon Kingdom of God

MICHAEL SCOTT VAN WAGENEN

As the founder of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, Joseph Smith's interest in Texas coincided with the strategic goal of Sam Houston to create a buffer zone between the areas of Anglo settlement and Mexico. In 1844 Smith and his followers were received with political jealousy, religious suspicions, and distaste by their neighbors in Nauvoo, Illinois. Smith looked outside the United States for both refuge and empire. Times were difficult for Houston, as well, as he faced the wrath of Comanches on the Western frontier and Santa Anna on the southern border. Here, Van Wagenen tells of the secret negotiations between Smith and Houston for a strip of Texas land on which the Mormons hoped to colonize.

$18.95

Hispanics in the Mormon Zion, 1912-1999

JORGE IBER

By the end of the twentieth century, Hispanics were a notable part of Utah's population and could be found in all of its major cities working in tourist, industrial, and service occupations. In this work, drawing on archives of the University of Utah and organizations such as the American G.I. Forum, SOCIO, Centro de la Familia, the Salt Lake Catholic Diocese, and the Mormon Church, Iber examines Mexican Americans in one of the "whitest" states in the nation.

$34.95 cloth; $14.95 paper
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BLOOD OF THE PROPHETS
BRIGHAM YOUNG AND THE
MASSACRE AT MOUNTAIN MEADOWS

By Will Bagley

In Blood of the Prophets, Will Bagley tells the haunting story of the murder of 120 men, women, and children at a remote oasis on the wagon road to California in 1857. Incorporating a number of new sources, the book provides the most comprehensive look at the Mountain Meadows massacre since Juanita Brooks published her definitive study of the event in 1950.

$39.95 Hardcover
Read the stories of the first missionaries, humanitarian service workers, and senior couples who overcame daunting obstacles in their quest to create faithful Latter-day Saint communities in central and eastern Europe during the twentieth century.

As a special feature, this book also includes the extraordinary missionary account of Elder Mischa Markow, the first Mormon missionary to enter the region over a century ago.

Available from BYU Studies by calling (801) 422-6691 or visiting http://byustudies.byu.edu. Copies also available at your local Deseret Book store.
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JOSEPH SMITH'S NEW ENGLAND HERITAGE, REVISED EDITION
Richard Lloyd Anderson's classic study of Joseph Smith's family has been thoroughly revised and updated with new historical sources.
Softcover $19.95

JOHN A. WIDTSOE: A BIOGRAPHY
This carefully researched and well-written biography tells the fascinating story of an immigrant boy who grew up to become president of two universities and an apostle of the Lord. Available February 2003.
Hardcover $32.95